his £100, his money has described a specific movement quite different from that of commodity circulation, $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$. From the examination of the differences in form between this movement and $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$ the difference in content will also be found.

The two phases of the process taken separately are the same as in $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$. But there is a great difference in the process as a whole. In $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$ money constitutes the intermediary, the commodity the starting point and the finish; in this case the commodity is the intermediary, with money the starting point and the finish. In $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$ the money is spent once for all; in $M\rightarrow C\rightarrow M$ it is merely *advanced*, it is to be got back again. *It flows back to its starting point.* Here, therefore, is already a palpable difference between the circulation of money as money and money as capital.

In $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$ money can return to its starting point only through the *repetition of the whole process*, through the sale of *fresh* commodities. Hence the reflux is independent of the process itself. In $M\rightarrow C\rightarrow M$, on the other hand, it is conditioned from the outset by the structure of the process itself, which is incomplete if the reflux fails. (P. 110.)

The ultimate object of $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$ is *use-value*, that of $M\rightarrow C\rightarrow M$ *exchange-value itself*.

In $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$ both extremes possess the same definiteness of economic form. Both are *commodities*, and of *equal value*. But at the same time they are qualitatively different use-values, and the process has social interchange of matter as its content. In $M\rightarrow C\rightarrow M$ the operation, at first glance, seems tautological, meaningless. To exchange £100 for £100, and in a roundabout way to boot, seems absurd. One sum of money is distinguishable from another only by its *size*; $M\rightarrow C\rightarrow M$ acquires its meaning, therefore, only through the *quantitative difference* in the extremes. More money is withdrawn from circulation than has been thrown into it. The cotton bought for £100 is sold, say, for £100+£10; the process thus follows the formula $M\rightarrow C\rightarrow M'$, where $M' = M + \Delta M$. This $\Delta M$, this *increment is surplus-value*. The value originally advanced not only *remains intact* in circulation, but adds to itself a surplus-value, *expands itself*—and this movement *converts money into capital*.

In $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$ there may also be a difference in the value of the extremes, but it is purely accidental in this form of circulation, and $C\rightarrow M\rightarrow C$ does not become absurd when the extremes are equivalent—on the contrary, this is rather the necessary condition for the normal process.
The repetition of $C-M-C$ is regulated by an ultimate object outside itself: consumption, the satisfaction of definite needs. In $M-C-M$, on the other hand, the beginning and the end are the same, money, and that already makes the movement endless. Granted, $M+\Delta M$ differs quantitatively from $M$, but it too is merely a limited sum of money; if it were spent, it would no longer be capital; if it were withdrawn from circulation, it would remain stationary as a hoard. Once the need for expansion of value is given, it exists for $M'$ as well as for $M$, and the movement of capital is boundless, because its goal is as much unattained at the end of the process as at the beginning. (Pp. 111-13.) As the representative of this process, the owner of money becomes a capitalist.

If in commodity circulation the exchange-value attains at most a form independent of the use-value of a commodity, it suddenly manifests itself here as a substance in process, endowed with motion of its own, for which commodity and money are mere forms. More than that, as original value it is differentiated from itself as surplus-value. It becomes money in process, and as such, capital. (P. 116.)

$M-C-M'$ appears indeed to be a form peculiar to merchant capital alone. But industrial capital, too, is money which is converted into commodities, and by the latter’s sale reconverted into more money. Acts that take place between purchase and sale, outside the sphere of circulation, effect no change in this. Lastly, in interest-bearing capital, the process appears directly as $M-M'$, value that is, as it were, greater than itself. (P. 117.)

2. CONTRADICTIONS IN THE GENERAL FORMULA

The form of circulation by which money becomes capital contradicts all previous laws bearing on the nature of commodities, of value, of money and of circulation itself. Can the purely formal difference of inverted sequence cause this?

What is more, this inversion exists only for one of the three transacting persons. As a capitalist I buy commodities from $A$ and sell them in turn to $B$. $A$ and $B$ appear merely as simple buyer and seller of commodities. In each of the two cases I confront them merely as a simple owner of money or owner of commodities, confronting one as buyer or money, the other as seller or commodity, but neither of them as a capitalist or a representative of something that is more than money or commodity. For $A$ the transaction began with a sale; for $B$ it ended with a
purchase, hence, just as in commodity circulation. Moreover, if I base the right to surplus-value upon the inverted sequence, A could sell to B directly and the chance of surplus-value would be eliminated.

Assume that A and B buy commodities from each other directly. As far as use-value is concerned, both may profit; A may even produce more of his commodity than B could produce in the same time, and vice versa, whereby both would profit again. But otherwise with exchange-value. Here equal values are exchanged for each other, even if money, as the medium of circulation, intervenes. (P. 119.)

Abstractly considered, only a change in form of the commodity takes place in simple commodity circulation, if we except the substitution of one use-value for another. So far as it involves only a change in form of its exchange-value, it involves the exchange of equivalents, if the phenomenon proceeds in a pure form. Commodities can, indeed, be sold at prices differing from their values, but only when the law of commodity exchange is violated. In its pure form it is an exchange of equivalents, hence no medium for enriching oneself. (P. 120.)

Hence the error of all endeavours to derive surplus-value from commodity circulation. Condillac\(^a\) (p. 121), Newman\(^b\) (p. 122).

But let us assume that the exchange does not take place in a pure form, that non-equivalents are exchanged. Let us assume that each seller sells his commodity at 10 per cent above its value. Everything remains the same; what each one gains as a seller, he loses in turn as a buyer. Just as if the value of money had changed by 10 per cent. Likewise if the buyers bought everything at 10 per cent below value. (P. 123, Torrens.\(^c\))

The assumption that surplus-value arises from a rise in prices presupposes that a class exists which buys and does not sell, i.e., consumes and does not produce, which constantly receives money gratis. To sell commodities above their value to this class means merely to get back, by cheating, part of the money given away gratis (Asia Minor and Rome). Yet the seller always remains the cheated one and cannot grow richer, cannot form surplus-value thereby.

---

\(^a\) E. B. Condillac, "Le commerce et le gouvernement" (1776) in Mélanges d'économie politique, Paris, 1847, pp. 267 and 290-91.—Ed.

\(^b\) S. P. Newman, Elements of Political Economy, Andover and New York, 1835, p. 175.—Ed.

Let us take the case of cheating. A sells to B wine worth £40 in exchange for grain worth £50. A has gained £10. But A and B together have only 90. A has 50 and B only 40; value has been transferred but not created. The capitalist class, as a whole, in any country cannot cheat itself. (P. 126.)

Hence: if equivalents are exchanged, no surplus-value results; and if non-equivalents are exchanged, still no surplus-value results. Commodity circulation creates no new value.

That is why the oldest and most popular forms of capital, merchant capital and usurers' capital, are not considered here. If the expansion of merchant capital is not to be explained by mere cheating, many intermediate factors, lacking here as yet, are required. Even more so for usurers' and interest-bearing capital. It will later be seen that both are derived forms, and why they occur historically before modern capital.

Hence surplus-value cannot originate in circulation. But outside it? Outside it the commodity owner is the simple producer of his commodity, the value of which depends upon the quantity of his own labour contained in it, measured according to a definite social law; this value is expressed in money of account, e.g., in a price of £10. But this value is not at the same time a value of £11; his labour creates values, but not self-expanding values. It can add more value to existing value, but this occurs only through the addition of more labour. Thus the commodity producer cannot produce surplus-value outside the sphere of circulation without coming in contact with other commodity owners.

Hence capital must originate in commodity circulation and yet not in it. (P. 128.)

Thus: the transformation of money into capital has to be explained on the basis of the laws inherent in the exchange of commodities, the exchange of equivalents forming the starting point. Our owner of money as yet the mere chrysalis of a capitalist, has to buy his commodities at their value, to sell them at their value, and yet at the end of this process to extract more value than he put into it. His development into a butterfly must take place in the sphere of circulation and yet not in it. These are the conditions of the problem. *Hic Rhodus, hic salta!* (P. 129.)

---

*a* “Here is Rhodes, leap here!” (figuratively meaning: here is the main point, now show us what you can do!)—words addressed to a Swaggerer in a fable by Aesop, “The Boasting Traveller” who claimed that he had made tremendous leaps in Rhodes.—*Ed.*
The change in value of money that is to be converted into capital cannot take place in money itself, for in buying, it merely realises the price of the commodity, and on the other hand, as long as it remains money, it does not change the magnitude of its value; and in selling, too, it merely converts the commodity from its natural form into its money-form. The change must, therefore, take place in the commodity of $M-C-M$; but not in its exchange-value, since equivalents are exchanged; it can only arise from its use-value as such, that is, from its consumption. For that purpose a commodity is required whose use-value possesses the property of being the source of exchange-value—and this does exist—labour-power. (P. 130.)

But for the owner of money to find labour-power in the market as a commodity, it must be sold by its own possessor, that is, it must be free labour-power. Since buyer and seller as contracting parties are both juridically equal persons, labour-power must be sold only temporarily, since in a sale en bloc the seller no longer remains the seller, but becomes a commodity himself. But then the owner, instead of being able to sell commodities in which his labour is embodied, must rather be in a position where he has to sell his labour-power itself as a commodity. (P. 131.)

For the conversion of his money into capital, therefore, the owner of money must find in the commodity market the free labourer, free in the double sense that as a free man he can dispose of his labour-power as his commodity and that, on the other hand, he has no other commodities to sell, has got rid of, is free of all things necessary for the realisation of his labour-power. (P. 132.)

Parenthetically, the relation between money owner and labour-power owner is not a natural one, or a social one common to all ages, but a historical one, the product of many economic revolutions. So, too, do the economic categories considered up to now bear their historical stamp. To become a commodity, a product must no longer be produced as the immediate means of subsistence. The mass of products can assume commodity-form only within a specific mode of production, the capitalist mode, although commodity production and circulation can take place even where the mass of products never become commodities. Likewise, money can exist in all periods that have attained a certain level of commodity circulation; the specific money-forms, from mere equivalent to world money, presuppose various stages of develop-
ment; nevertheless, a very slightly developed circulation of commodities can give rise to all of them. *Capital*, on the other hand, arises only under the above condition, and this one condition comprises a world’s history. (P. 133.)

Labour-power has an exchange-value which is determined, like that of all other commodities, by the labour-time required for its production, and hence for its reproduction as well. The value of labour-power is the value of the means of subsistence necessary for the maintenance of its owner, that is, his maintenance in a state of normal capacity for work. This depends upon *climate, natural conditions*, etc., and also on the given *historical standard of life* in each country. These vary, but they are given for each particular country and for each particular epoch. Moreover, his maintenance includes the means of subsistence for his *substitutes*, i.e., his *children*, in order that the race of these peculiar commodity owners may perpetuate itself. Furthermore, for skilled labour, the cost of *education*. (P. 135.)

The minimum limit of the value of labour-power is the value of the *physically indispensable means of subsistence*. If the price of labour-power falls to this minimum, it falls below its *value*, since the latter presupposes *normal*, not stunted, quality of labour-power. (P. 136.)

The nature of labour implies that labour-power is consumed only *after* conclusion of the contract, and, as money is usually the *means of payment* for such commodities in all countries with the capitalist mode of production, the labour-power is paid for only after it is consumed. Everywhere, therefore, *the labourer gives credit to the capitalist*. (Pp. 137, 138.)

The process of consuming labour-power is at the same time the *process of producing commodities and surplus-value* and this consumption takes place outside the *sphere of circulation*. (P. 140.)
Chapter III
THE PRODUCTION OF ABSOLUTE SURPLUS-VALUE

1. THE LABOUR PROCESS AND THE PROCESS OF PRODUCING SURPLUS-VALUE

The purchaser of labour-power consumes it by setting its seller to work. This labour to produce commodities at first turns out use-values, and in this property it is independent of the specific relation between capitalist and labourer... Description of the labour process as such. (Pp. 141-49.)

The labour process, on a capitalist basis, has two peculiarities. 1. The labourer works under the capitalist's control. 2. The product is the capitalist's property, since the labour process is now only a process between two things purchased by the capitalist: labour-power and means of production. (P. 150.)

But the capitalist does not want the use-value produced for its own sake, but only as the depository of exchange-value and especially of surplus-value. Labour under this condition—where the commodity was a unity of use-value and exchange-value—becomes

---

a This chapter corresponds to Part III of the 1887 English edition (Chapter VII.—The Labour-Process and the Process of Producing Surplus-Value, Chapter VIII.—Constant Capital and Variable Capital, Chapter IX.—The Rate of Surplus-Value, Chapter X.—The Working-Day, Chapter XI.—Rate and Mass of Surplus-Value).—Ed.
the unity of the production process and of the process of creating value. (P. 151.)

Thus the quantity of labour objectified in the product is to be investigated.

Yarn, for example. Let 10 lbs. of cotton be necessary for making it, say 10 shillings, and instruments of labour, whose wear and tear are inevitable in the spinning—here denoted in brief as spindle share—say 2 shillings. Thus, there are 12 shillings' worth of means of production in the product, i.e., inasmuch as 1) the product has become an actual use-value, in this case yarn; and 2) only the socially necessary labour-time was represented in these instruments of labour. How much is added to it by the labour of spinning?

Thus, the labour process is here viewed from an altogether different angle. In the value of the product the labours of the cotton-planter, of the spindle-maker, etc., and of the spinner, are commensurable, qualitatively equal parts of general, human, necessary value-creating labour, and therefore distinguishable only quantitatively, and for that very reason quantitatively comparable by the length of time, presupposing that it is socially necessary labour-time, for only the latter is value-creating.

Assumed the value of a day's labour-power is 3 shillings, and that it represents 6 hours of labour, that $1\frac{2}{3}$ lbs. of yarn are made per hour, hence in 6 hours: 10 lbs. of yarn from 10 lbs. of cotton (as above); then 3 shillings of value have been added in 6 hours, and the value of the product is 15 shillings ($10+2+3$ shillings) or a shilling and a half per pound of yarn.

But in this case there is no surplus-value. This is of no use to the capitalist. (Vulgar-economic humbug,\textsuperscript{183} p. 157.)

We assumed that the value of a day's labour-power was 3 shillings, because $\frac{1}{2}$ working-day, or 6 hours, is incorporated in it. But the fact that only $\frac{1}{2}$ working-day is required to maintain the worker for 24 hours does not in any way prevent him from working a whole day. The value of labour-power and the value it creates are two different quantities. Its useful property was only a conditio sine qua non; but what was decisive was the specific use-value of labour-power in being the source of more exchange-value than it has itself. (P. 159.)

Hence, the labourer works 12 hours, spins 20 lbs. of cotton worth 20 shillings and 4 shillings' worth of spindles, and his labour costs 3 shillings: total—27 shillings. But in the product there are embodied: four days' labour in the shape of spindles and cotton, and one day's labour of the spinner, in all five days at 6 shillings
totalling 30 shillings' value of product. We have a surplus-value of 3 shillings: money has been converted into capital. (P. 160.) All the conditions of the problem are fulfilled. (Details p. 160.)

As a value-creating process, the labour process becomes a process of producing surplus-value the moment it is prolonged beyond the point where it delivers a simple equivalent for the paid-for value of labour-power.

The value-creating process differs from the simple labour process in that the latter is considered qualitatively, the former quantitatively, and only to the extent that it comprises socially necessary labour-time. (P. 161, details p. 162.)

As the unity of labour process and value-creating process, the production process is the production of commodities; as the unity of labour process and the process of producing surplus-value it is the process of capitalist production of commodities. (P. 163.)

Reduction of complex labour to simple labour. (Pp. 163-65.)

2. CONSTANT AND VARIABLE CAPITAL

The labour process adds new value to the object of labour, but at the same time it transfers the value of the object of labour to the product, thus preserving it by merely adding new value. This double result is attained in this manner: the specifically useful qualitative character of labour converts one use-value into another use-value and thus preserves value; the value-creating, abstractly general, quantitative character of labour, however, adds value. (P. 166.)

E.g., let the productivity of spinning labour multiply sixfold. As useful (qualitative) labour it preserves in the same period of time six times as many instruments of labour. But it adds only the same new value as before, i.e., in each pound of yarn there is only 1/6 of the new value previously added. As value-creating labour it accomplishes no more than before. (P. 167.) Conversely, if the productivity of spinning labour remains the same, but the value of the instruments of labour rises. (P. 168.)

The instruments of labour transfer to the product only that value which they lose themselves. (P. 169.) This is the case in differing degree. Coal, lubricants, etc., are consumed completely, raw materials take on a new form. Instruments, machinery, etc., transmit value only slowly and by parts, and the wear and tear are calculated by experience. (Pp. 169-70.) But the instrument remains
continually as a whole in the labour process. Therefore, the same instrument counts as a whole in the labour process but only partly in the process of producing surplus-value, so that the difference between the two processes is reflected here in material factors. (P. 171.) Conversely, the raw material, which forms waste, enters wholly into the process of producing surplus-value, and only [partly] into the labour process, since it appears in the product minus the waste. (P. 171.)

But in no case can an instrument of labour transfer more exchange-value than it possessed itself—in the labour process it acts only as a use-value and hence can give only the exchange-value that it possessed previously. (P. 172.)

This preserving of value is very advantageous to the capitalist but costs him nothing. (PP. 173, 174.) Yet the preserved value only reappears, it was already present, and only the labour process adds new value. That is, in capitalist production, surplus-value, the excess of the product's value over the value of the consumed elements of the product (means of production and labour-power). (PP. 175, 176.)

Herewith have been described the forms of existence which the original capital value takes on in dropping its money-form, in being converted into factors of the labour process: (1) in the purchase of instruments of labour; (2) in the purchase of labour-power.

The capital invested in instruments of labour does not therefore alter the magnitude of its value in the production process. We call it constant capital.

The portion invested in labour-power does change its value; it produces: 1) its own value, and 2) surplus-value—it is variable capital. (P. 176.)

(Capital is constant only in relation to the production process specifically given, in which it does not change; it can consist sometimes of more, sometimes of fewer instruments of labour, and the purchased instruments of labour may rise or fall in value, but that does not affect their relationship to the production process. P. 177. Likewise, the percentage in which a given capital is subdivided into constant and variable capital may change, but in any given case the c remains constant and the v variable. P. 178.)
3. THE RATE OF SURPLUS-VALUE

\[ C = £500 = 410 + 90. \]

At the end of the labour process in which \( v \) is turned into labour-power we get \( 410 + 90 + 90 = 590 \). Let us assume \( c \) consists of 312 raw material, 44 auxiliary material, and 54 wear and tear of machinery, in all 410. Let the value of all the machinery be 1,054. If this were entered as a whole, we would get 1,410 for \( c \) on both sides of our calculation; the surplus-value would remain 90 as before. (P. 179.)

Since the value of \( c \) merely re-appears in the product, the value of the product we get differs from the \( c \) created in the process; the latter, therefore, equals not \( c + v + s \), but \( v + s \). Hence the magnitude of \( c \) is immaterial to the process of producing surplus-value, i.e., \( c = 0 \). (P. 180.) This also takes place in practice in commercial accounting, e.g., in calculating a country's profit from its industry, imported raw material is deducted. (P. 181.) Cf. Vol. III \(^{184} \) for the ratio of surplus-value to total capital.

Hence: the rate of surplus-value is \( s : v \), in the above case 90:90 = 100%.

The labour-time during which the labourer reproduces the value of his labour-power—under capitalist or other conditions—is the necessary labour; what goes beyond that, producing surplus-value for the capitalist, surplus-labour. (Pp. 183, 184.) Surplus-value is congealed surplus-labour, and only the form of extorting it differentiates the various social formations.

Examples of the incorrectness of including \( c \), pp. 185-96. (Senior.)

The sum of the necessary labour and the surplus-labour equals the working day.

4. THE WORKING DAY

The necessary labour-time is given. The surplus-labour is variable, but within certain limits. It can never be reduced to nil, since then capitalist production ceases. It can never go as high as 24 hours for physical reasons, and, moreover, the maximum limit is always affected by moral grounds as well. But these limits are very elastic. The economic demand is that the working-day should be no

\(^{184} \text{N. W. Senior, Letters on the Factory Act, London, 1837, pp. 12 and 13.} —\text{Ed.}\)
longer than for normal wear and tear of the worker. But what is normal? An antinomy results and only force can decide. Hence the struggle between the working class and the capitalist class for the normal working day. (Pp. 198-202.)

Surplus-labour in earlier social epochs. As long as the exchange-value is not more important than the use-value, surplus-labour is milder, e.g., among the ancients; only where direct exchange-value—gold and silver—was produced, surplus-labour was terrible. (P. 203.) Likewise in the slave states of America until the mass production of cotton for export. Likewise corvée labour, e.g., in Romania.

Corvée labour is the best means of comparison with capitalist exploitation, because the former fixes and shows the surplus-labour as a specific labour-time to be performed—Réglement organique185 of Wallachia. (Pp. 204-06.)

The English Factory Acts are negative expression of the greed for surplus-labour, just as the foregoing was its positive expression.

The Factory Acts. That of 1850—(p. 207). 10 1/2 hours and 7 1/2 on Saturdays=60 hours per week. Millowners' profit through evasion. (Pp. 208-11.)

Exploitation in unrestricted or only later restricted branches: lace industry (p. 212), potteries (p. 213), lucifer matches (p. 215), wall-paper (pp. 215-17), baking (pp. 217-22), railway employees (p. 223), seamstresses (pp. 223-25), blacksmiths (p. 226), day and night workers in shifts: (a) metallurgy and the metal industry (pp. 227-36).

These facts prove that capital regards the labourer as nothing else than labour-power, all of whose time is labour-time as far as this is at all possible at a given moment, and that the length of life of labour-power is immaterial to the capitalist. (Pp. 236-38.) But is this not against the interests of the capitalist? What about the replacement of what is rapidly worn out? The organised slave trade in the interior of the United States has raised the rapid wearing out of slaves to an economic principle, exactly like the supply of labourers from the rural districts in Europe, etc. (P. 239.) Poorhouse supply. (P. 240.) The capitalist sees only the continuously available surplus-population and wears it out. Whether the race perishes—après moi le déluge.a Capital is reckless of the health and length of life of the labourer, unless it is forced by society to

---

a After me the deluge—the words attributed to Louis XV of France and Mme. de Pompadour.—Ed.
show consideration ... and free competition makes the inherent laws of capitalist production hold good as external coercive laws for every individual capitalist. (P. 243.)

Establishment of a normal working day—the result of centuries of struggle between capitalist and worker.

At the beginning laws were made to raise working-time; now to lower it. (P. 244.) The first Statute of Labourers, 23rd Edward III, 1349, was passed under the pretext that the plague had so decimated the population that everyone had to do more work. Hence maximum wages and limit of the working day were fixed by law. In 1496, under Henry VII, the working day of agricultural labourers and all artisans continued from 5 a.m. to between 7 and 8 p.m. in summer—March to September, with 1 hour, 1 1/2 hours and 1/2 hour, in all 3 hours' break. In winter it was from 5 a.m. to dark. This statute was never strictly enforced. In the 18th century the whole week's labour was not yet available to capital (with the exception of agricultural labour). Cf. controversies of that time. (Pp. 248-51.) Only with modern large-scale industry was this, and more, achieved; it broke down all bounds and exploited the workers most shamelessly. The proletariat resisted as soon as it recovered consciousness. The five acts of 1802-33 were only nominal, since there were no inspectors. Only the Act of 1833 created a normal working day in the four textile industries: from 5.30 a.m. to 8.30 p.m., during which time young persons from 13 to 18 years of age could be employed only 12 hours with 1 1/2 hours' pause, children from 9 to 13 years of age only 8 hours, while night work of children and young persons was prohibited. (Pp. 253-55.)

The relay system and its abuse for purposes of evasion. (P. 256.) Finally, the Act of 1844 which put women of all ages on the same basis as young persons. Children limited to 6 1/2 hours; the relay system curbed. On the other hand, children permitted from 8 years on. At last in 1847 the ten-hour bill forced through for women and young persons. (P. 259.) The capitalists' efforts against it. (Pp. 260-68.) A flaw in the Act of 1847 led to the compromise Act of 1850 (p. 269), which fixed the working day for young persons and women—5 days of 10 1/2, 1 day of 7 1/2=60 hours per week, and that between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. Otherwise the Act of 1847 in force for children. The exception for the silk industry. (P. 270.) In 1853 the working-time for children also limited to between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. (P. 272.)

Printworks Act in 1845 limits almost nothing—children and women can work 16 hours!
Bleaching and dyeing works 1860. Lace factories 1861; potteries and many other branches 1863 (under the Factory Act, special acts passed the same year for bleaching in the open air and baking). (P. 274.)

Large-scale industry thus at first creates the need for limiting working-time, but it is later found that the same overwork has gradually taken possession of all other branches as well. (P. 277.)

History further shows that the individual “free” labourer is defenceless against the capitalist and succumbs, especially with the introduction of women’s and children’s labour, so that it is here that the class struggle develops between the workers and the capitalists. (P. 277.)

In France, the twelve-hour day law for all ages and branches of work was passed only in 1848. (Cf., however, p. 253, footnote on the French child labour law of 1841, which was really enforced only in 1853, and then only in the Département du Nord.) Complete “freedom of labour” in Belgium. The eight-hour movement in America. (P. 279.)

Thus, the labourer comes out of the production process quite different than he entered. The labour contract was not the act of a free agent; the time for which he is free to sell his labour[-power] is the time for which he is forced to sell it, and only the mass opposition of the workers wins for them the passing of a law that shall prevent the workers from selling, by voluntary contract with capital, themselves and their generation into slavery and death. In place of the pompous catalogue of the inalienable rights of man comes the modest Magna Charta of the Factory Act. (Pp. 280, 281.)

5. RATE AND MASS OF SURPLUS-VALUE

With the rate, the mass is also given. If the daily value of one labour-power is 3 shillings, and the rate of surplus-value is 100 per cent, its daily mass=3 shillings for one labourer.

I. Since the variable capital is the money expression of the value of all the labour-powers simultaneously employed by one capitalist, the mass of the surplus-value produced by them is equal to the variable capital multiplied by the rate of surplus-value. Both factors can vary, different combinations thus arising. The mass of surplus-value can grow, even with decreasing variable capital, if the rate rises, that is, if the working day is lengthened. (P. 282.)
II. This increase in the rate of surplus-value has its absolute limit in that the working day can never be prolonged to the full 24 hours; hence the total value of one worker's daily production can never equal the value of 24 working hours. Thus, in order to obtain the same mass of surplus-value, variable capital can be replaced by increased exploitation of labour only within these limits. This is important for the explanation of various phenomena arising from the contradictory tendency of capital: (1) to reduce the variable capital and the number of workers employed; and (2) to produce the greatest possible mass of surplus-value nonetheless. (Pp. 283, 284.)

III. The masses of value and surplus-value produced by different capitals, with the given value and equally high degree of exploitation of labour-power, are related directly as the magnitudes of the variable components of these capitals. (P. 285.) This seems to contradict all facts.

For a given society and a given working day, surplus-value can be increased only by increasing the number of workers, i.e., the population; with a given number of workers, only by lengthening the working day. This is important, however, only for absolute surplus-value.

It now turns out that not every sum of money can be transformed into capital—that a minimum exists: the cost price of a single labour-power and of the necessary instruments of labour. In order to be able to live himself like a worker, the capitalist would have to have two workers, with a rate of surplus-value of 50 per cent, and yet save nothing. Even with eight he is still a small master. Hence, in the Middle Ages people were forcibly hampered in transformation from craftsmen into capitalists by limitation of the number of journeymen to be employed by one master. The minimum of wealth required to form a real capitalist varies in different periods and branches of business. (P. 288.)

Capital has evolved into command over labour, and sees to it that work is done regularly and intensively. Moreover, it compels the workers to do more work than is necessary for their sustenance; and in pumping out surplus-value it surpasses all earlier production systems based upon direct compulsory labour.

Capital took over labour with the given technical conditions, and at first does not change them. Hence, with the production process considered as a labour process, the worker stands in relation to the means of production not as to capital, but as to the means of his own appropriate activity. But, considered as a process of creating surplus-value, otherwise. The means of production become means
of absorbing the labour of others. It is no longer the worker who employs the means of production, but the means of production that employ the worker. (P. 289.) Instead of being consumed by him ... they consume him as the leaven necessary to their own life-process, and the life-process of capital consists only in its movement as value constantly multiplying itself.... The simple transformation of money into means of production transforms the latter into a right by law and a right by coercion to the labour and surplus-labour of others.
Chapter IV

PRODUCTION OF RELATIVE SURPLUS-VALUE

1. THE CONCEPT OF RELATIVE SURPLUS-VALUE

For a given working day, surplus-labour can be increased only by reducing the necessary labour; this can in turn be obtained—apart from lowering wages below value—only by reducing the value of labour[-power], that is, by reducing the price of the necessary means of subsistence. (Pp. 291-93.) This, in turn, is to be attained only by increasing the productive power of labour, by revolutionising the mode of production itself.

The surplus-value produced by lengthening the working day is absolute, that produced by shortening the necessary labour-time is relative surplus-value. (P. 295.)

In order to lower the value of labour[-power], the increase in productive power must seize upon those branches of industry whose products determine the value of labour-power—ordinary means of subsistence, substitutes for the same, and their raw materials, etc. Proof of how competition makes the increased productive power manifest in a lower commodity price. (Pp. 296-99.)

The value of commodities is in inverse ratio to the productive power of labour, as is also the value of labour-power, because it is determined by the value of commodities. Relative surplus-value, on the contrary, is directly proportional to the productive power of labour. (P. 299.)

The capitalist is not interested in the absolute value of commodities, but only in the surplus-value incorporated in them.

---

a This chapter corresponds to Part IV of the 1887 English edition (Chapter XII.—The Concept of Relative Surplus-Value, Chapter XIII.—Co-operation, Chapter XIV.—Division of Labour and Manufacture, Chapter XV.—Machinery and Modern Industry).—Ed.
Realisation of surplus-value implies refunding of the value advanced. Since, according to p. 299, the same process of increasing productive power lowers the value of commodities and increases the surplus-value contained in them, it is clear why the capitalist, whose sole concern is the production of exchange-value, continually strives to depress the exchange-value of commodities. (Cf. Quesnay, a p. 300.)

Hence in capitalist production, economising labour, through developing productive power by no means aims at shortening the working day—the latter may even be lengthened. We may read, therefore, in economists of the stamp of McCulloch, Ure, Senior and tutti quanti, on one page that the labourer owes a debt of gratitude to capital for developing the productive forces, and on the next page that he must prove his gratitude by working in future for 15 hours instead of 10. The object of this development of productive forces is only to shorten the necessary labour and to lengthen the labour for the capitalist. (P. 301.)

2. CO-OPERATION

According to p. 288, capitalist production requires an individual capital big enough to employ a fairly large number of workers at a time; only when he himself is wholly released from labour does the employer of labour become a full-grown capitalist. The activity of a large number of workers, at the same time, in the same field of work, for the production of the same kind of commodity, under the command of the same capitalist, constitutes, historically and logically, the starting point of capitalist production. (P. 302.)

At first, therefore, there is only a quantitative difference compared to the past, when fewer labourers were employed by one employer. But a modification takes place at once. The large number of labourers already guarantees that the employer gets real average labour, which is not the case with the small master, who must pay the average value of labour[-power] none the less; in the case of small shops, the inequalities are compensated for society at large, but not for the individual master. Thus the law of the production of surplus-value is fully realised for the individual producer only when he produces as a capitalist, and sets many labourers to work at the same time—hence from the outset average social labour. (Pp. 303-04.)

---

a F. Quesnay, Dialogues sur le commerce et sur les travaux des artisans.—Ed.
Moreover: economy in means of production is achieved through large-scale operation alone, less transfer of value to the product by constant capital components arises solely from their joint consumption in the labour process of many workmen. That is how the *instruments* of labour acquire a social character before the labour *process* itself acquires it (up to this time merely similar processes side by side). (P. 305.)

The economy in the means of production is to be considered here only in so far as it cheapens commodities and thus *lowers the value* of labour [-power]. The extent to which it alters the ratio of surplus-value to the *total capital* advanced \((c+v)\) will not be considered until Book III.\(^{186}\) This splitting up is quite in keeping with the spirit of capitalist production; since it makes the working conditions confront the worker independently, economy in the means of production appears to be a distinct operation, which does not concern him and is therefore detached from the methods by which the productivity of the labour-power consumed by the capital is increased.

The form of labour of many persons, methodically working together and alongside one another in the same production process or in related production processes, is called co-operation. (P. 306.) (*Concours de forces.* Destutt de Tracy.\(^{a}\))

The sum-total of the mechanical forces of individual workers differs substantially from the *potential mechanical force* developed when many hands *act together* at one time in the same undivided operation (lifting of weight, etc.). Co-operation, from the very start, creates a productive power that is, in and of itself, a *mass power*.

Furthermore, in most productive work, *mere social contact* creates a *spirit of emulation* which raises the individual efficiency of each, so that 12 workers turn out more work in a joint working day of 144 hours than 12 workers in 12 distinct working days, or one worker in 12 successive days. (P. 307.)

Although many may be doing the same or similar things, the individual labour of each may still represent a different phase of the labour process (chain of persons passing something along), whereby co-operation again saves labour. Likewise, when a building is started from several sides at once. The combined worker, or collective worker, has hands and eyes before and behind and is, to a certain degree, omnipresent. (P. 308.)

\(^{a}\) A. L. C. Destutt de Tracy, *Traité de la volonté et de ses effets*, Paris, 1826, p. 80.— *Ed.*
In complicated labour processes co-operation permits the special processes to be distributed and to be done simultaneously, thus shortening the labour-time for manufacturing the whole product. (P. 308.)

In many spheres of production there are critical periods when many workers are needed (harvesting, herring catches, etc.). Here only co-operation can be of aid. (P. 309.)

On the one hand, co-operation extends the field of production and thus becomes a necessity for work requiring great spatial continuity of the working arena (drainage, roadbuilding, dam construction, etc.); on the other hand, it contracts the arena by concentrating the workers in one work-place, thus cutting down costs. (P. 310.)

In all these forms, co-operation is the specific productive power of the combined working-day, social productive power of labour. The latter arises from co-operation itself. In systematic joint work with others, the worker sheds his individual limitations and develops the capacities of his species.

Now, wage-labourers cannot co-operate unless the same capitalist employs them simultaneously, pays them and provides them with instruments of labour. Hence the scale of co-operation depends upon how much capital a capitalist has. The requirement that a certain amount of capital be present to make its owner a capitalist now becomes the material condition for the conversion of the numerous fragmented and independent individual operations into one combined social labour process.

In a like manner, capital's command over labour was up to now only the formal result of the relation between capitalist and labourer; now it is the necessary prerequisite for the labour process itself; the capitalist represents precisely combination in the labour process. In co-operation, control of the labour process becomes the function of capital, and as such it acquires specific characteristics. (P. 312.)

In accordance with the aim of capitalist production (the greatest possible self-expansion of capital), this control is at the same time the function of the greatest possible exploitation of a social labour process, and hence involves the inevitable antagonism between exploiter and exploited. Moreover, control of proper utilisation of the instruments of labour. Finally, the connection between the various workers' functions lies outside them, in capital, so that their own unity confronts them as the capitalist's authority, as an outside will. Capitalist control is thus twofold (1. a social labour process for producing a product; 2. a process of expansion of capital), and in its
form despotism. This despotism now evolves its own peculiar forms: the capitalist, just relieved from actual labour himself, now hands over immediate supervision to an organised band of officers and non-coms, who themselves are wage-labourers of capital. In slavery, the economists count these supervision expenses as faux frais,a but in capitalist production they bluntly identify control, so far as it is conditioned by exploitation, with the same function, so far as it arises from the nature of the social labour process. (Pp. 313, 314.)

The supreme command of industry becomes the attribute of capital, just as in feudal times the supreme command in war and in the law-courts was the attribute of landed property. (P. 314.)

The capitalist buys 100 individual labour-powers, and gets in return a combined labour-power of 100. He does not pay for the combined labour-power of the 100. When the labourers enter the combined labour process, they already cease to belong to themselves; they are incorporated in capital. Thus the social productive power of labour appears as the productive power immanent in capital. (P. 315.)

Examples of co-operation among the ancient Egyptians. (P. 316.)

The natural co-operation at the beginnings of civilisation, among hunting peoples, nomads, or in Indian communities, is based: (1) on common ownership of the means of production; (2) on the natural attachment of the individual to the tribe and the primeval community.—The sporadic co-operation in antiquity, the Middle Ages, and in modern colonies is based upon direct rule and violence, mostly slavery.—Capitalist co-operation, on the contrary, presupposes the free wage-labourer. Historically, it appears in direct opposition to peasant economy and the independent handicrafts (whether in guilds or not), and in this connection, as a historical form peculiar to, and distinguishing, the capitalist production process. It is the first change experienced by the labour process when subjected to capital. Thus, here at once: (1) the capitalist mode of production presents itself as a historical necessity for the transformation of the labour process into a social process; (2) this social form of the labour process presents itself as a method of capital to exploit labour more profitably by increasing its productivity. (P. 317.)

Co-operation, as considered so far, in its elementary form, coincides with production on a large scale, but it does not constitute a fixed form characteristic of a particular epoch of capitalist production, and it still exists today, when capital operates

---
a Overhead costs.—Ed.
on a large scale without division of labour or machinery playing an important part. Thus, although co-operation is the basic form of the whole capitalist production, its elementary form reappears, as a particular form, alongside its more developed forms. (P. 318.)

3. DIVISION OF LABOUR AND MANUFACTURE

Manufacture, the classic form of co-operation based upon division of labour, prevails from about 1550 to 1770.

It arises:
(1) Either through the throwing together of different crafts, each of which performs a detail operation (e.g., vehicle building), whereby the individual craftsman in question very soon loses his ability to pursue his whole handicraft, on the other hand doing his detail work so much better; and thus the process is converted into a division of the whole operation into its component parts. (Pp. 318, 319.)
(2) Or many craftsmen doing the same or similar work are united in the same factory, and the individual operations, instead of being performed successively by one worker, are gradually separated and done simultaneously by several workers (needles, etc.). Instead of being the work of one craftsman, the product is now the work of a union of craftsmen, each of whom performs only a detail operation. (Pp. 319, 320.)

In both cases its result is a production mechanism whose organs are human beings. The work retains a handicraft nature; each detail process through which the product goes must be performable by hand; hence any really scientific analysis of the production process is excluded. Each individual worker is completely chained to a detail function because of its handicraft nature. (P. 321.)

In this way labour is saved, as compared to the craftsman, and this is increased still more by transmission to succeeding generations. Thus the division of labour in manufacture corresponds to the tendency of former societies to make a trade hereditary. Castes, guilds. (P. 322.)

Subdivision of tools through adaptation to the various partial operations—500 kinds of hammers in Birmingham. (Pp. 323-24.)

Manufacture, considered from the standpoint of its total mechanism, has two aspects: either merely mechanical assembly of independent detail products (watch), or a series of related processes in one workshop (needle).

In manufacture, each group of workers supplies another with its
raw material. Hence the basic condition is that each group produces a given quantum in a given time; thus a continuity, regularity, uniformity and intensity of labour of quite a different kind are created than in co-operation proper. Thus here we have the technological law of the production process: that the labour be socially necessary labour. (P. 329.)

The inequality of the time required for the individual operations stipulates that the different groups of workers be of different size and number (in type founding: four founders and two breakers to one rubber). Thus manufacture sets up a mathematically fixed ratio for the quantitative extent of the separate organs of the collective worker, and production can be expanded only by employing an additional multiple of the whole group. Moreover, only after a definite level of production has been reached does it pay to make certain functions independent: supervision, transporting the products from place to place, etc. (Pp. 329, 330.)

Combination of various manufactures into a united manufacture also occurs, but as yet it always lacks real technological unity, which arises only with machinery. (P. 331.)

Machines appeared in manufacture at an early date—sporadically—grain and stamping mills, etc., but only as something subordinate. The chief machinery of manufacture is the combined collective worker, who possesses a much higher degree of perfection than the old individual craft worker, and in whom all the imperfections, such as are often necessarily developed in the detail worker, appear as perfection. (P. 333.) Manufacture evolves differences among these detail workers, skilled and unskilled, and even a complete hierarchy of workers. (P. 334.)

Division of labour: 1) general (into agriculture, industry, shipping, etc.); 2) particular (into species and subspecies); 3) in detail (in the workshop). The social division of labour also develops from different starting points. 1) Within the family and the tribe the natural division of labour according to sex and age, plus slavery through violence against neighbours, which extends it. (P. 335.) 2) Different communities according to location, climate, and level of culture, turn out different products which are exchanged where these communities come in contact. (P. 49.) Exchange with strange communities is then one of the chief means of breaking off the natural association of the community itself through further development of the natural division of labour. (P. 336.)

Division of labour in manufacture thus presupposes a certain degree of development of the social division of labour; on the
other hand, it develops the latter further—as in the territorial division of labour. (Pp. 337, 338.)

For all that, there is always this difference between social division of labour and division of labour in manufacture that the former necessarily produces commodities, whereas in the latter the detail worker does not produce commodities. Hence concentration and organisation in the latter, scattering and disorder of competition in the former. (Pp. 339, 341.)

Earlier organisation of the Indian communities. (Pp. 341, 342.)

The guilds. (Pp. 343-4.) Whereas in all these there exists division of labour in society, the division of labour in manufacture is a specific creation of the capitalist mode of production.

As in co-operation, the functioning working body is a form of existence of capital in manufacture as well. Hence the productive power arising from the combination of labours appears as the productive power of capital. But whereas co-operation leaves the individual's mode of working on the whole unchanged, manufacture revolutionises it, cripples the worker; unable to make a product independently, he is now a mere appendage of the capitalist's workshop. The intellectual faculties of labour disappear as far as the many are concerned, to expand in scope for the one. It is a result of the division of labour in manufacture that the labourers are confronted with the intellectual faculties of the labour process as the property of another and as a ruling power. This process of separation, which begins as early as co-operation and develops in manufacture, is completed in large-scale industry, which separates science as an independent productive force from labour and presses it into the service of capital. (P. 346.)

Illustrative quotations. (P. 347.)

Manufacture, in one aspect a definite organisation of social labour, is in another only a particular method of begetting relative surplus-value. (P. 350.) Historical significance precisely in this.

Obstacles to the development of manufacture even during its classical period are limitation of the number of unskilled workers owing to the predominance of the skilled; limitation of the work of women and children owing to the men's resistance; the insistence on the laws of apprenticeship up to recent times, even where superfluous; continual insubordination of the workers, since the collective worker as yet possesses no framework independent of the workers; emigration of the workers. (Pp. 353, 354.)

Besides, manufacture itself was unable to revolutionise the whole of social production or even merely to dominate it. Its narrow technical basis came into conflict with the production
requirements that it had itself created. The machine became necessary, and manufacture had already learned how to make it. (P. 355.)

4. MACHINERY AND LARGE-SCALE INDUSTRY

a. Machinery as Such

The revolution in the mode of production, starting in manufacture with labour-power, here starts with the instruments of labour.

All fully-developed machinery consists of 1) the motor mechanism; 2) the transmitting mechanism; 3) the machine tool. (P. 357.) The industrial revolution of the eighteenth century started with the machine tool. What characterises it is that the tool—in a more or less modified form—is transferred from man to the machine, and is worked by the machine under the operation of man. At the outset it is immaterial whether the motive power is human or a natural one. The specific difference is that man uses only his own organs while the machine can, within certain limits, employ as many tools as demanded. (Spinning-wheel, 1 spindle; jenny, 12 to 18 spindles.)

So far, in the spinning-wheel it is not the treadle, the power, but the spindle that is affected by the [industrial] revolution—at the beginning man is still motive power and tender at the same time everywhere. The revolution of the machine tool, on the contrary, first made the perfecting of the steam-engine a necessity, and then also carried it out. (Pp. 359-60; also pp. 361-62.)

Two kinds of machinery in large-scale industry: either (1) co-operation of similar machines (power-loom, envelope-machine, which combines the work of a number of detail workers through the combination of various tools), in this case technological unity already, through the transmission and the motive power; or 2) machine system, combination of different detail machines (spinning-mill). The natural basis for this is the division of labour in manufacture. But at once an essential difference. In manufacture every detail process had to be adapted to the labourer; this is no longer necessary here—the labour process can be objectively dissected into its component parts, which are then left to science, or to experience based upon it, to be mastered by machines.—Here the quantitative ratio of the several groups of workers is repeated as the ratio of the several groups of machines. (Pp. 363-66.)

In both cases the factory constitutes a huge automaton (moreover perfected to that stage only recently) and this is its adequate form.
(P. 367.) And its most perfect form is the machine-building automaton, which abolished the handicraft and manufacture foundation of large-scale industry, and thus first provided the consummate form of machinery. (Pp. 369-72.)

Connection between the revolutionising of the various branches up to the means of communication. (P. 370.)

In manufacture the combination of workers is subjective. Here there is an objective mechanical production organism, which the worker finds ready at hand, and which can function only through collective labour; the co-operative character of the labour process is now a technological necessity. (P. 372.)

The productive forces arising from co-operation and the division of labour cost capital nothing; the natural forces: steam, water, also cost nothing. Neither do the forces discovered by science. But the latter can be realised only with suitable apparatus, which can be constructed only at great expense; likewise the machine tools cost much more than the old tools. But these machines have a much longer life and a much greater field of production than the tool; they therefore transfer a much smaller portion of value, comparatively, to the product than a tool, and hence the gratuitous service performed by the machine (which does not re-appear in the value of the product) is much greater than in the case of the tool. (Pp. 374, 375, 376.)

Reduction in cost through concentration of production is much greater in large-scale industry than in manufacture. (P. 375.)

The prices of finished goods prove how much the machine has cheapened production, and that the portion of value due to the instruments of labour grows relatively but declines absolutely. The productivity of the machine is measured by the extent to which it replaces human labour-power. Examples. (Pp. 377-79.)

Assumed a steam plough takes the place of 150 workers getting an annual wage of £3,000, this annual wage does not represent all the labour performed by them, but only the necessary labour—however, they also perform surplus-labour in addition. If the steam plough costs £3,000, however, that is the expression in money of all labour embodied in it. Thus, if the machine costs as much as the labour-power it replaces, the human labour embodied in it is always much less than that which it replaces. (P. 380.)

As a means of cheapening production, the machine must cost less labour than it replaces. But for capital its value must be less than that of the labour-power supplanted by it. Therefore, machines that do not pay in England may pay in America (e.g., for stonebreaking). Hence, as a result of certain legal restrictions, machines that
formerly did not pay for capital may suddenly make their appearance. (Pp. 380-81.)

b. Appropriation of Labour-Power Through Machinery

Since machinery itself contains the power driving it, muscular power drops in value. —Labour of women and children; immediate increase in the number of wage-labourers through the enrolling of members of the family who had not previously worked for wages. Thus the value of the man's labour-power is spread over the labour-power of the whole family, i.e., depreciated. —Now four persons must perform not only labour, but also surplus-labour for capital that one family may live, where only one did previously. Thus the degree of exploitation is increased together with the material of exploitation. (P. 383.)

Formerly the sale and purchase of labour-power was a relation between free persons; now minors or children are bought; the worker now sells wife and child—he becomes a slave-dealer. Examples (pp. 384-85).

Physical deterioration—mortality of workers' children (p. 386), in industrialised agriculture as well. (GANG SYSTEM,2) (P. 387.)

Moral degradation. (P. 389.) Educational clauses and manufacturers' resistance to them. (P. 390.)

The entrance of women and children into the factory finally breaks down the male worker's resistance to the despotism of capital. (P. 391.)

If machinery shortens the labour-time necessary to produce an object, in the hands of capital it becomes the most powerful weapon for lengthening the working day far beyond its normal bounds. It creates, on the one hand, new conditions that enable capital to do so, and on the other, new motives for so doing.

Machinery is capable of perpetual motion, and limited only by the weakness and limitations of the assisting human labour-power. The machine that is worn out in seven and a half years, working twenty hours daily, absorbs just as much surplus-labour for the capitalist, but in half the time, as another that is worn out in fifteen years working ten hours daily. (P. 393.)

The moral depreciation of the machine—by superseding—is in this way risked still less. (P. 394.)

---

a Here means women and adolescents working in a group for wages.—Ed.
Moreover, a larger quantity of labour is absorbed *without increasing the investments* in buildings and machines; thus not only does surplus-value grow with a lengthened working day, but the outlay required to obtain it diminishes relatively. This is more important in so far as the proportion of *fixed* capital greatly predominates, as is the case in large-scale industry. (P. 395.)

During the first period of machinery, when it possesses a *monopoly* character, profits are enormous, and hence the thirst for more, for boundless lengthening of the working day. With the general introduction of machinery this monopoly profit vanishes, and the law asserts itself that surplus-value arises, not from the labour *supplanted* by the machine, but from the labour *employed* by it, that is, from the variable capital. But under machine production the latter is necessarily *reduced* by the large outlays. Thus there is an inherent contradiction in the capitalist employment of machinery: for a given mass of capital it *increases* one factor of surplus-value, its *rate*, by *reducing* the other, the *number of workers*. As soon as the value of a machine-made commodity becomes the regulating social value of that commodity, this contradiction comes to light, and *again drives towards lengthening the working day*. (P. 397.)

But at the same time machinery, by setting free supplanted workers, as well as by enrolling women and children, produces a *surplus working population*, which must let capital dictate the law to it. Hence machinery overthrows all the moral and natural bounds of the working day. Hence the paradox that the most powerful means of shortening labour-time is the most infallible means of converting the whole lifetime of the worker and of his family into available labour-time for expanding the value of capital. (P. 398.)

We have already seen how the social reaction occurs here through the fixing of the normal working day; on this basis there now develops the *intensification of labour*. (P. 399.)

At the beginning, with the speeding-up of the machine, the intensity of labour increases simultaneously with the lengthening of labour-time. But soon the point is reached where the two exclude each other. It is different, however, when labour-time is restricted. Intensity can now grow; in 10 hours as much work can be done as ordinarily in 12 or more, and now the more intensive working-day counts as *raised to a higher power*, and labour is measured not merely by its length of time, but by its intensity. (P. 400.) Thus, in 5 hours of necessary and 5 hours of surplus-labour, the same surplus-value can be attained as in 6
hours of necessary and 6 hours of surplus-labour at lower intensity. (P. 400.)

How is labour intensified? In manufacture it has been proved (note 159, p. 401), pottery, for instance, etc., that mere shortening of the working day is sufficient to raise productivity enormously. In machine labour this was far more doubtful. But R. Gardner’s proof. (Pp. 401-02.)

As soon as the shortened working day becomes law, the machine becomes a means of squeezing more intensive labour out of the worker, either by greater speed or less hands in relation to machine. Examples. (Pp. 403-07.) Evidence that enrichment and expansion of the factory grew simultaneously therewith. (Pp. 407-09.)

c. The Whole Factory
in Its Classical Form

In the factory the machine takes care of the proper manipulation of the tool; thus the qualitative differences of labour developed in manufacture are here abolished; labour is levelled out more and more; at most, difference in age and sex. The division of labour is here a distribution of workers among the specialised machines. Here division is only between principal workers, who are really employed at the tool, and feeders (this is true only for the self-acting mule, scarcely so for the throstle, and still less for the corrected power loom), in addition, supervisors, engineers and stockers, mechanics, joiners, etc., a class only outwardly aggregated to the factory. (Pp. 411-12.)

The necessity for adapting the worker to the continuous motion of an automaton requires training from childhood, but by no means that a worker be any longer chained to one detail function all his life, as in manufacture. Change of personnel can take place at the same machine (relay system), and because of the slight effort required to learn, the workers can be shifted from one kind of machine to another. The work of the attendants is either very simple or is taken over more and more by the machine. None the less, at the beginning, the division of labour dictated by manufacture persists traditionally, and itself becomes a greater weapon for exploitation by capital. The worker becomes a lifelong part of a detail machine. (P. 413.)

All capitalist production, in so far as it is not only a labour process but also a process for expanding the value of capital, has this in common that it is not the worker who makes use of the
conditions of labour, but vice versa, the conditions of labour which make use of the worker; but only through machinery does this perversion acquire technological, palpable reality. Through its conversion into an automaton, the instrument of labour itself confronts the labourer, during the labour process, as capital, as dead labour that dominates and sucks dry the living labour-power. Ditto the intellectual faculties of the production process as the power of capital over labour... The detail skill of the individual, pumped-out machine operator vanishes as a tiny secondary thing alongside science, the tremendous natural forces and social mass labour which are embodied in the machine system. (Pp. 414, 415.)

Barracks-like discipline of the factory, factory code. (P. 416.)
Material conditions of the factory. (Pp. 417-18.)

c or d. The Workers' Struggle Against the Factory System and Machinery

This struggle, existing since the origin of the capitalist relationship, first occurs here as a revolt against the machine as the material basis of the capitalist mode of production. Ribbon looms. (P. 419.) Luddites.\(^{189}\) (P. 420.) Only later do the workers distinguish between the material means of production and the social form of their exploitation.

In manufacture the improved division of labour was rather a means of virtually replacing the labourers. (P. 421.) (Digression on agriculture, displacement p. 422.) But in machinery the worker is actually displaced; the machine competes with him directly. Hand-loom weavers. (P. 423.) Likewise India. (P. 424.) This effect is permanent, since machinery continually seizes upon new fields of production. The self-dependent and estranged form that capitalist production gives the instrument of labour as against the labourer is developed by machinery into a thorough antagonism—hence now the labourer's revolt first against the instrument of labour. (P. 424.)

Details of the displacement of workers by machines. (Pp. 425, 426.) The machine as a means of breaking the workers' resistance to capital by displacing them. (Pp. 427, 428.)

Liberal political economy maintains that the machine, displacing workers, at the same time releases capital that can employ these workers. On the contrary, however, every introduction of machines ties up capital, diminishes its variable and increases its constant components; it can, therefore, merely restrict capital's
capacity for employment. In fact—and this is what these apologists also mean—in this manner not capital is set free; but the means of subsistence of the displaced workers are set free; the workers are set free from the means of subsistence, which the apologist expresses by saying that the machine sets free means of subsistence for the worker. (Pp. 429-30.)

This further developed (very good for "Fortnightly") (pp. 431-32): the antagonisms inseparable from the capitalist employment of machinery do not exist for the apologists, because they do not arise out of machinery as such, but out of its capitalist employment. (P. 432.)

Expansion of production by machines directly and indirectly, and thus possible increase in number of workers hitherto employed: miners, slaves in cotton states, etc. On the other hand, displacement of Scotch and Irish by sheep to suit the requirements of the woollen factories. (Pp. 433, 434.)

Machine production carries the social division of labour much further than manufacture did. (P. 435.)

c" or e. Machinery and Surplus-Value

The first result of machinery: increasing surplus-value together with the mass of products in which it is embodied and on which the capitalist class and its hangers-on live, thus increasing the number of capitalists; new luxury wants together with the means of satisfying them. Luxury production grows. Likewise means of communication (which, however, absorb only little labour-power in the more developed countries) (evidence p. 436)—finally, the servant class grows, the modern domestic slaves, whose material is supplied by the releasing [of workers]. (P. 437.) Statistics.

Economic contradictions. (P. 437.)

Possibility of absolute increase in the mass of labour in one branch of business owing to machines, and the modalities of this process. (Pp. 439-40.)

Enormous elasticity, capacity for sudden extension by leaps of large-scale industry at a high degree of development. (P. 441.) Reaction upon the countries producing raw materials. Emigration owing to release of workers. International division of labour of the industrial and agricultural countries—periodicity of crises and prosperity. (P. 442.) Workers thrown back and forth in this process of expansion. (P. 444.)
Historical data on this. (Pp. 445-49.)

Displacement of co-operation and manufacture by machinery (and the intermediate stages, pp. 450-51). Also change in branches of industry not run on factory lines but in the spirit of large-scale industry—domestic industry, an outside department of the factory. (P. 452.) In domestic industry and modern manufacture, exploitation still more shameless than in the factory proper. (P. 453.) Examples: London print-shops (p. 453), book-binding, rag-sorting (p. 454), brick-making (p. 455). Modern manufacture in general. (P. 456.) Domestic industry: lace making (pp. 457-59), straw plaiting (p. 460). Conversion into factory production with achievement of ultimate limit of exploitability: wearing apparel by the sewing-machine (pp. 462-66). Speeding-up of this conversion by extension of the compulsory Factory Acts, which put an end to the old routine based upon unlimited exploitation. (P. 466.) Examples: pottery (p. 467), lucifer matches (p. 468). Furthermore, effect of the Factory Acts upon irregular work, owing to the workers' irregular habits, as well as to seasons and fashions. (P. 470.) Overwork alongside idleness, owing to the seasons, in domestic industry and manufacture. (P. 471.)

Sanitary clauses of the Factory Acts. (P. 473.) Educational clauses. (P. 476.)

Discharge of workers merely because of age, as soon as they are grown up and are no longer fitted for the work, and can no longer live on a child's wages, while at the same time they have learned no new trade. (P. 477.)

Dissolution of the mysteries and of the traditional ossification of manufacture and handicraft, by large-scale industry, which converts the production process into a conscious application of natural forces. Hence it alone is revolutionary, as against all earlier forms. (P. 479.) But as a capitalist form it lets the ossified division of labour persist for the worker, and since it daily revolutionises the former's basis, it ruins the worker. On the other hand, in this very thing, in this necessary change of activities of one and the same worker lies the requirement of his being as versatile as possible and the possibilities of the social revolution. (Pp. 480-81.)

Need for extending factory legislation to all branches not operated on factory lines. (P. 482 ff.) Act of 1867. (P. 485.) Mines (note, p. 486 ff.).

Concentrating effect of the Factory Acts; generalisation of factory production and thus of the classical form of capitalist production; accentuation of its inherent contradictions, maturing
of the elements for overturning the old society, and of the elements for forming the new. (Pp. 488-93.)

Agriculture. Here release of workers by machines is even more acute. Replacement of the peasant by the wage-labourer. Destruction of rural domestic manufacture. Accentuation of the antithesis between town and country. Dispersion and weakening of the rural labourers, whereas the urban workers become concentrated; hence wages of agricultural workers are reduced down to a minimum. At the same time robbing of the soil: the acme of the capitalist mode of production is the undermining of the sources of all wealth: the soil and the labourer. (Pp. 493-96.)

---

a Here follows the title of the next chapter: Chapter V.—Further Investigations of the Production of Surplus-Value, and the manuscript breaks off.—Ed.
FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS
Mr. Fox has rolled up a rather phantastic picture of the foreign policy of the French Ancient Regime. According to his view, France allied herself with Sweden, Poland, and Turkey in order to protect Europe from Russia. The truth is that France contracted those alliances in the 16th and 17th centuries, at a time when Poland was still a powerful state and when Russia, in the modern sense of the word, did not yet exist. There existed then a Grand Duchy of Muscovy, but there existed not yet a Russian Empire. It was therefore not against Russia that France concluded those alliances with the Turks, the Magyars, the Poles, and the Swedes. She concluded them against Austria and against the German Empire, as a means of extending the power, the influence, and the territorial possessions of France over Germany, Italy, Spain. I shall not enter upon details. It will suffice for my purpose to say, that France used those alliances in the midst of the 17th century to bring about the treaty of Westphalia, by which Germany was not only dismembered, one part of it being given to France and the other to Sweden, but every little German prince and baron obtained the treaty right to sell his country and France obtained a protectorate over Germany. After the treaty of Westphalia, in the second part of the 17th century, Louis XIV, the true representative of the old Bourbon policy at the time of its strength, bought the king of England, Charles II, in order to ruin the Dutch republic. His system of vandalism and perfidy then carried out against Holland, Belgium, Spain, Germany and Piedmont—during about 40 years, cannot be better characterised than by the one fact, that in a memorandum, drawn up in 1837 by the Russian chancellery for the information of the present Czar, the system of
war and diplomacy of Louis XIV from the middle to the end of the 17th century is recommended as the model system to be followed by Russia.

Modern Russia dates only from the 18th century, and it is therefore from that time alone that resistance to Russia could have entered into the policy of France or any other European state.

I proceed at once to the time of Louis XV which Mr. Fox has justly pointed out as the epoch when the French foreign policy was most favourable to Poland and most hostile to Russia.

Now there happened three great events under the regime of Louis XV—in regard to Russia and Poland, 1) the so-called Polish succession war, 2) the Seven Years’ War, and 3) the first partition of Poland. I shall consider the attitude taken by the French government in regard to these events.

1. The So-called Polish Succession War

After the death of Augustus II (king of Poland and elector of Saxony), in September 1733, one party of the Polish aristocracy wanted to elect his son as king. He was supported by Russia and Austria, because he had promised to the Czarina not to reclaim Courland, formerly a fief of Poland, and because he had promised to the Emperor the guarantee of the pragmatic sanction. The other party, instigated by France, elected Stanislaus Leszczinski, who had formerly been made Polish king by Charles XII of Sweden and who was at that time the father-in-law of Louis XV. There broke consequently a war out between France on the one hand, Russia and Austria on the other. This is the only war which France has ever professedly carried on behalf of Poland. France made war in Germany and Italy, but as far as her Polish protégé was concerned, limited herself to sending 1,500 men to Dantzick, then a Polish town. The war having lasted two years, what was its upshot? A treaty of peace (Peace of Vienna, October 1735), by which the duchy of Lorraine, a German fief, was incorporated into France, and the Bourbon dynasty planted in Naples and Sicily, the same dynasty of which king Bomba was the last lively representative. In all other respects this “war about the throne of Poland” ended in acknowledging the Russian candidate, Augustus III, as king of Poland, but securing to Louis XV’s

a Frederick Augustus II (later King Augustus III of Poland).—Ed.
b Anna Ivanovna.—Ed.
c Charles VI.—Ed.
d Ferdinand II (nicknamed “Bomba” for the bombardment of Messina in September 1848).—Ed.
father-in-law the prerogative of being called king and a very large yearly pension to be paid by Poland. This war instigated and carried on by France under false pretences, ended in the humiliation of Poland, the extension of the Russian power, and great disadvantages to Turkey and Sweden, which France had also driven into a false position and then left in the lurch. But I shall not enter upon these details.

The conduct of the French government cannot be excused on the plea that the British government prevented it during this so-called Polish succession war of acting in the right direction. On the contrary. When the Emperor Charles VI appealed to England, the latter clung to the Anglo-French alliance which had continued since 1716 and was barren of any good results whatever. At all events: this time the French government's good designs for Poland were not baffled by England.

Before leaving the subject, I must mention that the peace between Turkey and Russia, brought about by French mediation (Villeneuve, French ambassador) in 1739, was a great blow to Poland. I quote Rulhière; he says:

"it annulled the treaty of the Pruth, the only shield that remained to the Poles" ("cet unique bouclier qui restait à la Pologne"), et le nouveau traité, signé à Belgrad, in 1739, déclara dans son dernier article "que toutes les conventions antérieures n'auraient plus aucune force".

2. The Seven Years' War (1756-1763)

I come now to the 7 Years' War.

Mr. Fox has told you that that war was very unhappy for France, because it deprived her, to the benefit of England, of most of her colonies. But this is not the question before us. What we have to inquire into is, what part France played during that war in regard to Poland and Russia.

You must know that from 1740 to 1748, during the so-called Austrian succession war, France had allied herself with Frederick II of Prussia against Russia, Austria and England. During the Seven Years' War she allied herself with Austria and Russia against Prussia and England, so that, at all events, during this war England was the official enemy, and France the avowed ally of Russia.

It was first in 1756 under the Abbé Bernis, and then again 1758 under the duke of Choiseul, that France concluded her treaty with Austria (and Russia), against Prussia.

---

a and the last article of the new treaty signed in Belgrade in 1739 declared "that all previous conventions will have power no more". Cl. Rulhière, Histoire de l'Anarchie de Pologne, t. I, Paris, 1819.— Ed.
Let us hear Rulhière. (Histoire de l'Anarchie de Pologne etc. Paris, 1819. 2nd edit.)

"When Count Broglie arrived in 1752 as ambassador at Varsovie, France had no party in Poland. People thought of the promises which France had already so often failed to fulfil (auxquelles la France avait déjà si souvent manqué). They had not forgotten that three times since a century, France had rallied around her powerful Polish factions... but that after having formed them with passion (ardeur), she had always abandoned them with levity (elle les avait chaque fois abandonnées avec légèreté). She had left in distress the majority of those who had trusted to the seductions of her pretended projects for the welfare of the republic" (t. I, 213).

("Elle avait laissé dans l'infortune la plupart de ceux qui s'étaient livrés à la séduction de ces prétendus projets pour le salut de la république.")

"The Duke of Broglie, after three years' activity, had formed a counterparty against the Czartoryski, a won over the Polish court, put into motion the Swedes, the Tartars, the Turks, opened a connection with the Cossacks of the Ukraine" etc. "Frederick II contributed to call into life this formidable coalition against the Russians, from which he expected himself his own security. The Russian minister b had lost all influence at Warsaw. In one word, in the first months of 1756, at the moment when the hostilities between England and France, first opened in America, were on the point of embracing the whole of Europe, Count Broglie had it in his power to form in Poland a confederation which, supported by the subsidies of France, provided by her with arms and munitions, and protected by so many border nations would have altogether withdrawn Poland from the yoke of Russia and restored to that republic laws, government, and power. But France suspended all the help (secours) she had promised, and upset all the measures of her ambassador." (Rulhière, t. I, p. 225.)

The levy with which France abused her influence may be seen—en passant—from the way in which she treated Sweden. First she goaded her into a war with Prussia against Russia (in the Austrian succession war), and then into a war with Russia against Prussia, Sweden being both times the victim of those French intrigues, and Russia gaining both times in that quarter.

Well. What were the consequences of the Seven Years' War which France carried on as the ally of Russia (and Austria) against Prussia (and England)?

That the material resources of Poland were exhausted, that Russia founded her supremacy in Germany, that Prussia was made her slave, that Catherine II became the most powerful sovereign in Europe, and that the first partition of Poland took place. Such were the immediate consequences of the French policy during the Seven Years' War.

1) During the Seven Years' War the Russian armies treated Poland as their property, took there their winter-quarters etc. I shall quote Favier:

---

a Fryderyk Michal Czartoryski.—Ed.
b Heinrich Gross.—Ed.
"The peril was that Russia, improving the pretext of the war against the king of Prussia, enforced, on the territory of Poland, the passage of her troops, appropriated herself the means of subsistence, and even took her winter-quarters in Poland. By allowing her to employ anew those arbitrary means, that vast country was surrendered to the greediness of the Russian generals, the despotism of their court, and all the projects of future usurpations which Russia would be tempted to form, from the facility of exercising all sorts of vexations against a nation divided, insulated, and abandoned." (Politique de tous les cabinets de l'Europe etc. 2nd edit. par L. P. Ségur, Ex-ambassadeur. Paris, 1801, t. I, p. 300.)

France discredited herself by giving the Russians such free scope.

"That weakness on her part seemed the less pardonable (excusable) because ... she was then in a position to make the law to Russia and Austria, and not at all to receive it from them."

Count Broglie had made in vain proposals to that effect... France allowed Russia to treat Poland like her own property... The Polish nation, from that moment, considered France as a mere instrument in the hands of the courts of Vienna and Petersburg.

"This was the origin of our discredit, of our nullity at the time of the election of Count Poniatowski, and of the bad success of everything we attempted or favoured since that epoch". (303, 304, l. c. Ségur) ("la nation polonaise ne vit plus dès lors la France que comme un instrument des cours de Vienne et de Pétersbourg. [...] Voilà l'origine de notre discrédit, de notre nullité etc.")

France was bound, by the treaty of Oliva (1660)\textsuperscript{203} to protect the Polish Republic.

2) During the 7 Years' War the Russians used Poland, although she was ostensibly neutral,\textsuperscript{204} as their basis of operations against Prussia. This the Poles allowed under the diplomatic pressure of France. It was thus that the Russians were enabled during 7 years to devastate Prussia proper, Silesia, Pomerania, Brandenburg, and even sack Berlin. They in fact ravaged the Prussian monarchy like wild beasts, while the French acted in the same style in Hanover, Westphalia, Saxony, Thuringia etc. Now, Poland was by the treaty of Wehlau (1660 or so)\textsuperscript{205} obliged to defend Prussia, against Russia. Frederick II insisted upon the fulfilment of this treaty. That he was right in asking the Poles to observe at least a complete neutrality, and not allowing the Russians to use their country etc., is proved by the fact that on all the diets kept in Poland since the opening of the Seven Years' War, it was impossible to come to any resolution, because the patriotic party declared, the Poles could not deliberate as long as Russian armies occupied the Polish soil and acted against Prussia. In the last year of the war (1762) the nobility of Posen (Great Poland) had even formed a confederation against the Russians.
If f. i. Belgium allowed Prussia to use it during 7 years, despite its neutrality, as a basis of warlike operations against France, would France not be entitled to treat Belgium as an enemy, and, if she could, to incorporate Belgium, or destroy its independence?

3) The immediate upshot of the 7 Years' War was a treaty between Prussia and Russia, by which the king of Prussia professed himself the vassal of Russia, Poniatowski king of Poland but was allowed, in compensation, to share in the partition of Poland. That the latter was already convened upon in the treaty of 1764 between Russia and Frederick II is shown by the fact that in the same year Frederick II's and Catherine II's ambassadors at Warsaw solemnly protested against that "calumny", and that a few years later the English resident at Berlin wrote to his court that Austria, although at first protesting, would be compelled by her proper interests to share in the partition of Poland.

Mr. Favier says:

"Our exclusive alliance with the court of Vienna deprived Frederick II of all hope, and reduced him to the necessity of joining that very court which had let loose France upon him, in order to destroy him."  

The same Favier avers that the secret of all the future successes of Catherine II and of the first partition of Poland is to be found in the infeodation to her of Prussia. (Frederick II.)

Such was the result of the French policy during the 7 Years' War. It cannot be said that England this time prevented her good designs for Poland, because France was then the ally of Russia, while England stood on the other side.

[3.] First Partition of Poland  

Now I must say that even if France had acted more energetically during the Polish war which ended in the first partition of Poland than she really did, it would not have made up for the immense services she had rendered to Russia during the Seven Years' War. The sending of some French officers and subsidies to Poland during the war of the Confederation of Bar could in the best case only prolong a useless resistance. It is true that France incited (1768) Turkey to a war against Russia, but only to betray Turkey as usually, and prepare for her the "treaty of Kudjuk Kainardji" (1774), from which the supremacy of Russia over Turkey must really be dated.

---

a Gedeon Benoit and Heinrich Gross.— Ed.
b Andrew Mitchell.— Ed.
1770. **Russian Expedition into the Mediterranean.** The then almost dying republic of Venice showed much more courage than France. In that year Choiseul still French foreign minister. It was only at the end of 1770 (beginning of 1771) that he was replaced by the Duke d'Aiguillon.

"How," says Favier, "did it happen that, while France was at peace with England, no step was taken for a convention of neutrality for the Mediterranean? Or why did France alone not oppose this Russian enterprise in a quarter so important for her interests?"

The opinion of Favier is, that

"the destruction of the Russian fleet in the Mediterranean by the French [which] might have been easily effected, would probably have changed the whole course of events both in Turkey and Poland, and would, moreover, have taught Austria to respect the French Alliance" (Ségur etc. Politique de tous les cabinets etc., v. II, p. 174).

But France who had goaded Turkey into the war against Russia did not move one finger against the Russian expedition of 1770, the only one which was of any import. (The Turkish fleet destroyed in the narrow bay of Tschesmé.\(^{269}\) The same Choiseul had English bluster (Chatham himself) not allowed to prevent him a year ago from buying Corsica from the Genoese. You must not forget that at that time North was minister, and could only keep himself in office by keeping the peace at any price. He was one of the most unpopular ministers. At that time revolutionary, antidynastic movement in England. It is true that in 1773 (the Russians made then a new naval expedition which, however, remained without any influence upon the war with Turkey) the duke of Aiguillon allowed himself to be prevented by the English Ambassador at Paris, Lord Stormont, from attacking the Russian fleet in the Baltic (and Mediterranean). At that time the first partition of Poland was already consummated. The true object of the French demonstration was not Poland, but Sweden, and France so far succeeded, that Gustave III was not forced by Russia to rescind his coup d'état (1772).\(^{210}\)

Moreover, what sort of fellow this d'Aiguillon was?

*Ségur* says in his notes to *Favier*:

"When the rumour got first afloat as to the partition which was to give Prussia an increase of territory which Austria was afraid of, the court of Vienna warned France, and gave her to understand that she would oppose herself, if the court of Versailles would support her. Louis XV, at that time only occupied by his pleasures, and M. d'Aiguillon by his intrigues, the Austrian cabinet received no re-assuring answer and liked better to concur to the partition of Poland than to maintain alone a war against the Prussians and Russians combined." ([t. I], 147, Note.) "Count Mercy—Austrian ambassador—has publicly given out" (répandu dans le public) "that the king of Prussia had communicated to the Austrian
minister a the answers of the Duke of Aiguillon, by which that minister assured His Prussian Majesty that France was indifferent to all that could be done in Poland and that she would not consider a casus foederis” (case of war) “anything that might be agreed upon, in regard to that subject, by the courts of Berlin and Vienna” (243, Note).

Now, although I do not put any confidence whatever in the assurances of the Austrian court, which was then acting with the utmost perfidy, the very fact, that a French ambassador of Louis XVI (Ségur), published this at Paris, shows the estimation Louis XV and his d’Aiguillon enjoyed—and were worth enjoying.

[4.] French Republic

From September 21, 1792 to November 11, 1799 (the day after 19 Brumaire, when the Executive Directory b was overthrown)

The second partition treaty between Russia and Prussia on 4 January 1793:

The first crusade against France 1792 had taken such an unfortunate turn, that already in the beginning of winter the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium) were occupied by the French. Prussia withdrew her troops from the field of action; the condition insisted upon by her on the Congress of Verdun c for continuing her participation in the Anti-Jacobin war was that she should be allowed to make with Russia a second partition of Poland. Austria was to be compensated by indemnities in the Alsace.

At the end of 1793 (September) Prussia again withdrew her troops to march them, under the king, d to the Polish frontier (to “secure” his Polish possession), because some differences had broken out, in regard to some definitive stipulations, between Prussia and Russia, the latter seeming to turn against Prussia her influence over the expiring diet of the traitors of Targowicze. e The result of this second withdrawal of Prussia, to take real possession of her Polish provinces, forces the Austrians to withdraw from the Alsace.

In the spring of 1794 Kościuszko’s revolutionary rising. Prussia marched at once her troops against Poland. Beaten. In September 1794, while forced to retreat from Warsaw, at the same time rising

---

a Gottfried van Swieten.— Ed.
b The text in brackets is in French in the original.— Ed.
c More accurately: January 23, 1793.— Ed.
d Frederick William II.— Ed.
in Posen. Then the king of Prussia declared his intention to withdraw from the contest carried on against France. Austria also, in the autumn 1794, detached a body of troops for Poland, by which circumstance the success of the French arms on the Rhine and so forth was secured. Already towards the end of 1794 Prussia commenced negotiations with France. Withdraw. Consequence: Holland succumbed to the French (conquest of Holland through Pichegru).

Those diversions facilitated by turns the conquest of Belgium, the success on the Alps, the Pyrenees, the left bank of the Rhine, and, 1795, the conquest of Holland by Pichegru. In the very months October, November (1794) everywhere French successes when Kościuszko succumbed, Praga was taken by Suvorov etc., immense murdering etc.

Third Partition of Poland signed: 24 October 1795.

By the outbreak of the French Revolution Catherine got the opportunity quietly first to carry on her war with Turkey, while all Europe was turned to the West.

As the Pope has issued bulls for crusades against the infidels, so Catherine II against the Jacobins. Even while Leopold II chased the French Emigrés from his states and forbade them to assemble on the French frontiers, Catherine, through her agent Rumjanzev, provided them with money and quartered them in the frontier provinces, bordering upon France, and ruled by ecclesiastic princes.

After the conclusion of her war with Turkey, Catherine II did not commence her hostilities against Poland before she had been informed that the National Assembly had declared war to Austria. This news arrived at Vienna on 30 April 1792, and on the 18 May the Russian ambassador Boulgakov presented a declaration of war to the Polish king Stanislaus. The first in impressing upon England, Austria and Prussia the dangers of the revolutionary principles, Catherine steadily pursued her own separate interests (in Turkey and Poland) without furnishing a single Cossack or subscribing a single rouble for the "common cause".

Poland was blotted out under cover of the French Revolution and the Anti-Jacobin war.

Rev. L. K. Pitt (a nephew or cousin of the English minister), chaplain to the British factory at St. Petersburg, writes in a secret document: "Account of Russia during the Commencement of the Reign of the Emperor Paul":

---

a Poniatowski.—Ed.
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“She” (the Czarina) “was not perhaps displeased to see every European power exhausting itself in a struggle, which raised in proportion to its violence her own importance ... the state of the newly acquired provinces in Poland was likewise a point which had considerable influence over the political conduct of the Czarina. The fatal effects resulting from an apprehension of revolt on the late seat of conquest, seem to have been felt in a very great degree by the combined powers who, in the early period of the revolution, were so near re-instating the regular government in France. The same dread of revolt deterred likewise the late Empress of Russia from entering on the great theatre of war.”

The question is now: How behaved revolutionary France towards this useful ally.

Let us first hear a French historian, Lacretelle (t. XII, p. 261 sqq.):

“The Republic”, says he, “had shown itself very indifferent to the troubles and misfortunes of Poland. It was on the contrary a great motive of security for it to see the Empress of Russia occupy all the forces of her powerful empire for the conquest and dismemberment of that unfortunate country. Very soon the French Republic became aware that Poland freed it of its most ardent enemy, the king of Prussia etc.”

But republican France actually betrayed Poland.

“The Polish agent Bars at Paris presented to the government”, says Oginski, an eye-witness, “the plan of the revolution which was preparing in Poland, and which was received with a general enthusiasm and approbation. He enumerated the assistance of every kind which would be necessary for that important and daring enterprise. The Comité du Salut Public found his demand very just and promised to do every thing possible; but to promises all the negotiation was limited.” (Michel Oginski: Mémoires sur la Pologne etc., from 1788 to the end of 1815. Paris, 1826, t. I, p. 358.)

“The comité of public welfare had promised to general Kościuszko a sum of 3 millions of livres and some officers of artillery; but we did receive neither one single sou nor one single officer”,

we are told by an aide-de-camp of Kościuszko, J. Niemcewicz: Notes sur ma captivité à St. Pétersbourg, en 1794-1796. Paris, 1843. (V. p. 90.)

On 5 April 1795 the directory (which had then replaced the comité du salut public) concluded with Prussia the Peace of Basel. By this peace Holland and the left bank of the Rhine were surrendered to France. The northern part of Germany, designed by a line of demarcation, was neutralised, Prussia to be indemnified by the secularisation of several German bishoprics. That treaty of Basel
“by guaranteeing the respective possessions of the two contracting powers, and including no clause whatever in regard to the newly invaded provinces of Poland, granted their possession to the king of Prussia”.

Ogiński tells us that when the Poles were informed of the peace-negotiations, their agent Bars addressed the members of the directory peculiarly friendly to Poland, and asked for a clause obliging the king of Prussia to renounce etc.

“He was answered that the condition was not acceptable since it would retard the negotiations with Prussia, that France wanted to restore her forces, that the peace with Prussia would not last long, that the Poles should keep themselves ready for new efforts which would be asked from them in the cause of liberty and their country etc.”

The same Ogiński, t. II, p. 133 and 223, tells us:

“The treaty concluded between the French Republic and the king of Prussia had made a very bad impression upon the Divan, which pretended that if France had been unable to obtain anything for Poland in her negotiations with the court of Berlin, it was impossible that the ‘Turcs alone could act in favour of Poland.’

After the third division Russia was forced to keep quiet for a few years. The Poles now participated in all the campaigns of the French Republic, principally in Italy. (See: Chodžko: Histoire des Légions Polonaises en Italie, dé 1795 à 1802. Paris, 1829.)

Before the conclusion of the Peace of Campo-Formio (17 October 1797), after a plan mutually agreed upon, and with the consent of Bonaparte, General Dombrowski was to march through Croatia and Hungary, into Galicia, and thus make a diversion in favour of Bonaparte, who would have marched upon Vienna. Charles de la Croix, minister of foreign affairs (see Ogiński, t. II, p. 272-278) proposed to Ogiński “to insurge Galicia”. Ogiński was afraid lest the Poles should be treated as mere tools thrown away after having been used. He therefore demanded a positive assurance that those sacrifices would earn for them French assistance for the recovery of their country. Lacroix played then the irritated bully. The French government did not want them; if they had no confidence, they might try their fortune somewhere else etc. He gave Ogiński three days’ time for considering, after which they were to accept or [to] refuse, but without putting any conditions whatever. The poor Poles declared ready for whatever the French government wanted. But that government wanted only their formal acceptance in order to intimidate Austria by it and so to hasten the conclusion of peace. Armistice at Leoben, 18 April 1797.

— Ed.
Treaty of Campo-Formio in which the Poles were again sacrificed in the same way as they had been in the treaty of Basel.

In 1799 at last Suvorov, the effect of the disappearance of Poland made itself felt to the French republic. Russian armies appeared in Holland and in Italy. Suvorov penetrates to the very frontiers of France.

When on 27 July\(^a\) 1799 the French surrendered Mantua to the Russian general Vielhorski,\(^b\) there was a secret article in the capitulation by which the Austrians got back their deserters, viz. the Austrian Poles who had entered the legions. After the surrender of Mantua, the 2nd legion fell into the hands of the enemy; the first legion, under Dombrowski, joined the Great Army,\(^c\) and was almost entirely annihilated in the great battles against the Russo-Austrian armies.

[5.] Consulate

9 November 1799 (18 Brumaire) Consulate. Bonaparte authorizes the formation of new Polish legions, one at Marseilles under Dombrowski, one on the Danube under general Kniaziewicz. These legions assist at Marengo and Hohenlinden.\(^d\) See order of the day of general Moreau, where he renders justice

"to the stern constancy of general Kniaziewicz and his Polish soldiers".\(^e\)

Treaty of Lunéville with Austria, 9 February\(^c\) 1801.\(^f\) No article relating to Poland.

Treaty of Paris, October 1801, with Paul I of Russia.\(^g\) In this treaty Paul I and Bonaparte promised each other

"not to allow that any of their subjects should be allowed to entertain any correspondence, whether direct or indirect, with the internal enemies of the actual governments of the two states, there to propagate principles contrary to their respective constitutions, or to foment troubles".\(^h\)

This article related to the Poles on the [one] hand, to the Bourbons and their partisans on the other.

In 1801 there appeared in the Moniteur a series of articles written by Bonaparte himself and justifying the ambition of France, because her conquests were hardly an equivalent for the acquisitions which Russia, Austria and Prussia had made by the partition of Poland. (Thiers, Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire, t. III, p. 153.)

\(^a\) Inaccuracy in the manuscript: April 28.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) Quoted from Sawaszkiewicz, op. cit., p. 57, note.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^c\) Inaccuracy in the manuscript: January 26.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^d\) Quoted from Sawaszkiewicz, op. cit., p. 58.—\textit{Ed.}
During the peace the Polish legions were treated as an encumbrance. Part of them were, like Mamelucks, given by Bonaparte as a present to the queen of Etruria.\footnote{Marie-Louise-Joséphine, wife of Duke Louis Bourbon of Parma.—\textit{Ed.}}

\textit{Treaty of Amiens, 27 March 1802.}\footnote{Joseph Bonaparte.—\textit{Ed.}} The first consul made embark, by force, for \textit{St. Domingo} part of the Polish legions and made present of the other part to the new \textit{king of Naples}.\footnote{Tomasz Ostrowski's account of Napoleon's speech was rendered by Antoni Ostrowski in \textit{Żywot Tomasza Ostrowskiego}, Paris, 1836. Marx quotes from Sawaszkiewicz, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 66.—\textit{Ed.}} Threatened by the fire of artillery, they were embarked at Genoa and Livorno to find their graves in St. Domingo.\footnote{Frederick August I.—\textit{Ed.}}

\[6.\] \textit{Empire}

\textit{May 1804} (crowned 2 \textit{December 1804}) until 1815.

\textit{1806-1807}. During his war with Prussia, supported by Russia, Napoleon sent the remainders of the Polish legions under Dombrowski into Prussian Poland, where they conquered Dantziick for him, and insurged the country.

\textit{18 December 1806}. Napoleon himself in Warsaw, then Prussian. Great enthusiasm of the Poles. In his autobiography \textit{Thomas Ostrowski} (Paris 1836), \textit{president of the Senate}, narrates that Napoleon, at the first audience he gave to the members of the administration, received them with the words:

"Gentlemen, I want to-day 200,000 bottles of wine, and as many portions of rice, meat and vegetables. No excuses; if not, I leave you to the Russian knout... I want proofs of your devotion; \textit{I stand in need of your blood}" ("j'ai besoin de votre sang").\footnote{\textit{Ed.}}

He enrolled a Polish army. The campaign lasted until 6 \textit{May} 1807.

\textit{25 and 26 June 1807}. Fraternisation between Napoleon and Alexander on the Niemen.

\textit{Treaty of Tilsit, signed 7 \textit{July 1807} (9 \textit{July} with Prussia)}.\footnote{\textit{Ed.}}

\textit{Art. V} of that treaty proclaimed the foundation of the \textit{duchy of Warsaw} which Napoleon cedes

"\textit{in all property and sovereignty} to the king of Saxony,\footnote{Frederick August I.} to be ruled by constitutions, which, while securing the liberties and privileges of the duchy, were compatible with the \textit{tranquillity of the neighbouring states}".

This duchy was cut out of \textit{Prussian Poland}.\footnote{\textit{Ed.}}
Art. IX cedes to Russia a part of Poland, the circle of Byalistock, recently conquered from Prussia, and which

"shall be united in perpetuity to the Russian empire, in order to establish the natural limits between Russia and the duchy of Warsaw".\(^a\)

Dantzig, on the pretext of being made a free town, was made a French maritime fortress.

Many large estates in the new duchy were made a present of by Napoleon to the French generals.

Lelewel calls this justly the Fourth Division of Poland.\(^b\)

Having beaten the Prussians and the Russians by the assistance of the Poles, Napoleon disposed of Poland, as if she was a conquered country and his private property, and he disposed of her to the advantage of Russia.

The duchy of Warsaw was small, without position in Europe. A large civil list; civil government by Saxony, military by Napoleon. Davout ruled like a Pasha at Warsaw. He made in fact of the duchy a recruiting place for France, a military dépôt.

( Sawaszkiewicz, Tableau de l'influence de la Pologne sur les destinées de la Révolution française. Paris, 1848, 3\(^{\text{me}}\) édit.)

The duchy of Warsaw was for Napoleon not only an advanced post against Russia. Napoleon had possessed himself of those very points which would serve him as a basis of offensive operations against Prussia and Austria. Nicholas acted in his spirit when he fortified those points by a chain of fortresses.

(By inserting at the head of the treaty of Tilsit the declaration that only out of courtesy for Alexander he restored to the king of Prussia\(^c\) half of his old territories, Napoleon proclaimed that king, and Prussia, a mere appendage to Russia.)

By the secret articles of the treaty of Tilsit the public ones were partly revoked. Thus f. i. only to deceive Austria, the public treaty contained articles for the integrity of Turkey. By the secret articles Napoleon sacrificed Turkey and Sweden to the Czar who surrendered to him Portugal, Spain, Malta, and the North African coast; promised his accession to the continental system, and the surrender of the Ionian islands to France.\(^{226}\) The partition of Turkey was only prevented by the opposition of Austria. All the arrangements for a partition of Turkey were beginning after the conclusion of the Tilsit treaty. In August 1808 Alexander handed

\(^a\) Articles of the Treaty of Tilsit are quoted from Sawaszkiewicz, op. cit., p. 68.—Ed.

\(^b\) J. Lelevel, Histoire de Pologne.—Ed.

\(^c\) Frederick William III.—Ed.
over to Napoleon the strong places of Dalmatia, also the protectorate over the Ionian islands; while the Danubian principalities were occupied by his troops, Napoleon ordered Marmont, the French commander in Dalmatia, to prepare the march upon Albania and Macedonia. The negotiations about the partition of Turkey were continued at Petersburg, whither Napoleon had sent Savary, the head of his gendarmes and mouchards. The Report on his negotiations with Rumjanzev, the Russian foreign minister, has been recently published. Even Thibaudeau, one of Napoleon's senators and admirers, says about the negotiations of Savary with Alexander I and Rumjanzev:

"Putting aside every diplomatical form, they transacted their business in the impudent and reckless way of robber-chiefs dividing their booty".3

According to the negotiations between Napoleon and Alexander at Tilsit, Sweden and Denmark were to be forced to join the continental system. Napoleon ceded to Alexander Finland (which the Russians occupied in 1808, and have ever kept since), and besides Denmark was interested in the robbery of Sweden by making Norway over to her. Thus Napoleon succeeded in completely breaking down this old antagonist of Russia.

27 September 1808. Napoleon and Alexander at the Erfurt Congress.

Never before had any man done so much to exalt the Russian power as Napoleon did from 1807-1812. From 1808 to 1811 the Poles were consumed by Napoleon in Spain. For the first time in their history they were prostituted as the mercenaries of despotism. Of the army of 90,000, formed in the duchy, so many were despatched to Spain, that the duchy was denuded of troops when the Austrian archduke Ferdinand invaded it in 1809.

1809, April. While Napoleon marched upon Vienna, the archduke Ferdinand upon Warsaw. The Poles invade Galicia, force the archduke to withdraw from Warsaw (1 June); the Russians, Napoleon's allies, enter Galicia to assist in fact the Austrians against the Poles.

14 October 1809: The Polish provinces called by the Austrians "New Galicia", together with the district of Zamojsk, was reunited to the duchy of Warsaw. Napoleon left to Austria old Galicia, after having separated from it, in order to make it over to Russia, the district of Tarnopol, part of old Podolia.227 What we have to think of this Fifth Partition (Lelewel) may be seen from a satirical letter of Czar Alexander I to prince Kourakin, published at the time in

---

3 A. C. Thibaudeau, Le Consulat et l'Empire, ou Histoire de la France et de Napoléon Bonaparte de 1799 à 1815, t. 6 (Empire—t. 3), p. 222, Paris, 1835.—Ed.
The gazettes of Petersburg and Moscow, d. d. Petersburg 1/13 November 1809. The Czar writes:

"The treaty is being ratified between France and Austria, and consequently our hostile movements against the latter cease simultaneously. According to the principles of that peace, Austria remains, as before, our neighbour by her possession of Galicia, and the Polish provinces, instead of being united into one single body, are divided for ever between the three crowns. Thus the dreams of a political revolution in Poland have vanished. The present order of things fixes the limits between Poland and Russia who has not only not suffered any loss in this affair, but on the contrary extends her dominion" (au sein de la Pologne) "in the very heart of Poland." b

The Poles now demanded the restoration of the name of Poland for the duchy. The Czar opposed. On October 20, 1809, Champagny, minister of foreign affairs, addressed a note, by order of Napoleon, to the Russian government, in which it was stated that he approved the effacing [of] the name of Pole and Poland, not only from every public act, but even from history. This was to prepare his proposal—after his divorce with Joséphine—for the hand of the Czar's sister. c

4 January 1810: Secret convention between Napoleon's ambassador Caulaincourt and count Rumjanzev, to this effect:

"Art. 1. The kingdom of Poland shall never be re-established. Art. 2. The name of Poland and Pole shall never be applied to any of the parties that previously constituted that kingdom, and they shall disappear from every public or official act." Besides "the Grand duchy shall never be aggrandised by the annexation of any of the old Polish provinces; the orders of Polish chivalry shall be abolished; and, finally, all these engagements shall be binding on the king of Saxony, Grand Duke of Warsaw, as on Napoleon himself." (Thiers, Consulat et l'Empire, XI, [357, 358].)

It was after the negotiations for that convention that Napoleon proposed for the hand of Alexander's sister. d Napoleon's irritation and wounded self-love at the hesitation of the Czar (who delayed declaring himself from middle of December to middle of January, under various pretexts), and the repugnance of the Czar's mother, made Napoleon look elsewhere for a wife, and break off negotiations.

"The Emperor Napoleon," says Crétineau-Joly: "Histoire de l'église Romaine en face de la Révolution", "did not allow his policy to lose itself in a phraseology sentimentally revolutionary. With one stroke of the pen his minister effaced, even

---

a Sankt-Peterburgskije vedomosti, November 9, 1809 and Moskovskije vedomosti, November 17, 1809.— Ed.
b Quoted from Sawaszkiewicz, op. cit., pp. 82-83.— Ed.
c Anna Pavlovna.— Ed.
d Maria Fedorovna.— Ed.
from history, the name of Poland, and a treaty, which subsequent events rendered null, struck out that name as if it were a geographical superfetation."

After his marriage with the daughter of the Austrian Emperor," Napoleon had a new opportunity for the restoration of Poland. I quote from a French author, whose history is an apotheosis of Napoleon. Norvins says:

"Napoleon was enabled, in 1810, to realise, at last, that noble project", viz. the restoration of Poland, "because Austria offered him both the Galicias, but he refused, in order not to have a war with Russia who prepared war against him the very day after the conclusion of the treaty of Tilsit."

After what has preceded, it is almost superfluous to say that Napoleon made his war of 1812 against Russia not out of any regard for Poland. He was forced into it by Russia who on 19/31 December 1810 allowed the import of colonial commodities in neutral ships, prohibited some French commodities, hardly taxed others, and made not the least concession despite all the diplomatic efforts of Napoleon at preventing the war. He must either resign his continental system, or make war against Russia.

28 June 1812. Day of entry of Napoleon at Vilna. On that day the existence of confederate Poland (that is Poland united to Lithuania) was proclaimed at the diet of Warsaw, and a national war. Napoleon told the deputies of Warsaw, that he did not want a national war. (Charras tells us that by his hatred of such a war etc. 100 days.)

Written in December 1864

First published in K. Marx, Manuskripte über die polnische Frage, S.-Gravenhage, 1961

---
a Marie Louise, daughter of Francis I.— Ed.
b J. M. Norvins’ Histoire de Napoléon is quoted from Sawaszkiewicz, op. cit., p. 84.— Ed.
c J. B. Charras, Histoire de la campagne de 1815. Waterloo, Londres, 1858.— Ed.
As to the accession of the General Federation of German Working Men's Societies, it will declare in one way or another the identity of its purposes with those of the International Association, but the adhesion cannot take place directly, through a formal resolution passed by the [representatives] of the General German Association, because such a step would be in contravention to the Prussian laws regulating associations.

From the same reason the Berlin Society of Printers and Composers, which takes the greatest interest in your proceedings, is disabled from adhering to the London society by way of a formal resolution.

However, even the latter society is sure to send a deputy to the Congress to be convoked by the London Committee.²³¹

Moreover, you must not forget, that our journal,³ the organ of the German Federation of Working Men's Societies, has been put at the entire disposal of the International Committee.

Written on January 24, 1865

Reproduced from the manuscript

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

---

³ Der Social-Demokrat.—Ed.
21 Febr. (Tuesday). Central Council resolves to send Le Lubez over there. Leaves.

Wednesday. 22 Febr. (Evening.) Lubez leaves.

Paris. 23 Febr. Invitation to a MEETING with Lefort at Fribourg’s, etc. (See LETTER OF Fribourg.) Lefort’s reply in Schily’s letter (p. 2).

24 Febr. Evening. MEETING Fribourg, etc.


Leaving Lefort in the vicinity for the time being, Schily then goes to Fribourg’s, where they found different friends, amongst others a friend of Leforts. All were decidedly against his intrusion. Schily then went away to fetch him, and did not conceal from him that he considered his claim such as formulated by him untenable (p. 2). Lefort was deceived on this occasion (l.c.). Steps taken to meet Lefort halfway (2, 3).

25 (!) Febr. Evening. MEETING. Le Lubez absent; went to Lefort’s soirée (3, 4).

Description of this MEETING of 25 Febr. (pp. 4, 5, 6).

Written on about March 4, 1865

First published, in Russian, in Generalny Sovêt Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1961.
I propose the following resolutions to the Sub-Committee. a

1) The present Paris branch Administration, consisting of Citizens Tolain, Fribourg, and Limousin, is confirmed in its functions by the London Central Council, which also expresses them its thanks for their zeal and activity;

2) The adjunction of Citizen Pierre Vinçard to the Paris branch Administration is thought desirable 236;

3) While thanking Citizen Lefort for the part he took in the foundation of the International Society, and earnestly wishing for his collaboration, as homme de conseil, with the Paris branch Administration, the London Central Council at the same time consider themselves not entitled to impose Citizen Lefort in any official capacity upon the Paris branch Administration.

4) Citizen Victor Schily is appointed the Paris delegate of the London Central Council.

In this character he has to act only with the Paris branch Administration. He will exercise that droit de surveillance which the Paris branch themselves have thought proper to acknowledge as a necessary attribute of the Central Council under the present political conjuncture. 237

Written on March 4, 1865

Reproduced from the manuscript


a This phrase is in German in the original.— Ed.
Karl Marx

[MEMORANDUM TO HERMANN JUNG ABOUT THE CONFLICT IN THE PARIS SECTION\textsuperscript{238}]

\textit{Sub-Committee Sitting. 4 March.} He\textsuperscript{a} wanted already to move his resolution, according to which the Paris Administration was to be composed as follows: Fribourg, Vinçard, Limousin, 3 members to be designated by Lefort, Schily as a sort of umpire.

\textit{Sub-Committee Sitting. 6 March.} He reproduces that motion.

\textit{Sitting of the Central Council. 7 March.} He allowed the appointment of Schily to pass \textit{without division}, that is, he \textit{accepted} it, speaking in a parliamentary sense.

After this had taken place, he writes in hot-haste to Paris, even before he had the \textit{Resolutions} in his hand. He expected, as he said (14 March), that the \textit{Paris Administration} would \textit{protest} against Schily. As by Resolution V (Resolution V. The Administration at Paris having expressed its readiness to acknowledge a direct delegation from the Central Council, the Council accordingly appoints Citizen Schily to be its delegate to the said Administration.)\textsuperscript{b}) Schily was only accredited to \textit{that} Administration, his appointment could only be protested against by them.

Having failed with them, Lubez conspires with the brothers of his lodge, to declare Schily's appointment the cause of their withdrawal.\textsuperscript{239}

\textsuperscript{a} Victor Le Lubez.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} See this volume, p. 83.—\textit{Ed.}
He puts himself in this awkward position: He protests against the Paris Administration in the name of Lefort, and he protests against Schily in the name of the Paris Administration which represents the French branch, etc.

On the remark of Mr. Fox (last sitting of Central Council) that this forgetfulness of Schily's nationality on 4 and 6 March, and his vivid recollection of it on March 14 could only be accounted for by his wish to revenge himself because of the slight he thought Mr. Lefort was put to, he accepted this plain explanation.

His mean insinuations:

1-stly) As if the introductory words of Resolution V had been inserted as a catch-vote on false pretences. These words rest upon facts, Mr. Schily's open letter, brought over by Lubez, read on March 7 in presence of Tolain, etc.; secondly Mr. Schily's report, communicated to the Sub-Committee; lastly the resolutions passed by the meeting of 24th February at Paris.240 The words were only inserted to avoid even the appearance of dictatorship on the part of the Central Council.

2-ndly) There had on March 7 time been killed by personal altercations in order to hurry the acceptance of the 3 last resolutions; carry them by surprise.

3-rdly) Mr. Schily was no ouvrier. Rejected as principle by Resolution II. Schily had only to act privately with the Paris Administration; Lefort was to act upon the public stage before the world in the name of the Association. The cases not analogous.

As to Lefort.

He asks us to appoint him Defender General in the French press. We do so because we suppose him to act in understanding, and in concurrence with Tolain, etc. This nomination so obtained, he turns afterwards against us into a legal title. On Tolain's letter, and before Lubez was sent to Paris, we cancel this appointment, as far as Mr. Lefort's name and public position is concerned. (We reduce it to this: he is allowed to write articles not signed by himself, but by an ouvrier—a thing which he might have done without our consent.) That such is the case, results from an angry letter he then wrote to Lubez, but he yielded. The Paris meeting of February 24th committed only this blunder that it protested

---

a The concluding part of Resolution II reads: the Council "protests that it does not sanction the principle that none but an ouvrier is admissible as an official in our Society".— Ed.
The last page of Marx's memorandum to Jung about the conflict in the Paris Section
against a resolution that had ceased to exist. And upon this Mr. Lefort, or his friends at London, feign to forget that he had already given up the post he was named to. He even menaces us to warn all democrats against us, forgetting that we can warn against him, if necessary.

He and his man Lubez say that he is not moved by personal ambition. He only wants a political guarantee. Well. We appoint Vinçard, a man who represents more guarantees than Lefort et Le Lubez put together. Having been appointed, Mr. Vinçard turns into a nonentity for Lefort and Lubez. The only thing they could say against his proposal by Tolain, etc., afterwards confirmed by us, is this: that it was not at the right time communicated to Lefort. Thus this miserable point of etiquette is their last pretence of opposition, etc.

International character of the Society endangered, and power of the Council to appoint ambassadors.
The class character of this movement. Républicains formalistes.

1) Pas de résolution contre Schily; Marx déclare la nomination de Mons. Schily comme non-venue et qu'il l'avait seulement acceptée parce qu'elle a passé unanimement.a

2) The instructions given to Le Lubez to communicate to the French Administration and Lefort (in the sitting of Council, b 7th March), run thus: “In case no compromise be arrived at, the Council declare that the group Lefort, after having taken out their cards of membership, will have the power, under our Statutes (see §7), to form a local branch society.”c

---

a "No resolution against Schily; Marx declares that appointment of M. Schily is cancelled and that he accepted it only because it was passed unanimously." The phrase is written in French in Jung's hand; the words "declares that appointment of M. Schily is cancelled and that" is written by Marx.—Ed.
b This part of the phrase is written in Jung's hand; the word "private" at its beginning is crossed out; the rest of the paragraph is in Marx's hand.—Ed.
c See this volume, p. 83.—Ed.
In the sitting of the Council of March 14 this private instruction was changed into a resolution, because no compromise could be arrived at. This was the only resolution passed.

(There was the other resolution passed that Lubez had to communicate literally to both sides the whole of the resolution.)

Written on March 16-18, 1865

First published, in Russian, in Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1961
Ernest Jones writes to Marx (d.d. March 16, Manchester) that he will support the delegation sent to the Manchester Conference.\textsuperscript{242} The middle class had sent to him and Hooson to sign the Circular convening the Manchester Conference. He had not accepted it at the date of the letter. He writes moreover\textsuperscript{a}:

"We are going to hold district meetings in Manchester to organise the Manhood Suffrage movement in support of the London one."

Give Mr. Cremer (privately) the address of E. Jones: 55, Cross Street, Manchester.

Written on March 18, 1865

Reproduced from the manuscript

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

\textsuperscript{a} These words are in German in the original.— Ed.
1) A general rise in the rate of wages will, broadly speaking, produce a general fall in the rate of profits, leaving the values of commodities unaltered.

2) Under very exceptional circumstances, only a general rise of wages could be realised. If obtained, it could only [be] lost under very exceptional circumstances. The general tendency of production, upon its present basis, is not to raise, but to lower wages. Even if a general rise in the rate of wages should obtain for any longer period, it would not abolish but only mitigate the slavery of the wages' labourer, that is, of the mass of the people.

3) Trades' Unions work well as far as they counteract, if even temporarily, the tendency to a fall in the general rate of wages, and as far as they tend to shorten and regulate the time of labour, in other words, the extent of the working day. They work well as far as they are a means of organising the working class as a class. They fail accidentally, by an injudicious use of their power, and they fail generally by accepting the present relations of capital and labour as permanent instead of working for their abolition.

Written in June 1865

Karl Marx
[NOTES FOR THE REPORT ON VALUE, PRICE AND PROFIT]
Eccarius in the chair.
Minutes read and confirmed.
Citizens Longuet et Crespelle were nominated members of the Council.

Marx communicated to the Council the receipt by Fox of a letter of thanks by Mrs. O'Donovan for his articles in the Workman's Advocate on Fenianism, and the reprint, in the same paper, of the appeal for the support of the convicted Fenians.

Marx proposed Citizen Longuet's nomination in his place as correspondent for Belgium. Seconded by Jung. Accepted.

Jung read a letter of Dujonquoy (Hotel de New York) requesting the payment of £7 17s. owed to him from the times of the Conference.

A discussion followed in which Le Lubez, Jung, Dupont, Wheeler, Lessner, and others took part.

Cremer: The members of the Council and the Association ought [to] pay their cards immediately.

Jung proposes: That Dupont should tell Dujonquoy that the Council having not been largely attended, part of the bill be paid on Wednesday next and a definite answer given. Seconded by Lessner.

---


b "The State Prisoners. An Appeal to the Women of Ireland", The Workman's Advocate, No. 148, January 6, 1866.—Ed.

c The London Conference, September 25-29, 1865.—Ed.
Jung reads: Talbot, of Caen, letter, and one pound (for 20 cards) (to Dupont).

Propaganda in different towns of the departments of Calvados, Orne, La Manche.

Mr. Wheeler moves: That notice be given that everyone who does not (renew) pay his card until 15th February, will cease to be member of the Association. (To be advertised in the Advocate.) Seconded by Citizen Jung. Carried.

Werecki (as delegate of the Poles) explains their absence on the Standing Committee. On Monday they had a meeting and got the necessary money together. After some discussion, as to the place of meeting, St. Martin's Hall, next Monday (22 January), 8 o'clock in the evening.246

Cremer read the Appeal to the British Members. Accepted Address. Difficulty as to the signature of the names. Moved subscription-sheets to be printed. Carried on the motion of Wheeler.

Recorded on January 16, 1866

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

Reproduced from the manuscript
Minutes of the Central Council Meeting of January 16, 1866 recorded by Marx
Frederick Engels  
[SWEDEN AND DENMARK. TRAVEL NOTES]^{247}

6 July, 9 a.m., Hero on the Humber, 11 a.m. at sea, fresh westerly breeze, 12 km per hour, wind rising, heavy sea after mid-day, wind veering more and more to the North, in the evening half a gale, heavy rolling of the long ship, Captain Soulsby falls and breaks a rib, an English passenger badly hurts his face in similar circumstances, the mainsail breaks loose from the lower block.

7 July, impossible to set foot on deck, heavy rolling until, towards evening, the wind at last abates and we can go on deck, with the Holmen light-house in view. Sea subsides more and more, but choppy.

8 July, 7 a.m. Vingan, then entrance to the Götaälv skerries, roches moutonnées everywhere, the effect of the ice visible at 1,000 paces. Soon the river gets narrower, with green valleys between the granite rocks, then a few trees too, finally the approaches to Göteborg, lovely and strange because of the squat spaciousness of the broad houses.

Göteborg proper, a modern city amid old-Swedish surroundings; all stone inside, all wood outside. Dutch canals with Dutch stench in the streets. The Swedes look far more German than English; foreign Finnish element among them. By and large, the women's complexions are poor; coarse, but not repulsive features; men more attractive, but also more reminiscent of the inland German philistine. People in their forties all look like Baden philistines.

English is tolerated. German predominates. The commercial and literary dependence on Germany very apparent. Railway stations, public buildings, private houses, villas, everything in the German style, with minor variations for climatic reasons. Of England, only
the parks and their tidiness, and a church in the English neo-Gothic style. One can speak German in every shop; even in hotel English speakers are requested to speak German if possible.

Pinks and hawthorn in full bloom, everything as on 8 May. Beautiful kinds of elms along with ashes predominate in the foliage. Green as an English spring. Interspersed everywhere with bare granite moutonnées.

The way of life quite Continental, not English at all despite the drinking of false port and cherry brandy. The style of the hotels—rooms, breakfast, cuisine—everything Continental. Similarly the mixing of classes in public houses. Aperitifs (Appetitsup) and Hors d’oeuvres (smörbrödsborden) (25 öre).

People’s stature: medium height and stocky, 5’6” (Rhenish). Soldiers of horse artillery (värfvade) taller. Both officers and men rather militia-like, reminiscent of the Swiss. The Hull sailors look more like Holsteiners, Lower Saxons, Frisians, Angles and Danes than like Swedes. The Swedes here lack a manly expression of the face, mostly flabby bloated features, except for some seamen with Frisian physiognomy and sinewy build. The soldiers look like Westphalians, the officers too, neither private nor officious.

As always, one can’t help thinking how much is done everywhere on the Continent for the health and recreation of the populus as compared with aristocratic England.

Comic effect produced by the 2 English swell ladies, stared at by all the Swedish women.

Voyage to Stockholm. Lay-out of the steamer: back cabin for sleeping, front cabin for taking meals. Substantial fare. Salad with cream. Sweets. People further inland showing more character in their features, the men more handsome, stronger and taller, the women plain but homely and not unpleasant, also tall and sturdily built. Their character increasingly reminds one of Black Forest people, Swiss and Tyroleans (Steub’s Tyrolean Goths?). Country squires. The language too sounds very much like High German without gutturals.

Country at Götaälv lovely, but subdued, up to Trollhättan. Four waterfalls straight above one another. Mountains not over 600 to 800 feet high, but impressive. Then Lake Väner with Kinnekullen a, flat and monotonous. Vättern likewise. Karlsborg’s fortifications not badly laid out, long lines, polygonal, but isn’t the mountain behind dominant now? The lakes beautiful but all alike. Endless forests of fir

a The name of a hill.—Ed.
Plan of the Swedish fortress of Karlsborg.

Drawing by Engels
trees, damaged at that. None of the stately heavy firs of Switzerland. **Scotch fir.**

Motalaälv valley again partly cultivated, beautiful in places where trees—elms and birches—line the canal.

The skerry-dotted sea gets more and more beautiful towards Stockholm. Change in formation—limestone here and there and greater weathering, hence more gentle slopes and Alpine meadows rising direct from the sea. Marble quarries on two islands. The skerries become higher and more beautiful the closer one gets to Stockholm. Lovely scenery along Lake Mälaren; forests, fields and villas alternating.


Stockholm has more the air of a capital city, foreign languages less coulant, but German spoken in every shop. Men's fashions, decidedly English in Göteborg, predominantly French here. Hypocrisy concerning brännvinsbordet when ladies around; childish entertainments: merry-go-rounds, puppet shows, tight-rope walkers and bad music. Boat parties still the best "mekanismen". And yet serious or hypocritical Lutheran character of the people, which tolerates no Tivoli-type public entertainments on a large scale.

Soldiers, even Guards, slovenly in the militia manner, officers ditto. No life in them. Not very tall either, no match to the men of the 69th. Eclectic uniform and old-fashioned leathers. Sentries chat. Beards. The Malmö hussars—as heavy as troopers of the line—are the most handsome of the men.

The trains—dear me. Three times ringing, once whistling. 5 minutes=15 à 20. Simple but good buffets, everything costs 1 riksdaler. Landscape picturesque, but after the first two hours monotonous and ultimately boring through perpetual repetition. The abundance of lakes readily explained by the effect of the ice. The valleys are mostly former seaboat or peat moors.
Smart trick this sending the people to Malmö to bring a series of diplomatic negotiations to an end.\footnote{248}

Copenhagen. Really more like a *hovedstaden* [capital] in size and life-style than Stockholm, but still small and modest. Decided preponderance of Germans, even on the streets. Cheerful children, all kinds of entertainments, above all for children. At least a hundred merry-go-rounds. The adults infantile too; ballet, circus, etc.; even the children’s cruelty, which takes the greatest satisfaction in tormenting children. Tivoli of the most characteristic kind.

Lovely trees everywhere in Copenhagen. Impressive entrance to the port. Old warships—very picturesque. The atmosphere of a peasant capital city that exploits 1.5 million peasants unmistakable everywhere.

Written between July 6 and 18, 1867


Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time
APPENDICES
October 5, 1864

The first meeting of the Committee, elected by the public meeting held at St. Martin’s Hall on the 28th of September 1864, was held at 18, Greek St., Soho, on October 5th, 1864, and on the motion of Mr. Weston, seconded by Mr. Whitlock, Mr. Odger was voted to the chair.

The Chairman said the first business was the appointment of a secretary to the Committee when Dr. Marx proposed and Mr. Whitlock seconded that Mr. Cremer be appointed.

Mr. Cremer would prefer the appointment of M. Le Lubez who was he believed in every way qualified to fill the office.

M. Le Lubez having for various reasons declined the office, Mr. Cremer was unanimously elected. [...] A very long and animated discussion then took place with regard to the principles on which the Association should be based, and ultimately on the motion of Mr. Dell, seconded by Mr. Trimlett, a sub-committee of 9 were appointed to draw up a platform of principles, such principles to be discussed at the next meeting of the General Committee.

The following were then elected as the Sub-Committee: Messrs. Whitlock, Weston, Dr. Marx, M. Le Lubez, Major Wolff, Mr. Holtorp, and Mr. Pidgeon, the Chairman and Secretary to be members by virtue of their offices.

November 1, 1864

Dr. Marx then read the Preamble, Address and Rules which the Sub-Committee had definitely agreed on and which they recommended to the Central Council for adoption.
Mr. Whitlock thought some explanation (in the form of a footnote) should be given as to the terms "nitrogen" and "carbon".

Messrs. Carter, Grossmith and others spoke in favour of the Address.

Mr. Whitlock proposed, Mr. Carter seconded: That the Address do pass as read.

As an amendment Mr. Worley proposed and Mr. Wheeler seconded: That the word "profitmongers" be erased.

For amendment—11, for resolution—10. The amendment being carried, the word "profitmongers" was struck out and the Address was unanimously agreed to.

Dr. Marx then read the Preamble, and on the motion of Mr. Wheeler, seconded by Blackmore, it was carried unanimously.

The Rules were then discussed, and on the proposition of Mr. Dell, seconded by Whitlock, the Preamble, Address and Rules were unanimously agreed to.\(^a\)

Mr. Wheeler then proposed and Mr. Dell seconded that the thanks of the Central Council be given to Dr. Marx, Mr. Weston and M. Le Lubez for their exertions and the production of so admirable an address. Carried unanimously.

---

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 5-16.—Ed.
November 8, 1864

Dr. Marx proposed, Mr. Jung seconded, that any person not being able to attend the meetings cannot be a member of this Council.a

Dr. Marx called attention to the reports in the Morning Star and Bee-Hiveb of the last meeting and complained that in such reports one of the fundamental principles of the Association, viz., truth, had been violated; he also complained of the Address having been published without the sanction of the Committee.251

The Secretaryc explained that he had nothing to do with the reports, at which he was very much surprised; he believed Mr. Hartwell had supplied the reports in question.

To obviate the recurrence of such erroneous reports Dr. Marx proposed, Mr. Fontana seconded:

That the Secretary purchase a manifold writer and for the future all reports for the press be sent through the Secretary.

Mr. Aldovrandi proposed and Mr. Carter seconded:

That Dr. Marx be requested to correct the typographical errors in the Address and that 500 copies of the Address, Programme d and Rules be printed. Carried unanimously.

---

a This resolution as published in The Bee-Hive Newspaper see on p. 17 of this volume.—Ed.
b Reports on the Central Council meeting of November 1, 1864 in The Morning Star, No. 2703, November 2, 1864 and The Bee-Hive Newspaper, No. 160, November 5, 1864.—Ed.
c W. R. Cremer.—Ed.
d A reference to the Preamble of the Provisional Rules of the International.—Ed.
November 15, 1864

Mr. Cremer then proposed, M. Le Lubez seconded: That 1,000 [copies of the] Address and Rules be printed. Carried unanimously. [...] A long discussion then took place with regard to the terms on which organised bodies should be received into the Association, and ultimately on the motion of Dr. Marx, seconded by Mr. Blackmore, the question was adjourned to the next meeting.¹

November 29, 1864

Dr. Marx then brought up the report of the Sub-Committee, also a draft of the address which had been drawn up for presentation to the people of America congratulating them on their having re-elected Abraham Lincoln as President. The address is as follows and was unanimously agreed to: [...] Mr. Wheeler proposed, Le Lubez seconded:

That the names of all those who are present be appended to the address, also those who are absent and are willing to endorse the views set forth in the address.²

December 13, 1864

Mr. Fox then read the address which he proposed should be adopted by the British Section of the Association and then transmitted to the National Government of Poland.²⁵²

A long discussion took place consequent on certain statements contained in the address and which statements were opposed by Mr. Jung, Le Lubez, Dr. Marx and supported by Mr. Carter.

Mr. Fox replied defending the statement that the traditional foreign policy of France had been favourable to the restoration and independence of Poland.

Mr. Cremer thought it important that the truth of this statement should be ascertained and would propose that the further

¹ Resolution on this point proposed by Marx and adopted by the Central Council on November 22, 1864 see on p. 18 of this volume.—Ed.
² See this volume, pp. 19-21.—Ed.
³ The report on this meeting, published in The Bee-Hive Newspaper, No. 164, December 3, 1864, states that the resolution was also supported by Marx.—Ed.
consideration of the address be deferred till the next meeting. Mr. Morgan seconded the motion. Carried unanimously.

December 20, 1864

Mr. Cremer read a letter from Mr. Adams, the United States Minister, suggesting that the address to President Lincoln be sent to him, Mr. Adams, instead of being brought.

Dr. Marx proposed, Mr. Fontana seconded, that the Secretary send the address to Mr. Adams.

Mr. Worley proposed, Mr. Wheeler seconded, that Mr. Adams be again appealed to receive the deputation.

For amendment—5, for resolution—13.

Mr. Fox then resumed his defence of the address to the Polish National Government and in an able address contended for the truth of the assertions therein contained, after some discussion it was agreed to adjourn the question till next meeting.

December 29, 1864

Mr. Fox stated in the absence of Dr. Marx he should defer any discussion on the address to the National Government of Poland.

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

Reproduced from the Minute Book

— Ed.

*The report about this Central Council meeting, published in The Bee-Hive, No. 166, December 17, 1864, has:

"Mr. Fox then brought up the address from the British Section of the Association to the National Government of Poland, when a very long and animated discussion took place, in which the following members took part—Messrs. Le Lubez, Holtorp, Cremer, Marx, Carter, Weston, Jung, the latter opposing a statement set forth in the address, viz., that the traditional foreign policy of France had been favourable to the restoration and independence of Poland. Karl Marx and Mr. Le Lubez also agreeing that while the foreign policy of France had appeared to favour such an object, in reality [it] had not, especially during the time of the first Napoleon, when the Poles had been used for his military ambition, and then cast aside. Mr. Fox defended the address and ably contended for the retention of the passage referring to the traditional foreign policy of France towards Poland, and it was ultimately agreed as the question was an important one that its further consideration be deferred till the next meeting."—*Ed.*
January 3, 1865

Dr. Marx handed in a German translation of the Address and Rules of the Association and stated that 50,000 copies had been circulated in Germany; he also stated that a branch of the Association was being formed in Switzerland. [...] Dr. Marx resumed the adjourned debate on the Address which it is proposed to send to the National Government of Poland, and in a very able historical resumé argued that the traditional foreign policy of France had not been favourable to the restoration and independence of Poland. The Address of Dr. Marx was pregnant with important historical facts which would be very valuable in a published form.

Mr. Fox in reply stated he did not defend the foreign policy of modern France; all he contended for was that the foreign policy of old France had been favourable to the Independence of Poland.

The following was then proposed by Mr. Jung, seconded by Le Lubez and unanimously adopted:

That the views expressed in the address concerning the French foreign policy towards Poland not being borne out by historical facts, that it be amended so as to accord with the truths of history.

January 24, 1865

Correspondence was read [...] by Dr. Marx from the Compositors' Society of Berlin, also from the General German Working Men's Association, both expressing their entire concurrence with the principles of the International Working Men's Association and

---

See this volume, pp. 311-27.—Ed.
regretting that there were legal impediments which prevented
them from becoming affiliated members of the Association, but
promising to send representatives to the congress.\textsuperscript{a}

Dr. Marx also read a very interesting letter from the military
commander\textsuperscript{b} of St. Louis,\textsuperscript{254} and a letter from M. Tolain having
reference to the position they occupied in Paris in relation to
International Working Men's Association.

A discussion then took place concerning certain statements or
rumours in regard to M. Tolain, and it was agreed that before any
cards of membership were sent to Paris that the truth of such
rumours should be investigated.\textsuperscript{255}

\textit{January 31, 1865}

A discussion then took place regarding the period when the
subscriptions of members should begin and end when Citizen
Marx proposed and Citizen Whitlock seconded: That subscriptions
begin on the First of January and end on the 31st of December.

Citizen Cremer then proposed and Citizen Fontana seconded: That those who have been elected members of the Central Council
but have not taken out their cards of membership by the 1st of
March next, shall after that date be considered as excluding
themselves from the Central Council. [...] Citizen Marx then read an extract from the \textit{St. Louis Daily Press}
eulogistic of our Address and Rules and expressing their regret at
not being able to publish the whole.\textsuperscript{c}\textsuperscript{256} [...] The Secretary\textsuperscript{d} then introduced the question of the suffrage,
stating there was an attempt being made to organise a meeting for
manhood suffrage and he thought the Council ought to watch the
preliminary proceedings and for that purpose would propose that
a deputation be appointed to attend the preliminary meeting
which will be shortly held.

\textsuperscript{a} The author's draft of this report see on p. 328 of this volume.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{b} J. Weydemeyer.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{c} \textit{The Bee-Hive Newspaper}, No. 173, February 4, 1865 has: "Dr. Marx also read
an extract from the \textit{St. Louis Daily Press} (America) approving the Address, and
rules of the International, and regretting their limited space would not allow the
entire publication of the Address, which, however, they printed in part, in proof of
the deep interest which the Association has excited. It may be mentioned that
hundreds of cards have been sent for from Paris, Belgium, &c.; and, although in
some places on the Continent working men are prohibited from openly associating
together for such principles as the International has in view, yet even in those places
they are exerting themselves to find some plan whereby they may affiliate themselves
to the Association without coming within the power of the law."—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{d} W. R. Cremer.—\textit{Ed.}
A long discussion took place in which Citizens Marx, Whitlock, Wheeler, Le Lubez, Carter took part. Citizen Wheeler seconded the resolution which was carried unanimously.\textsuperscript{257}

\textit{February 7, 1865}

Citizen Cremer gave the report of the Sub-Committee; they recommended to the Central Council the following:

[1] That separate cards be issued to societies forming the Association, such cards to be of a general character stating that the society whose name it bore had affiliated itself to the International Association\textsuperscript{a};

2nd. That all the money subscribed in England for individual cards be sent to the Central Council, but if any branch of the Association shall incur any legitimate expense, the Central Council may, if they deem it judicious, grant a sum for the liquidation of such debt;

3rd. That our Continental brethren be supplied with cards at 1s. each, which sums to be sent to the Central Council.

They were proposed by Citizen Cremer, seconded by Citizen Marx and carried unanimously. [...] Citizen Marx then proposed and Citizen Wheeler seconded, that Citizen Lefort be appointed as our literary defence in Paris. Carried unanimously.

\textit{February 14, 1865}

Citizen Marx then stated that a branch of the International Working Men’s Association had been formed in Manchester, he also read a letter from Mr. Ernest Jones on the subject of manhood suffrage.\textsuperscript{258}

The letter was fully discussed.

Citizen Marx also read an extract from the German \textit{Star}\textsuperscript{b} which stated that the Swiss were interesting themselves on behalf of the Association and that a meeting of the Republican League and French Swiss Society had been held; they had accepted the rules and would form branches throughout Switzerland with a central council in Geneva.

\textsuperscript{a} See this volume, pp. 369-70.— \textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} A reference to J. Ph. Becker’s “Muthiges Kämpfen” in Nordstern, No. 296, February 11, 1865.— \textit{Ed.}
February 21, 1865

On the motion of Whitlock, seconded by Citizen Marx, Citizen Le Lubez then read some correspondence from Paris which referred to unpleasant proceedings having taken place there, and as it was generally agreed that it would be difficult to settle the differences by correspondence, it was decided on the proposition of Citizen Whitlock, seconded by Fontana, that Le Lubez be sent to Paris to investigate the differences existing between Citizen Lefort and Citizen Fribourg.

Citizen Marx proposed, Citizen Lessner seconded, that Mr. Schily be appointed to co-operate with Citizen Le Lubez in settling the differences. Carried unanimously.

It was also agreed that the delegates be invested with power to act as circumstances may determine.

February 28, 1865

Citizen Marx read correspondence from Manchester regarding the suffrage, he also stated that he had withdrawn from any connection with the Social-Demokrat.

First published, in Russian, in Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1961
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a See this volume, p. 329.— Ed.
b Ibid., pp. 87-90.— Ed.
[...] Of the speeches made at the anniversary celebration I shall only report some remarks by Karl Marx. Concerning the dispute about self-help versus state-help he said that both parties were mistaken. In bourgeois society all the means of subsistence and of labour belong to the capitalists and therefore self-help is nonsense. On the other hand, it is obvious that under a Bismarckian government state assistance is out of the question.—The workers cannot sell themselves to the Bismarck government. State assistance can only proceed from a state in which the proletariat exercises supreme power. To preach the emancipation of labour within the Prussian monarchy would be to raise a storm in a teacup. The emancipation of labour implies the liberation of Germany and this in turn entails the restoration of Poland and the overthrow of the Prussian monarchy. Turning to the Progress Party's criticisms of the behaviour of the workers towards the bourgeoisie, Marx said that at the time when he had written that the workers must unite with the bourgeoisie against absolutism, it had been assumed that the German bourgeoisie would achieve at least as much as the English bourgeoisie had achieved in its time, but this had not happened in fact. In Germany, and particularly in Prussia, a press law was in force which freely permitted people high up in society to abuse and slander those beneath them. He added that the workers' newspapers and the workers' movement itself could only exist with police authorisation and that the government could only be attacked with kid gloves. In such conditions joint action by the workers and the bourgeoisie was impossible, particularly since the bourgeoisie was too cowardly to carry out its own programme.

Reported by Johann George Eccarius
First published in Der Social-Demokrat, No. 24, February 19, 1865
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AGREEMENT
BETWEEN MR. KARL MARX AND MR. OTTO MEISSNER,
PUBLISHER AND BOOKSELLER

1. We, the undersigned, jointly undertake to publish the first and all subsequent editions of the work entitled "Capital. A Critique of Political Economy" by Karl Marx on the following terms. The book will be approximately 50 signatures in length and will appear in two volumes. Each of the contracting parties will receive one half of the net earnings which are arrived at after deducting 33 1/3 per cent discount for the retailers from the gross receipts and after deducting the costs of paper, printing, binding, transport and advertisement, etc., from the remainder.

2. The accounts will be drawn up each August for the copies sold during the preceding year and the profit will be shared out at the same time. The Publisher reserves the right, however, to pay one-third of the sum not more than three months later.

3. The cost of paper, printing and binding will be calculated on the basis of the original invoices. To cover the costs of advertising, transport, circulars, postage, etc., Otto Meissner will debit the production costs with the round sum of 100 Thalers for each edition, irrespective of whether the actual sum be greater or less.

4. Should the work yield no profit, any resulting loss will be borne by the Publisher, Otto Meissner, alone.

5. Neither of us may transfer his rights in the publication to a third party without the consent of the other, except in the event of death, when the ownership passes to the heirs without the need for an additional deed of assignment.

6. The size of the edition and the format of the work shall be determined by mutual agreement. The Publisher shall have the discretion to determine the price and the method of sale of the work.
7. Each of the contracting parties has the right to receive ten free copies of the work for his own private purposes and these, together with the review copies to be sent to newspapers, will be deducted from the edition when the accounts are presented.

8. The Author undertakes to deliver the complete manuscript of the work to the Publisher on or before the last day of May of this year, while the latter undertakes to publish the work in its entirety by October of this year at the latest, and to dispatch the first volume sooner if possible.

We regard the above eight points as binding upon us and our heirs.
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Otto Meissner in Hamburg
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March 7, 1865

Citizen Fox then read to the Council the report of the Committee and the resolutions recommended by it in reference to the imbroglio in Paris.263

It was agreed to consider the resolutions seriatim.²

March 14, 1865

Citizen Le Lubez read a letter from Citizen Lefort. He also stated it was a mistake to suppose he had been or was now in any way prejudiced in favour of Lefort or Tolain. He also read a letter signed by Citizens Bocquet, Denoual, and himself, protesting against the former decision of the Central Council in turning out Citizen Lefort, and another letter signed by Citizens Bordage, Leroux, Denoual, Bocquet, and himself, protesting against the appointment by the Central Council of anyone not a Frenchman as the delegate to the Administration in Paris.

Citizen Marx stated the protest was unnecessary as he, Citizen Marx, was certain that Citizen Schily would not accept the appointment if there was the slightest opposition to him: it was against Citizen Schily’s wish that he had been elected.²⁶⁴

The President suggested the re-opening of the whole question. This was opposed by Citizens Howell, Kaub and Cremer.

The following resolution was then proposed by Citizen Weston, seconded by Citizen Morgan and carried unanimously:

---

² Here follows the text of the five resolutions on the conflict in the Paris section drawn up by Marx on behalf of the Standing Committee (see this volume, pp. 82-83) and record of the discussion on each of them.—Ed.
That the Central Council having the fullest confidence in Citizen Lefort, earnestly requests him to retain the card of membership he has in his possession and hopes that he will use his great influence to form a branch in France. [...]  

Citizen Weston gave notice of the following propositions for discussion at the earliest opportunity:
1st. Would not an advance of wages of any particular section of industry be secured at the cost of the other sections.
2nd. Would not the supposed advantages of a general rise in wages be negated by the corresponding advance in prices.

_April 11, 1865_

The situations of corresponding secretary for France, also for Belgium, having become vacant consequent on the resignation of Citizen Lubez, Citizen Jung proposed, Morgan seconded, that Citizen Marx be corresponding secretary _pro tem_ for Belgium. Carried unanimously.

Citizen Marx proposed, Citizen Cremer seconded, that Citizen Dupont be appointed corresponding secretary for France. Carried unanimously. [...]  

Citizen Marx stated that one of the 32 members who had met recently in Paris had been prosecuted by the French Government for publishing a pamphlet. Carried unanimously. [...]  

Citizen Longmaid proposed and Citizen Marx seconded:
That the Secretary write to those members of the Central Council who have not taken their cards of membership and inform them that unless they do so on or before April 25, that they will be considered as wishing to withdraw and their names will accordingly be struck off the roll of Councilmen. This resolution was considered by the Central Council necessary inasmuch as complaints had been made that a former resolution of a similar character had never been communicated officially to absentee members.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

It was then agreed to that the proposition of Citizen Weston on the question of wages should come on for discussion on May 2nd and that members of the Association were eligible to attend the discussion, also that any member of the Central Council is at liberty to introduce a friend.
April 25, 1865

Citizen Wheeler proposed, Citizen Marx seconded, that Continental corresponding members be *ex officio* members of the Central Council. Carried unanimously. [...] 

Citizen Marx read a letter from Ernest Jones on the suffrage, he also read a letter from Citizen Fontaine asking for a declaration of principles. Questions in said letter referred to Sub-Committee. He also read a letter from the compositors at Leipsic referring to their strike and expressing a hope that the London compositors would assist them. 

Citizens Fox, Marx and Cremer were deputed to attend the Compositors' Society.

May 2, 1865

Marx gave a report from Paris stating there were changes about being made there in the Administration which when made would be fully reported to the Central Council. [...] 

Cremer referred to the assassination of President Lincoln and proposed that an address should be drawn up and sent to the American people expressing the views of the Central Council on recent events in America, more particularly referring to the murder of Mr. Lincoln. 

The resolution was seconded by Lucraft and carried unanimously.

Weston then read a portion of his paper on the question of wages; the remainder was adjourned to the next sitting.

May 9, 1865

Citizen Fox read a letter from Citizen Vinçard who had been appointed on the Paris Administration, stating that the state of his health would preclude him from accepting the appointment, also expressing his best wishes for the success of the Association and regretting that he could not assist to make it so. 

Jung proposed, Marx seconded: 

That the General Secretary write to Citizen Vinçard thanking him for his past services and hoping that he will, as far as [is] consistent with his health, do his utmost for the interest of the Association. Carried unanimously. 

Citizen Marx read the address to President Johnson in reference to the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. 

---

a See this volume, pp. 99-100.—*Ed.*
Cremer proposed, Weston seconded:
That the address be adopted, written on parchment, signed by
the Central Council and transmitted to President Johnson through
the United States Legation. Carried unanimously.

Citizen Howell, who had been appointed to attend with Citizen
Cremer the Reform Conference in Manchester on the 15th and
16th of May, having been elected by the Reform League as its
secretary and being deputed by that body to attend said
conference, his appointment from this Council was therefore on
the proposition of Citizen Wheeler, seconded by Citizen Marx,
cancelled and Citizen Odger was elected in his stead. [...]  

Citizen Fox proposed, Bolleter seconded:
That Weston’s question for discussion stand adjourned to
Saturday, May 20th, at 8 o’clock, the entire sitting to be devoted to
the discussion. Carried unanimously.

May 16, 1865

Cit. Marx stated that he had sent to the New-York Tribune a
copy of the Society’s address to President Johnson. He also
mentioned that there had been an immense public meeting in
Geneva in regard to the assassination of the late lamented
President of the United States; that the Society’s correspondent,
Philipp Becker, had spoken at the same, and remarked upon the
international character of the meeting.

Cit. Becker then proceeded to state that the Working Men’s
International Association was at the head of the new movement
for popular rights, which statement was received with cheers by
the meeting.

May 23, 1865

Citizen Weston resumed the adjourned debate on his proposi-
tion regarding wages. He was followed by Citizen Marx who
opposed Citizen Weston’s views as did Citizen Wheeler, after which
Cremer proposed the adjournment of the debate till the 30th. Carried unanimously.

---
a The reference is to the electoral reform movement in England.— Ed.
b The point was not debated on that date.— Ed.
May 30, 1865

Citizen Marx recommended that the Council should concentrate its efforts upon promoting the success of the Working Men's Congress to be held in Belgium this year.\(^{275}\)

June 6, 1865

Citizen Marx stated that when Citizen Weston's propositions are again discussed he should read a paper in reply and propose a series of counter-resolutions.

June 20, 1865

Citizen Marx then read a part of his paper in reply to Citizen Weston's propositions on the question of wages.\(^{a}\)

Citizen Weston thought that in the part of the paper read by Citizen Marx nothing had been advanced or proved which in any way affected the principles he affirmed.

Citizen Cremer thought Citizen Marx had given two or three practical illustrations or rather facts which completely destroyed the positions affirmed by Citizen Weston.

The question was adjourned till June 27th at 9 o'clock. Citizen Marx will then read the latter part of his paper and propose a series of counter-resolutions.

June 27, 1865

Citizen Marx then, after recapitulating the principal points in the first part of his paper which he had read at the last sitting, proceeded to read the latter part, at the conclusion of which Citizen Cremer said there were many who would like to have both papers—of Citizen Weston and Citizen Marx's reply—printed, but he hardly knew how the expense was to be met.

Citizen Weston questioned the correctness of the statement contained in Citizen Marx's paper having reference to agricultural labourers.

On the motion of Citizen Eccarius the debate was adjourned to the next sitting to be opened by Citizen Eccarius.

July 4, 1865

Citizen Eccarius resumed the adjourned debate on Citizen Weston's propositions, arguing against Citizen Weston's views.

\(^{a}\) See this volume, pp. 101-49.—Ed.
Citizen Fox slightly differed with Citizen Eccarius as to the continued intellectual progress which Citizen Eccarius asserted had been made by mankind.

Citizen Carter altogether ignored the statistics of political economists and preferred to look at and judge man by what we knew of him.

Citizen Kaub proposed the adjournment of the debate till the next sitting. Carried unanimously.276
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INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION
FOUNDED ON 28TH SEPTEMBER, 1864,
AT A PUBLIC MEETING HELD AT ST. MARTIN'S HALL, LONDON

Central Council,
18 Greek Street, London, W.

The Address and Statutes issued by the Provisional Central Council fully explain the Association's objects and aspirations, which, however, may be summed up in a few words. It aims at the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation, economical and political, of the Working Classes. As a means to this great end it will promote the establishment of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labour in EACH COUNTRY, and the co-operation of the Working Classes of DIFFERENT COUNTRIES.

Its Organisation, with a Central Medium at London, and numerous affiliated Branches in Europe and America, will assist in uniting the Working Classes of all countries in a perpetual bond of fraternal co-operation. Annual Congresses of Delegates, elected by the affiliated Working Men themselves, will create for the Working Classes a public and powerful European representation.

The Executive Council on behalf of the Operative Bricklayers' Society, assembled at the 25, Hatfield Street, Blackfriars, London, having subscribed to the principles, and applied to enter the fraternal bond, are hereby admitted as an affiliated Branch of the Association.

Dated the 21st of February 1865

G. Odger, President of Council
G. W. Wheeler, Honorary Treasurer

E. Dupont, Corresponding Secretary for France.
K. Marx, do Germany.

—a italicised words and "21st of February 1865" are in handwriting.—Ed.
E. Holtorp, do Poland.
H. Jung, do Switzerland.
L. Lewis, do America.

W. R. Cremer, Honorary General Secretary.

Published as a leaflet in London in the summer of 1865

Reproduced from the leaflet
International Working Men's Association,

CENTRAL COUNCIL,

18 GREEK STREET, LONDON, W.

---

Trade, Friendly, or any Working Men's Societies are invited to join in their corporate capacity, the only conditions being that the Members subscribe to the principles of the Association, and pay for the declaration of their enrolment (which is varnished and mounted on canvas and roller), the sum of 5s. No contributions are demanded from Societies joining, it being left to their means and discretion to contribute or not, or as they may from time to time deem the efforts of the Association worthy of support.

The Central Council will be pleased to send the Address and Rules, which fully explain the principles and aims of the Association, to any Society applying for them: and, if within the London district, deputations will gladly attend to afford any further information that may be required. Societies joining are entitled to send a representative to the Central Council. The amount of contribution for individual members is 1s. per annum, with 1d. for Card of Membership; which may be obtained; with every information concerning the Association, by applying to the Honorary Secretary, or at the Central Council's Meetings, which are held every Tuesday Evening, at 18 Greek Street, from Eight to Ten o'clock.

E. DUPONT, Corresponding Secretary for France.
K. MARX, " " Germany.
E. HOLSTORP, " " Poland.
H. IUNG, " " Switzerland.
L. LEWIS, " " America.

G. ODGER, President of Central Council.
G. W. WHEELER, Hon. Treasurer.

Central Council's Address to working men's societies
FORM OF APPLICATION
FOR SOCIETIES WISHING TO JOIN THE
International Working Men's Association.

We, the Members of the
____________________
____________________ assembled
at the ______________________
declare our entire concurrence with the principles and aims of the International Working Men's Association, and pledge ourselves to disseminate and reduce them to practice; and as an earnest of our sincerity we hereby apply to the Central Council to be admitted into the fraternal bond as an affiliated Branch of the Association.

Signed on behalf of the Members, _____ in number.

__________________________
Secretary.

__________________________
President.

__________________________ 186
In consequence of the urgent representations of our French and Swiss correspondents who call upon the Central Council to take some steps in fulfilment of the pledge given at the time of the foundation of the Association that a congress would be held in Brussels in the present year to discuss questions of general interest to the proletarians of Europe, your Committee have taken the whole subject into their consideration and submit to you the following series of proposals:

1. That it is not possible to assemble a congress in Brussels or London at the present time. In lieu thereof we propose a conference which shall assemble in London on Monday, September 25th.

2. That the following declaration be published in the Continental and British journals which are favourable to our cause:

"The Central Council of the International Working Men’s Association announce that they have resolved on postponing the convocation of a general congress of working men at Brussels or elsewhere for three reasons:

1st. Because they have felt the advisability of having a preliminary conference with a few delegates from their principal branches on the Continent touching [on] the programme which ought to be laid before the said congress.

2nd. Because in Britain the reform movement, the general elections and the industrial exhibition and in France the strikes have absorbed the energies and attention of the working classes to such an extent as to have retarded the maturity of the Association.

3rd. Because during the present year the Belgian Parliament has passed an alien act\(^{280}\) of such a character as to put an end to..."
the project the Association had entertained of holding a congress,
or to any they might have entertained of having a conference in
the capital of Belgium."

3. The conference is to be constituted in this wise: two delegates
from every central administration are to be invited, also two from
Lyons. The cost of the travelling expenses of the delegates will be
borne by their constituents. Their costs in London will be defrayed
by the Central Council.

4. As to the ways and means of defraying these costs, the
Committee have received the generous offer from Citizen Jung
that he will board and lodge the delegates from Switzerland. For
the rest the Committee recommend:
1st. That the members of the Central Council renew their
annual subscriptions in the month of September previous to the
assembling of the conference.
2nd. That the General Secretary\(^a\) be instructed to appeal to the
secretaries of the societies who have already joined the Association
to exert themselves to sell cards of membership to their individual
members for the sake of meeting the outlay of the conference.
3rd. That the members of the Central Council be recommended
to take cards on sale, paying to the Council the amount of the
same in ready money recouping the immediate outlay from the
produce of the sales.

5. The Committee propose that the Central Council should
adopt and submit to the conference a certain programme which
was amended and passed in the following form by the Central
Council:
1) Questions relating to the Congress.
2) Questions relating to the organisation of the Association.
3) Combination of effort by means of the Association in the
different national struggles between capital and labour.
4) Trades' unions, their past, present, and future.
5) Co-operative labour.
6) Direct and indirect taxation.
7) Reduction of the number of the hours of labour.
8) Female and children labour.
9) The Muscovite invasion of Europe and the re-establishment
of an independent and integral Poland.
10) Standing armies, their effects upon the interests of the
productive classes.

6. Preliminary sittings of the delegates to be held with
Committee, the definitive sittings with the Central Council.

\(^a\) W. R. Cremer.— Ed.
7. On the 28th of September a soirée will be held for the three following objects: 1st, to commemorate the founding of the Association; 2nd, to do honour to the Continental delegates; and 3rd, to celebrate the triumph of federalism and free labour in America.

The soirée to consist of a tea, speaking, conversation, and dancing.

Fellow Working Men!

It is a fact that amongst the thousands of daily and weekly newspapers existing at the present day, those that advocate the interests of the working class and defend the cause of labour might be counted at your fingers' ends. Nor is this to be wondered at when you bear in mind that, almost without exception, they are the property of capitalists, established for their own use, either for political party purposes or as commercial speculations. Thus, the publicity of matters concerning our political enfranchisement, our social emancipation, or our material well-being as hired wages labourers depends to a great extent on sufferance, and when now and then an editor, in his superior wisdom, takes it into his head to side with us, it is frequently doubtful whether decided opposition would not be preferable to the favour bestowed. This is a very unsatisfactory state of things for a body of men like the working men of this country with high and well-founded aspirations to raise themselves in the political and social scale.

Benjamin Franklin is reported to have said,

"If you want a thing done, and well done, do it yourself",

and this is precisely what we must do. If your expected elevation is not to prove a delusion and a mockery—we must take the work of our salvation into our own hands, and this can only be done by acquiring a more prominent position in the press and on the platform than we have hitherto done.

In order that we may guard against deceitful friends, we require a press of our own. To this end we must establish and support as many newspapers and periodicals as we can, wherein we ourselves
must advocate and defend our own cause against open antagonists and wily friends. In the press, as well as on the platform, we must qualify ourselves to hold our own against all comers; for then, and not till then, shall we succeed in bettering our condition.

To accomplish this, a number of well-known advocates of working-class interests have established a Limited Liability Association, entitled "The Industrial Newspaper Company", with a nominal capital of £1,000, divided into shares of £1 each; 2s. 6d. to be paid on application, and 2s. 6d. on allotment per share.

The Company have succeeded in purchasing the copyright, goodwill, &c., of the *Miner and Workman’s Advocate*, which they have resolved to turn into a first-class newspaper, not only for miners, but for all branches of industry—a newspaper in which all political, social, and industrial questions, whether they affect the whole or only a portion of the working class, shall be amply discussed.

We, the undersigned, on behalf of the Company, invite all lovers of freedom who have the welfare of their fellow beings at heart to co-operate in the good and arduous task the Company have undertaken, by taking up shares, helping to increase the circulation, &c., so that the working man’s press may soon be able to occupy an honourable position, and—take an active and dignified part in the struggles of the day.

Application for shares may be made immediately, by letter, enclosing 2s. 6d. for each share applied for.

*G. Odger, President*

*E. S. Mantz, Secretary pro tem.*

*G. W. Wheeler, Treasurer*

Written in the latter half of August 1865

First published in *The Miner and Workman’s Advocate*, No. 130, September 2, 1865

Reproduced from the newspaper
THE INDUSTRIAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY
(LIMITED)

Capital £1,000, in Shares of £1 each. Deposit 2s. 6d. per Share.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Mr. G. Odger, Chairman — Mr. Nieass
— W. R. Cremer — Jung
— R. Applegarth — Christmas
— Coulson
— H. Turff
— Eccarius
— W. Stainsby
— Worley
— Facey
Treasurer—Mr. E. Coulson
Secretary—Mr. Edwin Shelly Mantz

PROSPECTUS

The object of the promoters of the above Company is to supply a great want of the age—to establish a Newspaper devoted to the interests of the Working Classes, and to secure for them a truthful exponent of their wrongs, and a faithful champion of their rights.

To further this object, the Board of Directors are happy to state that they have succeeded in purchasing the Miner Newspaper, which is now incorporated with the Workman’s Advocate, and they have also made arrangements with some of the most advanced writers to contribute to its columns.
The well-known character of the men connected with its management renders it needless to indulge in professions. Suffice it to say, that it will be Democratic in Politics—and ever prepared to maintain principle against expediency.

To those who have been accustomed to view the efforts of the poor as a series of vain struggles of Labour against Capital, it may be observed that those efforts have failed, not from a want of justice in the objects to be attained, but from the want of a legitimate organ to influence public opinion. If an Oxford Professor or an enlightened writer have occasionally come forward to champion the creed of the downtrodden millions, his voice has been but the echo of human agony, heard amidst the clamour of contending interests, and silenced by the diatribes of newspaper hirelings. To say the Newspaper Press represents public opinion, is to administer insult to intelligent men. It is the property of speculators, political leaders, large contractors, and railway directors. Can we expect truth through the channels of falsehood—light from the regions of darkness, or fairness from those whose business it is to calumniate, pervert, and deceive? Certainly not. Hence the necessity for an organ that shall be beyond the taint of corruption, invulnerable against attacks, and inspired by men who feel it is their mission to teach the truths they have acquired by hard toil and bitter suffering.

The Workman's Advocate boldly takes its stand upon this necessity. Dignified and fearless, as becomes the champion of the masses, it requires the aid of no dishonest scribes or unprincipled adventuriers. It will look to Labour and Labour's friends for its associates. The class that has produced an Elliott, Clare, and Burns—that has given a Defoe to fiction; a Stephenson to science, and a Shakespeare to literature, still claims within its ranks many a noble son who can wield the pen as well as the shuttle or the hammer.

An Industrial Newspaper Company is an application of the Co-operative principle—a sign of the times that the men of action are likewise men of thought, who will tell their own "unvarnished tale", in an organ of their own.

On the great questions of the day the Workman's Advocate will pronounce a decided opinion. With the view of promoting the complete political and social enfranchisement of the toiling millions, it will energetically support Manhood Suffrage, vote by ballot, representation based upon numbers, direct taxation, the nationalisation of the land, the development of co-operative self-employment to national dimensions, reduction of the number
of the hours of labour, Saturday half holiday movements, political international, and trade associations, everything that tends to advance the cause of human progress.

Originated by the representatives of Labour, to the sons of Labour must it chiefly look for encouragement and support; but as good men are to be found in every station of life, it is believed that many ardent lovers of freedom who have means at their command, will derive a pleasure in co-operating with our efforts. Aid from this source will be generous, and may be gracefully tendered, as it will be gratefully received.

Firm in the faith of those political truths, for the utterance of which so many noble martyrs have suffered, and conscious that the period has arrived when revolutions must be effected by mental effort, and not by physical violence, the conductors of the Workman's Advocate will never descend to scurrility or vulgar abuse, but seek to prove the justice of its claims by the soundness of its arguments, and the charity of its spirit.

Enrolling amongst its literary associates some of the brightest intellects of all countries, its articles upon Foreign Affairs will be the matured opinions of profound thinkers; and from its close connections with the International Working Men's Association, which has correspondents in all parts of the world, this department will be one of its most valuable features.

Upon domestic topics the result of the week will be faithfully recorded in a well-written Summary, and the various movements of political bodies will be chronicled and commented fairly on.

On all questions affecting the rights of Labour the platform will be its own, and every working man will feel that at least the columns of one journal will be open to him and those who advocate his cause.

To bring the proprietorship of the Workman's Advocate within the reach of the masses, the Shares are being issued at the sum of £1 each; and to make the mode of payment as easy as possible, the Directors have determined to accept deposits of 2s. 6d. per Share.

(By order of the Directors)

E. S. Mantz, Secretary
FORM OF APPLICATION FOR SHARES

Please to allot me_________ Shares in the Industrial Newspaper Company, for which I send_________ as my first deposit, authorising the Secretary to instruct the district collector to wait upon me weekly.

Name______________________________________
Address______________________________________

To Mr. E. S. Mantz, Secretary,

Rose Cottage, 60, Downham Road, Kingsland.

Written in the latter half of August 1865 Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in The Miner and Workman's Advocate, No. 132, September 16, 1865
FROM THE MINUTE BOOK
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

CENTRAL COUNCIL MEETINGS
(September 1865)

September 12, 1865

A discussion then took place as to the forthcoming conference taken part in by Marx, Weston, Lubez, Cremer, and on the motion of Citizen Lubez, seconded by Mantz, the further consideration of the question was adjourned till the 19th inst., the meeting to be special for the consideration of the conference.

September 19, 1865

Citizen Marx announced that no delegates from Germany would attend the conference, but that a report of the doings in Germany would be sent him which he would read to the conference. He had also sent [a letter] to Ernest Jones asking him to be present and speak at the soirée.

First published, in Russian, in Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1961
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September 26

The question of a general congress was next discussed.

*Marx* in the name of the Central Council proposed that the Congress assemble in Geneva.

*Dupleix* seconded the proposition.

*Fribourg* wished it recorded that the French delegates had received instructions to propose Geneva instead of, as heretofore decided, Belgium as a protest against the law passed in Belgium with regard to foreigners. The resolution was carried unanimously.

*De Paepe* proposed, *Tolain* seconded, that the following be submitted to the Conference this evening:

That the Conference transfer the place of meeting of the Congress from Belgium to Geneva as a solemn protest against the law concerning foreigners passed in Belgium. Carried unanimously.

The period for the assembling of the Congress was next discussed.

*Marx* and *Cremer* in the name of the Central Council proposed that it take place in September or October of next year, unless unforeseen circumstances shall occur to necessitate its further postponement.

The delegates from Paris as an amendment proposed that the Congress assemble on the first Sunday in April next year. They all declared that to longer postpone the Congress would be fatal to the Association in France. [...] 

*Marx* was impressed by the statements of the French delegates and was inclined to withdraw the resolution. [...]

15*
The French delegates would so far yield as to agree to the last week in May.

Marx having withdrawn his proposition for September, the amendment became the resolution and was unanimously agreed to.\textsuperscript{286} [...] Marx and Fribourg proposed that the following questions be submitted to the Congress: “Co-operative labour”, “Reduction of the number of the hours of labour”, “Female and child labour”.

All present voted for them as questions but Weston.

Marx and Fribourg proposed the following for the Congress: “Direct and indirect taxation”. Agreed to.

The following questions marked 3, 4 and 10\textsuperscript{287} on the programme were also agreed to:

3. Combination of effort by means of the Association in the different national struggles between Capital and Labour.

4. Trades’ unions—their past, present and future.

10. Standing armies: their effects upon the interests of the productive classes.

First published, in Russian, in \textit{Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866}, Moscow, 1961
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October 3, 1865

The question as to the publication of the doings at the conference was then discussed.

Citizens Carter and Lubez proposed that Citizen Marx be requested to compile the report of the conference proceedings. Carried unanimously.

Tuesday, November 21, 1865

The Secretary for Germany\(^a\) stated that, in view of the sudden demand for cards that had arisen at Paris, he and the Secretary for Switzerland\(^b\) had guaranteed the printer for the cost of preparing 2,000 cards, of which number 1,000 should be sent to Paris, 500 reserved for the French province and 100 reserved for Germany. He desired the sanction of the Council to this arrangement.

It was moved by Citizen Morgan and seconded by Wheeler and carried \textit{nem. con.}: “That we sanction the arrangement made by Citizens Marx and Jung with the printer of the cards and that the allotment of them be as proposed by Citizen Marx.”

GENERAL REPORT

Citizen Marx stated that on his proposition it had been resolved at the conference that a report should be drawn up of the transactions of the Association for the first year of its existence.

\(^a\) Marx.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) Jung.—\textit{Ed.}
He now advised that the resolution for preparing such report be rescinded on two grounds: (1) because the French delegates had already published a report, (2) that its publication at the present moment was not opportune and should be delayed until May. He had, however, communicated copies of the resolution and programme to our correspondents in Belgium and to Citizen Jung.

The resolution for drawing up a report was accordingly rescinded.

PROPAGANDA IN GERMANY

The Secretary for Germany said he was glad to be able to report that our Association was at length making headway in Germany, where it had obstacles to overcome greater than those which existed in France. Steps were being taken to form branches in Berlin, Mayence and Leipsic by men for whom the speaker could vouch. These societies would probably be represented at the Geneva Congress.

Tuesday, November 28

SWITZERLAND

In the regretted absence of the Secretary for Switzerland, Citizen Marx stated that Citizen J. Ph. Becker had issued a proclamation to the German Swiss, concerning the Association, portions of which he thought should be translated and published in our report. In it it was announced that the branch societies in Switzerland were about to issue a paper in German and French which would be the organ of the Association in that country.

December 26. Boxing night!

Citizen Le Lubez laid on the table the first of a projected series of attacks on the policy of the Central Council published in the Journal de Verviers (Belgium).

Citizen Marx made some observations in defence of the Council.

---

a A reference to the Journal de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs and Vorbote.—Ed.
January 9, 1866

Marx thought that the Constitution published in the Echo de Verviers as emanating from the French branch in London ought to have been laid before the Council before publication. He then alluded to the attack which he said was written by Citizen Vésinier. Jung denounced the attack as an infamous one and exposed some of its misstatements. Such a manifesto ought to have been signed. He moved that Vésinier retract these falsities or be expelled from the Association.

Le Lubez admitted that Vésinier was the author of the attack. Marx took occasion to defend our Paris correspondents from the aspersions made upon them. They had left with the Council all their accounts and correspondence and had behaved in the most honourable manner. [...] Marx objected to the word “retraction”. Vésinier should be called upon to substantiate or to make his exit. [...] Jung, then withdrew his motion and Marx moved and Jung seconded that Vésinier be called upon to substantiate his accusation or, failing to do so, be expelled.

Le Lubez moved as an amendment that the subject be referred to a committee of three to conduct a correspondence with Vésinier. He objected to the harsh measure of expulsion. This amendment was not seconded.

The motion of Marx was carried with one dissentient and one neutral.

January 23, 1866

Marx read a letter from the Leipsic correspondent Liebknecht. They had formed a small branch there; he also referred to a visit he had recently received from the editor\(^a\) of the Social-Demokrat.\(^{292}\) Marx also read letter from De Paepe\(^b\) explaining his long silence; he was sorry they had not increased in numbers; but they had now confederated with the “People”\(^c\) and had made the Tribune of the People their organ\(^293\); they wished to exchange with the Workman’s Advocate.

---
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\(^a\) Hofstetten.—Ed.

\(^b\) of January 14, 1866.—Ed.

\(^c\) La Tribune du Peuple.—Ed.
The following lines are taken from a letter written in London on January 29:

"With respect to religion, a significant movement is currently developing in stuffy old England. The top men in science, Huxley (Darwin's school) at the head, with Charles Lyell, Bowring, Carpenter, etc., give very enlightened, truly bold, free-thinking lectures for the people in St. Martin’s Hall, and, what is more, on Sunday evenings, exactly at the time when the lambs are usually making a pilgrimage to the Lord’s pastures; the hall has been full to bursting and the people’s enthusiasm so great that, on the first Sunday evening, when I went there with my family, more than 2,000 people could not get into the room, which was crammed full. The clerics let this dreadful thing happen three times.—Yesterday evening, however, the assembly was informed that no more lectures could be held until the court case brought by the spiritual fathers against the Sunday evenings for the people[a] was heard. The gathering emphatically expressed its indignation and more than a hundred pounds were then collected for fighting the case. How stupid of the clerics to interfere. To the annoyance of this pious band, the evenings even closed with music. Choruses from Händel, Mozart, Beethoven, Mendelssohn and Gounod were sung and received enthusiastically by the English, who had, until now, only been allowed to bawl out Jesus, Jesus, meek and mild[b] or take themselves off to the gin palace on Sundays."[c]

[a] In the original the English words are followed by a German translation in brackets.—Ed.
[b] In the original the first words of a hymn are given in English with a German translation in brackets.—Ed.
[c] The next two paragraphs are from Der Vorbote editors.—Ed.
These events may well provide the incentive for the numerous societies of free-thinkers in England, which so far have taken a more reserved stand, to come before the people in order that their research might be put to practical use.

It is also a sign of the times that the Fenian cause arouses deep sympathy among the English working class, both because it opposes the clerics and because it is republican.

Written on January 29, 1866

First published in Der Vorbote, No. 2, February 1866

Printed according to the journal checked with the manuscript

Published in English for the first time
TO THE EDITOR OF L'ECHO DE VERVIERS

18, Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, London

Sir,

We count upon your sense of justice and your desire "to spread the truth and the light among the working classes" in asking you to publish the following letter, a copy of which has been sent to Citizen V.\(^a\)

Yours faithfully,

Jung

Mr. V.,

L'Echo de Verviers published an article, in its issue No. 293 of December 16, 1865, ostensibly aimed at explaining to working men the spirit that animates the members of the Central Council of the International Working Men's Association. Citizen Le Lubez, who presented it to the Council (as he had been instructed to do), recognised that the article, although anonymous, was from your pen.

After long discussion, the Central Council at its meeting on January 9, 1866, adopted the following resolution:

"Citizen V. is expected to provide evidence for the facts he has cited; if he refuses or is incapable of doing so, he shall be expelled from the International Working Men's Association."\(^b\)

Since your article departs completely from the truth, the Central Council regards it as its duty to restore the full facts. The Central Council is aware of its mission, and of the mandate entrusted to it;

\(^a\) Pierre Vésinier.— Ed.
\(^b\) Cf. this volume, p. 389.— Ed.
it will not refute slander with slander, nor lies with lies. It will not stoop to personal accusations but will let the accused vindicate themselves. It will not be deterred by any obstacles, and despite false friends, it will leave no spot or blemish on its reputation.

Particularly noteworthy are the following passages:

I

"Before long all the French and Italian members resigned on account of the presence of Messrs. Tolain and Fribourg in the Committee, and their intrigues" (Echo de Verviers, No. 293).

Of the nine French members, only two withdrew, namely, Messrs. Denoual and Le Lubez, the latter returning shortly afterwards. As for the Italians, one of them (Citizen Wolff) gave as the reason for his resignation, not "the presence of Messrs. Tolain and Fribourg in the Committee, and their intrigues", but a Central Council resolution concerning Citizen Lefort\(^a\) proposed by the Sub-Committee, for which he himself had voted, a few hours earlier, as a member of the Sub-Committee.

II

"The Committee continued to function without them, and has done so to this day" (Echo de Verviers, No. 293).

Of the two French members who withdrew, Citizen Le Lubez, former secretary for France, returned shortly afterwards as the delegate from the Deptford section; consequently, the Committee did not function without him for long.

III

"It (the Committee) published an Address and Provisional Rules, the former being from the pen of an eminent publicist of Latin race, etc." (Echo de Verviers, No. 293).

The Address and the Rules were published prior to the withdrawal of the two French members and the Italian members. The Address is not from the pen of an eminent publicist of Latin race, but of a writer of Teutonic race.\(^b\) The Address was adopted

---

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 82-83, 330.— *Ed.*

\(^b\) The reference is to Giuseppe Mazzini and Karl Marx.— *Ed.*
unanimously by all the members of the Central Council, including the French and the Italians, even before the publicist of Latin race had acquainted himself with it. So far from being its author, had he acquainted himself with it, he would have urged the Italian members to oppose it because of its anti-bourgeois character. But, having arrived too late, all he could do was to prevent the Italian members from translating it into Italian. It is evident that you have never read this Address, and the eminent publicist of Latin race will not thank you for attributing it to his pen.

IV

"Has it (the Committee) pursued the aim it has set itself—the complete emancipation of the working people?"

"No. Instead, it has wasted a precious year to call a conference and work out the programme of the congress that is to take place in Geneva, etc." (Echo de Verviers, No. 293).

The Central Council hardly began to function till around 1865. This means that nine months passed before the conference was held. It spent these "precious" nine months to establish international relations and extend its contacts in Britain. Every week, for a period of several months, deputations composed of Council members were sent to various working men's societies to induce them to join the Association. Here is the result: at the time of the conference the International Working Men's Association numbered 14,000 members in Britain; among the affiliated societies were such important organisations as the Shoemakers' and Operative Bricklayers' societies; the most influential and noted men of these large working men's organisations (TRADES UNIONS) were members of the Central Council; a newspaper had been founded whose very title (The Workman's Advocate) indicates its mission, a newspaper which always and everywhere defends the interests of the working class.

The association for universal suffrage (the Reform League) was founded in Britain, an association which has thousands of members and whose secretary, as well as most of the members of its Executive Council, have been elected from our midst. In France we have several thousand supporters.

In Paris there is a strong, active and irreproachable Administration with over two thousand members; there are branches in

---

a George Howell.— Ed.
Lyons, Rouen, Nantes, Caen, Neufchâteau, Pont-l’Evêque, Pantin, St. Denis, Lisieux, Puteaux, Belleville, etc., etc., etc.

In Switzerland—an administration in Geneva, made up of the finest people, with 500 members, and branches in Lausanne, Vevey, Montreux and the Neuchâtel canton.

In Belgium the movement was taking shape under the most auspicious circumstances, and the Central Committee had reason to believe that it would not be long before Spain followed suit.

V

"No, it (the Committee) did not invite to its conference in September 1865 even a single delegate from Germany, where there are so many working men's societies, nor from the numerous British societies, nor from the Italian societies, which are so well organised, nor from those existing in France, for Tolain, Fribourg & Co. are not delegates of any society of French working men—they delegated themselves; they did not provide any proof of being invested with any mandate. Far from being delegates of French working men's associations, their very presence was the sole reason why the latter did not send delegates to the London Conference. We could name several associations which refused for this reason to attend, etc., etc." (Echo de Verviers, No. 293).

In principle, representation at the conference was restricted to the sections of the International Working Men's Association and to the societies which had subscribed to its principles; moreover, the state of our finances impelled us to limit the number of delegates to the barest minimum.

In the case of Germany, "where there are so many working men's societies", the only ones that could have been represented were the consumers' societies, founded by Schulze-Delitzsch, and the Lassallean societies, the General Association of German Workers. The former—whose membership is unaware of the fact—are merely a tool of the Prussian liberal bourgeoisie, with Schulze-Delitzsch as one of its matadors; the Lassallean societies were, and still are, in a state of complete disintegration, one group having entered into a coalition with Bismarck, while the other, which had not yet reconstituted itself, recognised as its leader J. Ph. Becker, the Swiss delegate to the conference. While the conference was in session, he received a mandate from the workers of the Solingen factories, and he also represented the German Society in Geneva—the German Workers' Educational Society. The German Society in London (German Workers' Educational Society) was represented by its delegates to the Central Council.
Apart from the obstacles which working men encounter in forming societies in Germany, the law also prohibits them from joining foreign societies. Nevertheless, several sections have been formed in the North and South of Germany.

In view of all these difficulties, is it so very surprising that Germany was not represented as well as the Central Council would have liked?

The British societies were very well represented by the British members of the Central Council: Odger, the President, is Secretary of the Trades Council (supreme council of all the British Trades Unions); Cremer, the General Secretary, is a member of the Carpenters’ Executive Committee; Howell, Secretary of the Reform League and a member of the Operative Bricklayers’ Executive Committee, and Coulson, Secretary of the latter society, are both delegates from it to the Central Council; Wheeler, general manager of a mutual life insurance company, is a member of the Central Council.

The shoemakers (5,500 members) were represented by Odger, Morgan and Cope, while Shaw represented the house-painters, etc., etc.

Citizen Wolff, who attended the Italian working men’s congress at Naples in 1865, and the other Italian members of the Council, did not succeed in winning a single supporter in Italy, although they took a very active part in the work of the Central Council. The Central Council deplores the fact that the Italian members did not, even before they withdrew, enjoy sufficient confidence with “the Italian societies, which are so well organised”, to persuade at least one of them to join the International Association.

“Not a single delegate from those [societies] existing in France, for Tolain, Fribourg & Co. are not delegates of any French society—they delegated themselves”.

The members of the Lyons section regretted that the lack of funds had prevented them from sending delegates, but like those of the Caen and Neufchâteau sections, they sent a manifesto, thereby taking part in the work of the Central Council.

Tolain, Fribourg, Limousin and Varlin had been elected by general vote in the Paris section; this section is composed of workers of all trades as well as several hundred members of the Crédit au Travail association. Beluze, who heads the association, is also a member of the section. All of them took, or could have taken, part in the election of the delegates. Limousin, one of the four Paris delegates, is secretary of the Board of the newspaper L’Association, international organ of the co-operative societies.
Mr. Clariol was delegated by the Printers' Society of Paris. On the invitation of the Central Council, Messrs. Schily, Dumesnil-Marigny and others came from Paris to attend the conference, in which they took a very active part.

Which are the other societies that you say were prevented by the presence of Tolain, Fribourg & Co. from sending delegates to the conference? Are you referring to the Society of December 10, the only one permitted by the present French regime?

The report on the conference appeared in all the liberal newspapers of Paris without giving rise to a single complaint or a single objection on the part of the members of the International Association or the French co-operative societies. The mandate given to the delegates had been verified and approved by the Sub-Committee of the Central Council.

At the very beginning of the conference the Paris delegates presented a detailed and faithful report on the activities of their Administration and the state of their finances, and corroborated it by putting their books and the whole of their correspondence at the disposal of the Central Council. The Central Council may congratulate itself on the effective steps taken by the Paris Administration to establish and propagate the International Association in France.

VI

"Belgium sent a very able delegate, Citizen De Paepe, but he was the only representative from that country, which numbers many associations" (Echo de Verviers, No. 293).

It is regrettable that Belgium sent only one delegate and that this delegate was the one to represent the least number of electors. Nevertheless, that country was fittingly represented in the person of César De Paepe.

VII

"Switzerland, or rather Geneva, sent two delegates who are not Swiss, namely, a French refugee and another from Baden, who arrived for the conference together with the two supposedly French delegates mentioned above—altogether five or six persons of the same brand, and one real and serious delegate, the Belgian" (Echo de Verviers, No. 293).

The Swiss delegates had been elected by general vote by all the members of the various sections of the International Association in

a F. Dupleix and J. P. Becker.— Ed.
Switzerland, the Grütli Society, which is entirely Swiss, and the German Society.

The German Workers’ Educational Society, too, participated in the election through its representatives in the International Association’s organisation in Switzerland. By the choice of their delegates, the Association’s Swiss members have won an honourable place in the history of the International Association.

The Swiss delegates arrived at the conference, not “together with the two supposedly French delegates”, but with the four Paris delegates.

Citizen Becker, one of the conference delegates, has been a naturalised Swiss for more than twenty years. He was made a citizen of the town of Bienne in recognition of his services to the cause of world democracy. A working man himself, he became distinguished as an agitator, soldier, organiser and writer. He has always used his manifold talents for the cause of the working people. It is ridiculous to see pygmies assailing such giants, whose merits, clearly, may be judged only by men who are themselves known for their probity and disinterested attitude.

VIII

“We ask: is that a satisfactory result?” (Echo de Verviers, No. 293).

The Central Council is composed almost exclusively of workmen who are used to handling hammers and files, and it is only at the price of personal sacrifice that they can change them for the pen. Whenever they turn to the pen, they do so to defend or promote a noble cause, and not to sell themselves to Bonapartism. If the result is not as satisfactory as workers in general would have liked it to be, we are convinced that they will take into account the evenings spent working after a long and exhausting day of labour, and the anxiety which their brothers had to experience before they achieved the present state of affairs.

IX

“Yielding to pernicious influences, questions such as the abolition of Russian influence in Europe that bear no relation to the aims of the Association, were included in the programme of the Geneva Congress” (Echo de Verviers, No. 294).
What are the pernicious influences to which the Central Council yielded by including in its programme the question of the need to do away with Muscovite influence in Europe (not Russian influence, which means an entirely different thing)? The need to “do away with Muscovite influence in Europe” is recognised in principle by our Inaugural Address, which was certainly not published under anyone’s pernicious influence.

What are the other questions included in the programme as a result of pernicious influences?

X

“This enormous mistake has already had fatal consequences; the Poles have demanded en masse to be admitted into the Committee, and they will soon command a vast majority on it” (Echo de Verviers, No. 294).

The Poles did not demand en masse to be admitted into the Central Council, and far from commanding a vast majority on it, they form less than one-twentieth of it.

How can one reason with a writer who says:

“The Committee drew up and put to the vote a programme of twelve points covering nearly all the more general problems of political economy, but did not pose a single scientific question”,

and who, a few lines further down, recognises, without even pausing for breath, “the scientific importance” of the very same questions?

The Central Council, far from being exclusive, has always sought to benefit by the knowledge and culture of all sincere friends of the working people’s cause; it has been doing all in its power to promote its great principles and to unite the workers of all countries. To this end, it has founded three newspapers in Switzerland: Journal de l’Association Internationale des Travailleurs and La Voix de l’Avenir, published in French, and The Forerunner (Vorbote), published in German; and one in Britain, The Workman’s Advocate, the only English newspaper which, proceeding from the right of the peoples to self-determination, recognises that the Irish have the right to throw off the English yoke.

The Central Council cannot pass judgement on its own actions. The Geneva Congress will decide whether the Council is worthy of
the trust placed in it, or whether it has abandoned lightly the
noble goal set before it.

I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

H. Jung

For the Central Council
of the International Working Men's Association

February 15, 1866

First published in L'Echo de Verviers,
No. 43, February 20, 1866

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the French
Citizen Marx made a speech in reference to the proceedings at
the previous meeting. He said it was not true, as Major Wolff had
stated, that Mazzini had written our Statutes. He, Marx, wrote
them after discussion in Committee. Several draughts were
discussed, Wolff's draught among the rest. On two points they
were quite distinguished from each other. Marx spoke of capital
oppressing labour. Wolff wanted centralisation and understood by
Working Men's Associations only benefit societies. Mazzini's
statutes were printed at the time of the conference in Naples.

It could hardly be true that Mazzini had seen Marx's Address
before it was printed as it was in Marx's pocket, unless Mazzini saw
it after it had been put in Le Lubez's hands and before it had
been taken to the Bee-Hive.

Again Mazzini wrote to Brussels, to Fontaine, a letter which was
to be communicated to the Belgian societies, in which he warned
them against Marx's Socialist views. This was stated by De Paepe at
the conference.

Major Wolff was not a member of the Council. Major Wolff
ought to have sent a letter informing the Council that he intended
to prefer his complaint. He [Marx] protested against the proceed-
ings at the last meeting in the name of himself and the other
Continental secretaries. He desired a note of this to be taken as it
might be brought before the Congress at Geneva.

Moscow, 1960

Reproduced from the Minute Book
The Schiller Institute, whose six-year-long existence offers complete proof that it is an institution which satisfies real needs, must leave its present premises in June next year, since the lease will then have expired, and the owner will have definitely refused to extend it.

The Board of Directors has therefore to tackle the following task in order to provide the Institute with the premises it needs for its purpose.

After all attempts to find a suitable building had failed, and no contractor could be found who was prepared to erect such a building which would then be let to the Institute, there remained no other way out than to see if the necessary funds could be raised for a building to be erected at the Institute’s own expense.

The essential points that one must bear in mind here are the following:

The Institute must be located in a central part of the city.

Visitors to the Institute must be able to enter it on the ground floor.

Its individual rooms must be at least the same size as the present ones.

The fulfilment of these conditions appeared indispensable to us, if the Institute was to continue to thrive. In addition, however, it seemed desirable to provide the various associations existing in Manchester with the opportunity of finding a common home in the projected new building. This purpose can be achieved if the uppermost floor were turned into a hall seating 250 to 300 people. Such a hall would make a negligible difference to the cost of the building, while the Institute’s income could be greatly supplemented by letting it.
We have accordingly put every effort into finding a suitable plot of land and into ascertaining the cost of such an undertaking. The following is the result of our calculations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of a plot of land with a building area of approximately 350 to 400 square yards</td>
<td>£6,000 to £7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of the building work</td>
<td>£3,500 to £4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipping and furnishing the building</td>
<td>£500 to £500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£10,000 to £11,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We firmly believe we can obtain a mortgage of £5,000 to £6,000 on land and property of this type, and draw from the past financial practices of the Institute, taking account of the expected increase in income and expenditure, the firm conviction that the interest on such a loan would be covered.

To go ahead with our plan, we would therefore need capital of our own of from £5,000 to £5,500.

Although the Schiller Institute is open to members from all nations and non-Germans have repeatedly taken part in its activities, the Institute is essentially a German one.

According to the present register, it has a membership of over 300 members and offers them the following facilities:

- a library consisting of more than 4,000 volumes at present,
- a reading room in which 55 newspapers are available, most of which are German,
- lectures on scientific and literary subjects, namely in the special associations, which have been formed for this purpose within the Institute.

Whenever possible the Institute does its best to further German intellectual activities, and also offers opportunities for social gatherings to be held on its premises which are particularly beneficial to new arrivals from the fatherland who have no other meeting place here.

We are firmly convinced that the Institute can pursue these goals in the future to an even greater extent, if we are able to carry out our plans to improve the Institute from the point of view of accommodation, as the latter would also improve our financial situation.

From the above, it becomes obvious that we are mainly appealing to Germans residing in Manchester; we are enquiring whether they are willing to provide the funds necessary for the purposes mentioned.
So as not to burden the Institute from the outset with exorbitant interest payments, the Board of Directors decided to attempt to raise the above-mentioned sum by donations; however, to ensure that the building to be erected could only be used for the purposes of the Institute, it was simultaneously decided that, in case the Schiller Institute should cease to function, the donors should become its creditors to the amount of their donation, and this will be expressly stated in the receipts given for donation.

As soon as it was made known that the Institute intended to have its own building and thereby safeguard its existence, such a lively response was evoked among the members that within a few days nearly £1,200 in donations of £25 and less were placed at the disposal of the Board of Directors.

This highly significant sum is essentially the result of the willing efforts and sacrifice of the more recently arrived Germans who also represent those who benefit directly from the Institute.

Encouraged by this result, which proves that even at the present moment the Institute is needed by a significant number of Germans residing locally, we are now turning to those who take perhaps a less involved interest in an institution which strives for such goals and which, once it is firmly established, will form a focal point of all German efforts in Manchester.

We are appealing to you to enable us to carry out our plans by donating the funds.

The Board of Directors trusts that all the Germans in Manchester will work together for this goal which will benefit us all. Only in this way can it hope to see this project come to life, and therefore believes it is justified in warmly recommending these plans.

By order of the Board of Directors

F. Engels, Chairman
J. G. Wehner, Treasurer
A. Burkhard, Secretary

First published as a leaflet in March 1866
Printed according to the leaflet
Published in English for the first time
May 1, 1866

Lessner reported that as a number of German tailors had been imported into Edinburgh and as it was currently reported that some of the London employers were making arrangements to bring several here, the German tailors resident in London had formed themselves into a committee and wished to co-operate with the Council of the International Working Men's Association to checkmate the designs of the employers and their agents which they had in Germany.

Marx stated that if Lessner would send him the facts, he would directly communicate with the German papers.306

May 15, 1866

Citizen Marx read extracts from Leipsic journals\(^a\) cautioning German tailors against coming to England to supplant the English tailors who were on strike.

---

\(^{a}\) A reference to “A Warning” written by Marx for German newspapers (see this volume, pp. 162-63).— *Ed.*
Paul Lafargue

SURVEY OF THE PROGRESS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION

The International Working Men's Association was founded at a
meeting on September 28, 1864 in St. Martin's Hall, London. This
meeting was attended by representatives of the principal European
nations (Germany, Poland, Switzerland, France, Belgium and
Italy). The election took place of a provisional Central Committee
charged with the tasks of editing the manifesto, drawing up the
regulations and establishing branches throughout Europe.

Our present wish, in advance of the Congress,* is to give an
account of what has been achieved to all the members of the
Association, as well as to those who have not yet joined.

ENGLAND

A large number of the English working men's societies* have
accepted the principles of the International Association and are
affiliated to it (the society of bricklayers, the shoemakers, the
cabinet-makers, the tailors, etc.)...

At the present time the societies of the carpenters, coopers,
joiners, etc., are ready to become members.

The reform movement has absorbed the entire attention of the
working class for a moment and the entire activity of the Central

* The reader should remember that the English working class is partly
organised. Indeed its societies (trade-unions) comprise all the members of a singular
industry. Some of these societies contain a considerable number of men; the
shoemakers, for example, number around 30,000 members.

a A reference to the Geneva Congress of the International.—Ed.
Council. But for some time past deputations from the Central Council have been sent to all the working men's societies in order to acquaint them with its principles and to invite them to join. These deputations have everywhere been warmly received.

In London the Central Council has established a newspaper, *The Commonwealth*, which has become its official organ.

A German branch and a French branch of the *International Association* have been formed.

But its greatest title to public attention is that it has awakened and sustained in the English working class the consciousness of its own political power, a consciousness that had been lost since the reaction of 1848, as was pointed out in the Inaugural Address. The stimulus it has provided in this respect has been so great that the society of shoemakers has deleted from its statutes the clause which forbade it to concern itself with politics; the society of masons is in the process of doing likewise.

It is the *International Association* which induced the workers to persevere in their anti-slavery policy during the American War. The International was one of the first to send a message of congratulations to Lincoln on his re-election. Lincoln replied and strongly urged the members of the Association to continue its campaign for union and harmony.

The *Association* has taken the initiative in the movement of the Reform League. After the first meeting of the reformists an organisational and agitational committee was set up. It was composed of 27 members, 24 of whom belonged to the Central Council, and it was these who called for universal suffrage. At a time when the entire English press clapped its hands and applauded the government's treatment of the Fenians, *The Commonwealth* was alone in venturing to raise its voice in their defence. The Central Council even sent a request to the Secretary of State to be granted an interview with the Minister in order to plead for better treatment for the prisoners. The request was refused.

The *International Association* has latterly achieved a success which has modified the attitude of the press towards it. The journeymen tailors had been *locked out* by their employers,* who

* In England, the employers as well as the workers go on strike. They close their workshops and set their wretched employees out on the street. This is what is happening at the moment in Sheffield where the workers in the woollen industry are without work and all the other societies have come to their aid.

---

\[\text{a} \quad \text{See this volume, p. 10.— Ed.}\]

\[\text{b} \quad \text{Ibid., pp. 19-21.— Ed.}\]
immediately sent agents to the Continent to recruit workers to replace them. The Central Council warned its correspondents, who managed, either by word of mouth or through the press, to thwart the plans of the employers. However, a certain number of German workers, who originated in towns where the *International Association* has no members, did arrive in Edinburgh. Two of their compatriots were dispatched to meet them and on their return they were able to report to the Central Council, announcing the workers’ departure, which in fact took place a few days later.*

**SWITZERLAND**

It is above all in Switzerland that the *International Association* has experienced the most rapid growth and has achieved some positive results. It has established branches in almost all the towns of Switzerland: Geneva, Lausanne, Vevey, Montreux, La Chaux-de-Fonds, St.-Imier, Sonvillier, Porrentry, Bienne, Basle, Zurich, Aubonne, Wetzibonne, etc.

The *International Association* is the owner of three newspapers, two written in French, the *Voix de l’Avenir* and the *Journal de l’Association Internationale*, and one in German, *Der Vorbote*. All the Swiss papers have put their publicity at the service of the *Association*.

In Lausanne the members of the *Association* undertook work for the state last winter, earning around 24,000 francs, with the aim of providing workers with work during the idle season. The workshop, managed by the workers themselves and without the participation of any employer, was a source of astonishment to visitors and the municipal authorities. The Association has set up a bank known as the *Caisse du crédit mutuel* with a capital of 20,000 frs divided into shares of 5 francs each.—A workers’ circle has been created.

In La Chaux-de-Fonds a bakers’ co-operative has been established and a butchers’ co-operative has been announced. Hardly had the bakery been started when the bakers lowered the price of bread to 16 centimes a pound. Nor has the project of the butchers’ co-operative failed to have an impact on the price of meat; the butchers have already reduced it by 9 centimes.

* At the request of Odger, its President, the Central Council intends to discuss the question of the war and will call a large meeting of workers to sound out popular feeling.
In Geneva a consumers’ society is being formed. In Offenbach it has been decided to create funds for the construction of workers’ homes, on the lines of the *familistère* of Guise, near Paris.

**GERMANY**

The *International Association* in Germany, as in France, has not been able to develop very far, owing to the absence of freedom! Nevertheless it has succeeded in forming branches in Leipzig, Hamburg, Hanover, Mainz, Berlin, Pelewodau, Lulingen, Langenbielau, Pulberg, Wult, Eudorf, etc.

With the approach of war, greater freedom has been allowed and so the *Association* is now better able to prosper. All the chief leaders of the German working-class movement have accepted its principles and are actively engaged in propagating them.

**FRANCE**

The *International Association* has branches in a number of towns: Paris, Lyons, Bordeaux, Caen, Neufchâteau, Argentau, Rennes, Rouen, Grandville, etc., etc.

Although little developed as yet, it has rendered a service to the working class of Lyons. The tulle workers were on strike and were about to give in because their bosses had threatened to bring in English workers who, it was alleged, were paid less. The workers asked for information and the Central Council replied that the opposite was the case. So they persevered and obtained their demands.

**BELGIUM**

Several branches have been established in Brussels, Antwerp, Liège, Verviers, Ghent, Namur, Patignies, etc. The society known as *Le Peuple* is federated with the *International Association*, and its organ, the *Tribune du Peuple*, now belongs to the Association.

In the Belgian Reform movement, it is the Association that has exercised the greatest influence and through its numerous

---

* A workers’ community based on Fourierist principles.—*Ed.*
* Presumably Peterswaldau.—*Ed.*
* The Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—*Ed.*
meetings it has succeeded in focussing reformist aspirations unequivocally on the issue of universal suffrage.

ITALY

Hitherto Italy has been preoccupied with the questions of unity and has not been able to devote much thought to social problems. However the Central Committee of all the Italian workers' societies has accepted the principles of the *International Association* and has undertaken to promote its ideas. Branches already exist in Genoa, Milan, etc.

AMERICA

The Association is in communication with New York and a number of towns in Massachusetts.

Written at the beginning of June (before 12), 1866
First published in *La Rive Gauche*, No. 24, June 17, 1866

Printed according to the newspaper
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time
June 12, 1866

Lafargue read from La Rive Gauche a summary of doings of the Central Council.a

Citizen Marx read a letter from Leipsic which stated that all the Saxon working men's associations had joined the International.310

June 19, 1866

The debate on the war311 attracted a large concourse of members. It was ably opened by Citizen Eccarius, who illustrated his address with a map of Germany, made for the occasion. He was followed by Citizens Le Lubez, Fox, Lafargue, Marx, who made a highly interesting speech, Carter, Dutton and Hales. Speeches were made in French and English.

July 17, 1866

The Discussion on the War was then resumed. Cits. Dutton, Bobczynski and Marx were the principal speakers. Cits. Cremer and Fox withdrew their respective amendments, and the wording of the Bobczynski-Carter resolution was amended and ultimately passed, nem. con., in the following form:

"That the Central Council of the International Working Men's Association consider the present conflict on the Continent to be one between Governments and advise working men to be neutral, and to associate themselves with a view to acquire strength by unity and to use the strength so acquired in working out their social and political emancipation."312

a See this volume, pp. 406-10.—Ed.
July 24, 1866

That the Secretary and any member of the Central Council take whatever steps they may deem advisable to get Italian societies represented at the Congress. Carried unanimously.\[315\] [...]

The Order of the Day was then discussed, led off by Cremer who proposed as recommendation to Congress that the Central Council should sit in London. Seconded by Marx. Carried unanimously.\[314\]

September 18

Citizen Marx stated that the notice of the Manchester tailors' strike\[315\] had been inserted in the democratic journals in the North, South, and Centre of Germany; he gave a list of those journals.

September 25

Lawrence moved that Marx be President for the ensuing twelve months; Carter seconded that nomination.\[316\] Marx proposed Odger: he, Marx, thought himself incapacitated because he was a head worker and not a hand worker. Weston seconded Odger. A ballot was taken and Odger was carried by 15 v. 3. [...] Marx proposed to constitute this Committee provisioning only, for the present. The Committee to consist of the office-holders and secretaries already appointed. Agreed to by common consent.

October 2

Carter contended that affiliation and membership were two different things and that the Congressional Rules applied only to the latter.

Marx, on the authority of the Minutes, contradicted Carter and said that the Congress refused to recognise any affiliation as distinct from membership.\[317\]

October 9

On the motion of Marx the General Secretary\[b\] was ordered to write to the French Ministre de l'Intérieur complaining of the

---

\[a\] The Standing Committee.— Ed.
\[b\] Fox.— Ed.
seizure of the Association’s papers and requesting that they be restituted.\textsuperscript{318}

Citizen Dupont read a letter from Citizen Fribourg of Paris asking for the Minutes of the Congress to enable them to publish a report of the Congress.

Marx protested against the latter step, inasmuch as the duty of publishing an account of the Congress was devolved by that body exclusively on the Central Council. Further, the Parisians had kept their Mémôre\textsuperscript{319} in violation of the Congressional order, which ordained that this and other documents should be handed over to the Central Council.

The General Secretary was ordered to write to Fribourg in this sense.

\textit{November 6}

The Secretary then brought up the following resolution from the Standing Committee:

1. “That any member of the Central Council who shall be absent for more than four sittings from Council meetings without giving satisfactory reasons therefor, shall be liable to have his name erased from the list of the Council.

2. “This resolution to be immediately communicated to every member of the Council.”

A lively discussion sprang up on this resolution, Carter, Lessner, Hales, and Jung being in favour of it and Eccarius, Fox, and Weston against it.

Weston thought that at least so important a resolution should not be carried in so thin a meeting and until notice had been given in the Commonwealth. He moved that the debate be adjourned until next week; Lessner seconded this, and the adjournment was carried unanimously.

\textit{November 20}

On the resolution from the Standing Committee being read with regard to absentees, the following amendment was carried:

That a book be provided for the members of the Council to sign their names in; the said book to be presented to [the] Congress for inspection; and, if any delegate from a society should be absent more than four nights without assigning [a] reason for so doing, the Secretary shall write to the society he represents and inform them of the neglect. [...]
It was proposed by Citizen Marx and seconded by Citizen Jung:
That the anniversary of the Polish Insurrection be celebrated on
the 22nd of January. Carried unanimously.

November 27

Fox then proceeded to say that the French Government had,
since the close of the Geneva Congress, departed from its policy of
neutrality towards them and was levying war upon them. The
French Government had allowed us two years' growth and we
were now able to defy the Continental blockade which the French
and the Prussian governments had declared against us. We could
no longer trust the French and Prussian post-offices; we must seek
indirect and secret means of communication with our Continental
friends.

Marx said that we must force Bonaparte to declare himself, in
order that any credit he may have gained for his liberality in
letting us flourish unmolested might be lost to him.

December 18

Marx reported that Revue des deux Mondes and Revue contem-
poraine had been commenting on the doings of the Association,
and, although they did not agree with the objects of the
Association entirely, still they acknowledged it to be one of the
leading events of the present century. Marx also said that the
Fortnightly Review had been commenting on the matter.¹

First published, in Russian, in Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1864-1866 and 1866-1868, Moscow, 1961 and 1963

¹ See Marx's speech at the Polish meeting (this volume, pp. 196-201).—Ed.
Karl Marx spoke about wage labour and capital and showed very lucidly how the workers create capital, how they are kept in a state of slavery with the help of the product of their own labour and how capital is constantly used to make their shackles ever stronger. Admittedly the so-called free labourer has the consciousness of being a free labourer, but he is all the more subject to the power of capital as he is compelled to sell his labour for a pitiful wage to obtain the means for satisfying his most essential needs. In most cases, the material condition of the free labourer is worse than that of the slave or serf. The working class has no need to abolish personal property, which was abolished long ago, and is still being abolished daily; what must be abolished is bourgeois property, which is wholly based on fraud.

Regarding social relations in Germany, Marx noted that the German proletariat was best able successfully to effect a radical cure. Firstly, the Germans had to a greater extent freed themselves of all religious nonsense; secondly, unlike the workers in other countries, they need not go through the lengthy period of bourgeois development, and thirdly, their geographical position would compel them to declare war on Eastern barbarism, as it was from there, from Asia, that all reaction hostile to the West had issued. This was impelling the workers' party onto the ground of revolution, the ground on which it must act to attain complete emancipation.
April 16

Lafargue (on behalf of Marx) said that the resolution moved by Odger at one of the Reform meetings conferring a vote [of] thanks upon Count Bismarck was calculated to injure the credit of this Association. He therefore demanded that a vote of censure should be passed upon Odger.

A discussion ensued which ended in instructing the Secretary to write to Odger requesting his attendance at the next meeting.

April 23

After some discussion in which several members took part, the following resolution, proposed by Citizen Lessner and seconded by Citizen Lafargue, was carried unanimously.

Resolved, “That inasmuch as Citizen Odger has proposed a resolution at the Council of the Reform League thanking Mr. Bismarck for what he had done for the democratic cause in Germany; and inasmuch as Citizen Odger is President of the International Working Men’s Association, the General Council feels it to be its duty to repudiate any solidarity with the said resolution and with Citizen Odger’s speech in support thereof.”

First published, in Russian, in Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1866-1868, Moscow, 1963

---

a P. Fox.—Ed.
b Inaccuracy in the minutes: at that time Odger was President of the General Council. There was no such post as President of the International Working Men’s Association.—Ed.
MANCHESTER SCHILLER INSTITUTE CIRCULAR

TO THE UNDERWRITERS OF THE FUND
FOR THE BUILDING
OF A NEW SCHILLER INSTITUTE

Since the subscription, which was started last year by the Board of Directors for the above purpose, was closed owing to the war and the business crisis after £2,875 had been subscribed, the conditions pertaining to the Institute's existence were fundamentally changed with respect to the new building. The Board of Directors accordingly considers it its duty to give the underwriters of the fund the necessary explanation.

Since the sum of money stipulated in the circular of March 19, 1866, was insufficient to cover the cost of the building proposed (a total of £5,000 to £5,500 was needed), and in the circumstances obtaining at the time there were also no prospects for collecting the remaining amount in time, the Board of Directors had no choice but to look around for temporary premises for the present.

It turned out that such premises were not available in the centre of the city where the Institute was to be located according to the Basic Rules. Consequently, the Board of Directors was forced to maintain the present premises until June 1868 which could only be achieved by paying double rent, a rise from £225 to £450.

In these circumstances, the question could no longer be ignored whether it was absolutely essential for the Institute to be in the centre, i.e. in the city's business quarter; whether the advantages thereby gained would not be paid for too dearly, owing to the enormous increases in the prices of land and in rents; and whether a, strictly speaking, less central site, for example, near All Saints' Church, which would cost far less, might not in fact be more

---

* The Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—Ed.
convenient and central for the overwhelming majority of the Institute's members.

According to the plan drawn up last year, even if £5,000 were collected through donations, the Institute would still have to carry a mortgage of £56,000, and would therefore have to pay interest amounting to between £250 and £300 annually. As the value of land in the centre of the city has significantly increased since last March alone, the purchasing price fixed at the time and the mortgage necessary to cover it, and therefore the Institute's annual debt, can likewise be assumed to be greater. The Institute's balance-sheet over the last two years has only shown £200 left for rent. Although we could count on more members in better premises, and certain additional revenue would have to be taken into account, it is still obvious that the above-mentioned interest could only just be afforded. Every pound paid in rent is taken from the Institute's education fund. Last year we were only able to allocate £80 for journals and £20 for the library, although the Institute's total income was £500.

It would be quite different if the premises were moved to the All Saints' district. Here, among other things, there is a suitable plot of land in an extremely favourable position going for £1,700, with an additional £26 Chief Rent. By way of example, this building site forms the basis of our calculations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing price of the plot of land</td>
<td>£1,700 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building costs</td>
<td>£3,500 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New furniture</td>
<td>£  500 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£5,700 0 0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for which a mortgage of £2,000 could certainly be obtained. In this case, subscriptions to the building fund would only need to total approximately £3,500 to £4,000, that is £1,000 to £1,500 less than if the new building were in the centre of the city. After the success of last year's subscriptions and with the change in circumstances, we have every reason to hope that the requisite amount will be collected in a short time.

The financial position of the Institute would improve substantially, in spite of the total subscriptions necessarily being smaller. Besides the Chief Rent of £26, there would be £100 interest to pay on the mortgage, so that the total sum needed for the rent would be only £126 instead of £225, which was paid last year, and £450 that we are paying now, or the £250 to £300, which was envisaged in last year's building plan. Even with the income of the last
financial year, instead of £100, £174 could be spent annually on the Institute’s library and reading room, which would be almost double the sum available for that purpose. Now, however, it is certain that, with this new building for the Institute, new financial sources would become accessible owing to the increased number of subtenants and the greater membership, and the proceeds from these sources would be used almost exclusively to support the Institute’s intellectual pursuits.

If the Institute remains in the centre of the city as it has done up till now, even with donations of £5,000 to £5,500, it will at best only be in a position to eke out an existence with great difficulty and will have to appeal to the German circles in Manchester at every unfavourable change in circumstances.

If, however, it is moved to a district where building sites are cheaper, then donations of £3,500 to £4,000 would not only once and for all establish a permanent existence for itself, but also guarantee an annual surplus in income which would finally allow it to fulfil its purpose in the best way possible.

In these circumstances, the Board of Directors could be in no doubt as to what action it should take. It decided to move to the All Saints’ district and set about changing the Basic Rules connected with this. The Board called a general meeting on June 6th which was well attended and where all but one of the participants voted for the following:

"The general meeting declares it desirable that, in the future, Article 1 of the Basic Rules should read in the following manner:

"It is declared expedient to establish a literature and arts institute, to be known as the Schiller Institute here in the city, on the best possible central site

"and authorises the Board of Directors through Article 7 of the Basic Rules and Clause 20 of the Regulations to take a conditional vote on it."

As a result the Board of Directors has taken the necessary steps for definitive voting, which is to take place at the end of August.

The question was raised why, once the decision was made to move the Institute, nobody looked round for a house which could have been taken for a number of years at a relatively cheap rent. The Board of Directors replied that it had been looking for just such a house, but had not found one; that a house of this type would only be found in a location much farther away from the centre of the city than the All Saints’ district; that such a location was only to be chosen in an emergency and finally that even in that case at least £1,500 to £2,000 in donations would be needed for the necessary extensions and the furnishing of premises which
would only after all be temporary. For these reasons, such premises were rejected for the present.

When the Board of Directors gains the necessary majority, of which there can be no doubt, to change the Basic Rules, it intends to do the following:

Should the funds prove sufficient to purchase a suitable plot of land near All Saints', to erect a building on it according to the plans made last year, namely with the basement equipped for the gymnastics club and with a large hall on the first floor accommodated, among other things, for the choir, so that the original aim would be achieved of bringing all of Manchester German Associations together under one roof.

If, on the other hand, the contributions should not reach the sum necessary, to correspondingly scale down the new building, but in any case only to put up a building which would conform to the Institute's needs better than the present premises.

The Board of Directors requests you to acquaint yourselves with the above mentioned changes in the building plan and at the same time would like to inform you that a deputation from its midst will have the honour to seek your approval for this.

By order of the Board of Directors

F. Engels, chairman
J. G. Wehner, treasurer
A. Davisson, secretary

Manchester, June 28, 1867

First published as a leaflet

Printed according to the leaflet

Published in English for the first time
Proletarians!

From the correspondence that we receive we can see that the members of the Association are continuing to spread its principles, and that the number of branches is multiplying. This work is particularly striking in Switzerland, where most of our branches are actively engaged in establishing workers' societies of every kind and putting them in contact with us.

Following the Marchiennes massacre, Belgium is making commendable efforts to gather the whole of the Belgian proletariat under our banner.

However, various circumstances have impeded propaganda work in other countries:

Germany, which prior to '48 had manifested such an interest in the study of social questions, has concentrated almost all its active forces on the movement for unification.

In France, where the freedom of the working class is extremely limited, the spread of our principles and of our Association has not been as rapid as one might have hoped: for we had thought that the aid which, thanks to us, the English workers' societies gave to French workers' societies during their strikes might have won for us the support of all French workers. Now, as the struggle in France between the capitalist class and the working class is entering into that phase which we will call the English phase, that is to say, is becoming particularly acute, the workers must understand that if they are to resist the power of the capitalists successfully, the different members of the working-class community must be linked together by a powerful bond of unity.
England, which has been preoccupied with the reform movement, had put the economic movement temporarily aside. However, now that the reform movement has ended and the enquiry into *the trade unions* is revealing the size and noting the strength of the working class, we believe that the time has come for all workers' societies to recognise our usefulness.

At delegate meetings of the working class tribute has already been paid more than once to the role played by our Association, and a large number of societies have already joined our ranks. It is England, whose working class possesses a powerful organisation, that is called upon to be our most reliable support.

The United States appears to have emerged rejuvenated from its bloody war: the working class is already centralised and has brought its influence to bear upon the bourgeois government which rules in America, obliging several State Legislatures to pass a bill introducing the eight-hour working day. The forthcoming presidential elections have compelled the various political parties to state their position: speaking for the radical party, Wade, president of the Senate, has recognised the need to devote special attention to the question of labour and capital, and he has come out openly in favour of a transformation of capitalist and landed property. As the working class in the United States has considerable organisational power, it will be able to impose its will.

Today, in every civilised country, the working class is on the move, and it is in such countries as America and England, where industry is most developed, that the working class is most solidly organised and the struggle between the bourgeois class and the working class is at its sharpest.

The power of the human individual has disappeared before the power of capital, in the factory the worker is now nothing but a cog in the machine. In order to recover his individuality, the worker has had to unite together with others and create associations to defend his wages and his life. Until today these associations had remained purely local, while the power of capital, thanks to new industrial inventions, is increasing day by day; furthermore in many cases national associations have become powerless: a study of the struggle waged by the English working class reveals that, in order to oppose their workers, the employers either bring in workers from abroad or else transfer manufacture to countries where there is a cheap labour force. Given this state of affairs, if the working class wishes to continue its struggle with some chance of success, the national organisations must become international.
Let every worker give serious consideration to this new aspect of the problem, let him realise that in rallying to our banner he is defending his own bread and that of his children.

We, the General Council, appeal to everyone to ensure that the next Congress, which will take place on September 2, 1867, in Lausanne, will be an impressive demonstration by the working class.

According to the Regulations of the first Congress, each branch has the right to send one delegate to the Congress. Those branches with more than 500 members may also send one delegate for every additional 500 members. Those branches which do not have sufficient resources to send a delegate may join with other branches and contribute to the cost of sending a delegate who will represent them.a

The questions to be debated at the Congress are:

1) What practical measures can be taken to turn the International Association into a common centre of action on behalf of the working class (female and male) in its struggle to liberate itself from the yoke of capital?

2) How can the working classes use for their own emancipation the credit that they give to bourgeoisie and governments?

Greeting and fraternity:

Corresponding Secretaries:

E. Dupont—for France; K. Marx—for Germany; Zabicki—for Poland; H. Jung—for Switzerland; P. Fox—for America; Besson—for Belgium; Carter—for Italy; P. Lafargue—for Spain; Hansen—for Holland and Denmark

G. Odger, President
G. Eccarius, Vice-President
W. Dell, Treasurer
Shaw, Secretary-Treasurer
Peter Fox, General Secretary

16, Castle Street, Oxford Street

Drawn up in the middle of July 1867. Printed according to the leaflet

First published as a leaflet “Proletaires, parmi les correspondances...”, London, July 1867 Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

a Reference to articles 6, 7 and 8 of the Administrative Regulations. See this volume, pp. 445-46.—Ed.
Citizen Marx called the attention of the Council to a Parliamentary Blue Book,\textsuperscript{328} “Reports by Her Majesty's Secretaries of Embassy and Legation on the Manufactures and Commerce of the Countries in which they reside, 1867”, of which the following is an extract:

“During the first eleven months of 1864 the imports into Belgium of raw cast iron were 7,200 tons, of which 5,300 were British; in the corresponding period of 1865 they rose to 18,800 tons, of which 17,000 tons were British, and in 1866 they rose to 29,590 tons, of which 26,200 tons were British. On the other hand, the exports of Belgian cast iron during the first eleven months of 1864 amounted to 24,400 tons, 17,200 tons of which went to France, and 5,900 tons to England; whereas in the corresponding period of 1866 they did not amount to more than 14,000 tons, of which 9,600 tons were exported to France, and only 241 tons to Great Britain. The exports of Belgian rails have also fallen from 75,353 tons, during the first eleven months of 1864, to 62,734 tons in 1866.

The following is an exact statement, in a tabular form, of the quantities of iron and steel of all sorts imported into Belgium from Great Britain, and of Belgian iron and steel exported to Great Britain during the first eleven months of 1866, as compared with the corresponding period of 1864.

\begin{center}
\textbf{IMPORTS INTO BELGIUM FROM GREAT BRITAIN.}
\textbf{FIRST ELEVEN MONTHS}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lrr}
                      & 1866 & 1864 \\
\hline
Ore and filings         & 0    & 1     \\
Raw, cast, and old iron & 26,211 & 5,296 \\
Hammered iron (nails, wire, etc.) & 1,031 & 1,777 \\
Castings               & 41   & 24    \\
Wrought iron           & 255  & 203   \\
Steel in bars, plates, and wire & 3,219 & 1,227 \\
Wrought steel          & 522  & 0     \\
\hline
Total                  & 31,289 & 8,528 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
EXPORTS FROM BELGIUM TO GREAT BRITAIN.
FIRST ELEVEN MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1866</th>
<th>1864</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ore and filings</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>5,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw, cast, and old iron</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>5,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammered iron (nails, wire, etc.)</td>
<td>6,727</td>
<td>9,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought iron</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel in bars, plates, and wire</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought steel</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,817</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,979</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results may be briefly stated thus:—whereas in 1864 (taking the first eleven months of the year) Belgium supplied England with 20,979 tons of iron and steel, in 1866 she only sent 8,817 tons, whilst the exports of British iron and steel to Belgium rose from 8,528 tons in 1864 to 31,289 tons in 1866” [No. 5, pp. 594-95].

It would be recollected that some of the middle-class newspapers had last year raised an outcry about the pernicious effects of the Trades Unions, that their doings were driving the iron trade from this country into the hands of the Belgian ironmasters. None of the papers that had raised that outcry had even mentioned the appearance of this Blue Book, much less stated its contents.

First published in *The Bee-Hive News-
paper*, No. 302, July 27, 1867 and *The Working Man*, No. 18, July 27, 1867

Reproduced from the Minute Book
While the balloting was going on, Citizen Marx called attention to the Peace Congress to be held in Geneva. He said it was desirable that as many delegates as could make it convenient should attend the Peace Congress in their individual capacity; but that it would be injudicious to take part officially as representatives of the International Association. The International Working Men's Congress was in itself a peace congress, as the union of the working classes of the different countries must ultimately make international wars impossible. If the promoters of the Geneva Peace Congress really understood the question at issue they ought to have joined the International Association.

The present increase of the large armies in Europe had been brought about by the revolution of 1848; large standing armies were the necessary result of the present state of society. They were not kept up for international warfare, but to keep down the working classes. However, as there were not always barricades to bombard, and working men to shoot, there was sometimes a possibility of international quarrels being fomented to keep the soldiery in trim. The peace-at-any-price party would no doubt muster strong at the Congress. That party would fain leave Russia alone in the possession of the means to make war upon the rest of Europe, while the very existence of such a power as Russia was enough for all the other countries to keep their armies intact.

It was more than probable that some of the French Radicals would avail themselves of the opportunity to make declamatory speeches against their own Government, but such would have more effect if delivered at Paris.
Those who declined putting their shoulders to the wheel to bring about a transformation in the relations of labour and capital ignored the very conditions of universal peace.\footnote{In the minutes here follow the text of the resolution moved by Marx on this point (see this volume, p. 204) and the report on its adoption by the Council.—Ed.}

First published in *The Bee-Hive News-paper*, No. 305 and abridged in *The Working Man*, No. 21, August 17, 1867

Reproduced from the Minute Book
The Congress passed a resolution appointing the London delegates to wait upon the Swiss, the French, and the British postal authorities to bring the question of international penny postage—of cheap postage—under their notice.\textsuperscript{332}

The Swiss postmaster agreed to all the deputation urged, but observed that the French Government stepped [in their] way.

In France the delegates could get no audience, and the British Government only consented to receive a written statement which has been sent.

The other duties imposed upon the General Council by the first annual Congress were: 1. The publication, in several languages, of the transactions of the Congress, including the letters and memoirs addressed to that Congress. 2. To publish periodical or occasional reports in different languages, embracing everything that might be of interest to the Association. 3. To give information of the supply and demand for labour in different localities. 4. An account of co-operative societies. 5. Of the condition of the working class in every country. The Council was also charged with causing a statistical inquiry to be instituted, which was to contain special and detailed information about every branch of industry, in which wages labour is employed, in the most civilised countries of Europe.

To enable the Council to fulfil these various duties, the Congress voted a contribution of threepence per member to the Executive, and a salary of $2 a week to the General Secretary, leaving his appointment to the Council.

As soon as the London delegates had returned, and the Council was reorganised, information was received that some of our

\textsuperscript{a} The French version has here: “The Duties Imposed by the Geneva Congress (September 1866)”.—\textit{Ed.}
Congress documents had been seized on the person of Jules Gottraux by the French police on the frontier.333

The General Secretary was instructed to write to the French Minister of the Interior, but not receiving any reply, an application was made to the British Foreign Office. Lord Stanley, with the greatest readiness, instructed Lord Cowley, the British Ambassador at Paris, to intercede; the result was that within a few days our documents were restored, and a parcel of Tribunes du Peuple, which had evidently been seized from somebody else, superadded.

The Congress documents were then handed over to the Standing Committee, with instructions to prepare the report for publication. As there were no funds to pay the General Secretary this labour devolved upon volunteers, who had to do it in their spare hours, which caused further delay. When all was ready the lowest estimate to have a thousand printed in one language was £40. To comply with the Congress instructions required an immediate outlay of £120; the cash in hand on the 31st of December amounted to 18s. 4d.

The General Secretary was instructed to appeal to the affiliated societies of the British section for their contributions—only the London cigar-makers and the Coventry and Warwickshire ribbon-weavers responded immediately. The board of management of the latter association, with a highly commendable zeal to fulfil its obligation—having no funds in hand and many members out of work—forthwith raised a levy to the required amount from the members in work.

The Council then availed itself of an offer made by Citizen J. Collet, the proprietor and editor of the International Courier, to publish the report in French and English in weekly parts in the columns of his journal. He also agreed to stereotype the whole at his own expense with the view of publishing it in pamphlet form, and to let the Council share in the profits, if any, the Council undertaking no responsibility whatever in case of loss.

But hardly was this highly advantageous arrangement completed when, on account of not having complied with some legal intricacy, of which the government had previously taken no notice, Citizen Collet had to suspend the publication of his journal for several weeks, and it was not till March that the publication of the Congress report could be regularly proceeded with.4

The numbers of the *International Courier* containing the report have been sent gratis to the branches. A German version could, for want of a similar opportunity, not be published.

When the publication was completed it was again want of funds that prevented, and still prevents, the publication in pamphlet form.

To make matters worse the French police seized a parcel of rules and cards of membership, purposely issued for the French section, the printing of which cost £4, which was borrowed money.\(^{33}\)

Besides this dead loss, there was the further injury of curtailing the contributions, which in France depend principally upon the scale of individual membership. Beyond all this, there were the old liabilities which were acknowledged as the debt of the Association by the Congress, but no special provision made for their liquidation. They have greatly hampered our action, and continue to be a source of trouble.

Under these circumstances it was utterly impossible to publish either periodical or occasional reports; nor have our correspondents taken the trouble to send us any special information with a view to such publication. The question of entering upon the statistical inquiry had to be abandoned for the present year. To be of any use at all it cannot be limited to the trades at present comprised within the circle of our affiliated societies. Such an inquiry, to answer its purpose, must include every trade, every country, and every locality. This involves not only a large expenditure for printing, stationery, and postage, but also an amount of labour in the shape of correspondence, compiling, and arranging the scattered and specific statements into a comprehensive and comprehensible whole, \([so\) that the possibility of having it done by volunteers in their leisure hours is altogether out of the question.

**INTERFERENCE IN TRADES' DISPUTES**

One of the best means of demonstrating the beneficent influence of international combination is the assistance rendered by the International Working Men's Association in the daily occurring trades' disputes. It used to be a standard threat with

---

\(^3\) The French version has here: "The Role of the International Working Men's Association in the Struggle between Capital and Labour".— Ed.
British capitalists, not only in London, but also in the provinces, when their workmen would not tamely submit to their arbitrary
dictation, that they would supplant them by an importation of
foreigners. The possibility of such importations taking place was in
most cases sufficient to deter the British workmen from insisting
on their demands. The action taken by the Council has had the
effect of putting a stop to these threats being made publicly.
Where anything of the kind is contemplated it has to be done in
secret, and the slightest information obtained by the workmen
suffices to frustrate the plans of the capitalists. As a rule, when a
strike or a lock-out occurs concerning any of the affiliated trades,
the Continental correspondents are at once instructed to warn the
workmen in their respective localities not to enter into any
engagements with the agents of the capitalists of the place where
the dispute is. However, this action is not confined to affiliated
trades. The same action is taken on behalf of other trades upon
application being received. This generally leads to the affiliation
of the trades that invoke our aid.

Now and then it happens that the capitalists succeed in getting a
few stragglers, but they generally repudiate their engagements
upon being informed of the reason why they were engaged.

During the London basket-makers' dispute last winter informa-
tion was received that six Belgians were at work under the railway
arches in Blue Anchor Lane, Bermondsey. They were as strictly
guarded against coming in contact with the outside public as a
kidnapped girl in a nunnery. By some stratagem a Flemish
member of the Council succeeded in obtaining an interview, and
upon being informed of the nature of their engagement the men
struck work and returned home. Just as they were about to
embark a steamer arrived with a fresh supply. The new arrivals
were at once communicated with; they too repudiated their
engagements, and returned home, promising that they would
exert themselves to prevent any further supplies, which they
accomplished.335

In consequence of the appeals made by deputations from the
Council to various British societies, the Paris bronze-workers
received very considerable pecuniary support during their lock-
out, and the London tailors on strike have in turn received
support from Continental associations through the intercession of
the Council.336 The good offices of the Council were also
employed on behalf of the excavators, the wire-workers, the
block-cutters, the hairdressers, and others.
PROPAGANDA AND AFFILIATED SOCIETIES

The work of propaganda and affiliation of societies has been greatly impeded in England during the past year. It seems as if the British Legislature could never move a step in the right direction in any matter of great social or political importance unless compelled by a threatening and overwhelming pressure from without, when the public excitement assumes the character of a monomania. While the Reform agitation was at its height, the frequent monster demonstrations in course of organisation, it was almost hopeless to try to engage the attention of working men to the somewhat distant aims of the International Working Men's Association. Most of our British Council members took an active part in these proceedings, which reduced our available forces to go on deputations, while the proceedings themselves caused so much excitement and absorbed so much of the attention of those who might have entertained our applications, that there was no room for their consideration. These proceedings, too, in diverting men's attention to other objects have had the effect of preventing many new members being enrolled and some old ones to renew their subscriptions. Everywhere one was met with the observation that the struggle for Parliamentary Reform was [not] only the struggle of a season, but the paramount duty of the hour and an indispensable stepping stone to that complete emancipation of the working classes from the domination of capital which is the aim of the International Working Men's Association. One step has undoubtedly been gained by the Act of 1867. It is sufficiently comprehensive to enable the working classes to politically combine for class purposes within the precincts of the Constitution, and exercise a direct influence upon the Legislature in matters of social and economical reform in as far as they affect the labour question.

But though our propagandism has been much impeded during the past it has not been arrested. The ordinary mode of proceeding with the affiliation of corporate bodies is somewhat tedious. When the Council has any reasonable ground for believing that the question will be favourably entertained by an association, it applies to the president or secretary by letter. If the application be favourably received, a deputation is requested to attend the Executive to state the aims of the Association. If the

---

3 In the French version this and the next sections are combined in Section III entitled "English Section" which is divided in its turn into two paragraphs: "a) Propaganda" and "b) Contributions".—Ed.
Executive endorses the statement of the deputation it recommends the question to be entertained at some future general or delegate meeting, when perhaps the deputation is again requested to attend. In some cases the question of affiliation is decided at once—in others the votes of all the members and branches have to be taken to arrive at a decision.

The affiliation of 33 organised bodies has been brought about in this manner during the past year. More than twenty have been corresponded with and received deputations. With some the decisions are pending, others have deferred the consideration to a more favourable opportunity; only one society has flatly refused to enter into any relationship because the Association entertains political questions.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND AFFILIATED SOCIETIES

The question as to the contributions of affiliated societies occupied the Council at various times. While the question was pending, the Executive of the Operative Bricklayers' Society joined and agreed to contribute £1 per annum.

In March 1865, a deputation from the Council waited on the conference of the Amalgamated Cordwainers' Association, at which the following resolution, proposed by the delegate from Birmingham, and seconded by the delegate from Hull, was unanimously carried:

"That we cordially agree with the principles of the International Working Men's Association as represented by the deputation from that body, and pledge ourselves to join them for the furtherance of those principles, and endeavour to spread them amongst our constituents."

The question of contributions was raised, but the discussion being out of order was stopped. Some weeks after it was resolved that a declaration of enrolment should be printed, for which organised bodies should pay an entrance fee of 5s., that as many cards as possible should be sold to individual members of such societies, the remainder, when funds were required, should be left to their generosity. It was while this state of things lasted that the liabilities already alluded to were incurred.

The money granted by various affiliated societies last year were voluntary gifts towards defraying the expenses of the delegates to the first Congress, and it was expended for that purpose.

The Cordwainers' Executive granted £5.
To remove this state of uncertainty the Council proposed a minimum contribution per member from affiliated societies.

The Congress voted threepence, which the British delegates maintained could not be levied from trades societies in England.

When, after the Geneva Congress, our deputations were sent to trades societies, it was found that, as the British delegates had foreseen, the threepence per member formed an insurmountable obstacle to the affiliation of organised bodies.

On the 9th of October the Council resolved unanimously that the contribution should be lowered to one halfpenny per member. All the societies that have since been affiliated have joined with that understanding.

The Amalgamated Cordwainers’ Association has distinctly declared that the resolution of its Conference of 1865 does not amount to an affiliation, and the conference of the same body of 1867 has rescinded the resolution, which enabled the Council to grant us £5 last year.

The Executive of the Operative Bricklayers has paid £1 for 1867, but has not yet announced any decision, whether it considers the whole society affiliated or not.

The Cordwainers’ Association was put down in last year’s estimate as containing 5,000 members, the Bricklayers’ 3,000 to 4,000.

Two appeals have been made in the course of the year for the contributions; some of the previously affiliated societies have paid, others have not; but, excepting the cordwainers, none have repudiated their obligation.

The Executive of the Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners has recently passed resolutions to contribute £2 per annum to the funds of the Council, but the question is now under consideration to take the votes of all the members whether the association is to be affiliated in its entirety or not. It numbers about 9,000 members, and extends over England, Wales, and Ireland. The following is a list of the affiliated societies of the British section, and the money furnished by them during the last two years.a

Beyond this the elastic web-weavers have granted £1 to the Congress fund; the cigar-makers £1 ls.

There is a considerable difference in the actual income of the two years, but there is an essential difference as to its purport. Last year the money was voted to send delegates to the Congress; it was therefore not available for other purposes; this year’s income consists of contributions to defray the expense of

---

a See this volume, pp. 435-36.—Ed.
### Gifts and Entrance Fees 1866

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of affiliated societies</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>Contributions 1867</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London, Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, French Branch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Section of Polish Exiles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative Bricklayers' Executive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1 Lodge of Operative Bricklayers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Cabinet-Makers' Society</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Cabinet-Makers' Society</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Working Bookbinders' Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-in-Hand Coopers' Society</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Cigar-Makers' Association</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamated Cordwainers' Executive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington Section of ditto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham Section of ditto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry and Warwickshire Ribbon-Weavers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 9 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing-Case Makers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddlers and Harness Makers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal Shoemakers' Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End Ladies' Boot-Makers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Operative Tailors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington Section of Amalgamated Tailors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Societies Affiliated Since Sept., 1866

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Societies Affiliated Since Sept., 1866</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London Basket-Makers' Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block-Printers of Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Coach-Builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach-Trimmers (The Globe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach-Trimmers (The Crown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elastic Web-Weavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Excavators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Polishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ-Builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern-Drawers and Block-Cutters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters' and Joiners' Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Society of Journeyman Curriers (joined August 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Reform League</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
administration. Last year, we incurred liabilities because we had no settled income; this year, we liquidated liabilities, because we had such an income.

The reason why some of our affiliated societies have not yet paid their annual contribution, and why others have not contributed to the Congress fund, is severe pressure upon their funds in consequence of the stagnation of trade, strikes, and lock-outs.

We have received several letters, stating these as reasons why the same societies that contributed so handsomely towards the Congress fund last year, cannot give anything this year. The tailors' strike has absorbed all the available funds of the London trades societies.

### CONTINENTAL AND AMERICAN SECTIONS

As a rule, the General Council only corresponds with individual branches abroad, where police restrictions prevent the formation of branches.\(^a\)

In Belgium an attempt has been made to affiliate trades societies, but we have no information about the result, nor have we received any contributions.

Germany is still in an unsettled state. Citizen Philipp Becker, the President of the German section at Geneva, has succeeded in establishing several branches, but we have no particulars at present.

In Italy there is a regular working men's organisation with whose officers we are in correspondence, but formal affiliations have not yet taken place.

In the New World, we have two affiliated branches at New York and Hoboken, N.J. We are in correspondence with the National Labour Union Committee, and the President\(^b\) of the International

---

\(^a\) In the French version here follow the reports on the activity of the Association's sections in France, Switzerland and Belgium.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) W. Sylvis.—*Ed.*
Ironmoulders' Union.\textsuperscript{339} Particulars will be found in the special report of the American Secretary.\textsuperscript{340}

**GENERAL REMARKS**

The past year has been characterised by intense struggles and agitation. In America, in England, in France, in Belgium strikes, lock-outs, persecution and prosecution of the working class have been the order of the day.

The capitalists have perseveringly treated the workmen as nobodies who only exist obsequiously to submit.

One society in the United States has spent 70,000 dols. to resist the encroachments of the capitalists\textsuperscript{341}; in England it has been decided in the courts of law that to rob the funds of trades unions is not punishable by law. An official inquiry into the working of trades unions has been instituted with a view to damage their character and to affix to them the stigma of being criminal in their proceedings.\textsuperscript{342}

The wholesale prosecutions of the London master tailors against their men, the attitude of magistrates, judges, and the daily press, the convictions of the Paris tailors and the massacre at Marchienne,\textsuperscript{343} are facts that demonstrate incontrovertibly that society consists but of two hostile classes—the oppressors and the oppressed—and that nothing short of a solitary union of the sons of toil throughout the world will ever redeem them from their present thraldom. We therefore conclude with the motto: *Proletarians of all Countries, Unite!*\textsuperscript{344}

First published in *The Bee-Hive News*paper, No. 309, September 14, 1867

Reproduced from the newspaper
September 24

Upon the proposition of Citizen Hales, it was unanimously agreed not to appoint a standing president.\textsuperscript{345} Upon the proposition of Citizen Shaw, it was unanimously [agreed] that the functions hitherto performed by the financial secretary should be transferred to the general secretary and the office of financial secretary abolished.

October 8

Citizen Marx announced that a member of the Association, Citizen Liebknecht, had been returned to the North German Parliament by the working men of Saxony.\textsuperscript{346} He was the only member that had dared to attack Bismarck's war policy, for which he had been invited by the Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein—a Schulze-Delitzsch society—to receive the acknowledgements of the working men for his services.

October 22

Citizen Marx read some extracts from the stenographic reports of the North German Parliament. Mr. Liebknecht, a member of the Association, had delivered a speech in favour of the abolition of standing armies and the introduction of popular armaments, and subjecting Bismarck's conduct in the Luxemburg affair to a severe criticism.\textsuperscript{347}

First published, in Russian, in Generalny Soviet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1866-1868, Moscow, 1963

Reproduced from the Minute Book
FROM A LETTER BY JENNY MARX
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER

We present here an excerpt from a letter by a friend in London; among other things, it mentions the Working Men's Congress in Lausanne and the Peace Congress in Geneva, as well as Marx's latest work:

"...You will simply not believe what a tremendous sensation the Lausanne Congress has caused here in all the papers. Once The Times had set the tone, by printing daily reports, the other papers no longer considered it beneath their dignity to print not just short notices on the labour question, but even long editorials. There has been comment on the Congress not only in all the dailies, but the weeklies, too. It was, on occasion, quite naturally treated in a condescending and ironical way. After all, everything has a comical side, as well as a more lofty one, so why should our good Working Men's Congress, with its garrulous Frenchmen, be the exception? In spite of everything, however, generally it was treated quite properly and taken au sérieux. Even the Manchester Examiner, the organ of the Manchester school, and John Bright himself, in an excellent leader presented it as important and epoch-making. When compared with its stepbrother, the Peace Congress, the advantage was always on the elder brother's side, one seen as a threatening tragedy of fate, while the other as merely farce and burlesque.

"If you have already acquired Karl Marx's book, and if, like me, you have not yet managed to work through the dialectical

---

a "International Working Men's Congress", The Times, Nos. 25909, 25911-25913, September 6, 9-11, 1867. The author of the reports was Eccarius.—Ed.

b K. Marx, Das Kapital, Kritik der politischen Ökonomie. Erster Band, Hamburg, 1867.—Ed.
subtleties of the first chapters, I advise you to read those on the primitive accumulation of capital and the modern theory of colonisation first. I am sure that, like myself, you will obtain great satisfaction from this part. Marx does not, of course, have any specific remedy at hand, which the bourgeois world, that now also calls itself socialist, so violently cries out for, he has no tablets, no ointments, or lint, to heal the gaping, bleeding wounds of our society; but to me it seems that, basing himself on the natural historical rise and development of modern society he has indicated the results and their practical application, including even the most daring conclusions, and that it was no small matter to bring the astounded philistine to the giddy heights of the following problems by means of statistical data and dialectical reasoning:

"'Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power... A great deal of capital, which appears today in the United States without any certificate of birth, was yesterday, in England, the capitalised blood of children... If money "comes into the world with a congenital blood-stain on one cheek", capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore with blood and dirt.' Or the whole passage from: 'The knell of capitalist private property sounds, etc.'," to the end.

"I must admit openly that I was gripped by this simple pathos and that history became as clear as daylight to me."

Written on about October 5, 1867

First published in Der Vorbote, No. 10, October 1867

Printed according to the journal

Published in English for the first time

---

RULES AND ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

RULES

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

a The 1866 French edition here reads: "Rules of the International Working Men's Association Adopted by the Geneva Congress at the Sitting of September 5, 1866".—Ed.
b The 1866 French edition has "not a struggle for new privileges" instead of "not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies".—Ed.
c The 1866 French edition has "of these countries" instead of "of the most advanced countries".—Ed.
That the present revival of the working classes in the most industrious countries of Europe, while it raises a new hope, gives solemn warning against a relapse into the old errors, and calls for the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements;

For these reasons:—

The first International Working Men's Congress\(^a\) declares that this International Association and all societies and individuals adhering to it will acknowledge truth, justice, and morality, as the basis of their conduct towards each other, and towards all men, without regard to colour, creed or nationality;

This Congress considers it the duty of a man to claim the rights of a man and a citizen, not only for himself, but for every man who does his duty. No rights without duties, no duties without rights;

And in this spirit they have drawn up\(^b\) the following Rules of the International Association:—

1. This Association is established to afford a central medium of communication and co-operation between Working Men’s Societies existing in different countries, and aiming at the same end, viz., the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation of the working classes.

2. The name of the Society shall be: “The International Working Men's Association”.

3. The General Council shall consist of working men belonging to the different countries represented in the International Association. It shall from its own members elect the officers necessary for the transaction of business, such as a president, a treasurer, a general secretary, corresponding secretaries for the different countries, &c. The Congress appoints annually the seat of the General Council, elects a number of members, with power to add to their numbers, and appoints time and place for the meeting of the next Congress. The delegates assemble at the appointed time and place without any special invitation. The General Council may, in case of need, change the place, but has no power to postpone the time of meeting.

4. On its annual meetings, the General Congress shall receive a public account of the annual transactions of the General Council.

---

\(^a\) In the 1866 French edition this paragraph begins with the words: “The Congress of the International Working Men’s Association held in Geneva between September 3 and 8, 1866”.—Ed.

\(^b\) The 1866 French edition has “the Congress has adopted as final” instead of “they have drawn up”.—Ed.
In cases of urgency, it may convok the General Congress before the regular yearly term.

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

6. Since the success of the working men's movement in each country cannot be secured but by the power of union and combination, while, on the other hand, the usefulness of the International General Council must greatly depend on the circumstance whether it has to deal with a few national centres of working men's associations, or with a great number of small and disconnected local societies; 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

---

a In the 1866 French edition the beginning of the paragraph reads: “The General Council shall establish relations with different workers' associations”.—Ed.
b The end of the sentence from the words “when immediate practical steps...” reads in the 1866 French edition: “when some practical proposal or international complication demands interference by the Association, its action be uniform”.—Ed.
c The part of the sentence from the words “the usefulness of the International General Council” to “local societies” reads in the 1866 French edition: “the usefulness of the General Council will be the greater the less its actions are scattered”.—Ed.
d In the 1866 French edition this word is omitted.—Ed.
c The 1866 French edition has “Central Councils” instead of “central national organs”.—Ed.
1 Articles 7-12 are omitted in the 1866 French edition.—Ed.
not only in all matters tending to the general progressive improvement of public life but also in the foundation of productive associations and other institutions useful to the working class. The General Council shall encourage them in every possible manner.

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

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

10. Every section or branch has the right to appoint its own corresponding secretary.

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

12. Everything not provided for in the present Rules will be supplied by special Regulations subject to the revision of every Congress.

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

1. The General Council is commissioned to carry the resolutions of the Congress into effect. (A) For this purpose it collects all the documents sent by the Central Committees of the different countries, and such as it may be able to procure by other means. (B) It is charged with the organisation of the Congress, and to bring the Congress programme to the knowledge of all the branches through the medium of the Central Committees.

2. As often as its means permit, the General Council shall publish a report embracing everything that may be of interest to the International Working Men's Association, taking cognisance above all of the supply and demand for labour in different localities, Co-operative Associations, and of the condition of the labouring class in every country.

3. This report shall be published in the several languages and sent to all the corresponding offices for sale. To save expense the corresponding secretaries must previously inform the General

---

\[a\] The 1866 French edition has "Special Regulations".—Ed.
Council of the approximate number of copies that may be disposed of in their respective localities.\[a\]

4. To enable the General Council to fulfil these duties an annual contribution of ONE PENNY per member will be levied from affiliated societies for the use of the General Council payable in quarterly instalments.\[b\] This contribution is destined to defray the expense of the General Council, such as the remuneration of the General Secretary, postage, printing, &c.\[c\]

5. Whenever circumstances may permit Central Committees representing groups of branches using the same language\[d\] will be established. The functionaries of these Committees are elected by the respective sections, but may be recalled from their offices at any time. They shall send their reports at least once a month, oftener if need be.

6. The expense of the Central Committees shall be defrayed by their respective sections.\[e\] Every branch, whatever the number of its members, may send a delegate to the Congress.

7. Branches that are not able to send a delegate may unite with other branches to form a group to send a delegate to represent them.

8. Every branch, or group, consisting of more than 500 members, may send a delegate for every additional full 500 members. Only the delegates of branches and sections who have

---

\[a\] In the 1866 French edition this sentence is part of the previous one and reads "whose duty it is to send one copy to each branch".—Ed.

\[b\] The 1866 French edition has: "To enable the General Council to fulfil these duties a contribution of 30 centimes (3d.) per member of the Association will be levied for 1866-1867 as an exception."—Ed.

\[c\] The 1866 French edition has "expenses on publication, correspondence, organisation and other preparations for the Congress" instead of "postage, printing, &c."—Ed.

\[d\] The words "representing groups of branches using the same language" are omitted in the 1866 French edition.—Ed.

\[e\] In the 1866 French edition the next sentence opens Article 9 the end of which corresponds to Article 7 in the English edition; in the French edition this phrase is followed by two Articles which are missing in the English edition, namely:

7. The only function of the corresponding Central Councils, and also the General Council, is to recognise the credit granted to members of the Association by their respective branches when their cards are countersigned by the secretary of the branch to which the bearer belongs.

If the branch to which the bearer applies to make use of his credit is short of funds, it is authorised to draw on the bureau of the branch issuing the credit.

8. The Central Councils and the branches must communicate the reports of the General Council on demand and free of charge to every member of the Association."—Ed.
paid their contributions to the General Council can take part in the transactions of the Congress.\(^a\)

9. The expense of the delegates is defrayed by the branches and sections who appoint them.\(^b\)

10. Every member of the International Working Men's Association is eligible.\(^c\)

11. Each delegate has but one vote in the Congress.\(^d\)

12. Every section is at liberty to make Rules and Bye-Laws for its local administration, suitable to the peculiar circumstances of the different countries. But these Bye-Laws must not contain anything contrary to the general Rules and Regulations.

13. The present Rules and Regulations may be revised by every Congress, provided that two-thirds of the delegates present are in favour of such revision.

BYE-LAWS FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM\(^c\)

1. The contribution for individual members is Is. per annum.
2. Societies joining in their corporate capacity have to pay an entrance fee of 5s.
3. Affiliated societies in the Metropolitan district have the right to send a delegate to the meetings of the General Council. Upon invitation deputations from the General Council will wait upon societies in the Metropolitan district to explain the aims and objects of the Association.

By order of the General Council,

Robert Shaw, Chairman
J. George Eccarius, Hon. Gen. Sec.

Published as a pamphlet Rules of the International Working Men's Association, London [1867]

\(^a\) Corresponds to Article 12 in the 1866 French edition where the second phrase is omitted.—Ed.
\(^b\) Article 10 in the 1866 French edition.—Ed.
\(^c\) The respective Article 11 in the 1866 French edition reads: "has the right to elect and be elected".—Ed.
\(^d\) Corresponds to Article 13 in the 1866 French edition; the next two Articles are 14 and 15 respectively.—Ed.
\(^e\) This addition is omitted in the 1866 French edition.—Ed.
NOTES
AND
INDEXES
On September 28, 1864 an international meeting was held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London. It was organised by the London trade-union leaders and a group of Paris Proudhonian workers jointly with the representatives of German, Italian and other foreign workers then living in London and a number of prominent European democratic émigrés. The meeting resolved to found an International Working Men's Association (later known as the First International) and elected a Provisional Committee which shortly afterwards constituted itself as the leading body of the Association. This body, known as the General Council of the International, was mainly called the Central Council until the end of 1866. Karl Marx was elected to this Committee and later to the Sub-Committee appointed at its first meeting on October 5 to draw up the Association's programme documents. The Sub-Committee, or Standing Committee, subsequently functioned as an executive body and included the President of the Central (General) Council (until autumn 1867, when this post was abolished), the General Secretary and the corresponding secretaries for different countries. Marx did not attend its first meetings, when the Sub-Committee drew up a document consisting of an introductory declaration of principles, written by the Owenite John Weston and edited by the French petty-bourgeois democrat Victor Le Lubez, and the Rules of the Italian workers' societies, drawn up by Mazzini and translated into English by the Italian Luigi Wolff.

This document, edited by Le Lubez, was discussed at the Sub-Committee meeting on October 15 about which Marx was informed too late for him to attend, and at the Provisional Committee meeting on October 18, when Marx first familiarised himself with this material. His critical assessment of it is to be found in his letter to Engels of November 4, 1864 (see present edition, Vol. 42). Circumstances did not allow Marx to prevent the Provisional Committee's approval of the declaration of principles and the Rules, but he convinced the Committee members that the document needed polishing and insisted on referring it back to the Sub-Committee for final editing. On October 20 the Sub-Committee met at Marx's house; at that meeting they managed to edit only the first point of the Rules. By the next meeting of the Sub-Committee on October 27 Marx had completely revised the submitted document. He wrote a new document—the Inaugural Address of the
Working Men's International Association, which was not in the original draft; he altered the Preamble to the Rules, discarding the loosely-phrased declaration of principles, reduced the 40 points of the Rules to 10, and formulated them in a way which expressed the proletarian nature of the organisation then being founded, and eliminated all Mazzinian organisational principles (petty regulation typical of secret societies, etc.). The Sub-Committee approved the Address and the Rules as drawn up by Marx, stipulating, however, that two declarative phrases on "rights and duties" and "truth, justice, and morality" be inserted in the Preamble to the Rules.

On November 1, 1864 both documents were unanimously approved by the Provisional Committee. On the proposal of a Committee member, Whitlock, Marx supplemented the Inaugural Address with a note on carbon and nitrogen as most important elements of food.

The Inaugural Address was first published by The Bee-Hive Newspaper, No. 160, November 5, 1864 without the sanction of the Central Council and as an offprint to be sent to various newspapers. Marx strongly disapproved of this publication which contained a number of misprints (see this volume, p. 353). In November 1864 the Address and the Rules were published in London as a pamphlet Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association, Established September 28, 1864, at a Public Meeting Held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London. On the decision of the Central Council of May 9, 1866 the English version of the Inaugural Address, the Provisional Rules and some other documents were again published as a pamphlet in London in August that year. The Address was also published in The Miner & Workman's Advocate, No. 93, December 10, 1864. The German authorised translation entitled "Manifest an die arbeitende Klasse Europä's" was published in Der Social-Demokrat, Nos. 2 and 3, December 21 and 30, 1864.

During 1865, 1866 and later, various translations of the Inaugural Address appeared: into French in Paris, Geneva and Brussels; into Italian in Genoa and Naples; into German in Leipzig, Geneva, Berlin and Vienna in 1866 and 1868; into Hungarian in Pest in 1868; into Russian in Geneva in 1871; into Spanish and Portuguese in Madrid and Lisbon in 1873. Various German translations continued to be published in Germany and Switzerland (Zurich) in the early 1870s as well.

The Inaugural Address has survived in two manuscript copies written by Mrs. Marx and Jenny Marx (Marx's daughter), and copies of pamphlets with Marx's corrections.

In this volume the document is published according to the English pamphlet of 1864. The most important differences between the English version and the German authorised translation are given in footnotes.

At the end of the pamphlet there was a list of the Central Council members:

"Names and Nationalities of the Central Provisional Council.


"French: Denoual, Le Lubez, Jourdain, Morrissot, Leroux, Bordage, Boquet, Talandier, Dupont.

"Italian: L. Wolff, Fontana, Setacci, Aldovrandi, Lama, Solustri.

"Swiss: Nusperli, Jung.

"German: Eccarius, Wolff, Otto, Lessner, Pfländer, Lochner, Marx, Kaub, Bolleter.

"Polish: Holtorp, Rybczinski."
George Odger, President of the Central Council.
George W. Wheeler, Honorary Treasurer.
Karl Marx, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for Germany.
G. P. Fontana, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for Italy.
J. E. Holtorp, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for Poland.
Hermann F. Jung, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland.
V. Le Lubez, Honorary Corresponding Secretary for France.
William R. Cremer, Honorary General Secretary.

2 This presumably refers to the articles “The Trade and Navigation Returns” and “Pauperism.—July 1850 and 1849”, published in The Economist, August 10, 1850.

3 Garottes—robbers who strangled their victims. In the early 1860s such attacks often occurred in London and were a subject of special debate in Parliament.

4 Blue Books—a series of British parliamentary and foreign policy documents published in blue cover since the seventeenth century.

5 The Civil War in America broke out in April 1861. The Southern slaveholders rose against the Union and formed the Confederacy of the Southern States. The war was caused mainly by the conflict between the two social systems: the capitalist system of wage labour established in the North and the slave system dominant in the South. The Civil War, which had the nature of a bourgeois-democratic revolution, passed two stages in its development: the period of a constitutional war for maintaining the Union and the period of a revolutionary war for the abolition of slavery. The decisive role in the defeat of the Southern slaveholders and the victory of the North in April 1865 was played by the workers and farmers. Marx analysed the causes and the nature of war in America in his articles published in the Vienna newspaper Die Presse (see present edition, Vol. 19).

The discontinuance of cotton imports from America as a result of the blockade of the Southern States by the Northern fleet caused a crisis in the cotton industry of several European countries. In England, for two or three years beginning in 1862, over 75 per cent of spinners and weavers in Lancashire, Cheshire and other counties were fully or partly unemployed. Despite privation and distress, the European proletariat gave all possible support to the American fighters against slavery.

6 The phrase from Gladstone’s speech on April 16, 1863, quoted here by Marx, appeared in almost all the London newspaper reports of this parliamentary session (The Times, The Morning Star, The Daily Telegraph, April 17, 1863) but was omitted in Hansard’s semi-official publication of parliamentary debates in which the text was corrected by the speakers themselves. In the magazine Concordia, No. 10, March 7, 1872 the German bourgeois economist Brentano used this as a pretext for accusing Marx of unscrupulous misquotation. Marx replied to this libel in his letters to the editor of Der Volksstaat on May 25 and July 28, 1872 (see present edition, Vol. 23).

After Marx’s death, the same accusation was made in November 1883 by the British bourgeois economist Taylor. The lie to this assertion was given by Eleanor Marx in two letters to the magazine To-Day in February and March 1884, and then by Engels in the Preface to the fourth German edition of Capital in June 1890 and in the pamphlet Brentano Contra Marx in 1891.
7 The *Ten Hours' Bill*, the struggle for which had been waged for many years, was passed by Parliament in 1847 against the background of sharply intensified contradictions between the landed aristocracy and the industrial bourgeoisie, generated by the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. In revenge on the industrial bourgeoisie, a section of Tory M.P.s supported the Bill. Its provisions applied only to women and children. Nevertheless, many manufacturers evaded it in practice. Engels devoted two special articles to this Bill in 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 271-76 and 288-300). True, they were written at a time when Marx's economic teaching was not yet sufficiently developed, and in these articles this shows up as a certain underestimation of the struggle for a shorter working day.

8 Marx has in mind the polemical articles by the Chartist leader Ernest Jones, published in the weekly *Notes to the People* in 1851 and 1852 and aimed at Christian socialists and bourgeois advocates of the co-operative principle who asserted that social evils could be eliminated under the existing bourgeois system by setting up workers' co-operative societies. In contrast to them, Jones proved that co-operatives could be a powerful means of social transformation if introduced on a national scale by a working class which had won political power. Jones wrote some of the articles jointly with Marx (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 573-89).

9 At a parliamentary session in 1863, the Irish deputies headed by Thomas Maguire demanded legislative measures limiting landlords' arbitrariness, in particular, the tenants' right to have their expenses on a rented plot compensated when the lease had expired or been terminated. In his speech on June 23, 1863 Palmerston called these demands "communistic doctrines" "subversive of all the fundamental principles of social order".

10 The reference is to the demonstrations by English workers during the American Civil War against their government's interference on the side of the Southern slaveholding states. The massive campaign of the English workers against intervention which became particularly widespread at the end of 1861 and the beginning of 1862 prevented reactionary quarters from drawing Europe into the war on the side of the slaveholders and greatly strengthened the idea of the international solidarity of the proletariat.

11 The *Provisional Rules of the Association* were drawn up by Marx simultaneously with the Inaugural Address, approved by the Sub-Committee on October 27 and unanimously adopted by the Provisional Committee on November 1, 1864. They were published in English together with the Inaugural Address in the pamphlet *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association*... in London in November 1864 and also in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 161, November 12, 1864 and *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*, No. 93, December 10, 1864. The French translation of the Provisional Rules made by the Proudhonists at the end of 1864 contained a few inaccuracies and distortions later used in the struggle against the General Council (see present edition, Vol. 21, K. Marx, "General Council to the Federal Council of the Romance Switzerland", "Confidential Communication"). This translation was reproduced in a number of publications in France, Belgium and Switzerland. The new and improved French translation was made by Charles Longuet, checked by Marx and published together with the Inaugural Address in the pamphlet *Manifeste de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs suivi du Règlement provisoire*, Brussels, 1866. The German translation appeared in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 10, January 18, 1865 and in *Der Vorbote*, Nos. 4 and 5, April and May
1866. The Italian translation was published in *L'Unità Italiana*, February 18, 1865 (Milan) and *Il Dovere*, August 26, 1865 (Genoa). At its sitting on September 5, 1866, the Geneva Congress of the International Working Men's Association confirmed the text of the Rules (General Rules) supplementing it with the Regulations which were confirmed at the sitting of September 8, 1866 and were later called the Administrative Regulations. p. 14

12 This and the preceding paragraphs of a declarative character were included by Marx in the Preamble to the Rules on the insistence of other members of the Sub-Committee, who discussed the document on October 27. Marx informed Engels about this in his letter of November 4, 1864 (see present edition, Vol. 42). p. 15

13 The first Congress of the International Working Men's Association scheduled for 1865 in Brussels was held between September 3 and 8, 1866 in Geneva. The decision to postpone the Congress was taken by the Central Council on July 25, 1865 on Marx's insistence. He considered that the local organisations of the International were not yet strong enough in ideological and organisational respects and suggested that a preliminary conference be held in London (see this volume, pp. 375-77). p. 15

14 The resolutions proposed by Marx on the constitution of the Central Council (later called the General Council), the leading body of the International Working Men's Association, worked out in detail the general principles briefly formulated in points 4, 5 and 6 of the Provisional Rules (see this volume, pp. 15-16).

   The first of these resolutions forbade the then widespread practice in England of promoting to the leading bodies of various societies honorary, but actually non-working, members, because this enabled representatives of the property classes to influence workers' organisations without putting themselves under obligation to them. The press report did not name the author of this resolution, but it is obvious from the Minute Book of the General Council that all three were moved by Marx.

   Between January and April 1865 the Central Council adopted several more resolutions which specified the rights and duties of its members. They were proposed by various Council members, usually supported by Marx and sometimes initiated by him (see this volume, pp. 357 and 364-65).

   The resolutions II and III were published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 17

15 These resolutions were used as a basis for the Address of the Central Council to Working Men's Societies (see this volume, pp. 372-73) made public in the summer of 1865. p. 18

16 On November 22 the Central Council, on the proposal of its members Dick and Howell, decided to congratulate Abraham Lincoln on his re-election to the presidency. The writing of the letter of congratulation was entrusted to the Sub-Committee.

   The text, written by Marx, was approved by the Sub-Committee, unanimously confirmed by the Central Council on November 29, 1864, and sent to President Lincoln through Adams, the American envoy to London. On January 28, 1865 the Council received a reply in Lincoln's name which was read out at the Council meeting on January 31 and published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper* on February 4, 1865 and *The Times* on February 6, 1865. As Marx wrote to Wilhelm Liebknecht in February 1865, of all Lincoln's replies to
congratulations he had received, only the one to the International Working
Men’s Association was “not merely a formal acknowledgement of receipt”.

This address to Lincoln was first published in The Daily News, No. 5813, December 23, 1864 and then in The Miner and Workman’s Advocate, No. 95, December 24, 1864, Reynolds’s Newspaper, No. 750, December 25, 1864, The Bee-Hive Newspaper, No. 169, January 7, 1865 and in the German newspapers Der Social-Demokrat, No. 3, supplement, December 30, 1864, Berliner Reform, No. 4, January 5, 1865 and Hermann, No. 314, January 7, 1865. It was also included in the book, Life of Abraham Lincoln, New York, 1865.

In this volume the address has been reproduced from the hand-written copy signed by all members of the Central Council and has been checked with the text in the newspapers.

17 The reference is to the Declaration of Independence passed by the delegates of 13 North American colonies at the Congress in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776. The Declaration proclaimed the secession from England and the formation of an independent republic—the United States of America. It formulated such bourgeois-democratic principles as freedom of the individual, equality before the law, sovereignty of the people, exerting great influence on the European revolutionary movement and the French Revolution in particular. However, the democratic rights proclaimed were from the very start violated by the American bourgeoisie and planters who secured their power as a result of the American War of Independence (1775-83), the first American bourgeois revolution, excluded the common people from political life, and preserved slavery. p. 19

18 See Note 5.

19 This is a covering letter to Marx’s statement (printed below) to the editor of Der Beobachter, a Stuttgart petty-bourgeois democratic newspaper. Der Beobachter, No. 268, November 17, 1864, carried an anonymous report from Bradford, the author being Karl Blind. Blind’s cowardly attempt to deny his authorship of the anonymous leaflet “A Warning” reprinted in June 1859 by Das Volk (London) and the Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg) and depicting Karl Vogt as a Bonapartist secret agent was censured by Marx in 1860 in his pamphlet Herr Vogt (see present edition, Vol. 17). Blind’s new article compelled Marx to expose him again as a liar and refute his boasts of enjoying influence in the USA. At the request of Sophie von Hatzfeldt, Lassalle’s friend, Marx also came out against Blind’s attacks on Lassalle. On December 22, 1864 Marx wrote to Sophie von Hatzfeldt: “It was at your request that I wrote this attack, although its composition did not come easily to me as I did not agree with Lassalle’s political tactics” (see present edition, Vol. 42).

The Beobachter editor confined himself to publishing only the covering letter and his own “comments” on Marx’s statement. Marx’s statement did not appear in the newspaper columns.

20 On Marx’s motive for writing this statement, see Note 19.

Marx foresaw that the Beobachter editor might not publish his statement and sent a copy of it to Sophie von Hatzfeldt for publication in other German papers. Countess Hatzfeldt placed it in the Hamburg Nordstern.

A copy of the statement in Mrs. Marx’s hand with the author’s corrections has survived.

21 Marx wrote this article on January 24, 1865 on the occasion of Proudhon’s death and at the request of J. B. Schweitzer, the editor of Der Social-Demokrat, the newspaper of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers
(founded in May 1863). Schweitzer invited Marx and Engels to contribute to the paper (started in Berlin on December 15, 1864) as early as November 11 of that year. Absence of specifically Lassallean slogans in its prospectus and Wilhelm Liebknecht's membership of the paper's editorial board encouraged Marx and Engels, who had at that time no other press organs for influencing the working-class movement in Germany, to accept the invitation. Moreover, Marx hoped to use this paper for the criticism of Lassallean dogmas and tactics. Thus, in the article on Proudhon, he revealed the methodological defects of Proudhon's views and indirectly stressed the unfeasibility of Lassalle's kindred reformist and sectarian views. Exposing Proudhon's time-serving behaviour with respect to the Bonapartist order, Marx in fact censured Lassalle and his followers for flirting with Prussian ruling circles. A rough copy in Marx's hand of part of the article has survived.

In addition to Marx's article on Proudhon, *Der Social-Demokrat* published the Inaugural Address and the Provisional Rules of the Working Men's Association and Engels' translation of the old Danish folk song *Herr Tidmann* (see this volume, pp. 5-16 and 34-35).

However, Marx and Engels soon became aware that the *Social-Demokrat* editors did not wish to abandon the Lassallean reformist course and the hopes of a deal with the Prussian Government. This compelled them to break all relations with the paper (see this volume, pp. 80 and 87-90).

The article on Proudhon was reprinted in the first and second German editions of Marx's *The Poverty of Philosophy* edited by Engels and published in 1885 and 1892. The French translation was made by Engels in 1884 and checked by Paul Lafargue; it served as the basis of the translation published in the French 1896 edition of *The Poverty of Philosophy*.


22 In the columns of *Le Populaire* and *Le Populaire de 1841* published in the 1830s and 1840s, Étienne Cabot, while publicising projects in the spirit of peaceful utopian communism also criticised the July monarchy regime and helped disseminate democratic ideas. In his works, articles and leaflets, Cabot sharply criticised the capitalist system and this greatly contributed to the political education of the French proletariat.

23 This refers to Proudhon's speech in the French National Assembly on July 31, 1848. Its full text was published in *Compte rendu des séances de l'Assemblée Nationale*, Vol. II, Paris, 1849, pp. 770-82. Proudhon made a few proposals of a petty-bourgeois utopian character, the abolition of loan interest among them, and described the reprisals against the heroic proletarians who had taken part in the Paris insurrection of June 23-26, 1848 as violence and despotism. A detailed assessment of this speech is to be found in "Proudhon's Speech Against Thiers" (present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 321-24).

24 In his speech on July 26, 1848 in the National Assembly, Thiers opposed the proposals to reform credit and taxation which Proudhon had submitted to the Assembly's finance committee. After Proudhon's speech of July 31, 1848, Thiers published his own speech in a separate pamphlet as an attack on his opponent.

25 In *Si les traités de 1815 ont cessé d'exister? Actes du futur congrès* Proudhon opposed the revision of the Vienna 1815 Congress decisions which sanctioned the partition of Poland by Austria, Prussia and Russia and also any support to the Polish national liberation movement.
Engels presumably translated this Danish folk song into German from the collection *Et Hundkede udvalde Danske Viser*, published in Copenhagen in 1787, and sent it on January 27, 1865 to be published in *Der Social-Demokrat*. As is seen from Engels’ letter to Marx of January 27, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42), he wanted to draw the readers’ attention to the peasants’ revolutionary traditions and, in contrast to Lassalle’s disregard of their interests, to stress the importance of the struggle against the survivals of feudalism and the exploitation of the peasants by the nobility.

In 1883, Engels’ translation was reprinted in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, the newspaper of the Socialist Workers’ Party of Germany, and in 1893 in K. Henckel’s *Buch der Freiheit*, Bd. 11, Berlin.


This statement was written by Marx and sent to Engels for his signature on February 6, 1865. By that time, they were convinced that Schweitzer, the newspaper’s editor, was continuing Lassalle’s policy of flirting with the Bismarck Government and was acting in accordance with Lassalle’s dogmas, treating the workers’ movement in other countries with nationalist contempt. Marx and Engels regarded their statement as a warning to Schweitzer. It was prompted by an item in *Der Social-Demokrat* of February 1 which was written by the newspaper’s Paris correspondent Moses Hess, who libellously accused French members of the International of being in contact with Bonapartists.

The criticism by Marx and Engels compelled the editors to change the newspaper’s tone to some extent. Issue No. 21 of February 12, 1865 carried an item by Hess in which he withdrew his assertions. For that reason Marx and Engels did not insist on the publication of the statement; at the same time, as is seen from Marx’s letter to Engels of February 13, 1865, they decided to stop contributing to the newspaper for the time being. Marx and Engels announced their final break with *Der Social-Demokrat* on February 23, 1865 (see this volume, p. 80).

The text of the statement sent to Schweitzer has not survived. It is published here according to the rough manuscript attached to Marx’s letter of February 6, 1865 to Engels. A passage from the statement was later quoted by Marx in the statement on the reasons for their refusal to contribute to *Der Social-Demokrat*, published in the latter half of March 1865 in the *Berliner Reform* and other newspapers (see this volume, p. 80).

This statement was published in English for the first time in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Correspondence, 1846-1895*. A Selection with Commentary and Notes, Martin Lawrence Ltd., London, 1934.

Engels wrote this article to substantiate the tactics of the German working class in the so-called constitutional conflict between the Prussian Government and the bourgeois-liberal majority of the Provincial Diet which, in February 1860, refused to confirm the army reorganisation project proposed by War Minister von Roon. However, the Government soon managed to secure allocations from the Provincial Diet to “maintain the army ready for action” which in fact meant the beginning of the planned reorganisation. When, in March 1862, the liberal majority of the Chamber of Deputies refused to endorse military expenses and demanded a ministry responsible to the Provincial Diet, the Government dissolved the Diet and announced new elections. At the end of September 1862 the Bismarck Ministry was formed. In October it again dissolved the Provincial
Diet and began to carry out the military reform without the sanction of the Diet. The conflict was settled only in 1866 when, after Prussia's victory over Austria, the Prussian bourgeoisie capitulated to Bismarck.

At first Engels agreed to write an article on the Prussian military reform for *Der Social-Demokrat*, but the newspaper's kowtowing before the Bismarck Government made him give up his intention. After consulting Marx, he decided to have his work published as a separate pamphlet. He began writing it late in January 1865, and finished most of it before February 9. Then he sent the manuscript to Marx for review. After making a number of improvements in it on his friend's recommendation, Engels sent the manuscript to the Hamburg publisher Meissner on February 12 and informed Marx about this on the following day (see present edition, Vol. 42).

The pamphlet was published in Hamburg at the end of February 1865 and caused widespread comment in Germany. Its publication was announced in many workers' and democratic newspapers. Wilhelm Liebknecht arranged for it to be discussed in several workers' associations in Berlin. Extracts from the pamphlet appeared in the Social-Democratic press at various times: in the *Berliner Zeitung*, No. 57, March 8, 1865, *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 71, March 25, 1866, the *Sozialdemokratische Monatsschrift*, Nos. 10-11, November 30, 1890 and the *Berliner Volks-Tribüne*, No. 1, March 1, 1891.

The mobilisation of the Prussian army in 1850 was caused by the exacerbation of the conflict between Austria and Prussia for supremacy in Germany. Prussia was forced to surrender by the weakness of its army as well as the vigorous opposition of Russia, which supported Austria. The mobilisation of 1859, caused by the Italian War fought by France and Piedmont against Austria, likewise revealed serious defects in the Prussian military system.

This refers to the July 1830 bourgeois revolution in France and the revolts that followed it in various parts of Germany (Saxony, Brunswick, Hesse, Bavaria and Hanover).

The Prussian land forces, formed during the struggle against Napoleon on the basis of the 1814-15 legislation, consisted of the regular army (troops of the line), its reserve (training and reserve battalions) and the *Landwehr* of the first and the second levy. The *Landwehr* had been formed in Prussia back in 1813 as a people's militia and included members of the older age groups liable to military service who had done three years active service and not less than two years in the reserve and were called up in case of special emergencies. In wartime the *Landwehr* of the first levy was usually included in the field army, while that of the second levy served for the reinforcement of the garrison troops.

This refers to the war of Prussia and Austria against Denmark in 1864 over Schleswig and Holstein, duchies subject to Denmark but inhabited mainly by Germans. Austria joined the war in the fear that if its rival, Prussia, fought on its own, it would enjoy all the fruits of victory. Denmark was defeated. Schleswig and Holstein were declared joint possessions of Austria and Prussia, which aggravated the conflict between the two countries. After its defeat in the war with Prussia in 1866, Austria had to renounce its rights to the duchies in Prussia's favour.

The conscription system was based on general liability for military service, but allowed many deviations, mainly in the form of money redemption and
substitution. The substitution system was widely practised in France where the members of the propertied classes had the privilege of buying themselves out of military service by hiring substitutes. Under the legislation of 1853, substitutes were selected in the main by government bodies and the payment for them went towards a special "army donation" fund. The substitution system was abolished in France in 1872.

Liability for military service determined by ballot was practised in the nineteenth century in those West European countries where the number of persons liable for service exceeded the demand. The ballot decided who was to serve, the rest were recruited either as militiamen or, in certain countries, for short-term military training.  

34 This reserve consisted of men whose conscription was deferred by reason of minor physical defects or special domestic circumstances. It was used for the reinforcement of the army during wartime.  

35 The Franco-Austrian cadre-system of the 1860s was characterised by the predominance of the regular army, whose personnel remained constant for a long time, by a lengthy period of military service and by conscription, in contrast to the Prussian military system based, under the legislation of 1814, on universal liability for military service and a comparatively short period of service.  

36 A reference to the colonial war of conquest in Algeria, begun by France in 1830 and fought for forty years, and to the Crimean war (1853-56), in which Russia confronted the allied forces of France, Britain, Turkey and Piedmont (Sardinia). For the Italian War of 1859, see Note 29.  

37 At the Battle of Jena (Thuringia) on October 14, 1806 French troops under Napoleon routed part of the Prussian army. On the same day, Marshal Davout defeated the main Prussian forces at Auerstädt. The defeat of Prussia, a member of the fourth anti-French coalition (Britain, Russia, Prussia and Sweden) in these two battles (often referred to as the Battle of Jena), led to the occupation of the greater part of Prussia by the French. Hostilities were ended by the Treaty of Tilsit on July 9, 1807, on terms which were harsh and humiliating for Prussia.

On the River Katzbach (Silesia) the Silesian army under Blücher, which consisted of the Prussian and Russian troops, defeated the French troops under Marshal Macdonald on August 26, 1813 during the war of the sixth coalition of the European states (Russia, Austria, Prussia, Britain, Sweden, Spain, etc.). This victory contributed to the Allies' successes in the struggle against Napoleon and led to the expulsion of the French army from Germany. At the beginning of 1814, military operations were conducted on French territory, and in March the Allied forces entered Paris.  

38 The Swiss Landwehr consisted of men liable for military service who had completed their term of service in the country's irregular troops periodically called up for training. In Switzerland, as in Prussia, the Landwehr served to reinforce the army during the war and was mobilised at the threat of war.  

39 The original here has "Düppel im Innern" (enemy within), an expression first used with this meaning in a political survey published in the Bismarckian
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Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung on September 30, 1864 and widely current later.

Düppel (Danish: Dybböl)—Danish fortification in Schleswig which the Prussians captured by storm on April 18, 1864 during the Austro-Prussian war against Denmark.

40 In 1849, during the uprisings in South-Western Germany in support of the Imperial Constitution drafted by the Frankfurt National Assembly but rejected by German sovereigns, the Baden troops sided with the insurgents and made up the nucleus of the Baden-Palatinate revolutionary army. The Baden cavalry regiments, however, were the least reliable. Thus, in the battle with the Prussians at Waghäusel on June 21, 1849 the insurgents took to flight owing to the treachery of an officer in command of several Baden dragoon squadrons.

41 The reference is to the “liberal” course announced by Prince William of Prussia (King of Prussia from 1861) when he became regent in October 1858. He made the Manteuffel Ministry resign and called the moderate liberals to power. The bourgeois press dubbed this the policy of the “New Era”. It was, in fact, solely intended to strengthen the position of the Prussian monarchy and the Junkers. This soon became clear to the representatives of the liberal opposition whose hopes had been deceived and who refused to approve the government project of a military reform. The constitutional conflict that ensued and Bismarck’s advance to power in September 1862 put an end to the “New Era”.

42 Engels is referring to the time when a counter-revolutionary Brandenburg government came to power in Prussia in November 1848 (Manteuffel held in it the post of the Minister of the Interior) and soon dissolved the Prussian National Assembly. After Brandenburg’s death Manteuffel was appointed Prime Minister in 1850. This government was in power until 1858, and under it all the gains of the 1848 revolution (freedom of the press, of assembly, etc.) were abolished and the moderate constitution “imposed” (granted by the King) under Brandenburg was repeatedly revised in the spirit of further curtailment of the Provincial diets’ rights. Taking advantage of the bourgeoisie’s cowardly and conciliatory attitude, the government turned the constitutional representative body into a fiction, restoring the police-and-bureaucratic regime and the privileges and power of the landed aristocracy and nobility.

43 The Provincial diets (Landtags) were introduced in Prussia in 1823. They consisted of representatives of four estates (princes, nobility, representatives of town and rural communities). Property and other electoral qualifications secured the majority in the Provincial diets for the nobility. The Provincial diets were convened by the King and were competent to deal only with questions of local economy and administration. The district assemblies of estates, with an even more restricted competence, were based on the same principles.

Relegated to the background during the 1848-49 revolution, the Provincial diets and district assemblies of estates lost their significance which was not regained until the 1850s, during the period of reaction.

44 Engels formulated this proposition on Marx’s advice (see Marx’s letter to Engels of February 11, 1865, present edition, Vol. 42).

45 Schulze-Delitzsch, a German bourgeois economist and a leader of the Party of Progress, advocated small savings banks and loan offices, and consumer and
producer cooperatives based on the workers' own means with the aim of diverting workers from the revolutionary struggle against capital. Schulze-Delitzsch advocated harmony of capitalists' and workers' interests, asserting that cooperatives could help improve workers' conditions under capitalism and save small producers and artisans from ruin. p. 57

46 A reference to the members of the Party of Progress founded in June 1861 (the most eminent figures were Waldeck, Virchow, Schulze-Delitzsch, Forckenbeck and Hoverbeck). The Party of Progress advocated unification of Germany under Prussia, convocation of an all-German parliament, and a liberal ministry responsible to the Chamber of Deputies. Fearing a people's revolution, it did not support the basic democratic demands—universal suffrage, freedoms of the press, association and assembly. In 1866 the Party of Progress split and its Right wing founded the National Liberal Party, which capitulated to the Bismarck Government. p. 58

47 A reference to the war launched by Prussia and Austria on Denmark in 1864 (see Note 32). p. 61

48 Frederick William III of Prussia promised a constitution in 1815 when the patriotic feeling caused by the struggle against Napoleonic France was still strong in the country. The promise was never kept. p. 64

49 The Confederates—representatives of the Confederacy formed by the Southern slave-holding States which seceded from the Union during the American Civil War of 1861-65 (see Note 5). p. C-

50 The bureaucratic regulation of industry also continued to operate in Prussia in the mid-1860s. A system of special authorisation (concessions) was introduced in a few branches of industry; unless they were granted, industrial activity was prohibited. This medieval guild legislation inhibited the development of capitalism. p. 65

51 The Imperial Constitution was adopted by the Frankfurt National Assembly on March 28, 1849. While proclaiming a number of civil liberties and introducing national central institutions, the Constitution nevertheless shaped the united German state as a monarchy. The Prussian-oriented liberal deputies of the Frankfurt Assembly insisted on handing the imperial crown to the Hohenzollerns and King Frederick-William IV was elected "Emperor of the Germans". However, he refused to accept the offer. Apart from the Prussian Government, those of almost all the larger German states (including Saxony, Bavaria and Hanover) refused to recognise the Constitution. Afraid of revolutionary action, liberals and democrats in the Frankfurt National Assembly proved incapable of upholding the Constitution. The people themselves were its sole defender, and in the spring and summer of 1849, they started an armed struggle led by petty-bourgeois democrats. However, the scattered revolts in defence of the Constitution in Dresden, Rhenish Prussia, the Palatinate and Baden were put down by the counter-revolutionary troops.

Prussian hegemony (Preußische Spitze). Frederick-William IV of Prussia first used this expression on March 20, 1848 when he spoke of his readiness to stand "at the head (an die Spitze) of the whole fatherland in order to save Germany". It was used later too to denote Prussia's aspiration for unification of the country under its supremacy.

Tripartite system—a plan for the reorganisation of the German Confederation which, along with Austria and Prussia, envisaged the formation of a union
of Middle states. This plan, supported especially by Bavaria and Saxony, was directed against the Austrian and Prussian supremacy and expressed the particularist tendencies of the Middle states which were trying to maintain their independence.

Here Engels cites the demands put forward in the Programme of the General Association of German Workers (founded in 1863). However, on Marx's advice (see Marx's letter to Engels of February 11, 1865, present edition, Vol. 42), he formulated them in his pamphlet in such a way that they could not be interpreted in the spirit of Lassalle's reformist ideas about the possibility of resolving the social problem. As Engels saw it, the demand for workers' associations acquired a revolutionary meaning because the winning of political power by the working class was specified as the prime condition for its implementation.

A reference to the workers' right to organise trade unions and to go on strike. In January 1865 the Prussian Provincial Diet debated the right of association in connection with the workers' opposition to the trade regulations then in force. Two members of the Party of Progress, Schulze-Delitzsch and Faucher, used the occasion to have the articles restraining capitalism repealed. They proposed to revoke Article 181, which forbade employers to resort to lockouts, and also demagogically demanded the cancellation of Article 182 concerning the punishment of workers for incitement to strike. The workers in turn wanted the repeal of Article 183 which made them obtain police permission to form associations, and of Article 184 banning strikes.

On February 14, 1865 the Prussian Provincial Diet annulled Articles 181 and 182 and left the workers' demand for freedom of association unsatisfied.

An allusion to Lassalle's followers, who favoured flirting with the Bismarck Government, the nobility and the Junkers.

The Lay of Hildebrand—partly extant German eighth-century epic.

By the time of writing this statement, Marx and Engels had become fully convinced that the political line of Der Social-Demokrat could not be set right. The proof of this was Schweitzer's letter to Marx of February 15, 1865 (for details see this volume, pp. 89-90) and his series of articles Das Ministerium Bismarck in which Bismarck's policy of unifying Germany under Prussia's supremacy was openly supported. The appearance of these articles enabled Marx and Engels to publicise and explain to the masses their break with the newspaper.

Marx wrote this statement on February 18, 1865 and sent it to Engels, who fully approved it and returned it to Marx with his signature; on February 23, 1865 Marx sent the statement to the editors of Der Social-Demokrat.

Marx took measures to make Schweitzer publish the statement. He instructed Liebknecht to place it with the Berliner Reform in case Schweitzer refused to publish it. Marx also sent two copies to Karl Siebel, asking him to print the statement in the Rheinische Zeitung or Düsseldorfer Zeitung two days after receipt. The statement was published in many papers, among them the Barmer Zeitung and Elberfelder Zeitung (No. 60) on February 26, Düsseldorfer Zeitung (No. 59) on February 28, Berliner Reform (No. 51), Neue Frankfurter
Early in 1865 a conflict arose among the Paris members of the International: a group of Proudhonist workers headed by Henri Tolain and Charles Limousin, on the one hand, and, on the other, a French lawyer and bourgeois republican Henri Lefort, who claimed to be the founder and leader of the International Working Men's Association in France. Those close to Lefort accused Tolain and other members of the Paris Administration of being in contact with the Bonapartists (Marx and Engels exposed this insinuation in the statement to Der Social-Demokrat, see this volume, p. 36). Nevertheless, wishing to draw into the International the workers grouped around Lefort, Marx supported the Central Council resolution of February 7, 1865, on Lefort's appointment as "Counsel for the literary defence" of the International in France. Those present at the meeting of the Paris Section, however, lodged a protest against this decision, and sent Tolain and Fribourg to London on February 28 to speak on this point at the Central Council meeting. The Council referred the problem to the Sub-Committee which discussed it on March 4 and 6. Marx proposed a draft resolution which has survived in his notebook (see this volume, p. 330). When Marx drew it up, he tried to protect the French organisation of the International from attacks by bourgeois elements and to strengthen the leadership of the Paris Section by bringing in revolutionary proletarians.

This draft formed the basis of the relevant Central Council resolutions adopted on March 7, 1865 (published below). The resolutions also criticised certain Proudhonist dogmas defended by members of the Paris Administration.

The text of the resolutions has survived in the Council Minute Book and as a handwritten copy which was appended to Marx's letter to Engels of March 13, 1865 and also contained the private instruction to Schily.

The document was published in English for the first time in The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1962.
Accused of contacts with Bonapartist elements, Tolain tendered his resignation, which was discussed by the Central Council on February 7, 14 and 21, 1865. The Council dissociated itself from these charges. p. 82

On February 24, 1865, the Paris Section of the International called a meeting over the appointment of Lefort as the Association's "Counsel for the literary defence" in Paris. The meeting protested strongly against this appointment, believing that Lefort would exploit this to seize leadership in the Paris Section. The meeting adopted a resolution drafted by Limouzin which showed, however, the sectarian position of the French Proudhonists in relation to the intellectuals. It stressed that if the purely working-class character of the Association was to be preserved, only workers should hold leading positions in it. The resolution, signed by 32 members of the Paris Section, was brought to London by Tolain and Fribourg. p. 82

In a letter to Hermann Jung of March 13, 1865 Marx expressed his regret that as a result of the debate in the Central Council "too many concessions to Lefort" had been made in Resolution II (see present edition, Vol. 42). p. 82

This Proudhonist demand was also put forward by the French delegation at the Geneva Congress of the International in 1866, but was rejected.

During the discussion of the General Rules and Regulations, Tolain proposed that the relevant point should stress that a delegate to the Congress had to be a person directly engaged in manual labour. His proposal was vehemently rejected by the English delegates. Cremer and Carter emphasised that the International owed its existence to many citizens not engaged in manual labour. They particularly noted the services of Marx who, as Cremer pointed out, had made the triumph of the working class his life's work.

The coopting of Pierre Vinçard, working-class journalist and veteran of the 1848 Revolution, to the Paris Administration was meant to make the French members of the International familiar with the revolutionary and socialist traditions of the French working class of the 1840s. However, Vinçard did not accept the appointment for personal reasons (see this volume, p. 365). p. 82

In a letter of March 20, 1865 Schily informed Marx that he had refused to accept his appointment as the Central Council representative on the Paris Administration. However, he continued informally to help Marx and the Council in consolidating the International's organisation in Paris. p. 83

The reference is to the Crédit au travail Bank founded in Paris in 1863 by the petty-bourgeois socialist Jean Pierre Beluze to grant credits to producer and consumer co-operatives and to draw workers' savings to promote the co-operative movement. The bank lasted until 1868. p. 83

That this synopsis was written by Marx is clear from his letter to Engels of March 18, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42). A newspaper clipping with the text of this synopsis marked in Mrs. Marx's hand "Londoner Anzeiger. 17. März, 1865" has survived. An illegible word at the end of the clipping is deciphered as "erschöpfend" (exhaustive) in Mrs. Marx's hand. p. 84

See Notes 28 and 46. p. 84

On March 18, 1865 Marx informed Engels about his review (see present edition, Vol. 42). It had originally been intended for the Londoner Anzeiger, but
was sent to another emigrant paper, *Hermann*, where it was printed unsigned on March 18, 1865. p. 85

71 This statement was written by Marx in connection with the campaign launched by Schweitzer against Marx and Engels after their break with the newspaper (see their statement of February 23, 1865, this volume, p. 80). In *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 31, March 8, 1865, Schweitzer falsified the relations of Marx and Engels with Lassalle using Karl Blind's article published in the *Neue Frankfurter Zeitung* on March 5 in which attacks were made on Marx and Engels.

Marx sent his statement to several newspapers simultaneously. Apart from the *Berliner Reform*, the statement was published in the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung*, No. 79, March 20, *Staatsbürger Zeitung*, No. 79, March 20 and *Hermann*, No. 325, March 25, 1865. p. 87

72 Marx is referring to his letter to Liebknecht of February 2, 1865 which has not survived. Its contents are given in Marx's letter to Engels of February 3, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42) and show that Marx protested against the Lassalle cult in the columns of *Der Social-Demokrat* and the attempts to justify directly or indirectly his flirtation with the Bismarck Government. p. 89

73 Judging by the excerpts quoted by Marx in his letter to Engels of February 18, 1865, he severely criticised the political tactics of the Lassalleans in his letter to Schweitzer of February 13, 1865. He explained the importance of associations, the role of trade unions in organising the working class for the struggle against the bourgeoisie. Following Lassalle, Schweitzer refused to recognise the importance of strikes and trade unions in the workers' struggle against capital and put forward the Lassallean demand for a universal suffrage and producer associations as the only panacea for resolving the social problem in a peaceful reformist way; moreover, like Lassalle, Schweitzer encouraged the workers to hope for assistance from the Prussian Government. p. 89

74 This statement was prompted by Schweitzer's new attacks on Marx; in particular, he tried in the columns of *Der Social-Demokrat* (No. 37) and the *Berliner Reform* (No. 37) to represent Marx's explanation of his break with *Der Social-Demokrat* as motivated by his personal hostility to Lassalle. Apart from the *Berliner Reform* Marx may have sent this statement to the Hamburg *Nordstern*. The original of this statement and the covering note to the editor of that newspaper have survived. The note reads: "Herr K. Bruhn, Editor of the *Nordstern*.

Sir, you would much oblige me by publishing the following lines. Yours truly, K. Marx."

The *Nordstern* did not publish this statement. It appeared in the *Berliner Reform*, No. 78, April 1, 1865 and was reprinted in the *Allgemeine deutsche Arbeiter-Zeitung*, No. 119, April 9, 1865. p. 91

75 Marx wrote this article in reply to Bernhard Becker, President of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers, who spoke at a meeting of the Association's Hamburg branch on March 22, 1865. His speech, published in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 39, on March 26, slandered the International Working Men's Association and also Marx, Engels and Liebknecht. On March 27, 1865 Becker was stigmatised by Liebknecht at the meeting of the Association's Berlin branch. The rank-and-file members of this organisation, greatly discontented with Becker, resolved to expel him and recommended other organisations to follow suit. Similar meetings were held in many other branches. In June 1865
Becker was compelled provisionally to delegate his presidential powers to his deputy Fritz sche and he completely renounced them the following November.

Marx wrote this article on his return from Holland where he had a rest at his uncle's, Lion Philips, at Zalt-Bommel from March 19 to April 8, 1865. Apart from the Berliner Reform the article was published in the Rheinische Zeitung.

76 Marx added Szemere's name from memory. It is possible, however, that the Hungarian correspondent in Paris mentioned here was Gustav Zerffi (Bangya's secret accomplice in the police service, something of which Marx was totally unaware) and that Bertalan Szemere was the third person, as mentioned below, who helped to expose Bangya.

77 An allusion to the fact that the post of President of the General Association of German Workers was bequeathed to Bernhard Becker by Lassalle, the first President of this organisation.

78 Marx has in mind a letter sent to him by Liebknecht from Berlin on about January 20.

79 Marx is referring to his letter to Lassalle of June 10, 1859 (see present edition, Vol. 40) occasioned by his pamphlet Der italienische Krieg und die Aufgabe Preußens. Eine Stimme aus der Demokratie which was published anonymously and in which Lassalle advocated the unification of Germany under Prussia's supremacy. Marx wrote to tell him that the views expressed in the pamphlet differed radically from his own opinion and that of his London friends, and let Lassalle know that he might criticise these views in public.

80 A reference to the bourgeois-democratic International Association founded in London in 1855 by French, Polish and German refugees jointly with the Chartists. The Association, which existed till 1859, maintained contacts with some Belgian democrats and with petty-bourgeois German emigrants in the USA. It published its own Bulletin de l'Association Internationale from March 1857 to March 1858.

81 An ironical allusion to what Becker himself said at the meeting of the Hamburg branch of the General Association of German Workers on March 22, 1865. He complained that as Countess von Hatzfeldt's secretary he also had to perform the duties of a servant and buy food.

82 On March 1, 1865 a mass meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall, London, to mark the anniversary of the Polish national liberation insurrection of 1863-64. In its special resolution of February 21, 1865 the Association's Central Council called upon its members and adherents to lend support to the meeting and contributed much to preparing and conducting it. The British bourgeois press, the London liberal Daily News included, covered the speeches of bourgeois radicals (Beales, Leversön and others) at the meeting, but passed over in silence a resolution submitted on behalf of the International and the speeches of Peter Fox and Georg Eccarius, the Central Council members. A full report of the meeting appeared in The Bee-Hive Newspaper, No. 177, March 4, 1865 and it was used by Marx when writing this note intended for the Zurich Der weiße Adler, which reproduced in issue No. 30 of March 11, 1865 a garbled report from the British bourgeois newspapers.

The original of this note has survived. It was enclosed in a letter which Marx sent to Hermann Jung on April 13, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42)
who, in his capacity of Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland, dispatched it to the newspaper with a covering letter. With minor changes the note was printed in Der weiße Adler, No. 48, April 22, 1865 over Jung's signature.

The English translation of the note was first published in The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1962. p. 97

On April 14, 1865 US President Abraham Lincoln was assassinated by the actor John Wilkes Booth, an agent of Southern planters and New York bankers. Andrew Johnson became President. The Central Council took a decision on May 2, 1865 to send an address to the American people on this occasion. At the Council meeting on May 9 Marx read out the Address he had written. It was approved and passed to President Johnson through Adams, the American envoy to England. The Address was published in Reynolds's Newspaper, No. 771, May 21, 1865 and the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 7536, June 1, 1865, and its German translation in the Chicago, Sonntags-Zeitung, on June 4, 1865. p. 99

A reference to the statement made by William Seward at a meeting in Rochester on October 25, 1858. He spoke about "an irrepressible conflict", which, according to him, had to turn the United States either into a "slave-holding nation" or a "free-labour nation". On April 14, 1865, when Lincoln was assassinated, Seward, then US Secretary of State, and his son were both seriously wounded. p. 100

On April 15, 1861, to counter the hostilities opened by the Confederacy of the Southern States, the Lincoln Administration declared the recruitment of 75 thousand volunteers, planning to put down the revolt in three months; the American Civil War did not, however, end until 1865. p. 100

The reference is to the 100 Years' war (1337-1453) between France and England and the all-European Thirty Years' war between the Catholic states and the Protestant countries supported by France (1618-48). By the 23 Years' war, Marx meant wars of European coalitions against the French Republic and Napoleonic France which lasted, with short intervals, from 1792 to 1815. p. 100

This is Marx's report read at the Central Council meetings on June 20 and 27, 1865. Being a further step in the elaboration of his economic theory, it was at the same time, thanks to its popular form, a model of how to present such material to advanced workers.

Marx was prompted to make this report by the speeches of the Central Council member, John Weston, the Owenite. At the meetings of April 11, May 2, 20 (the minutes of this meeting have not survived) and 23, 1865, Weston sought to prove the uselessness of a general rise in wages for the workers and hence concluded that the corresponding efforts on the part of the trade unions would have deleterious consequences. The problems raised by Weston became the subject of discussion in the Central Council in May-August 1865. On May 20 and 23 Marx made preliminary remarks, and on June 20 and 27 countered Weston's views with an extended scientific substantiation of the working-class tactics of economic struggle and elucidated a number of key points in the Marxist political economy. Other speakers at these and subsequent meetings (Eccarius and Cremer) expressed their solidarity with Marx's report and disagreement with Weston's views; they recommended the publication of the discussion, Marx's report included.

As is seen from Marx's letter to Engels of June 24, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42), Marx thought that in principle the publication of the report
would be expedient, but was afraid that this would prematurely anticipate his *Capital* on which he was working hard at the time. These considerations, the excessive burden of theoretical studies connected with the writing of *Capital* and the various affairs of the International prevented Marx from publishing his work which has survived in manuscript form. Notes for the report have also been preserved in his notebook (see this volume, p. 338).

The report was first published in London in 1898 by Marx's daughter Eleanor Marx-Aveling under the title *Value, Price and Profit* with a preface by Edward Aveling. The manuscript had no title and opened with the words "Read to the Central Council on Tuesday, 20th June 1865". It was divided by the author into 14 sections marked with Arabic numerals. The introduction and first six sections had no headings in the manuscript; these were provided by Aveling. In this volume all the headings have been preserved, but have been enclosed in square brackets to distinguish them from those given by Marx himself.

Marx's work became widely known under a different title—*Wages, Price and Profit*. It was provided by the German translator who published it in *Die Neue Zeit* in 1898. However, the logical presentation of the theoretical problems shows that the title provided by the Avelings in the first publication is more appropriate. That is why it is used in this publication.  

88 At that time the Central Council debated the date and the agenda of the International's Congress, which, in keeping with the Provisional Rules, was planned for September 1865 in Brussels. The report of the Standing Committee, approved by the Central Council on July 25, 1865, proposed to have a conference in London in September that year instead of the Congress. It was to discuss the agenda of the Congress, which was postponed until the following year (see Note 13). This agenda contained points about workers' international aid in the struggle (including strikes) against capital, and about the role of the trade unions (see this volume, pp. 375-77).  

89 Tradition has it that the Roman patrician Menenius Agrippa persuaded the plebeians who had rebelled and withdrawn to the Mons Sacer in 494 B.C. to submit by telling them the fable about the other parts of the human body revolting against the stomach because, they said, it consumed food and did not work, but afterwards becoming convinced that they could not exist without it.  

90 The reference is to the 'Ten Hours' Bill of 1847 (see Note 7), which came into force on May 1, 1848. In August 1850 Parliament introduced an additional factory act which prolonged the working day for women and adolescents to ten and a half hours on the first five days of the week and reduced it to seven and a half hours on Saturday.  

91 This refers to the laws passed by the Convention on May 4, September 11 and 29, 1793 and March 20, 1794 which introduced maximum prices on grain, flour and other consumer goods, together with maximum wages.  

92 Marx attended the 31st annual meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in September 1861 at Manchester when he was there on a visit to Engels. The meeting was addressed by William Newmarch, President of the Economic Science and Statistics Section, publisher of Tooke's *History of Prices* mentioned below. Marx is referring to his speech. See *Report of the Thirty-First Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Manchester in September 1861*, London, 1862, p. 230.
The extensive demolition of dwelling houses of the agricultural labourers in England in the middle of the nineteenth century took place in the midst of the rapid growth of capitalist industry and the reorganisation of agriculture along capitalist lines which was accompanied by relative overpopulation in rural areas. This can be explained to some extent by the fact that the amount of taxes paid by the landlords for the benefit of the poor largely depended on the number of the poor people residing on their land. The landlords intentionally demolished the houses they did not need but which could still be used as shelter by the "surplus" agricultural population (for details, see Marx's *Capital*, Vol. I).

*Society of Arts*—a bourgeois educational and philanthropic society founded in London in 1754. In 1869 Marx joined it (see Marx's letters to Peter Le Néve Foster, May 28, 1869, Vol. 43).

The *Corn Laws* were repealed in June 1846. They imposed high import duties on agricultural produce in the interests of the landowners so as to maintain high prices on the home market. The repeal of the Corn Laws was a victory for the industrial bourgeoisie, who opposed them under the slogan of free trade.

See Note 5.

A reference to the so-called cotton crisis caused by the discontinuance of cotton exports from America during the Civil War there. On the cotton crisis, see Note 5.

A reference to the wars which England waged as a member of the European coalitions against the French Republic and Napoleonic France. During these wars, which lasted, with intervals, from 1792 to 1815, the British ruling circles established a brutal regime of terrorism in their country, several revolts were put down and laws were adopted banning workers' associations.

A reference to the stand taken by the representatives of British capitalist and official circles when the Ten Hours' Bill of 1831 for children and adolescents was debated in Parliament in February and March 1832.

*Juggernaut* (*Jagannath*)—a title of Krishna, the eighth avatar of Vishnu. The cult of Juggernaut was marked by sumptuous ritual and extreme religious fanaticism which manifested itself in the self-torture and suicide of believers. On feast day some believers threw themselves under the wheels of the chariot bearing the idol of Vishnu—Juggernaut.

According to the Poor Laws, which were introduced in England in the sixteenth century and remained in force at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a special tax to support the poor was collected in each parish. The parishioners unable to provide for themselves and their families, received support through the poor-box.

In Vol. I of *Capital*, Marx devoted a special chapter (Ch. XXXIII) to the analysis and critique of this colonisation theory, using as an example the works of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, who was one of its main originators.

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1962.*

*The London Conference of the International* was held from September 25 to 29, 1865. It was convened on Marx's insistence, for he considered that the
Association's sections were not yet strong enough to succeed in holding a general congress as stipulated by the Provisional Rules. The conference was attended by 9 delegates from France, Switzerland and Belgium and the Central Council members. A meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall on September 28, 1865 to celebrate the first anniversary of the founding of the Association.

The Conference heard the Central Council's report, its financial statement, and also delegates' reports on the situation in individual sections. The main point discussed was the agenda and the procedure for convening the forthcoming congress. It was decided to hold it in Geneva in May 1866 (later the Central Council postponed it until early September 1866). Though the Proudhonists demanded that the Polish question should be struck off the agenda of the Congress and that the right of any member of the Association to participate in it be recognised the Conference retained in the agenda the point on the restoration of Poland's independence and recognised only elected delegates as competent members of the Congress. Other proposals of the Council concerning the programme of the Congress were also approved. The London Conference of 1865 which was prepared and conducted under Marx's guidance played an important part in the formation and organisational shaping of the International.

Marx submitted this resolution at the Council meeting after he had agreed with Weston's proposal to begin discussing the agenda of the forthcoming Geneva Congress drawn up by the London Conference.

This resolution was published in English for the first time in The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1962.

Engels wrote this series of articles between the end of January and April 6, 1866, at Marx's request in connection with the controversy that developed in the International at the 1865 London Conference and after it over the inclusion of the demand for Poland's independence in the agenda of the forthcoming Geneva Congress. In order to substantiate the position of the Central Council on the nationalities question, it was necessary, on the one hand, to criticise the nihilism displayed in this vital matter by the Proudhonists, and their allegations that such political problems as the liberation of the oppressed nations had nothing to do with the working class and diverted it from its aims; on the other hand, it was necessary to reveal the demagogic essence of the so-called principle of nationalities which helped the Bonapartist circles to use national movements in their interests. This series of articles remained unfinished.

During Engels' lifetime they were translated only into Polish and published in the London Przedświt, No. 7, 1895.

On May 15, 1848, the Paris workers led by Blanqui, Barbès and others took revolutionary action against the anti-labour and anti-democratic policy pursued by the bourgeois Constituent Assembly which opened on May 4. The participants in the mass demonstration forced their way into the Assembly premises, demanded the formation of a Ministry of Labour and presented a number of other demands, including aid to the fighters for Poland's independence. An attempt was made to form a revolutionary government. The National Guards from the bourgeois quarters and the regular troops succeeded, however, in restoring the power of the Constituent Assembly. The leaders of the movement were arrested and put on trial.
The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, published under Marx's editorship in Cologne in 1848 and 1849, resolutely championed Poland's independence, whose liberation it associated with the overthrow of the Tsarist regime in Russia, then one of the main bulwarks of the feudal and absolutist reaction in Europe. p. 152

A reference to the national liberation insurrections of 1830-31 and 1863-64 in Poland put down by Tsarist Russia, and the 1846 insurrection in the so-called free city of Cracow, which was under the joint protectorate of Austria, Prussia and Russia by decision of the 1815 Vienna Congress. After the suppression of the Cracow insurrection by Austrian troops, the city was annexed to the Austrian Empire. p. 152

Engels has in mind point 9 on the agenda of the forthcoming congress of the International which was discussed at the London Conference (see this volume, p. 376). On the London Conference, see Note 103. p. 153

Engels is referring to a series of articles on the Polish question written by the Proudhonist Hector Denis and published in the *Tribune du peuple*, the newspaper of the International's Belgian sections, between March and July 1864, and also to the accusations levelled at the Central Council in the *Echo de Verviers* in December 1865 (see this volume, pp. 388-89, 392-400). p. 153

Poland was partitioned in 1772, 1793 and 1795 between Russia, Prussia and Austria. Austria participated in the first and the third partitions.

The partition treaties were signed in St. Petersburg on August 5, 1772, January 23, 1793 and October 24, 1795. p. 154

A reference to *Young Europe*, a secret organisation of bourgeois revolutionaries founded in 1834 in Switzerland on Mazzini's initiative. It included national organisations, among them Young Italy and Young Poland. Their aim was the national unification and national independence of their respective countries and the establishment of a republican system. p. 155

Engels' views on the historical destiny of small nations and nationalities were not borne out in reality. Engels held that, as a rule, small nations were not capable of independent national existence and were bound to be absorbed, in the course of centralisation, by larger, more viable nations. Correctly noting the tendency towards centralisation and the creation of large states, which is inherent in capitalism, Engels did not give due consideration to another tendency which was not so manifest at the time, namely, the struggle of small nations against national oppression, for their independence and the establishment of their own states. History has shown that many small nations proved capable of independent national development and played a considerable role in the progress of humanity. Engels' later works on the nationalities question, on the history of Ireland in particular, show that his own view on the problem had changed. p. 157

*Ruthenes* (*Ruthenians*)—the name given in nineteenth-century West-European ethnographical and historical works to the Ukrainian population of Galicia, the Bukovina and the Sub-Carpathian Ukraine, which was separated at the time from the bulk of the Ukrainian people. p. 157

The unification of Poland and Lithuania was laid down by the Krevo Union of 1385—a dynastic alliance of the two states. p. 158

In the 1230s the Russian lands were invaded by the Tatars and Mongols. Their further advance to the West was weakened and halted by the resistance of the
subjugated peoples. After many years of hard oppression, Russian troops under Dmitry, Grand Duke of Moscow, routed the forces of the Golden Horde on Kulikovo plain in 1380 and thus shook the foundation of Mongol domination. The final liberation was won in 1480 under the Grand Duke of Moscow Ivan III. He also scored great successes in uniting the Russian lands into a single centralised state.

In June 1605 Moscow was captured by the Poles and Lithuanians who supported their figurehead, the False Dmitry, in his claims to the Russian throne. In May 1606 he was overthrown as a result of a popular uprising. In September 1610 Moscow again fell into the hands of Polish invaders who dropped all pretences this time. In October 1612 Moscow was set free by people’s volunteers under Minin and Pozharsky.

United Greeks—members of the Uniat Church formed by the synod of Brest in 1596 (Brest Union). It recognised the supremacy of the Pope and the main Catholic dogmas but preserved the Orthodox rite and the Slavonic liturgy. The Uniat Church found adherents mostly among the Belorussians and Ukrainians in Poland.

Marx wrote this address on the instructions of the Central Council in connection with the importation into Scotland of German and Danish tailors to be used as strike-breakers. This issue was discussed at the Central Council meeting of May 1, 1866. Friedrich Lessner informed the meeting that London manufacturers also intended to have recourse to German workers. For this reason the German tailors living in London formed a committee headed by Lessner and Haufe and took a decision to act jointly with the Council in order to frustrate the plans of the manufacturers and their agents in Germany. The Central Council sent two representatives to Edinburgh who persuaded the newly-arrived workers to cancel their contracts and return home.

On Marx’s request, Lessner and Haufe sent him on May 3 details about the events in Edinburgh.

“A Warning” written by Marx on May 4 was published in several German newspapers.

The author’s rough and fair copies of this document have survived.

At the same time Lessner and Haufe published a leaflet which set forth the aims and tasks of the German tailors’ London Committee and contained an appeal to German workers in London to collect funds. In July 1866 the committee issued a second leaflet, also signed by Lessner and Haufe, and addressed to the tailors in Germany.

This document was published in English for the first time in The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1962.

A reference to the trade union which was formed in London in March 1866 when the London journeymen tailors went on strike. It had an executive committee and, jointly with the Central Council, successfully directed the tailors’ strikes. In April 1866 this union joined the International. Their delegate, Matthew Lawrence, took part in the Geneva Congress.

In accordance with its decision of March 27, 1866 the Central Council made an appeal to the tailors, asking them to refrain from going to England in view of the tailors’ strike there. The appeal was published in several local papers of the
Engels devoted this series of articles to the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 which rounded off the long rivalry between Austria and Prussia and predetermined the unification of Germany under the supremacy of Prussia. Several German states—including Hanover, Saxony, Bavaria, Württemberg and Baden—fought on Austria's side. Prussia formed an alliance with Italy. In June and July military operations were conducted on two fronts: in Bohemia and in Italy. After a grave defeat at Sadowa on July 3 Austria began peace negotiations and signed a treaty in Prague on August 23. Austria conceded Schleswig and Holstein to Prussia, paid small indemnities to her and gave the province of Venetia to Italy. The German Confederation, which was founded in 1815 by decision of the Vienna Congress and embraced over 30 German states, ceased to exist, and the North German Confederation was founded in its place under Prussia's supremacy. As a result of the war, Prussia annexed the Kingdom of Hanover, the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, the Grand Duchy of Nassau and the free city of Frankfurt-am-Main.

In the first articles, Engels expressed the assumption that the Austrians might win the war, but withdrew it as soon as information on military operations enabled him to obtain a more accurate knowledge of the real balance of forces. Engels had made his preliminary forecast proceeding from the interests of achieving Germany's unification in a revolutionary way, believing that the defeat of militarist junker Prussia would be a contributory factor.

The Manchester Guardian published articles Nos. I and II under the heading "Notes on the War in Germany", and Nos. III-V under that of "Notes on the War".

The reference is to the quadrangle formed by the fortresses of Peschiera, Mantua, Verona and Legnago in Northern Italy. The Austrians, who were in possession of these strongholds, fortified them thoroughly after the 1848 revolution. On its military and strategic importance see Engels' "Po and Rhine" (present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 227-30).

Engels is referring to the tactics used by the Austrians in the war against France and Italy in 1859 (for details, see Engels' articles "The Campaign in Italy", "A Chapter of History", "The Battle of Solferino" and others, present edition, Vol. 16).

The Battle of Custozza (Northern Italy) was fought by the Italian army under Victor Emmanuel II and the Austrian troops under the Archduke Albrecht on June 24, 1866. The Austrians won. The rout of the Italian army, however, had no impact on the general outcome of the Austro-Prussian war, in which Austria was defeated and lost her last possession in Northern Italy, the Province of Venetia. She had already lost Lombardy in 1859 following the defeat in the war with France and Piedmont.
129 In the battles of Lonato and Castiglione (Northern Italy) on July 29 and August 5, 1796 during Bonaparte’s Italian campaign of 1796-97, the French troops defeated the Austrians under General Wurmser.

The Battle of Solferino on June 24, 1850 was the last great battle in the Austro-Italian-French war of 1859. The allied French and Piedmontese forces defeated the Austrians.

130 A reference to the Battle of Custozza on July 23-25, 1848 (below Engels calls it the “first battle of Custozza”) in which the Austrian army under Radetzky defeated the Piedmontese forces. The latter were forced to withdraw from Lombardy, freed from the Austrians in March 1848 after a popular uprising. Austrian rule was ultimately established there after a new defeat of Piedmont in March 1849.

131 Garibaldi’s “Thousand”—a detachment of revolutionary volunteers who, under Garibaldi’s command, landed in Sicily in 1860 to help the uprising there. The nucleus of this detachment consisted of the men of Garibaldi’s corps who successfully fought against the Austrians in Northern Italy in the war of 1859. Garibaldi’s expedition of 1860 brought about the liberation of Sicily and Southern Italy from the Neapolitan Bourbons.

132 Engels is writing about the occupation of Hanover, Hesse-Cassel and Saxony by the Prussian troops at the beginning of the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 and the flight of the rulers of those states.

133 On July 3, 1866 a decisive battle in the Austro-Prussian war was fought at Königgrätz (Hradec-Kralove), near Sadowa. The Austrian troops were defeated.

134 At the Battle of Ligny (Belgium) on June 16, 1815, the Prussian army under Blücher, marching to join up with the Anglo-Dutch army of Wellington, was defeated by Napoleon. But Blücher’s troops escaped from their pursuers commanded by Marshal Grouchy and reached the battlefield of Waterloo (near Brussels) at the decisive moment on June 18, thereby determining the outcome of the battle in favour of the Allies. This decided the final victory of the seventh anti-French coalition (Britain, Russia, Austria, Prussia, Sweden, Spain and other states).

135 The Central Council attached great importance to the preparations for the Geneva Congress and on July 17, 1866, it took a decision to discuss at its meetings the questions which were included in the programme of its work at the London Conference of 1865 in order to determine and specify its own stand on these questions. On July 31, 1866, the proposals concerning the programme of the Geneva Congress were submitted by Marx in compliance with that decision and in the name of the Standing Committee.

In the minute book of the General Council and the report published in The Commonwealth, the text of the proposals alternates with a short summary of the debates and notes on their adoption. These are omitted in the present edition and marked with a space.

136 The French version of the programme was published in Le Courrier français, June 24, 1866, and La Rive Gauche, No. 27, July 8, 1866. Here Marx suggests that Point 12 in the French version of the programme concerning the expediency of benefit societies for material and moral support to the orphans.
of the Association’s members should be put at the beginning of the programme. When Marx was drawing up the “Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council”, he inserted this point in the first section (see this volume, p. 185).

137 This schedule was one of the first of those submitted by Marx for the statistical inquiry into the condition of the working class. With some editorial alterations, it was included in the second section of the “Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council. The Different Questions”. Eugène Dupont, a member of the Central Council, reported on it at the Geneva Congress.

p. 183

138 This document was drawn up by Marx in August 1866, when final preparations for the Geneva Congress were being made. It was written in English (a few last pages of Marx’s rough manuscript beginning with the words “everyday necessities”, Section 6, second paragraph, have survived) and translated into French by Paul Lafargue.

The Geneva Congress of the International took place between September 3 and 8, 1866. It was attended by 60 delegates from the Central Council, various sections of the International and workers’ associations in Britain, France, Germany and Switzerland. Hermann Jung was elected its chairman. Marx’s “Instructions” were read as the official report of the Central Council. The Congress became a scene of struggle between Marx’s followers and the Proudhonists who enjoyed a third of the votes and countered the “Instructions” with their own programme on all the items on the agenda. Opponents of the revolutionary class struggle, who denied the importance of strikes and trade unions, the Proudhonists sought to confine the activities of the International to mutual aid in the sphere of credit and commodity exchange and to cooperative societies. They advocated the principles of “home education”. In heated debates with the Proudhonists, Jung, Eccarius, Dupont, Carter and other supporters of the Central Council succeeded in having most of the points in the “Instructions” adopted in the form of Congress resolutions on international action by the working class, a reduction of working hours, on children’s and women’s labour, and on cooperative labour, trade unions and standing armies. The Proudhonists managed to have their resolutions passed only on issues of secondary importance (international workers’ credit societies, etc.). Their attempt to introduce the principle that no person engaged in mental labour should be admitted as an official in the Association also failed; only over the Polish question did they manage to have a vague compromise resolution passed instead of the relevant point in the “Instructions”.

The Geneva Congress approved the Rules (based on the Provisional Rules drawn up by Marx) and the Regulations of the International Association. The Congress marked the end of the organisational period in the life of the International as an active proletarian organisation.

The “Instructions” were published, among other reports on the Geneva Congress and its documents, first in German in the article “Der Kongreß der Internationalen Arbeiterassociation in Genf”, in the journal Der Vorbote, Nos. 10 and 11, October and November 1866; then in English in The International Courier, Nos. 6/7 and 8/10, February 20 and March 13, 1867 and The Working Man, March 1 and April 6, 1867; and in French in Le Courrier international, Nos. 8/10 and 11, March 9 and 16, 1867. Later, the document was reprinted in full or in part in other press organs of the International as well. Certain points of the “Instructions” (in the form of the Congress

139 The general scheme of statistical inquiry into the situation of the working class (see Note 137) as suggested by Marx was unanimously accepted by the Geneva Congress. In practice, however, the collection of data and their publication in the form of Central Council reports were extremely difficult in view of the lack of material means and the negligence of the local organisations. The subsequent congresses of the Association—in Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869)—confirmed the need to carry out the Geneva Congress resolution on the workers' statistics, and the London Conference of 1871 included point "c" of the second section of the "Instructions" in the Administrative Regulations of the Association (see present edition, Vol. 23).

140 When the Civil War ended, the movement for the legislative introduction of an eight-hour working day intensified in the USA. Leagues of struggle for the eight-hour day were set up all over the country. The National Labor Union (see Note 339) declared at its inaugural convention in Baltimore in August 1866 that the demand for the eight-hour day was an indispensable condition for the emancipation of labour.

141 The British trade unions took an active part in the general democratic movement for the second electoral reform in 1865-67.

In the spring of 1865 the Central Council of the International initiated, and participated in, the setting up of a Reform League in London as a political centre of the mass movement. The League's leading bodies—the Council and the Executive Committee—included the Central Council members, mainly trade-union leaders. The League's programme was drafted under Marx's influence. Unlike the bourgeois parties, which confined their demand to household suffrage, the League advanced the demand for manhood suffrage. This revived Chartist slogan secured it the support of the trade unions, hitherto indifferent to politics. The League had branches in all the big industrial cities. However, the vacillations of the radicals in its leadership and the conciliation of the trade-union leaders prevented the League from following the line charted by the Central (General) Council of the International. The British bourgeoisie succeeded in splitting the movement and a moderate reform was carried out in 1867 which granted franchise only to the petty bourgeoisie and the upper layers of the working class.

142 During the Civil War, the American trade unions actively supported the Northern States in their struggle with the slaveholders; in the spring of 1864 the trade unions opposed the reactionary Hastings-Folger Bill on strikes.

143 The Conference of trades' delegates was held in Sheffield from July 17 to 21, 1866. It was attended by 138 delegates representing 200,000 organised workers. The battle against lockouts was the main question at the Conference. Its resolution, calling trade unions to become affiliated to the International Working Men's Association, was published in a book, *Report of the Conference of Trades' Delegates of the United Kingdom, held in Sheffield, on July 17th, 1866 and*
Four Following Days, Sheffield, 1866. In Marx's draft manuscript, a newspaper clipping with the text of the resolution was pasted in.

144 The Holy Alliance—an association of European monarchs founded in 1815 to suppress revolutionary movements and preserve feudal monarchies in European countries. Later, this expression was used to denote a coalition of counter-revolutionary powers.

145 This resolution was submitted by Marx at a meeting of the General Council (as the Central Council was officially named according to the Rules adopted at the Geneva Congress) on September 18, 1866, which heard the report of its delegates to the Geneva Congress (see Note 138) on the latter's work and results. The Council's official representatives at the Congress were James Carter, George Odger, Johann Georg Eccarius and Hermann Jung. The Congress was also attended by other Council members, including Eugène Dupont as delegate for the French section in London, Matthew Lawrence for the Operative Tailors' Association in London and William Randal Cremer for the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners in London.

Marx made this speech at a meeting held in Cambridge Hall, London, on January 22, 1867 to mark the fourth anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1863-64. The meeting was organised by the General Council of the International jointly with the Central London Section of the United Polish Exiles. Marx took an active part in preparing and organising this meeting (see this volume, p. 414). On March 12 the Central London Section of the United Polish Exiles expressed gratitude to the General Council for the organisation of the meeting and to Marx, among other speakers, for his report.

A detailed report of the meeting, Marx's speech included, was published in the Polish-language newspaper Głos Wolny, Nos. 129 and 130, January 31 and February 10, 1867. Moreover, the editors noted that "the speech, remarkable for its accurate observations and logical conclusions, is given word for word".

A draft manuscript in English has survived. Presumably it was in the possession of Marx's daughter, Laura Lafargue, who made it available to the editors of Le Socialisme for the publication of a French translation in No. 18 for March 15, 1905. The English text was published in Cahiers de l'Institut de Science économique appliquée, No. 4 (109), Paris, 1961. Some passages in the manuscript were crossed by Marx with a vertical line. Collation of the manuscript with the publication in Polish shows that Marx did not omit the crossed-out passages, but merely changed their placing. With the exception of these alterations and some minor amendments to the text, the English original and the Polish translation, which may have been made from the lost fair copy, coincide almost word for word.

In this volume the speech is reproduced from the draft manuscript in English with allowances made for the rearrangements by the author and reproduced in the Polish version. The most important discrepancies of meaning are given in the footnotes.

147 "To horse, gentlemen!"—Nicholas I pronounced these words on learning about the February revolution in France in 1848.

Marx has in mind the hostile position of the majority in the all-German National Assembly in Frankfurt (convened in May 1848 to work out an all-German constitution) in regard to the Polish national liberation movement
In the Grand Duchy of Posen, a dependency of Prussia. The debates on this subject held on July 24-27 resulted in the Assembly giving consent to the punitive police measures of the Prussian authorities in Posen and charging the government “to guarantee the security of Germans residing in Posen”. For details, see Engels’ series of articles, “The Frankfurt Assembly Debates the Polish Question” (present edition, Vol. 7).

In 1866-67, after the suppression of the Polish insurrection of 1863-64, the Russian Government promulgated “Regulations on the Gubernia and Uyezd Administration in the Kingdom of Poland” and a number of ukases aimed at the abolition of local Polish institutions and the consolidation of the administrative apparatus—the chief means of national oppression. The number of gubernias was increased, the prerogatives of the governors appointed by the Russian Government were extended, supreme bodies (State Council and others) were abolished, different administrative departments (post, communications) were subordinated to the respective ministries in St. Petersburg.

A reference to the Anglo-Dutch loan to Russia, the agreement on which was concluded on November 4, 1866.

The Vienna Congress of European monarchs and their ministers (September 1814-June 1815) established a system of all-European treaties after the Napoleonic wars. The decisions of the Congress helped to restore the feudal system and a number of old dynasties in states that had been subjugated by Napoleon and to preserve the political dismemberment of Germany and Italy, sanctioned the annexation of Belgium by Holland and the partition of Poland, and planned measures to combat the revolutionary movement. With this aim in view, the main participants in the Congress shortly afterwards founded the Holy Alliance (see Note 144) which Marx mentions below.

Marx sent this refutation to Ludwig Kugelmann in Hanover on February 18, 1867 with a request to have it published there in the Zeitung für Norddeutschland or any other local newspaper. Marx was particular about this because he intended in a few weeks to take his manuscript of Vol. I of Capital to Germany, to the Hamburg publisher Otto Meissner.

Instead of this statement, the Zeitung für Norddeutschland published the following item on February 21, 1867: “According to a statement sent by Herr Karl Marx from London, the English newspapers’ announcement (see the Zeitung für Norddeutschland, No. 5522) that he intends to take an active part in the preparations for a future insurrection in Poland and with this aim in view plans to travel all over the Continent, is a fabrication.”

On June 4, 1867, during preparations for the regular Lausanne Congress of the International, the General Council empowered a special commission to draw up an address containing its programme. When this document was considered at the Council meeting on July 9, Marx submitted a proposal concerning the first point on the Congress agenda (Resolution I). It was reproduced in the “Address of the General Council of the International Working Men’s Association. To the members and affiliated societies” adopted at this meeting and published in London as a leaflet. By decision of the Council, the “Address” was also published in French, the translation being
done by Paul Lafargue and edited by Marx. Its text was considerably improved in comparison with the English (see this volume, pp. 421-23).

By having this resolution passed and distributed in English, French and other languages, Marx sought to direct the work of the future congress to the consolidation of workers' international solidarity in the struggle for their class interests, in contrast to some French members of the International who wanted to direct the Congress along Proudhonist lines. With this aim, as early as February 1866, the Paris Section worked out for the Congress its own agenda, which was permeated with Proudhonist ideas about mutual aid societies in the sphere of credit and commodity exchange being the main lever of social transformation. This agenda was reproduced in the Address of the Paris section to all workers' associations, published in Le Courrier français, No. 25, July 20, 1867. This compelled Marx to submit, at the General Council meeting of July 23, a resolution against the separatist actions of the section and in defence of the Council's prerogatives to draw up the Congress programme.

The League of Peace and Freedom was a pacifist organisation set up in 1867 with the active participation of Victor Hugo, Giuseppe Garibaldi and other democrats. Voicing the anti-militarist sentiments of the masses, the League's leaders did not reveal the social sources of wars and often confined anti-militarist activity to mere declarations. The inaugural Congress of the League was to open on September 9 (originally on September 5) in Geneva and was specially timed to coincide with the end of the Lausanne Congress of the International (September 2-8, 1867). At the General Council meeting of August 13, Marx spoke against the International's official participation in the League's Congress, since this would mean solidarity with its bourgeois programme; but he recommended that some members of the International should attend the Congress on their own in order to make it adopt revolutionary-democratic decisions (see the record of Marx's speech in this volume, pp. 426-27). Concluding his speech, Marx submitted this resolution, which the Council adopted. In the Minute Book of the General Council, the speech and resolution are reproduced in the form of a clipping from The Bee-Hive carrying a report of the Council meeting.

The Lausanne Congress ignored the General Council's resolution and, influenced by petty-bourgeois elements, resolved officially to take part in the Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom. The Congress of the League, however, attended by several General Council and some other International members revealed great differences between the proletarian and the abstract, pacifist approach to the struggle for peace. Marx's tactics in regard to the League was fully approved at the Brussels Congress of the International in 1868, which opposed official affiliation to the League but called upon the working class to combine efforts with all progressive anti-military forces.

This review is the first in the series of articles written by Engels to break the "conspiracy of silence" with which official bourgeois scholars met the publication of Volume One of Marx's Capital on September 14, 1867.

Even before the work was published, Engels had decided "to attack the book from the bourgeois point of view", as he wrote to Marx on September 11, 1867, in order to draw the attention of the general public. Marx liked this idea and called it "the best military means" (see present edition, Vol. 42). The reviews Engels wrote for a number of bourgeois newspapers looked as if they
had been penned by an unbiased bourgeois scholar who did not share the views of the author of the book but was compelled to acknowledge its scientific soundness and merits. The review for the Zukunft was in a similar vein, having been written, as Engels said, in such a way that any bourgeois newspaper could publish it. In the reviews intended for the democratic and proletarian newspapers, Engels sought to popularise the content of Capital without any resort to disguise.

With Ludwig Kugelmann’s assistance, the review was published in the Zukunft on October 30, 1867, unsigned. The next day the newspaper editor, Guido Weiß, dispatched off-prints of it to Marx. In this volume the review is published according to Engels’ manuscript, which has survived.

Engels sent this review, together with that for the Zukunft, to Kugelmann on October 12, 1867, for publication in one of the bourgeois newspapers. Kugelmann’s attempt to have it published in the Rheinische Zeitung failed because one of the editors, Heinrich Bürgers, a former Communist League member who by that time had become a liberal, refused to accept it. The review has survived in manuscript form (one page is missing) and was first published in German in 1927 in Marx-Engels-Archiv, Bd. 2, and in Russian the same year in the magazine Letopisi marksisma, No. IV.


Several workers’ candidates of the democratic Saxon People’s Party, which had a strong proletarian wing, stood for election to the North German Imperial Diet on August 31, 1867 (for demagogic reasons, the Bismarck Government, when passing the Constitution early in 1867, introduced universal suffrage, but deprived women, soldiers and servants of the right to vote. The party succeeded in getting four deputies elected, among them August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht, and two deputies were elected from the Lassallean General Association of German Workers.

A reference to the law of August 15, 1867, which brought new industries under the factory bills (including that of 1847) on the ten-hour working day (see Notes 7 and 90).

This review was published in the Elberfelder Zeitung, No. 302, November 2, 1867, with the assistance of Carl Siebel, a German poet and distant relative of Engels. The initial letter of his name was placed before the title.

This review was published, with Carl Siebel’s assistance, in the Düsseldorfer Zeitung, No. 316, November 16, 1867, unsigned.

As is seen from Engels’ letters to Marx of November 8 and 10, 1867, he handed it over to Siebel on November 9 in Liverpool when Siebel was on a visit to England. Moreover, Engels gave him two more reviews to be published in Germany: one in the Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt, the other, to judge by Siebel’s letter to Engels of November 13, 1867, not in the Barmer Zeitung, as Engels wrote to Marx on November 10, but in the Rhein- und Ruhrzeitung. The text of these reviews has not been discovered.

Marx wrote this article in connection with a speech made by the Lassallean Hofstetten at a meeting of the General Association of German Workers on November 24, 1867. The report of this meeting was printed in Der Social-Demokrat, No. 139, first supplement, November 29, 1867. Hofstetten had borrowed separate passages from Marx’s Capital rewriting them almost word
for word, distorting their meaning and mentioning neither the work nor its author.

Marx's article was published unsigned in the supplement to the Zukunft, No. 291, December 12, 1867.

The translations of passages quoted by Marx from the first German edition of Volume One of Capital are given here close to the English edition of 1887 edited by Engels (page references in square brackets are to that edition). These passages are to be found in Chapter X, "The Working Day" and one in Chapter XV, "Machinery and Modern Industry".

Quoted from the resolution of the Geneva Congress of the International Working Men's Association (September 1866), which was drawn up on the basis of Marx's "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council. The Different Questions". Here the resolution reproduces the text of the "Instructions" word for word (see this volume, p. 187).

In his letter to Engels of December 7, 1867, Marx expressed a number of ideas about the nature of the review of Volume One of Capital for the Stuttgart newspaper Der Beobachter, making use of the anti-Prussian sentiments of its editor Karl Mayer, a petty-bourgeois democrat (see present edition, Vol. 42). Engels reproduced almost word for word the corresponding passages from the letter in his review, which was published, with Ludwig Kugelmann's assistance, in Der Beobachter, No. 303, December 27, 1867, unsigned.

A reference to an additional note to Section I of Chapter VI in the first German edition of Volume One of Capital at the end of the book. When preparing the second German edition (1872), Marx omitted this note and it did not appear in the subsequent authorised editions.

This review was published, with Ludwig Kugelmann's assistance, in the Staats-Anzeiger für Württemberg, No. 306, December 27, 1867, unsigned. On July 4, 1868 it was reprinted in the supplement to Hannoverscher Courier, No. 4232; on Kugelmann's request, 25 separate off-prints of this publication were made for distribution among bourgeois economists. Later, the review was also reprinted by the Sächsische Arbeiter-Zeitung, No. 122, October 5, 1890.

The Customs Union (Zollverein)—a union of German states, which established a common customs frontier, was set up in 1834 under the aegis of Prussia. Brought into being by the need to create an all-German market, the Customs Union subsequently embraced the majority of the German states except Austria and a few of the smaller states. After the foundation of the North German Confederation in 1867 customs agreements were concluded between the Confederation and the South-Western German non-member states. The Customs Union existed until the complete political unification of Germany under Prussian supremacy in 1871.

The new treaties of the Customs Union concluded on May 16, 1865 and July 8, 1867 marked a turn from protectionism to free trade.

This review was published, with Paul Stumpf's assistance, in the Neue Badische Landeszeitung, No. 20, January 21, 1868. The title was preceded by the initials "St."

This review differs essentially from the reviews of Volume One of Capital intended for the bourgeois newspapers. It was intended for the readers of the...
workers' newspaper and aimed at popularising Marx's work among them and explaining its importance for the working-class movement.

The review was published unsigned in the *Demokritisches Wochenblatt*, Nos. 12 and 13, March 21 and 28, 1868. Later, it was reprinted in the Leipzig newspaper the *Volksstaat* (Nos. 28 and 29, April 5 and 8, 1871) and in *Der Botschafter* (Nos. 8, 15 and 16, April 8, June 17 and 24, 1871), and its French translation in the Brussels newspaper, *La Liberté* (Nos. 47 and 50, June 6 and 9, 1870). In this volume, the figures in square brackets refer to the page numbers of the 1887 English edition of *Capital*.

The review was published in English for the first time in Marx and Engels, *Selected Works* in two volumes, Vol. I, Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the USSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1935.

---

170 See Note 7.

171 See Note 158.

172 This review, written by Engels in May and June 1868, was intended for the *Fortnightly Review* in which Marx and Engels hoped to publish it with the assistance of Professor Edward Beesly. He was a radical who sympathised with the working class and took part in the inaugural meeting of the International at St. Martin's Hall, London, on September 28, 1864. Engels planned that this review would consist of two articles at least. He had finished the first of them by June 28, 1868 and handed it over for examination to his friend, the lawyer Samuel Moore, the future translator of *Capital* into English. It was decided to publish the review over his signature. However, despite Beesly's application, the liberal editor of the journal, John Morley, did not accept the review, as became known at the beginning of August. In view of this, Engels did not write the continuation. The first article has survived in manuscript form and was first published in Russian in the magazine *Letopisi marksizma*, No. I, 1926.


The correspondence between Marx and Engels shows that during the spring and summer of 1868 they often exchanged views on the content and form of the review. Marx gave his advice and even versions of separate passages (see Marx to Engels on May 23, 1868, present edition, Vol. 43). It was assumed that Lafargue would translate it into French for *Le Courrier français* (see Marx to Engels on February 1, 1868).

In this review, Engels gives several quotations from Volume One of *Capital* in his own translation into English, but it was not used in preparing the English edition (translators Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling), published under Engels' editorship in 1887, and it differs substantially from the corresponding passages in that edition. The discrepancies are also explained by the fact that the 1887 English edition took account of the author's changes made in the German edition of 1872, and that of 1883 from which the English translation was made. In this volume the quotations are given in Engels' translation of 1868; to facilitate finding these passages in the book itself, the editors have supplied page references to the 1887 English edition in square brackets.

---

173 A reference to the champions of the so-called currency principle, one of the trends in bourgeois political economy which advocated the quantitative theory of money. Representatives of this school—Jones Loyd (Lord Overstone), Robert Torrens, George Arbuthnot and others—stated that the value and price
of commodities are determined by the quantity of money in circulation, that
the guarantee of stable currency is the obligatory backing of banknotes by gold
and that their issue is regulated according to the import and export of precious
metals, regarding violation of these "laws" as the decisive cause of economic
crises. The attempts of the British Government to rely on the "currency
principle" theory (Bank Act of 1844, etc.) failed, thus proving its scientific
infeasibility and its impracticability (see critique of this theory in Marx's A
 Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy).

p. 238

174 In the second German edition of the book (1872), the first chapter
("Commodities and Money") was turned into Part I, consisting of three
chapters. In the English edition of 1887 Part I also consists of three chapters:
Chapter I.—Commodities, Chapter II.—Exchange, and Chapter III.—Money,
or the Circulation of Commodities.

p. 239

175 Engels is referring to the passage in which Marx demonstrates the fallacy of the
allegations by the vulgar economist N. W. Senior that the capitalist's profit was
produced by the labourer in the last hour of his working day and of his
justified objections on this ground to the legal limitation of working hours (see
Capital, 1887, Part III, Chapter IX, Section 3).

p. 250

176 The Règlement organique—the first constitution of the Danubian principalities of
Moldavia and Wallachia. It was introduced by P. D. Kiselev, head of the
Russian administration, in 1831, during the temporary occupation of the
principalities by Russian troops under the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829, which
concluded the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29 and confirmed the autonomy of
Moldavia and Wallachia from the Sultan of Turkey. In accordance with the
Règlement, legislative power in each principality belonged to the assembly
elected by big landowners, while executive power was in the hands of the
hospodars elected for life by the representatives of landowners, the clergy and
towns. The Règlement ensured a dominant position for the boyars and the high
clergy by retaining the feudal practices, including corvée. At the same time it
envisaged certain bourgeois reforms (abolition of inland customs barriers,
separation of court from administration, etc.).

p. 252

177 The publication of Engels' reviews of Volume I of Capital and the reprinting
of Marx's preface to it (in excerpts or in full) by a number of bourgeois
newspapers (Die Zukunft, No. 206, September 4, 1867; Der Beobachter, No. 210,
September 7, 1867; Hamburger Nachrichten, No. 218, September 13, 1867;
Hamburger Börsenhalle, No. 17848, February 14, 1868) and working-class and
democratic newspapers (Der Social-Demokrat, No. 105, September 6, 1867; The
Bee-Hive, No. 308, September 7, 1867; Vorbote, Nos. 9-10, September-October
1867; Le Courrier français, No. 106, October 1, 1867; Demokratisches Wochenblatt,
No. 1, January 4, 1868 and others) made bourgeois economists break the
"conspiracy of silence" and comment on the book in the press. Their first
reviews, not yet numerous, often contained slanderous fabrications about the
author of Capital. In particular, they alleged that Marx had borrowed the
determination of the magnitude of value by the socially necessary labour-time
from the French vulgar economist Frédéric Bastiat. This accusation was made in
an anonymous review in the Vierteljahrschrift für Volkswirtschaft und
Kulturgeschichte, Jrg. 5, Bd. 20, 1868, and in another review by an unknown
author which was signed "h" in the Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland,
No. 28, July 4, 1868. This item is Marx's reply to these reviews; it was not
published during his lifetime and has survived in manuscript form.  p. 260
The National Liberals—members of the party formed by the German, principally Prussian, bourgeoisie in the autumn of 1866 after a split in the Party of Progress (see Note 46). Its policy showed that a considerable part of the liberal bourgeoisie had abandoned its claims to extend its political prerogatives and had capitulated to Bismarck’s Junker government as a result of Prussia’s victory in the Austro-Prussian war and the establishment of her supremacy in Germany. p. 261

Demagogues in Germany were participants in the opposition movement of intellectuals in the 1820s. The name became current after the Karlsbad Conference of Ministers of the German states in August 1819, which adopted a special decision against the intrigues of “demagogues”. p. 261

Synopsis of Volume One of “Capital” by Marx has survived as an unfinished manuscript covering only two-thirds of the book. Engels evidently wanted to use it in writing articles, reviews and, possibly, a pamphlet to popularise Marx’s work. The time of its writing is suggested by Engels’ letter to Marx of April 17, 1868, in which Engels wrote that he was summarising the book (see present edition, Vol. 42), and by Engels’ remark “for the Fortnightly Review” made on one of the last pages of his manuscript (see this volume, p. 306). The comment shows that Engels intended to use this passage in the second part of his review for that journal. But when he learned from Marx’s letter of August 10, 1868 that the editors had rejected the first part of his review (see Note 172), he gave up his intention. The synopsis may therefore have been written in the spring and summer (approximately April-early August) of 1868.

The synopsis was first published, in Russian, in Marx-Engels Archives, Book IV, 1929. In the language of the original it appeared in 1933 as a separate edition prepared by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU. It was published in English for the first time in the collection: Engels, On Marx’s “Capital”, Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the USSR, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936. p. 263

After the publication of Volume One of Capital, Marx made substantial alterations and additions to some sections of the book and changed its structure. As a result, instead of the six chapters and the supplement to Chapter I, the second (1872) and subsequent German editions are in seven parts consisting of 25 chapters. In the 1887 English edition edited by Engels, the structure of the volume conforms to that of the 1872-75 French authorised edition. In both editions, the text is divided into eight parts consisting of 33 chapters. p. 265

In Capital Marx pointed out that among the reasons for the extreme poverty of the rural population under Louis XIV was the “conversion of taxes in kind into money taxes”. Marx was referring to P. Boisguillebert’s “Dissertation sur la nature des richesses, de l’argent et des tributs” published in Paris in 1843 in the collection Économistes financiers du XVIII-e siècle, and also to Vauban; but he did not mention the source: it was probably his “Projet d’une dime royale” in the same collection. p. 274

Engels refers to the attempts of vulgar economists, in particular by John MacCulloch, to gloss over the source of capitalist profit and to depict the relations between capitalists and workers as an equal exchange of services. These attempts were criticised by Marx. p. 283
A reference to the future third volume of Capital which was written mainly in 1864-65. The volume was prepared for the press by Engels after Marx's death and published in 1894. p. 286

On the Règlement organique see Note 176. p. 287

This question was examined by Marx in Capital, Vol. III, Chapter V: “Economy in the Employment of Constant Capital”. p. 294


In 1844 the Preston manufacturer Robert Gardner reduced the working day at his factories from 12 to 11 hours, but achieved the same production results by increasing the speed of the machines and labour intensity. p. 304

As Marx noted, the introduction of the ribbon and lace looms, invented in Germany, caused great unrest in the second half of the seventeenth century among the weavers of the Netherlands, the German states and Britain. There were cases when the authorities were compelled to pass laws prohibiting or limiting the use of this machine.

Luddites—British workers and artisans who, because of their backwardness and lack of class consciousness, took part in a movement for the destruction of textile machinery in the second half of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. They are called so after Ned Ludd, a workman who is said to have been the first to smash a stocking frame in reply to his master's arbitrariness. Severe measures were taken against the Luddite movement, which was a spontaneous reaction by the workers to the consequences of the industrial revolution which were so disastrous for them. A law was passed in 1812 under which the destruction of machinery was punishable by death. p. 305

Marx meant James Mill, John MacCulloch, Robert Torrence, N. W. Senior, John Stuart Mill—the bourgeois economists who sought to justify the consequences inflicted on the working class by the capitalist use of machinery. p. 306

In his second article for the Fortnightly Review, Engels intended to examine Marx’s views on the role of machinery as a means to increase surplus-value by raising labour productivity. p. 306

In view of the anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1830-31, the Central Council of the International resolved at its meeting of November 29, 1864 to issue an address to the Polish people on behalf of the British members of the International Working Men's Association. Peter Fox, a Council member and leader of the British National League for the Independence of Poland, was instructed to write it. A democratically-minded journalist, Fox, however, shared the naive belief of many democrats at that time, and also trade-union leaders, in the “Poland worship” of Western ruling circles, in particular the Bonapartist Second Empire in France. The address submitted by Fox alleged that the traditional policy of France was favourable to Poland’s independence. The address led to a discussion at the Sub-Committee’s meeting of December 6 and...
at the Central Council's meetings of December 13 and 20, 1864 and January 3, 1865.

Marx took an active part in the discussion. He criticised Fox's report at the Sub-Committee's meeting of December 6, of which he informed Engels in a letter on December 10, 1864 (see present edition, Vol. 42), and at the Council's meetings of December 13 and January 3 (see this volume, pp. 354 and 356). Marx showed, particularly in his speech on January 3, 1865, that the French ruling circles, both under absolutism and under the bourgeois regimes right up to the time of Napoleon III, had always sought to exploit the Polish question in the selfish interests of the ruling classes and that their policy was not favourable to the cause of Poland's independence, of which the sole defenders were the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat. Marx's arguments made the Central Council adopt a decision to enter the appropriate amendments in Fox's address.

When preparing his speeches, Marx collected, in December 1864, material for his polemics with Fox and then used it for the draft speech published here. It reproduced in more concise and polished form the greater part of Marx's preparatory material, but the history of Franco-Polish relations was brought only to 1812. Marx elucidated their later development in his speeches, in particular on January 3, on the basis of preparatory material in which their history was traced up to 1848. The corresponding small part of the MS with preparatory materials is published in this volume, in Note 229.

Words and expressions, crossed out by Marx, and the vertical lines drawn by him in the left margins of the MS, usually opposite quotations, are not reproduced. Some paragraphs are numbered by Marx, the rest (in brackets) by the editors. Obvious slips of the pen in the dates have been corrected without comment.

193 The Treaty of Westphalia concluded the Thirty Years' War (1618-48) in which the Spanish and Austrian Habsburgs and the Catholic German princes, supported by the Pope, fought against the Protestant countries: Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, and a number of German states which adopted Reformation. In 1635 Catholic France, a rival of the Habsburg Empire, joined the Protestant coalition. Germany was the main arena of the struggle, and the Treaty of Westphalia set the seal on its political dismemberment.

194 Marx is referring to a secret treaty between Louis XIV and Charles II concluded in Dover in 1670 against the Republic of United Provinces. The conclusion of the treaty envisaged large money subsidies for Charles II. As a result, Britain was involved in a predatory war against Holland unleashed by Louis XIV in 1672. But in 1674 Britain concluded a peace treaty with Holland and withdrew from the anti-Dutch coalition.

195 This refers to Memoir on Russia, for the Instruction of the Present Emperor. Drawn up by the Cabinet in 1837, published in The Free Press on July 13, 1859. This document, which was claimed to be an instruction for the heir to the Russian throne, the future Emperor Alexander II, was reprinted from the conservative newspaper Preußisches Wochenblatt zur Besprechung politischer Tagesfragen, Nos. 23, 24 and 25, July 9, 16 and 23, 1855. As was later established, it was a forgery.

196 Courland or the Duchy of Courland—a state in the Baltic area formed in 1561 as a result of the disintegration of the Livonian order. It was a vassal state of the
Kingdom of Poland (Rzecz Pospolita). In 1705, during the Northern War, Courland was occupied by Russian troops who drove out the Swedes. The marriage of Anna Ivanovna (Peter I's niece and the future Empress) and the Duke of Courland in 1710 enabled the Tsarist government to consolidate its power in Courland, which formally became part of the Russian Empire in 1795.

197 The *pragmatic sanction*—a law of succession in the Habsburg Empire issued in 1713 by Charles VI. It envisaged the indivisibility of the Habsburgs' lands and the possible transfer of the Austrian crown to Maria Theresa, daughter of Charles VI.

198 During the War of the Polish Succession, *Danzig (Gdańsk)* supported Stanislaus Leszczyński in his claims to the throne. The town was besieged by Russian troops (from January 17 to May 27, 1734). A French squadron sent to aid the Poles considered that a landing would be useless, and Danzig capitulated on May 29, 1734.

199 Marx is referring to the preliminary peace treaty of Vienna concluded on October 3, 1735 between Austria and France with its allies (the final treaty was signed in Vienna in November 1738). Under this treaty, which ended the War of the Polish Succession, August III was recognised as King of Poland while Leszczyński received Lorraine, which was to go to France after his death. The younger, Spanish line of the Bourbons gained possession of Southern Italy (Kingdom of the Two Sicilies), for which Austria was compensated by other Italian lands. Russia and other states joined the Vienna treaty.

200 A reference to the Belgrade peace treaties of September 1 and 18, 1739, which were concluded, with France's mediation, between Russia and Austria on the one hand and Turkey on the other and which put an end to the war between these countries lasting from 1735 to 1739. Russia regained Azov (but undertook to remove the earthworks) which it had lost under the Pruth Russo-Turkish Treaty of 1711 (mentioned in the text below; it also contained an article by which Russia was forbidden to interfere in Polish affairs) and received the right to build a fortress on the Don. Austria was to return Serbia, part of Bosnia and Little Wallachia to Turkey.

201 The *Seven Years' War* (1756-63)—a war of Britain and Prussia against Austria, France, Russia, Saxony and Sweden. In 1756 and 1757 Prussian troops under Frederick II won a number of victories over Austrian and French troops, but the gains were nullified by the Russian successes in Prussia in 1757-60. As a result of the war, France ceded many of its colonies (including Canada and almost all its possessions in the East Indies) to Britain, while Prussia, Austria and Saxony had in the main to recognise the pre-war frontiers.

202 The *War of the Austrian Succession* (1740-48) was caused by the claims of some European states, primarily Prussia, to the Austrian Habsburgs' possessions which, after the death of Charles VI, passed to his daughter Maria Theresa, there being no male heir. Prussia's allies were France, Bavaria, Saxony (at the beginning) and other states. England, which strove to weaken France—its commercial and colonial rival—fought on the side of Austria, also supported by the Netherlands, Sardinia (Piedmont) and Russia. As a result of the war, Prussia seized and annexed Silesia, but the main Habsburgs' possessions remained in the hands of Maria Theresa.
The Treaty of Oliva, signed on May 3, 1660 (near Gdańsk) between Sweden, on the one hand, and Poland (Rzecz Pospolita), Austria and Brandenburg, on the other, ended the war between these states in the latter half of the 1650s. The treaty confirmed the transfer of a number of Polish lands in the Baltic area to Sweden and the earlier Polish-Brandenburg treaties under which Poland renounced its supreme rights to the Duchy of Prussia (formerly belonging to the Teutonic order) annexed to Brandenburg in the early seventeenth century as a Polish fief. France acted as mediator in concluding the treaty. p. 315

Poland did not take part in the Seven Years’ War (see Note 201), but August III, as the Elector of Saxony, fought against Prussia. Troops of the two belligerents passed through Polish territory devastating the country. p. 315

Under the Treaty of Wehlau of September 19, 1657, which formalised an alliance of Poland and Brandenburg against Sweden (until then Brandenburg fought on the side of the Swedes against Poland), the King of Poland renounced his supreme rights to the Duchy of Prussia and pledged himself to render military aid to Brandenburg. p. 315

A treaty of friendship and alliance between Russia and Prussia, signed on April 14, 1764, envisaged joint action by the two parties in the Polish question. p. 316

The Confederation of Bar, formed in Bar (Podolia) on February 29, 1768, represented chiefly the conservative Polish nobility (szlachta) who wanted to preserve the privileges of the Catholic Church, and opposed the granting of equal rights to other believers (Orthodox and Protestant), the reform of the political system and the limitation of feudal freedoms. At the same time the Confederation opposed Russia’s interference in the home affairs of Poland, and this attracted patriotic elements to it despite its reactionary programme. Various groups of magnates within the Confederation waged a fierce struggle for supremacy. Internal struggle in Poland (1768-72) enabled the neighbouring countries to reach an agreement on the first partition of Poland (see Note 111). p. 316

The Treaty of Kudjuk Kainardji (Kuchuk Kainarji), signed between Russia and Turkey on July 21, 1774, put an end to the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74, in which Turkey was defeated. By that treaty Russia obtained the Black Sea coast between the Dnieper and the Southern Bug with the fortress of Kinburn, and also Azov, Kerch and Jenikale, and secured independent status for the Crimea, facilitating its incorporation into Russia. Russian merchant ships were granted the right of free passage through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. The Sultan was to grant a number of privileges to the Greek Orthodox Church in Turkey. p. 316

A reference to the battle of July 5-7, 1770 between the Russian fleet, which had undertaken an expedition from the Baltic Sea into the region of the Greek archipelago in the Mediterranean, and the Turkish naval forces. On July 5, the Russians defeated them in the Chios Straits, trapped their ships in the Bay of Tschesmé (western coast of Asia Minor), and in the small hours of July 7 almost entirely destroyed the Turkish fleet there. This victory played an important role in the outcome, advantageous for Russia, of the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74. p. 317
Relying on his own army and France’s financial and diplomatic support, Gustavus III of Sweden staged a coup d’état on August 19, 1772. The regime of an aristocratic oligarchy was in fact replaced by absolute monarchy.

The Directory consisted of five directors one of whom was re-elected every year and was the leading executive body in France, founded under the 1795 Constitution after the fall of the Jacobin revolutionary dictatorship in the summer of 1794. The Directory existed until November 9-10, 1799 (18-19 Brumaire according to the Republican calendar), when General Napoleon Bonaparte staged a coup d’état and established a dictatorship in France. He concentrated all government power in his hands as a first Consul and was proclaimed Emperor in 1804.

The Congress of Verdun (1792), at which Britain and Holland were represented, was convened on the initiative of Prussia and Russia. Frederick William II, defeated in the struggle against the French Republic, sent a Note to the Congress on October 25, demanding that his losses should be compensated by Polish lands.

Prussia and France started unofficial negotiations on a separate peace treaty in July 1794. At first, France insisted that Prussia should return Polish lands, but at subsequent talks and in the Basle Peace Treaty of April 5, 1795 (mentioned below in the text) it recognised the partition of Poland and guaranteed Prussia its possessions on the eastern frontier in exchange for territorial concessions in the west and Prussia’s withdrawal from the anti-French coalition.

A reference to the Russo-Turkish war of 1787-91 that ended in a Russian victory. As a result, the Crimea’s annexation to Russia was confirmed and Russia’s south-western frontier was established along the Dniester.


The Treaty of Campo Formio was concluded by General Bonaparte and Austria’s representatives on October 17, 1797, after the Leoben armistice agreement in April. The treaty formalised Austria’s withdrawal from the first anti-French coalition, its relinquishment of its possessions in Northern Italy where the Cisalpine Republic was formed under French protectorate, and also other concessions (Belgium was virtually ceded to France, etc.).

An inaccuracy in the text: General Vielhorski commanded the Polish legion in the Mantua garrison defending the city against Austrian and Russian troops during the war between France and the second European coalition (Britain, Austria, Russia, Naples, Turkey, etc.). Mantua capitulated to the Austrian command on July 27, 1799.
The Great Army (Grande Armée)—the main body of French armed forces operating in the main theatres of the Napoleonic wars. Apart from French troops, it included contingents from countries conquered by Napoleon (Italy, Holland and German states) and also Polish legions. p. 322

At the Battle of Marengo (Northern Italy) on June 14, 1800 Napoleon’s army defeated the Austrian troops.

In the Battle of Hohenlinden (Bavaria) on December 3, 1800 the French army under Moreau defeated the Austrians.

The outcome of these two battles was of great importance for France’s victory over the forces of the second European coalition. p. 322

The Treaty of Lunéville, concluded between France and Austria on February 9, 1801, confirmed in the main the terms of the Campo Formio Treaty of 1797. The conclusion of the Lunéville Treaty marked the virtual collapse of the second anti-French coalition. p. 322

A reference to the Franco-Russian negotiations opened by Paul I’s representatives in Paris in January 1801 with a view to concluding a peace treaty with France. The Treaty was signed in Paris on October 8, 1801 during the reign of Alexander I. p. 322

The Treaty of Amiens was signed on March 27, 1802 by Napoleonic France and Britain. It was actually a brief truce in their struggle for supremacy, which was resumed in May 1803. p. 323

The Polish legions, reformed into infantry demi-brigades of the French army, were sent to Haiti (St. Domingo, French West Indies) to suppress a local liberation uprising. Most of the legionaries died of diseases or were killed fighting the insurgents. p. 323

The treaties of Tilsit—peace treaties signed on July 7 and 9, 1807 by Napoleonic France and member countries of the fourth anti-French coalition, Russia and Prussia, which were defeated in the campaigns of 1806 and 1807. In an attempt to split the defeated powers, Napoleon made no territorial claims on Russia and even succeeded in transferring part of the Prussian monarchy’s eastern lands to that country. He concluded an alliance with Alexander I when the two emperors met in Erfurt in the autumn of 1808. The treaties imposed harsh terms on Prussia, which lost nearly half its territory to the German states dependent on France, was made to pay indemnities, and had to reduce its army. Russia, like Prussia, had to break the alliance with Britain and join Napoleon’s Continental System, or Continental Blockade, which was to its disadvantage. Napoleon formed the vassal Duchy of Warsaw on Polish territory seized by Prussia during the partitions of Poland. Frederick August of Saxony, a French figurehead, was proclaimed Duke. Napoleon planned to use the duchy as a springboard in the event of war with Russia. p. 323

The Ionian Islands, annexed by France under the Treaty of Campo Formio (1797), were seized by the allied fleet of Russia, Turkey and Britain during the war of the second European coalition against France (1798-1801). The islands were under Russia’s control until the Tilsit Peace of 1807, which recognised France’s sovereignty over them. The Vienna Congress of 1814-15 established Britain’s protectorate over the Ionian Islands. p. 324

Marx is referring to a term of the Schönbrunn Peace Treaty (signed in the Schönbrunn Palace, Vienna), which was concluded on October 14, 1809 by
France and Austria, a member of the fifth anti-French coalition, after Austria lost the campaign of that year. The war was carried on by the other countries fighting Napoleon—Spain and Portugal, where a national liberation struggle against the French invaders began in 1808, and Britain. Under the Schönbrunn Treaty, of the territories obtained during the Polish partitions which Austria had to cede, Western Galicia was to be annexed to the Duchy of Warsaw and the Tarnopil district to Russia. In this way Napoleon sought to aggravate the Austro-Russian contradictions and to prevent these two countries from restoring the alliance between them.

228 The convention signed by Chancellor Rumiantsev and Napoleon’s Ambassador Caulaincourt in St. Petersburg on January 4, 1810 was not ratified because the St. Petersburg Court refused to give its consent to the marriage of the Grand Princess Anna Pavlovna and Napoleon.

229 The 100 days—the period between Napoleon’s arrival in Paris from Elba on March 20, 1815 and his second deposition on June 22 of the same year after his defeat at Waterloo on June 18.

The manuscript breaks off with the words “100 days”. An idea of what Marx said next can only be partly gleaned from the concluding text of his preparatory materials for the polemics against Fox, written by Marx in English and French and reproduced below. French quotations are translated into English; longer passages are placed in asterisks; the explanations in square brackets have been provided by the editors.

[...] Napoleon told the deputies of Warsaw that he did not want a national war. He took possession of the old Polish provinces in his name, not in that of Poland. The Polish army he disperses amongst the Grand Army.

It was, therefore, not the disaster of Napoleon which caused him to abandon Poland, but it was his renewed betrayal of Poland, that caused his disaster.

The enthusiasm in Poland was above all checked by the infamous conduct of the troops under the kings of Westphalia [Jerôme Bonaparte] and Naples [Joachim Murat]; under Vandamme etc. They were worse than Russians.

In Lithuania, besides, the grandees were brought over by George Adam Czartoryski to Alexander’s side. Hence no national demonstrations and movements, when the French entered.

*Fearing even that the Poles may start a war with Russia in their own interests, Napoleon dispersed their 80,000 troops in his Great Army—this is what produced a very pernicious effect on this campaign.* With a reconstituted Poland he might have restored himself from his disasters and waited upon the return of good weather on the lines of the Niemen, Bug and Narew.

Nobody will wonder at Napoleon’s tremendous blunder. Charras (colonel) has shown in his Histoire des cent jours that that despot rather than have a truly national and revolutionary war in France after his defeat at Waterloo, preferred to succumb to the Coalition.

At the same time not to forget: *“Poland was literally ravaged by the half-million soldiers composing the Great Army, whom it was obliged to feed”* [Sawaszkiewicz, op. cit., p. 96].

Those who want to be informed upon the details as to this point ought to read: “Abbé de Pradt, Histoire de l’Ambassade dans le Grand Duché de Varsovie en 1812, 2nd edit. Paris, 1815.” This Abbé was Napoleon’s ambassador at Warsaw at that time. The secret instructions which de Pradt received from Napoleon, amounted to this: “he should arouse in the Poles a patriotic enthusiasm and
excite them to the most extensive war preparations, but avoid giving any nourishment to the hope of a restoration of Poland.”

Is “Sawaskiewicz” wrong when he says:

* “The Poles fought abroad exclusively in the interests of France. Never did France undertake a single war in the interests of Poland: on the contrary it always sacrificed its ally for the sake of its own, ill-understood interests” *

[op. cit., p. 85].

Restoration.

3 January 1815. Secret treaty of Austria, France, England against Russia and Prussia. (Restoration of Poland one of the articles.) (Brought about by Talleyrand.)

(It cannot be denied that the correspondence between Castlereagh and Alexander, respecting the kingdom of Poland, Vienna, October, November 1814 (laid before the House of Commons 1847) does great honour to Castlereagh.)

This treaty paralysis and annulléd by Napoleon’s return from Elba. Talleyrand, the only Anti-Russian minister of the Restoration, fell in disgrace.

In 1821 at Hanover agreement between Metternich and Castlereagh at Hanover.

Richelieu, the French Premier under Louis XVIII, Russian minister.

Chateaubriand (see his Congrès de Vérone) afterwards tool of Alexander.

Polignac made treaty with Russia for the partition of Turkey, and the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France, when the Revolution of July (1830) took place.

By the secret despatches, found after Grand duke’s Constantine flight from Warsaw, and published in the “Portfolio”, 1836, it is seen—see f. i. despatch of Pozzo di Borgo, Paris, December, 1815—that Russia considered Metternich (Austria) as the only serious impediment in her way, but that she was also not quite content with England.

In an account to Nesselrode Pozzo di Borgo says: “Metternich addressed himself to England with the view of arming her against the Emperor, and he repeats his attempts at every phase which events present to him. He accredits the idea that all the governments are exposed to internal revolutions, because Russia would compel the Sultan to observe treaties; and he succeeds in intimidating many of them. He tampered with the French ministry, and it resisted, and he raises up internal broils because of that resistance. On the one hand he flatters the Bonapartists, and encourages them to revive the memory of the son of Napoleon [Herzog von Reichstadt]; on the other, he appropriates to himself the Gazette de France and the Quotidienne, pretended representatives of true royalism and jesuitism; and these papers, so-called Christian, become Turk, overwhelm the public with a deluge of insults and falsehoods against us. These truths, Count, escape no one here. The French ministry is convinced of them, it repeats and confirms them to me constantly.”

Louis Philippe.

A single night’s sleep on the velvet cushions of the Tuileries was enough to chase all liberal aspirations from the mind of Louis Philippe.

In an autograph and submissive appeal to the father of all the Russias he prostituted both his dignity and the revolution by representing himself as an involuntary instrument in the current of events, and apologised for the charter he had promised to France.

It was characteristic of the man—before the Polish Revolution: he did not scruple to encourage the refugees of Spain, led by Mina, Valdes, and Torrijos
against the bigoted Bourbon king [Ferdinand VII], who refused to acknowledge his dignity, and whose minister had issued a formal circular, condemnatory of the July revolution. These refugees paid dearly for their confidence placed in the French cabinet. Provided with arms and money, and incited to war by the most unequivocal assurances, they were afterwards permitted to be pursued by the Spanish army across the French frontiers, there to be hewn down or carried off.

Outbreak in Warsaw 29 November 1830. Prince Metternich indulged in a scheme for the reconstruction of Poland, in favour of an Austrian prince, and broached it to England and France; but as Louis Philippe would not act without England, and as Palmerston proved true to the Czar [Nicholas], the whole was quashed in embryo.... The ambitious designs of the Emperor Francis on Poland soon vanished, before the disturbed state of Italy.

Louis Philippe's conduct was the more infamous, since the Polish insurrection had saved France from a new Anti-jacobin war; since Prussia's convention with Russia against France, and her active measures against Russian Poland, and the general state in Germany allowed Louis Philippe to act without any regard whatever to England. He might have forced Palmerston, because England herself then in a revolutionary upheaving, and the Whig ministry, as Peel told them, lived only upon the "French Alliance".

The Russians, on the news of the revolution, of the barricades in Paris, determined to march upon France ... one of their first measures was to strengthen the Russian (not Polish) garrison of Warsaw with fresh Russian troops, in order to facilitate the movement of Constantine's Polish army towards the French frontier. Now, this location of Russian garrisons in Warsaw and elsewhere, was one of the gross violations of their promised constitution.... Some of their bravest young men flew to arms and attacked the Russian garrison and ere long the Polish population rose and joined them as if with one heart.

1831. Louis Philippe in his crown speech: "that the nationality of Poland shall not perish". The French chamber of deputies answered in the same strain.

Afterwards Sébastiani: *order is reigning in Warsaw.*

(Casimir Périer told the chamber on 7 March 1832, that Poland had not lost her treaty rights; on 26 February had Russia issued her statute, which made a Russian province of Poland.)

The Polish nation (that is to say the diplomatic clique) relied on the French "compliments". An intimation was given to the Polish generals, that if they delayed attacking the Russian army for 2 months, their security would be guaranteed. The Polish generals did delay—that fatal delay, and Poland was ruined, not by the arms of Russia, but by the promises of France (and Austria).

Lafayette communicated against the denials of Guizot, Thiers, Périer, Sébastiani, to the chamber of deputies the documentary proofs; 1) that the Poles had broken the Russian coalition against France; 2) that Louis Philippe had caused the Poles to prolong their resistance for 2 months; 3) that it had quite been in the power of France, by one firm declaration, as they had made it on behalf of Belgium, to prevent the Russian help which in fact decided the Russian victory.

* Sitting of the Chamber of Deputies of 16 January 1831:

Lafayette: "The war was prepared against us; Poland was to form an advanced guard; the advanced guard turned against the main body."

Mauguin: "Who arrested the movement of Russia? It was Poland. They wanted to hurl her against us; she became our advanced guard, and we are
leaving her! Well! Let her die! Her children are accustomed to die for us"

19 and 20 September 1831. The Minister of Foreign Affairs [Sébastiani] vigorously defended himself against the accusation that he had advised the Polish government to postpone the struggle for another 2 months, so as to give France time to intervene in favour of Poland. Lafayette exposed him as a liar by producing documents confirming this fact.

After a few explanations concerning the conduct of the French consul [Durant] in Warsaw, who, before taking his oath to the new, insurrectionist government, had dared to ask the permission of the Emperor of Russia, *he shows that the French cabinet by his advice first paralysed the means of defence, and afterwards prolonged the insurrection upon false pretences. He read:

1) Official declaration of Czartoryski, when Foreign Minister of the insurrectional government:* "Having placed our confidence in them" *(the cabinets)*, "we did not make use of all the internal and external resources... had it not been for the promises of the cabinets, we could have struck a blow which could have proved decisive; but we thought that we must wait a little"* [Lelewel, Histoire de Pologne, t. 1, p. 359]. (Lelewel says that the diplomatic clique by suppressing the Patriotic Society, opposing the emancipation of the peasants, and proclaiming the Constitutional Monarchy, spoiled everything.)

2) Lafayette read a letter, signed by General Kniaziewics and L. Plater d.d. Paris, 20 September 1831, where it is said: *"that it was the Minister of Foreign Affairs who suggested, on July 7, that we should send a messenger to Warsaw whose travelling expenses he had covered; that the purpose of sending this messenger was, as His Excellency Count Sébastiani told us, to convince our government to wait another 2 months because it was the time necessary for negotiations".* "To the dictation of the French government,* the Polish Embassy at Paris wrote to Czartoryski *that in 2 months the affairs will be arranged and that they should bide their time until then'"* [B. Sarrans, op. cit., t. 2, pp. 255-56, 324].

Sébastiani!

The Polish Refugees, disembarked from Prussia on the island Aix, were reduced to misery. The French government would not allow them any other asylum than Algiers. They say in their petition to Louis Philippe, Aix, 21 September 1832:

"Orders are announced as proceeding from Your Majesty, to organize a Polish battalion of us, in conformity with the ordinance of March 10, 1832. The stipulations contained in it, we consider to be repugnant to our custom, our honour, and our glory. A Polish soldier has never ranked among mercenaries: he has fought but for his domestic hearth, for his liberty, and for the freedom of his neighbours, and for that of France.... We learn with regret that France is interdicted to us. We did not hesitate to present a petition to Your Majesty's ministers with respect to what we called our transportation to Algiers.... Sire, you would not permit, we trust, that an expedition, not unlike that formerly sent to St. Domingo, should annihilate the last wrecks of ill-fated Poland" [Polonia, London, 1832. No. 3, pp. 170-71].

Lelewel's expulsion from France.

Republic of 1848

Russia interferes in the Danubian principalities and in Hungary. *That was sufficient.*
Blanqui—and under Louis Philippe the men of the rue Transnonain [worker participants in the Republican uprising in Paris in 1834]—were true friends of Poland. But their acts do not belong to the traditions of the French Foreign Office.

Marx made this report at the Central Council meeting of January 24, 1865 on the basis of Wilhelm Liebknecht's letter to him of January 21. Marx wrote the draft for the report between the lines of Liebknecht's letter. In the Minute Book of the General Council, Marx's speech was recorded in shorter form (see this volume, pp. 356-57). When speaking about the affiliation of the General Association of German Workers to the International Working Men's Association, Marx did not have sufficient information about the sectarian position of the Lassallean leadership of the General Association. Their sectarianism hindered the affiliation no less than the police bans then in force in Prussia and other German states (the Prussian law of 1850 on associations which forbade the workers officially to join any society abroad, and so on).

This document was published in English for the first time in The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1962.

Marx made these notes for his speeches at the meetings of the Standing Committee (Sub-Committee) on March 4 and 6, 1865 when it discussed a conflict between the founders of the Paris Section, the Proudhonist workers Tolain, Fribourg and Limousin, and a group of bourgeois republicans represented by the lawyer Lefort (see Note 60).

The notes, which have been preserved in Marx's Notebook, were made on the basis of a long letter to him of February 25-28, 1865 from the German refugee Victor Schily, the Central Council's representative in Paris. References in brackets are to pages of this letter. The notes were written in German and English and were followed by the original draft resolution on the conflict in the Paris Section (see this volume, p. 330).

The original of these notes was first published in The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1962.

Marx made a slip of the pen here: "February 24" instead of "February 23". Hence the events of February 24, in particular the Council's evening meeting, were erroneously attributed to February 25. An exclamation mark suggests that Marx himself was puzzled by this date.

It is evident from Schily's letter to Marx that in the morning of February 24 Lefort expressed his apprehension that the Paris Administration might be "deceived by Bonapartists". A guarantee against this, he believed, was his appointment as "literary defender" of the International Working Men's Association in Paris.

This document has survived in Marx's Notebook and is the Central Council's draft resolutions submitted by Marx to the Standing Committee (Sub-Committee). The latter discussed the conflict in the Paris Section at its meetings of March 4 and 6, 1865, at which the French delegates Tolain and Limousin were also present. The draft formed the basis of the final text of the resolution on the split in the Paris Section. The resolution itself was adopted, on the Standing Committee's proposal, by the Central Council on March 7, 1865 (see this volume, pp. 82-83).
On March 12, 1865, Hermann Jung, who had been instructed to write notes for the information of the International’s members in France about the conflict in the Paris Section, asked Marx to help him. Marx agreed and on March 18 he met Jung and handed over to him a memorandum written on three sheets of paper. The result of their talk was the text on the back of the first sheet, written partly by Marx and partly by Jung.

In his memorandum Marx showed that the essence of the conflict was in the bourgeois democrats’ encroachments on the class character of the international proletarian organisation and drew attention to the French refugee Le Lubez, who constantly supported the bourgeois republican Lefort. Marx, in particular, noted Le Lubez’s striving to coopt Lefort’s supporters into the Paris Administration and his opposition to the Central Council’s decision on this issue adopted on March 7, 1865. Le Lubez and his followers were rebuffed and he was forced, in early April 1865, to give up the post of Corresponding Secretary for France (see this volume, p. 364).

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962.

---

239 The protest against the official appointment of Schily as the Central Council’s representative in Paris came from the French bourgeois-democratic refugees, members of a Masonic lodge in London. They also belonged to the French Section in London which had several representatives on the Central Council. The protest was read out at the Council meeting on March 14, but was waived on the insistence of Marx who informed all the present at the meeting of Schily’s intention to reject the appointment (see this volume, p. 363).

240 See Note 62.

241 This note is a summary of Ernest Jones’ letter to Marx of March 16, 1865 concerning the participation of the International’s representatives in an electoral reform conference to be convened in Manchester by the Liberals. Marx, who advocated drawing the broad mass of workers into the campaign for a democratic reform, encouraged all the measures of the Central Council that were directed to this end. He sought to enlist the support of Ernest Jones, an active participant in the campaign for universal suffrage in Manchester, who exposed the attempts of bourgeois liberals and radicals to lend a moderate character to the reform. At the Central Council meetings of February 14 and 28 Marx read Jones’ letters on this campaign (see this volume, pp. 358, 359). Marx could not personally inform the Council of Jones’ letter of March 16 because of his forthcoming departure for Holland. Jung presumably acquainted Cremer with Marx’s summary of Jones’ letter. On Cremer’s proposal the Central Council carried on March 21 a resolution instructing its deputation to the Manchester conference to demand manhood suffrage. Marx wrote down the summary of Jones’ letter on the back of one of the three sheets of his memorandum to Hermann Jung about the conflict in the Paris Section (see Note 238).

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962.
The national Reform Conference, sponsored by the liberal National Reform Union, was held in Manchester on May 15 and 16, 1865. Most of its delegates were representatives of the bourgeoisie. They refused to include the demand for universal manhood suffrage in the conference's resolutions as proposed by the International's Central Council member Cremer, who was supported by Ernest Jones and some delegates of the radical Reform League (see Note 141). Edmond Beales, President of the Reform League, and other radicals adopted an indecisive attitude to the nature of the reform. As a result, the conference carried a moderate resolution to extend the franchise to householders and house tenants who paid poor-rates.

These notes were made by Marx in his Notebook for the report he delivered in the Central Council on June 20 and 27, 1865 (see this volume, pp. 101-49). They are a version of the last part of the report, the basic conclusions of which were formulated as resolutions proposed to the Council. On the final text of the concluding part of the report, see this volume, p. 149.

This document was published in English for the first time in The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1962.

Marx kept a record of the Central Council meeting of January 16, 1866 on a separate sheet of paper. The text of the minutes entered in the Minute Book by Cremer differs somewhat from that of Marx.

This document was published in English for the first time in The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866, Moscow, 1962.

Fenians—Irish revolutionaries who called themselves after the warriors of ancient Ireland. Their first organisations appeared in the 1850s in the USA among the Irish immigrants and later in Ireland itself. The secret Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood, as the organisation was known in the 1860s, aimed at establishing an independent Irish republic by means of an armed uprising. The Fenians, who represented the interests of the Irish peasantry, came mainly from the urban petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. They adhered to conspiracy tactics. The British government sought to suppress the Fenian movement by severe police reprisals. In September 1865 it arrested several leaders of the movement, including the editors of the banned newspaper The Irish People, Thomas Clarke Luby, John O'Leary, and Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa, and sentenced them to long terms of imprisonment (O'Donovan Rossa for life). The Central Council of the International came out in defence of the arrested Fenians. In particular, on January 2, 1866 the Council adopted a decision, on Fox's motion, to reprint in the International's newspaper, The Workman's Advocate, the appeal of Mrs. O'Donovan Rossa and Mrs. Clarke Luby, published in Irish newspapers, to raise funds for the Irish political prisoners. The appeal is mentioned below in these Minutes.

A reference to a meeting to celebrate the third anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1863-64. Initiated by the International Working Men's Association and Polish refugees, the meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall, London, on January 22, 1866. The resolution, moved by Fox and seconded by Marx, expressed solidarity with the cause of Poland's liberation.

Engels wrote these notes during his trip to Sweden and Denmark in July 1867. In a letter of June 26, 1867 he informed Marx that he and his wife Lydia (Lizzy) Burns intended to undertake this trip via Hamburg and Schleswig (see present edition, Vol. 42). Engels' notes on hotel bills, ship tickets and other travel documents allow us to trace the route and the length of stay in various
places. From July 7 to 9, Engels and his wife were in Göteborg, from July 11 to 13 in Stockholm, on July 14 in Malmö, from July 15 to 18 in Copenhagen, and on July 20 they were already in Flensburg, Germany. They returned to Manchester early in August 1867.

Engels' notes, written on three separate sheets of paper, have been preserved. Appended to them is a larger sheet with the plan of a fortress (apparently Karlsborg mentioned in the text) drawn by Engels. At the end of the first paragraph Engels drew a man's head.

An allusion to the negotiations in Malmö between Denmark and Prussia in 1848 during the war over the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. The negotiations resulted in the conclusion of an armistice on August 26, the terms being favourable to the Danes. Guided by dynastic and counter-revolutionary considerations, Prussia's ruling circles acted to the detriment of the national liberation of Schleswig and Holstein, which sought to break away from the Danish monarchy and join the German Confederation. Engels wrote a number of articles on the Malmö negotiations and armistice for the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 411-15 and 421-25).

The Minutes of the weekly (apart from extraordinary) meetings of the International's leading body—the General Council (originally known as the Committee, elected at the inaugural meeting of September 28, 1864, then the Provisional Central Committee or Council or simply the Central Council)—during its residence in London from 1864 to 1872 made up five Minute Books. They were usually kept by persons who were active as the Council's Secretary at the given moment. Some Minutes have been preserved as rough copies written on separate sheets of paper and pasted onto the corresponding pages of the Minute Book. Sometimes newspaper cuttings containing the printed report of a certain meeting were pasted into the Minute Book. As a rule, the Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed at the beginning of each meeting.

The first Minute Book covers the period from October 5, 1864 to August 21, 1866 and the records in it are very brief. The second book contains the Minutes from September 18, 1866 to September 1, 1868. Here, as in the subsequent books, the records are more detailed.

The section "Appendices" contains extracts from the first and second Minute Books of the General Council showing the most important aspects of Marx's activity in it, including his speeches, the brief summaries of which become understandable only in the context of the corresponding passage in the Minutes. The more detailed extant records of his speeches for the given period are published in this volume as separate documents.

This document was published in English for the first time in the collection, *Founding of the First International*, Moscow, 1935.

All the materials from the Minute Book of the General Council included in the Appendices to this volume were published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866 and 1866-1868*, Moscow, 1962 and 1964.

Marx is referring to the publication of the "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association" in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 160, November 5, 1864, with misprints in the text (see Note 1).

The National Government of Poland was set up in May 1863, during the national liberation insurrection of January 1863-May 1864. Moderate and
radical elements predominated in it alternately. This government headed the struggle of the Polish insurgents until mid-October 1863, when it handed over leadership to a military dictator. It had its representatives abroad from among Polish refugees who continued to regard themselves as such even after the defeat of the insurrection.

On the discussion of Fox's address in the International, see Note 192.

The reference is to the “Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association” published in Der Social-Demokrat, Nos. 2 and 3, December 21 and 30, 1864, under the title “Manifest an die arbeitende Klasse Europa's”. The German translation of the Address was made by Marx.

A reference to Joseph Weydemeyer's letter of January 2, 1865 in reply to Marx's letter of November 29, 1864, in which Marx wrote about the foundation of the International Working Men's Association. Weydemeyer was glad to hear the news and informed Marx of his intention to publish the Inaugural Address of the Association in the local workers' newspaper, St. Louis Daily Press, as well as in the democratic newspaper World.

A group of bourgeois republicans who claimed to be the leaders of the French organisation of the International, accused Tolain and other members of the Paris Administration of being in contact with Bonapartist circles. The underlying reason for these rumours was the conflict which was maturing in the Paris Section and which became the subject of discussion at many Central Council meetings (see this volume, pp. 82-83, 329-36 and Note 60).

The proposal temporarily to postpone the sending of membership cards to Paris was made by Marx at this meeting, as his letter to Engels of January 25, 1865 indicates (see present edition, Vol. 42).

A reference to the editorial in a January issue of St. Louis Daily Press; the same issue published excerpts from the “Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association”. Marx received the newspaper from Weydemeyer on January 31, 1865.

A discussion ensued on the participation of the Central Council's delegation in the preliminary electoral reform conference to be convened in the London Tavern on February 6, 1865 by a group of radicals. The conference was to prepare a larger meeting to be held in St. Martin's Hall on February 23, 1865 with a view to founding a mass organisation for the reform campaign (see Note 141).

The minutes of the meetings do not reveal the character of the debates and the content of Marx's speech. However, his letter to Engels written on February 1, 1865 shows that he managed to convince some Council members who objected to participation in the preliminary conference and the mass meeting to be convened by the radicals to give up their sectarian views. Marx proved the importance of the workers' joint action with the radicals in the reform campaign and, moreover, explained the terms on which an effective bloc with them was possible (recognition of the demand for universal suffrage, and participation of Central Council representatives in the leading bodies of the mass reform organisation which was being established). The tactical platform proposed by Marx was approved by the Council (see present edition, Vol. 42).

Marx based his first information on a letter from Ernest Jones dated February 13, 1865. He then read Jones' letter of February 10, 1865 in reply to his own
letter of February 1. In the latter, which has not survived, Marx outlined a plan to draw the broad sections of British workers into the electoral reform movement under the leadership of the Central Council. In his reply, Jones expressed his agreement with the measures outlined and stressed, in particular, the need to put forward a slogan of radical reform in contrast to the moderate programme of the liberal National Reform Union in Manchester. p. 358

Marx read a letter to him from Ernest Jones of February 25, 1865. Jones had written about the success of the reform movement in Manchester and welcomed the mass meeting in London on February 23 which declared the formation of the Reform League. He invited delegates of the League to Manchester to take part in a mass meeting in support of the demand for universal suffrage. p. 359

The only extant report of Marx's speech, delivered in early February 1865 at the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, when Marx criticised the idea of the bourgeois state giving assistance to workers' associations and other Lassallean and Proudhonist dogmas, was made by Johann Georg Eccarius and is rather unsatisfactory. In his letters to Wilhelm Liebknecht on February 23 and to Engels on February 25 (see present edition, Vol. 42), Marx drew their attention to mistakes in the report and emphasised that some ideas in it were completely the opposite of what he had said. This particularly applied to the last sentence about the impossibility of joint action by the proletariat and the bourgeoisie against reactionary regimes. Marx attributed these blunders in Eccarius' report to ill health.

_The German Workers' Educational Society in London_ was founded in 1840 by German worker refugees, members of the League of the Just. After the foundation of the Communist League in 1847, representatives of its local communities played the leading role in the Society, which had branches in various working-class districts in London. In 1847 Marx and in 1849-50 Engels took an active part in the Society's work, but in September 1850 they temporarily withdrew because the Willich-Schapper sectarian-adventurist group had increased its influence in the Society. In the late 1850s, when Marx's followers (Georg Eccarius, Friedrich Lessner and Karl Schapper, who had rejected his sectarian views, and others) prevailed again, Marx and Engels resumed their activities in the Educational Society. When the International Working Men's Association was founded, the Society became its German section in London. Eccarius, Kaub, Lessner, Lochner, Bollerter and other members of the Society joined the Central Council of the International Association and played an important part in its activities. The Society existed until 1918, when it was closed by the British government. p. 360

Marx was put in touch with the Hamburg publishing house of Meissner and Behre through former member of the Communist League Wilhelm Strohn, a commercial clerk from Bradford who often went to Hamburg on business. At the end of January 1865 Strohn and Otto Meissner agreed on the terms on which the book was to be printed. The text of the agreement was sent to Marx by Meissner in his letter of March 21, 1865. The date of the agreement was not indicated. Meissner left it to Marx's discretion to decide how the manuscript was to be delivered to him: by instalments or as a whole.
Marx could avail himself of the agreement only in two years' time. In April 1867 Marx personally handed in the manuscript of the first volume of *Capital*. The first edition appeared in September of that year.

The term of the agreement giving Meissner the right to put out subsequent volumes and reprint the book was observed during Marx's lifetime and after his death. Until 1914 the German edition of all three volumes of *Capital* was published by Meissner und Behr.

On the conflict in the Paris Section, see this volume, pp. 330-36 and Note 60.

Schily informed Marx of his refusal to accept the appointment as the Council's official representative on the Paris Administration in a letter dated March 20, 1865.

Marx acted as Corresponding Secretary for Belgium, while remaining Corresponding Secretary for Germany, until November 6, 1866, when these functions were entrusted to the Council member Alexander Besson.

Marx meant Charles Longuet, editor of the democratic weekly *La Rive Gauche* which published the International's documents (it began to appear in Paris on October 20, 1864). Longuet was sentenced to eight months' imprisonment for publishing articles against the Second Empire, and the paper was banned as of March 12, 1865. Publication was resumed on May 14, 1865 in Brussels and continued until August 15, 1866.

On the discussion of the question of wages in the Central Council and Marx's report "Value, Price and Profit", see Note 87.

A reference apparently to one of the two letters Jones wrote to Marx, on April 22 and 24, 1865, in which he informed Marx of the headway being made by the electoral reform movement in Manchester.

It soon became clear that Léon Fontaine, a Belgian democrat, had not established contacts with the workers, although he was empowered to do so, and had taken no steps to publicise the International in Belgium. In the letter, which Marx read at this meeting, Fontaine tried to justify his inactivity. The first section of the International in Belgium was founded on July 17, 1865 with the participation of the Belgian socialist César De Paepe.

Late in March 1865, the Leipzig Composers' Union declared a strike in reply to the employers' refusal to meet the composers' demand for higher wage rates. It involved nearly 650 people. On April 15, the Berlin Composers' Union, of which Wilhelm Liebknecht was one of the leaders, sent a letter to the Central Council asking it to support the Leipzig compositors. This letter is quoted in the report of the given Council meeting published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 185, April 29, 1865.

Marx communicated the news about the reorganisation of the Paris Administration on the basis of Schily's letter to him of April 27, 1865. As a result of the reorganisation, the Administration strengthened its ties with workers and drew several new members, among them Louis Varlin and Zéfirin Camélinat, into its activities.

On the Reform Conference in Manchester see Note 242.

The leading bodies of the Reform League (see Note 141)—the Council and the more narrow Executive Committee—were elected at the end of March
1865. The Executive included six Central Council members (Cremer, Leno, Nieass, Odger, Howell and Eccarius). Howell was elected the League's honorary secretary. In view of the forthcoming conference in Manchester, the League issued an address to the working classes to campaign for manhood suffrage.

p. 366

273 An extraordinary meeting of the Central Council to discuss problems raised by Weston was held in the evening of May 20. The minutes of this meeting are not extant. In a letter to Engels, dated May 20, 1865 (see present edition, Vol. 42), Marx gave the substance of Weston's views and his chief objections to them. As can be seen from the letter, Marx considered it important to counter Weston's erroneous theses with a scientific theory on the questions concerned, and to explain in popular form several basic propositions from his own economic teaching. Marx did not therefore confine himself to opposing Weston at this and subsequent meetings, but prepared a special report which he read in the Council on June 20 and 27, 1865 (see Note 87).

p. 366

274 Written by Marx, the Address of the Central Council was printed in the New-York Daily Tribune, No. 7536, June 1, 1865, under the heading "To Andrew Johnson, President of the United States". The heading was preceded by the words: "The Working Men of Europe to President Johnson".

p. 366

275 The Provisional Rules of the International Working Men's Association envisaged the convocation of a congress in Belgium in 1865 (see this volume, p. 15). However, Marx soon realised that the local organisations were not yet strong enough and that the International as a whole was not ready for a congress. He managed to convince Central Council members of the need to convene a conference in London, instead of a congress, on July 25, 1865. The Council approved the report of the Standing Committee on this question (see this volume, pp. 375-77).

p. 367

276 On July 11, 1865 the Central Council did not discuss this question. On July 18 the desire was once again expressed to publish the materials of the debate in the press, in particular in the columns of The Miner and Workman's Advocate. However, the report of the debate was not printed. The German refugee Karl Kaub made an attempt to resume the discussion of the question at the Council meeting on August 15 when he read his paper refuting Weston's theses. This was the last report on the subject recorded in the Minute Book of the General Council.

p. 368

277 The Central Council adopted a decision to issue such cards at its meeting on February 7, 1865 (see this volume, p. 358). This particular copy was filled in on behalf of the London Operative Bricklayers' Society by its Executive Council. The date of affiliation to the International (the 21st of February 1865) was inserted, most probably, retrospectively, because the card was issued only in the summer of 1865, as can be seen from the list of corresponding secretaries in the printed card. The list included E. Dupont, elected Corresponding Secretary for France on April 11, 1865 and L. Lewis who became a member of the Central Council on May 30, 1865 and was elected Corresponding Secretary for America on June 6.

p. 369

278 The address was drawn up on the basis of the Central Council's resolutions, drafted by Marx, on the terms of the admission of workers' organisations to the International (see this volume, p. 18). The leaflet with the address was
published in the summer of 1865, not before June 6 (when Lewis was elected Corresponding Secretary for America). p. 372

In view of the enquiries coming into the Central Council about the time of the Congress of the International, it was decided on June 13, 1865 to refer the question to the Standing Committee. The Committee's report reflected the viewpoint of Marx who held that it was too early to convok the congress in 1865 and suggested holding a preliminary conference in London. The programme for the London Conference, included in this report in amended form, was reproduced in two leaflets issued by the Central Council in August and September 1865 and was also printed in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 200, August 12, 1865. The announcement of the conference was published in *The Workman's Advocate*, Nos. 130-33, September 2, 9, 16 and 23, 1865. The preparations were also discussed at the Council's subsequent meetings (see this volume, p. 384).

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962. p. 375

An aliens act was passed in Belgium as early as 1835 and was renewed every three years. Despite widespread protests by the Belgian press and the public, this law was renewed for the tenth time at the end of June 1865. p. 375

At the end of July 1865 John Bredford Leno, proprietor of *The Miner and Workman's Advocate*, a weekly newspaper published in London from 1863, proposed placing it at the service of the Central Council of the International. The proposal was supported by the Council members. They discussed the matter at the Council meetings of August 8 and 15, at which Marx was not present, since he was busy working on *Capital*. But he was informed about the details of the discussion by Eccarius, who wrote to him on August 16, 1865.

On August 22, after the regular Council meeting, the shareholders of the Industrial Newspaper Company, established to finance the newspaper, held their foundation meeting. The meeting, which was attended by Marx, approved the address to the working men of Great Britain and Ireland, written by Council members earlier, and the Company's Prospectus, both published here, in the Appendices. On September 25, 1865, the London Conference declared the paper, which on September 8 had assumed the name of *The Workman's Advocate*, an official organ of the International Association. At the beginning of November 1865 the paper became the full property of the Industrial Newspaper Company. In February 1866 it was renamed *The Commonwealth*. Marx was a member of the Company's Board and remained on it until June 1866. However, the growing influence of reformist elements in the paper's Editorial Board and the vacillation and conciliatory policy on the part of the trade-union leaders on the Company's Board did not let Marx and his followers avert the transformation of this working-class paper into an organ supporting the policy of bourgeois radicals. It was published until July 20, 1867. p. 378

On September 11 Marx wrote to Wilhelm Liebknecht in Hanover inviting him to attend the London Conference of the International as a delegate from Germany (see present edition, Vol. 42). Liebknecht replied that he would not be able to come but would send a report on the working-class movement in Germany.

Liebknecht's report in English was not, however, read by Marx at the conference because it devoted too much attention to Marx personally, as he himself explained to Liebknecht in a letter of November 21, 1865. The report
has survived in manuscript form (see *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962, pp. 251-60). p. 384

A reference to the ceremonial evening to celebrate the first anniversary of the International to be held on September 28, 1865 in St. Martin's Hall, London. It was part of the London Conference programme. Jones had promised to attend, but was unable to leave Manchester. p. 384

The London Conference of the International was held from September 25 to 29, 1865 (see Note 103). The afternoon sittings were attended by the Standing Committee members together with the nine Continental delegates (from France, Switzerland and Belgium), the evening sittings—by all members of the Central Council and Continental delegates. The Conference minutes were recorded by Cremer, Le Lubez and Howell. However, neither these minutes nor the report of the Conference in *The Workman's Advocate*, No. 134, September 30, 1865, fully show Marx's role at the Conference, especially in the polemics with the Proudhonists when the agenda was being worked out for the future Geneva Congress of the International. In particular, the minutes of the afternoon sitting of September 27, which discussed the question of inclusion in the congress agenda of Point 9 of the Central Council's programme on the restoration of Poland's independence, have not survived. The Appendices to this volume feature extracts from the minutes of the afternoon sitting of September 26 which contain a more detailed record of Marx's speeches at the conference than any other minutes. p. 385

See Note 280. p. 385

The first congress of the International Working Men's Association met in Geneva on September 3-8, 1866; the decision to change the date of the Congress was adopted by the Central Council on May 1, 1866. p. 386

During the discussion of the agenda for the Geneva Congress, the main point of dispute between Marx's supporters and the Proudhonist-minded French, Belgian and other conference participants was whether or not to include the question of Poland's independence. The Proudhonists were against it, saying that political questions detract the workers from social problems. The discussion of the Polish question at the evening sitting of September 26 was adjourned to September 27. The minutes of the afternoon sitting for that day, at which Marx presumably refuted the Proudhonists' arguments, have not been preserved. At the evening sitting, the majority of delegates voted for the inclusion of the Polish question in the agenda as formulated in Point 9 of the draft worked out by the Central Council (see this volume, p. 376). p. 386

By decision of the London Conference, a congress of the International Working Men's Association was initially to take place in Geneva in May 1866, Later the convocation was postponed until September. p. 388

For the reactionary laws in Prussia prohibiting workers' organisations to join the International, and for the Lassallean leaders' opposition to this, see Note 230. Early in 1865 Marx proposed individual membership which enabled German workers to circumvent these laws. The International Association's members in Germany got in touch with the Central Council directly or through the German Section founded by Johann Philipp Becker in Geneva. This is how the contact was established with the workers in Mainz, Berlin, Solingen and other towns. Marx based his communication to the Central Council meeting about the headway being made by the Association in Germany on Liebknecht's
290 The appeal to the workers of Switzerland to join the International was issued by the German Section in Geneva in November 1865. An abridged version in English was published in The Workman's Advocate, No. 145, December 16, 1865.

291 On December 16 and 18, 1865 the Belgian democratic newspaper L'Echo de Verviers, Nos. 293 and 294, published an anonymous article which gave a distorted picture of the Central Council's activities and the work of the London Conference of 1865. Its author was the French petty-bourgeois republican Pierre Vésinier, a refugee in Belgium and the spokesman for petty-bourgeois elements in the French branch in London who opposed Marx and the Central Council. This branch was founded in the autumn of 1865 and included, besides petty-bourgeois refugees (Le Lubez, Félix Pyat and others), proletarian elements (Eugène Dupont, Hermann Jung and Paul Lafargue) who later broke away from its petty-bourgeois wing. Vésinier's article was discussed in the Central Council on December 26, 1865 and on January 2 and 9, 1866. On the instructions of the Council, Vésinier's slanderous attacks were refuted by Hermann Jung, who was helped by Marx to write a letter to the editor of L'Echo de Verviers (see this volume, pp. 392-400).

292 Wilhelm Liebknecht informed Marx in a letter of January 18, 1866 that the Leipzig Workers' Educational Society was willing to form a branch of the International. He also wrote that Hofstetten, an editor of Der Social-Demokrat, had tried again to get himself, Marx and Engels to contribute to the paper. Marx's letter to Engels of February 10, 1866 shows that Marx strongly objected to these attempts by the Lassalleans to use his name and that of Engels, and severely criticised Liebknecht for his conciliatory attitude (see present edition, Vol. 42).

293 The "People" (Peuple)—a Belgian atheist society consisting mainly of progressive intellectuals who advocated utopian socialism. It published a newspaper, La Tribune du Peuple, which became the organ of the International Working Men's Association in Belgium in August 1865 (officially in January 1866) when the society joined the International.

294 Jenny Marx's letter of January 29, 1866 to Joseph Philipp Becker, leader of the German sections of the International in Switzerland, contained information for the journal Der Vorbote, organ of the International Association in Switzerland of which he was the editor. In this case, as in the next (see this volume, p. 439), it was, presumably, Marx who, being ill at the time, asked his wife to send this kind of information. Trying to support this periodical, Marx also asked Liebknecht, Kugelmann and his other friends and associates to supply it with material.

The item published in Der Vorbote and the corresponding passage in the letter coincide. The introductory words and the last two paragraphs were added by the editors.

295 A reference to atheist societies active in England in the 1860s. A considerable influence on this movement was exerted by Charles Bradlaugh and other bourgeois radicals who were grouped around The National Reformer and were disseminating reformist ideas among the workers.
This letter was the Central Council's reply to Vésinier's slanderous article (see Note 291). It was written by Jung and, by the Council's decision of February 6, 1866, was sent to the editor of *L'Echo de Verviers*. The letter was edited by Marx, as is evident from Jung's letters to him of February 15 and 26, 1866.

The English translation of the letter was first published in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962.

The German Workers' Educational Society in London—see Note 260.

Marx, Eccarius, Lessner, Kaub, Schapper and other Council members, who were also members of the London Educational Society, took part in the London Conference of 1865.

The Society of December 10 (Société du Dix Décembre)—the secret Bonapartist society founded in 1849 and so called to commemorate the election of Louis Bonaparte, the Society's patron, to the Presidency of the French Republic on December 10, 1848. It consisted mainly of declassed elements. The Society played an active part in the Bonapartist coup d'état of December 2, 1851 which established the counter-revolutionary regime of the Second Empire headed by Napoleon III. Marx described the Society in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 149-51).

The Grüli Society (Société du Grüli)—a Swiss reformist organisation founded in 1838 as an educational association of artisans and workers. The name emphasised the Society's national character: legend has it that representatives of three Swiss cantons met on the meadow of Grüli (or Rüti) in 1307 and concluded an agreement on joint struggle against Austrian rule.

Marx's speech in the Central Council on March 13, 1866 testifies to his battle with the bourgeois democrats who tried to misrepresent the genuinely proletarian class nature of the International. Louis Wolff, a follower of Mazzini, withdrew from the Council in the spring of 1865 (he was later exposed as a police agent). On March 6, 1866 he came to the Council meeting—Marx was not present—and made a speech criticising the letter to *L'Echo de Verviers* (see this volume, pp. 392-400). He alleged that the letter had wrongly described Mazzini's attitude to the International and its programme documents. In this way, he wanted to make the Council recognise that these documents were based on Mazzini's principles. Influenced by reformist-minded British members, the Council passed a resolution in which it virtually apologised to Mazzini and Wolff himself for "harsh words" used about them in the letter. On March 10, the corresponding secretaries Dupont, Jung, Longuet and Bobczynski met in conference at Marx's place and decided that Marx would protest against the March 6 resolution at the next Council meeting. At its meeting on March 13, after Marx's speech supported by some members of the Council, the latter cancelled this resolution, and this was recorded in the minutes of the Council meeting of March 27.

This document was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866*, Moscow, 1962.

About Marx's work on the Inaugural Address and Provisional Rules of the International Association, see Note 1.

The Statutes submitted by Louis Wolff on October 8, 1864, at the first sitting of the committee elected to work out the International's programme
documents, had been written by Mazzini for an association of Italian workers' societies which he planned to set up. Written from the bourgeois-democratic standpoint, this draft was used as a basis for the Fraternal Bond between the Italian Workmen's Associations published in Il Giornale delle Associazioni Operaie in July 1864 and adopted at a congress of Italian workers in Naples at the end of October 1864.

This statement by De Paepe was not recorded in the minutes of the London Conference of the International.

The Schiller Institute, founded in Manchester in November 1859 in connection with the centenary of Friedrich Schiller's birth, strove to be the centre of cultural and social life of the German émigrés. Engels was critical of the Institute noted for its tendency to formalism and pedantry, and initially kept aloof from it. But when certain changes were introduced into its Rules, he became a member of its Directorate in 1864. Later, as the President of the Institute, Engels devoted much time to it and exercised a considerable influence on its activities.

In September 1868, while Engels was away from Manchester, the Institute invited Karl Vogt who was slandering the proletarian revolutionaries, to deliver a lecture. Engels felt that his political reputation would be compromised if he remained President and so he left the Directorate. In April 1870 he was again elected a member of the Directorate of the Schiller Institute, but did not take an active part in it.

On May 3, 1866 Marx received from the German Tailors' Committee in London material on German journeymen tailors being used as strike-breakers by Dutch and British employers. On May 4 he wrote the piece "A Warning" and sent it to Liebknecht on behalf of the Central Committee to be published in German papers (see this volume, pp. 162-63 and Note 119).

At the end of 1865, Paul Lafargue was expelled from the Medical Faculty of Paris University for his political statements against the regime of the Second Empire. He soon took an active part in the work of the International and on March 6, 1866 was elected member of the Central Council. As a contributor to the newspaper La Rive Gauche, Lafargue wrote for it a survey of the progress of the International Working Men's Association, drawing on Marx's oral information and probably on material received from him. The survey was first read out at a Central Council meeting on June 12, 1866 (see this volume, p. 411). La Rive Gauche of June 17, 1866 published it together with the French translation of the Inaugural Address of the Association made by Charles Longuet at Marx's request.

A mass meeting of electoral reformers held in St. Martin's Hall, London, on February 23, 1865 proclaimed the foundation of the Reform League (see Note 141). A special committee was formed, in which the Central Council members were in the majority (15 out of 29: Lafargue's figures are incorrect), to negotiate with the radicals about a joint campaign for electoral reform and the organisational structure of the League.

On February 20, 1866 the Central Council of the International discussed the harsh treatment of the Irish political prisoners in the Pentonville prison. The facts about this treatment penetrated into the opposition papers and were communicated to Peter Fox, a Central Council member, by the wife of the condemned Fenian leader, O'Donovan Rossa (see Note 245). The Council resolved to send a delegation to the Home Secretary George Grey demanding
the mitigation of the prison regime. When Grey refused to receive the
delegation the Council decided on March 6, 1866 to make all the available
material public. A document exposing the British authorities was drawn up by
Fox and published with the signature of the Council's President, George
Odger, in *The Commonwealth*, No. 157, March 10, 1866, under the heading
"The Irish State Prisoners. Sir George Grey and the International Working
Men's Association". p. 407

In his letters to Marx of May 25 and June 5, 1866 Liebknecht wrote that the
leaders of Saxon workers' associations were prepared to join the International
and asked for membership cards. p. 411

When the Austro-Prussian war began (see Note 122), the Central Council held
a discussion on the International Working Men's Association's attitude towards
it. The discussion began on June 19 and continued on June 26, July 3 and 17,
1866. The terse minutes convey the essence of the debate rather superficially,
in particular Marx's speeches on June 19 and July 17. A more detailed
impression of his first speech and the general trend of the discussion can be
obtained from his letter to Engels of June 20, 1866 (see present edition,
Vol. 42). The letter shows that Marx opposed the abstract pacifist approach to
war taken by some participants in the working-class movement, the inability to
understand the concrete historical nature of war, and the belittling or disregard
of the question of German as well as of Italian unity being decided in the
Austro-Prussian war, and the national question as a whole. This position was
adopted, in particular, by the French Council members, Paul Lafargue and
Charles Longuet, who failed to overcome the Proudhonian nihilist attitude
towards national problems and who declared that nations and national
demands were "outmoded prejudices". On the other hand, the reformist-
minded British trade unionists were inclined to identify the policy of the ruling
circles of Prussia and Italy with the national interests of the German and Italian
peoples. When defining the International's tactics during the Austro-Prussian
war, Marx sought to warn the proletarian organisation against a one-sided
approach. Marx and his followers thought it expedient for the International to
pursue a neutral policy, bearing in mind that the world proletariat favoured
the unification of Germany, as well as Italy, by revolutionary-democratic means
and that in the 1866 war the struggle for unification in these two countries had
been mixed up with the dynastic and narrow selfish strivings of the ruling
circles. It was in this spirit that the resolution was drawn up and adopted by the
Central Council on July 17. p. 411

The resolution was published in *The Commonwealth*, No. 176, July 21, 1866
and *La Rive Gauche*, No. 29, July 22, 1866. p. 411

The Italian workers' societies did not succeed in being represented at the
Geneva Congress. Italian delegates attended the congresses of the International
Working Men's Association beginning with the Lausanne Congress (September
1867). p. 412

This decision was adopted during the discussion of the agenda for the Geneva
Congress envisaged by the Central Council's resolution of July 17, 1866. In
compliance with this decision, the Geneva Congress resolved on September 8,
1866 that London should remain the seat of the Central (General) Council of
the International Working Men's Association in 1866-67.

Preparations for the Geneva Congress continued at the Council's subsequent
meetings. On July 31, in particular, Marx moved a number of proposals on
behalf of the Standing Committee concerning the agenda for the Congress, and later drew up “Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council. The Different Questions” (see this volume, pp. 183-94). p. 412

315 The notice concerned the dispute between Manchester employers and tailors. In August 1866, Manchester employers locked out over 700 tailors who were demanding shorter working hours and the regulation of rates for different operations in view of the widespread use of machinery in the clothing trade. The tailors applied for support to the Executive Committee of the London Operative Tailors’ Protective Association, whose President, Matthew Lawrence, represented it on the General Council (the name became current after the Geneva Congress). On September 12 a preliminary agreement was reached between the employers and the workers and the latter returned to their work. p. 412

316 By nominating Marx for the post of President of the General Council, the British Council members made a kind of challenge to the French Proudhonists, who tried at the Geneva Congress to have the view accepted that persons not engaged in manual labour should neither be admitted to workers’ organisations nor hold official posts in them. p. 412

317 Marx is presumably referring to Clause 4 of the Administrative Regulations adopted by the Geneva Congress. It stipulated that the general rules for paying dues also applied to members of the societies affiliated to the International (see this volume, p. 445). p. 412

318 Jules Gottraux, a Swiss-born subject of Great Britain and a member of the International, was detained by the French police on the French-Swiss frontier on September 30, 1866 when he was returning to London from his trip to Switzerland. The police confiscated some letters, printed matter, and other material entrusted to him by the International’s leaders in Geneva to be handed over to the General Council. The seized documents included the preliminary report on the work of the Geneva Congress which had been drawn up by Council member Frederick Card and published in French in Geneva as a pamphlet. (Later, this gave rise to a false rumour that the French authorities had confiscated the Congress minutes, which in reality had by that time been brought to London by Hermann Jung.) The General Council lodged a complaint with the French Minister of Home Affairs about this act of arbitrariness and demanded the return of the seized documents. And when he refused to reply to the complaint, written by Fox on the Council’s instructions, the General Council decided to use the fact to publicly expose the regime of the Second Empire (see also the record of Marx’s speech at the General Council meeting of November 27, 1866). At the beginning of December the Council addressed the British Foreign Secretary asking him to make a corresponding démarche to the French government, which forced the French authorities to return, on December 21, the materials taken from Gottraux. Fox wrote a special article on the actions of the Bonapartist authorities. It was published in The Commonwealth on January 12, 1867 and in The Working Man on February 1, 1867. p. 413

319 The Mémoire of the Paris Section for the Geneva Congress containing a detailed exposition of Proudhonist views, was supported by the Lyons and Rouen sections and was read as the report of the French delegates at the congress on September 4. The full text of the Mémoire was published in
On February 28, 1867 Marx made a speech at the celebration of the 27th anniversary of the German Workers' Educational Society in London (see Note 260). Besides German workers, the celebration meeting was attended by French members of the International in London and participants in the British working-class movement. The meeting was addressed by General Council members Peter Fox, Georg Eccarius and other speakers.

An account of the meeting, including the record of Marx's speech, was made by Friedrich Lessner and sent to Johann Philipp Becker to be published in Der Vorbote.

On April 3, 1867 the joint meeting of the Council of the Reform League (see Note 141) and delegates of the local branches adopted a resolution moved by Odger congratulating the people of North Germany on the introduction of universal suffrage in the elections to the North-German Imperial Diet. The resolution also expressed thanks to Bismarck "for the frank, manly and noble expressions on the happiness and general prosperity which must accrue to a nation governed on the principle of universal suffrage".

On Marx's initiative, the resolution was discussed at the General Council meetings on April 16 and 23, 1867. Marx himself could not attend the meetings because on April 10 he left for Germany where the first volume of Capital was being printed, and did not return to London until May 19.

However, Lafargue and Lessner who spoke at the meetings managed to have the resolution adopted in which the General Council of the International condemned Odger's laudation of Bismarck and disavowed itself from his appraisal of the "services" of the Chancellor of the North-German Confederation.

The French address edited by Marx differed greatly from the English text. It was published in London in July 1867 as a leaflet and reprinted by some newspapers (La Voix d'Avenir, No. 31, August 4, 1867; Le Courrier international, No. 28/29, July 30, 1867; La Tribune du Peuple, No. 8, August 31, 1867). The German translation of the French address made by Johann Philipp Becker was included by him in the pamphlet Einladung zum zweiten Kongress der Internationalen Arbeiter Association am 2-8. September in Lausanne and reproduced in Der Vorbote, No. 8, August 1867.

In February 1867, during the strike of Belgian miners and iron-workers of the Charleroi coalfield (Hainaut Province), near a colliery in Marchiennes, there
was a clash between soldiers on guard and the strikers, which resulted in a number of workers killed and wounded. On March 13, *The International Courier* published the General Council's address with a protest against the massacre in Marchiennes and a call on the British miners and iron-workers to aid the widows and those who had suffered.

325 This refers to the strikes of the Paris bronze-workers and tailors in February and March 1867. Thanks to the support of the General Council which organised among the English workers a collection of funds for the Paris strikers, they succeeded in making the employers introduce fixed wage rates. The broad scope of the strike started on April 1, 1867 by Paris journeymen tailors, and the International's support to them compelled the French government to interfere and take reprisals against the strikers. Their Mutual Aid Association was dissolved and its leaders were prosecuted and fined.

326 The Royal Commission to Make Inquiry Respecting the English Trade Unions was set up in February 1867 because the ruling classes were anxious about their growing activity and hoped the inquiry would help to outlaw the trade unions or at least restrict the scope of their activity. At the same time an anti-trade-union campaign was launched in bourgeois newspapers. The trade unions, supported by the General Council of the International, reacted to this by holding meetings all over the country and convening a national conference in London on March 5-8, 1867. The Royal Commission failed to make any serious charges against the trade unions, but it hindered the process of their full legalisation (defence of their funds by law, recognition of their right to fight strike-breakers, to post pickets and to support strikes organised by other trade unions).

327 Marx made this speech in reply to the attacks on the trade unions started by the bourgeois press in connection with the appointment of the Royal Commission to investigate trade union activities (see Note 326), in particular to the allegations of bourgeois newspapers that by organising strikes the trade unions hindered the development of major English industries and reduced their competitive power in the world market.

The statistical errors in the Blue Book have been reproduced, whereas the errors in the newspaper report have been corrected to conform with the Blue Book.

In the Minute Book of the General Council, Marx's speech is given in the form of the corresponding clipping from *The Working Man*, with minor corrections pasted in. It is preceded by the record of Marx's information about the affiliation to the International of the New York Communist Club (the Club was set up in 1857 by German revolutionary emigrants, with former members of the Communist League among them) and also of a kindred association in Hoboken. Marx took this information from Friedrich Adolph Sorge's letter of July 10, 1867. Sorge himself became a prominent organiser of sections of the I.W.A. in the USA.

328 See Note 4.

329 The Inaugural Congress of the bourgeois-pacifist League of Peace and Freedom (see Note 155) was originally to be held in Geneva on September 5, 1867. The League's Organising Committee, which had enlisted the support of bourgeois-radical and democratic leaders (John Stuart Mill, the Reclus brothers and others), also counted on the participation in the League's work of
representatives of European proletariat and its international organisation. The Committee consequently invited the sections of the International and its leaders, Marx included, to attend the Congress. At the same time it was decided to postpone the opening of the Congress until September 9, so as to enable delegates of the Lausanne Congress of the International (to be held on September 2-8) to take part.

The International's attitude towards the League of Peace and Freedom was discussed both by the General Council and the local sections. Unlike the advocates of unconditional support of the League's activity, in particular the leaders of British trade unions, Marx, in his speech on August 13, 1867 and the resolution he proposed (see this volume, p. 204), formulated the principles of the International's tactics as regards this kind of bourgeois-democratic movement. These principles envisaged the joint struggle with the democrats against the war threat on condition that the proletarian organisation preserves its class independence, and, in opposition to bourgeois-pacifist illusions, takes a revolutionary proletarian approach to the problems of war and peace.

In a letter to Engels of September 4, 1867 Marx wrote about the wide response to his speech. He also pointed out the extremely concise record of his speeches (Eccarius' report of the Council meeting published in The Bee-Hive Newspaper on August 17, 1867 and pasted into the Minute Book). He went on to say that this record gave only approximate idea of his speech, which lasted half an hour (see present edition, Vol. 42).

350 The brief newspaper report of the General Council meeting does not fully express the views of Marx and Engels on the role of the regular standing armies in the nineteenth century. They are given in greater detail in Engels' work "The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers' Party" (this volume, pp. 37-79).

351 The General Council's report to the Lausanne Congress of 1867 was approved by the Council on August 20 on the basis of Eccarius' draft and additions to it made by Council members. It was read to the Congress on September 3 in French by Guillaume, and in German by Eccarius. The French text was published in the pamphlet Rapports lus au congrès ouvrier réuni du 2 au 8 septembre 1867 à Lausanne, Chaux-de-Fonds, 1867.

The English text published in The Bee-Hive Newspaper, No. 309, September 14, 1867, is reproduced in this volume.

The English version is more concise than the French. It omitted parts of the report about the French, Swiss and Belgian sections of the International, and a special annual report of the Corresponding Secretary for America (Peter Fox). The part entitled "Continental and American Sections" gave a summary of the state of affairs in a number of countries and referred to the report of the Corresponding Secretary for America as a special document. Unlike the English report, which was unsigned, the French document was signed by the leading Council members, including Marx (the signatures are reproduced in Note 344).

The Lausanne Congress of the International was held on September 2-8, 1867. Marx took part in the preparations but, as he was busy reading the proofs of the first volume of Capital, was unable to attend: he withdrew his candidature at the General Council meeting of August 13, 1867.

The Congress was attended by 64 delegates from six countries (Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy and Switzerland). Apart from the annual report of the General Council, the Congress heard reports from the local
sections which indicated the increased influence of the International on the proletarian masses and the growing strength of its organisations in different countries. The Proudhonist-minded delegates, especially the French, made an attempt to change the orientation of the International’s activity and its programme principles. Despite the efforts of the General Council’s delegates, they imposed their agenda on the Congress and sought to revise the Geneva Congress resolutions in a Proudhonist spirit. They managed to pass a number of their resolutions, in particular on cooperation and credit, which the Proudhonists regarded as the chief factors in changing society by means of reform.

However, the Proudhonists failed to achieve their main aim. The Congress confirmed the Geneva Congress resolutions on the economic struggle and strikes. As distinct from the Proudhonist dogma on abstaining from political struggle, the Lausanne Congress resolution on political freedom emphasised that the social emancipation of workers was inseparable from political liberation.

The Proudhonists likewise failed to seize the leadership of the International. The Congress re-elected the General Council in its former composition and retained London as its seat.

332 Here and below, the Geneva Congress resolutions are given as published in the corresponding sections of the General Council’s report of the Congress in The International Courier, Nos. 12, 15 and 17, March 27, April 17, May 1, 1867.

333 See Note 318.

334 A reference to the membership cards (carnets de membre). Of the 1,000 copies printed, 800 were sent to France and confiscated by the French police at the frontier; as was the practice, they reproduced the Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International approved by the Geneva Congress of 1866. These cards were printed in London on November 25 by the General Council’s decision of September 16, 1866 in reply to a request from the Paris Administration. The Council thought it expedient to undertake this task, fearing that the Paris Administration, which had in the past published the Provisional Rules with Proudhonist distortions, would repeat them in subsequent editions. (And indeed the French Proudhonists did publish a similarly distorted text of the Rules at the end of 1866.) The French text of the Rules for the new publication was prepared by Marx, who drew on the Geneva Congress materials brought by Jung. The Administrative Regulations were translated from German by Paul Lafargue with the help of Marx’s daughter Laura, since there was no French text among the above-mentioned materials. The manuscripts of Marx and Lafargue are extant. Marx cut out paragraphs IV and V from the leaflet and pasted them into his manuscript. When preparing the Rules for the press, Lafargue rewrote the second page of Marx’s manuscript and repasted the cutting into it. The rewritten passages in Marx’s manuscript were crossed out. The publication appeared in London in November 1866 as a separate pamphlet, Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Statuts et règlements.

335 In October and November 1866, in reply to the basket-makers’ refusal to dissolve their trade unions and accept lower wages, the employers declared a lockout and tried to import Belgian workers for use as strike-breakers. The General Council’s measures compelled the employers to make concessions.
On the General Council's support of the Paris bronzeworkers' strike in February and March 1867, see Note 325.

In April 1867 nearly 7,000 London tailors went on strike demanding fixed rates for all branches of the clothing industry in all the big cities of England. Thanks to assistance organised by the General Council from the workers of France, Belgium, Switzerland and Germany, the strikers held out for several months.  

A reference to the Act of Parliamentary Reform finally passed by the British Parliament on August 15, 1867. It extended suffrage to persons who lived in towns not less than 12 months and were tenants of houses or flats. In the counties the right to vote was granted to tenants with an annual income of £12. As a result, the number of voters increased from 1,000,000 to 2,000,000. The electoral right extended not only to the middle-class strata of town and country, but also to the comparatively well-to-do upper stratum of the working class. The bulk of the working people of Britain, however, as before, had no right to vote.

The National Reform League was founded in London in 1849 by Bronterre O'Brien and other Chartist leaders. Its objective was to campaign for universal suffrage and social reforms. In 1866 the League became affiliated to the International. Its leaders Alfred Walton and George Milner joined the General Council and took part in several congresses of the International.

Marx informed the General Council about the affiliation of the Communist Club in New York, and also of a group of its supporters in Hoboken, on July 23, 1867 (see Note 327).

The National Labor Union was founded in the USA at a congress in Baltimore, in August 1866 with the active participation of William Sylvis, a prominent leader in the American labour movement. The Labor Union established contacts with the International Working Men's Association in October 1866, but its delegate to the next congress of the International, Richard Trevellick, elected by the Union's Congress in Chicago in August 1867, was unable to come to Lausanne. At the last sitting of the Basle Congress of the International (September 1869) Andrew Cameron was the National Labor Union delegate. At its congress in Cincinnati in August 1870, the Union adopted a resolution on its adherence to the principles of the International Association and its intention to join it. However, the resolution was not implemented. Its leaders soon became involved in utopian projects of money reform. In 1870 and 1871, many trade unions withdrew, and in 1872 the Union virtually ceased to exist.

The International Iron-moulders' Union was founded in 1859 and finally took shape in 1863 under the leadership of William Sylvis, who became its President. The Union combined the local iron-moulders' associations on a national scale and had its organisations in British Columbia and Canada. It led the strike movement and did much to strengthen other US trade unions.

The special report by Peter Fox, the Corresponding Secretary for America at the time, was included, somewhat abridged, in the French version of the General Council's report to the Lausanne Congress. It has also survived as Fox's own manuscript, inserted into the Minute Book of the General Council (Fox read this special report at a Council meeting on August 27, 1867). Fox's report was published in English for the first time in the book The General Council of the First International. 1866-1868. Moscow, 1964, pp. 304-10.
The manuscript version of the report stated, among other things, that Marx had given Fox a letter from F. A. Sorge, of July 10, 1867, written in the name of the Hoboken branch of the International Working Men's Association, and also the Statutes of the New York Communist Club, which had become affiliated to the Association.

A reference to the International Iron-moulders' Union (see Note 339). In a letter from its President, Sylvis, read at the General Council meeting of July 9, 1867, it was stated that the Union had expended $35,000 in 1866 and $40,000 in 1867 to support the workers' strikes.

When a branch secretary of the Boiler-Makers' Society embezzled trade-union funds, the society sued him. In January 1867, the Court of Queen's Bench ruled that the funds of trade unions, as allegedly unlawful organisations, were not entitled to legal protection. This ruling was one manifestation of the campaign launched by the ruling classes against the trade unions, which were demanding the legal rights enjoyed by other societies in Britain.

For the investigation into trade-union activities by a special royal commission, see Note 326.

For the prosecution of the organisers of the Paris tailors' strike, see Note 325.

For the massacre of the Belgian workers in Marchiennes, see Note 324.

The French text has the following signatures after these words:

"In the name of the General Council:

Odger, President
Eccarius, General Secretary
W. Dell, Treasurer
Shaw, Secretary-Treasurer

Corresponding Secretaries:
E. Dupont for France
K. Marx for Germany
Zabicki for Poland
H. Jung for Switzerland
P. Fox for America
Besson for Belgium
Carter for Italy
P. Lafargue for Spain
Hansen for Holland and Denmark."

As is evident from Marx's letter to Engels of October 4, 1867 (see present edition, Vol. 42), the proposal to abolish the office of the General Council's President was moved on Marx's initiative.

The abolition of this post, held by George Odger permanently since 1864, reflected the battle being fought by Marx and his followers to isolate, and weaken the position of, the trade-union reformist leaders in the governing bodies of International.

In its resolution on the organisational question, the Basle Congress of the International in 1869 approved this decision of the General Council.

Wilhelm Liebknecht was elected to the North-German Imperial Diet by one of the Saxon electoral districts. The returns became known on September 20, 1867.

In early 1867 a conflict arose between the ruling circles of Prussia and France, both claiming the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, which was connected by
personal union with the Netherlands (the King of the Netherlands was the Grand Duke of Luxemburg) and was also a member of the German Confederation. But when the latter was dissolved in 1866, Luxemburg refused to enter the North-German Confederation formed under Prussia's aegis. Napoleon III and the King of the Netherlands struck a bargain over the sale of Luxemburg to France, but Bismarck blocked this by using the Prussian garrison which has been sent to the Duchy when the German Confederation still existed. In May 1867 the Luxemburg question was discussed at an international conference in London which made it incumbent upon both powers to guarantee Luxemburg's former status and neutrality. Prussia was to withdraw its troops from the Duchy. The Luxemburg conflict was accompanied by military preparations and noisy militarist propaganda in these countries and was a stage in the preparations for the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71.

Liebknecht's speech in the North-German Imperial Diet on October 17, 1867 was reproduced in the report of the General Council meeting on October 22, published in The Bee-Hive Newspaper, No. 315, October 26, 1867. Marx attached great importance to this speech; he asked Lafargue to translate it into French and send it to France for the publication in Le Courrier français.

348 See Note 294.

The manuscript of this letter has not come down to us. Judging by a letter of October 5, 1867, which has survived, from Mrs. Marx to Becker and his reply to her on October 7, this material was sent by her to Geneva on about October 5.

p. 439

349 For the Lausanne Congress of the International Working Men's Association, see Note 331.

For the congress of the League of Peace and Freedom in Geneva, see Notes 155 and 329.

p. 439

350 The Manchester School—a trend in political economy expressing the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. It favoured free trade and non-interference by the state in the economy. The Free Traders' stronghold was Manchester, where the movement was led by Cobden and Bright, two textile manufacturers who founded the Anti-Corn Law League in 1838. In the 1840s and 1850s the Free Traders were an independent political group which later formed the Left wing of the Liberal Party.

p. 439

351 The Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association were approved by the Geneva Congress at its sittings on September 5 and 8, 1866. The Rules were based on the Provisional Rules drawn up by Marx in October 1864 (see this volume, pp. 14-16), into which some changes and additions were inserted. The Administrative Regulations were worked out during the Geneva Congress by a commission of which Eccarius was a member. Both documents were published in German by J. Ph. Becker in Der Vorbote, No. 9, September 1866. Subsequently, they were published in French and English in the reports on the Congress or in other forms in the various periodicals of the International.

Marx personally took part in preparing two of these editions. In the autumn of 1866, by the General Council's decision, he and Lafargue worked on a French translation of the Rules and Regulations, which was reproduced in the membership cards. As most of them were seized on the French frontier (for details see Note 334), the edition was not widely circulated.
The following autumn, after the Lausanne Congress, Georg Eccarius, with
the knowledge and support of Marx, prepared a new official edition of the
Rules and Administrative Regulations in English. On November 5, 1867, the
General Council sanctioned the publication of 1,000 copies, presumably delayed
for lack of funds. At the Council meeting on December 17, Marx offered to
advance his own money for the publication, and the pamphlet was brought out
in London at the end of 1867.

In the 1867 English edition the Rules and Regulations were given in the form
adopted at the Geneva Congress. Unlike the above-mentioned French edition of
1866, which reproduced the text of the Preamble but gave only the first six
paragraphs of the Rules, designated as “articles”, and omitted the remaining six
paragraphs (perhaps through the carelessness of the publisher who had
undertaken to print membership cards containing the Rules and Regulations) the
English edition of 1867 gave all 12 paragraphs. In both editions, French and
English, the number and sequence of paragraphs in the Regulations did not
coincide: the French text has 15 paragraphs, the English has 13. There are also
textual differences.

This volume reproduces the text of 1867 English edition of the Rules and
Administrative Regulations which was approved by Marx and later used by him
in subsequent work on these documents. The most important discrepancies
with the 1866 French edition are given in footnotes.
NAME INDEX

A

Adams, Charles Francis (1807-1886)—American diplomat and politician, Republican, the US envoy to London (1861-64).—355

Aesop (also Esop) (6th cent. B.C.)—semi-legendary Greek fabulist.—25, 244, 279

Aiguillon, Emmanuel Armand Vigneron-Duplessis-Richelieu, duc d' (1720-1788)—French statesman, Foreign Minister (1770-74).—317-18

Alaux, Jules-Émile (1828-1903)—French journalist.—414

Aldovrandi, P.—member of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864-April 1865).—20, 353

Alexander I (1777-1825)—Emperor of Russia (1801-25).—199, 323-26

Alexander Ludwig Georg, Prince of Hesse (1823-1888)—Austrian general; at first commanded a brigade and later a division in the Italian war of 1859 and an allied corps in Austria during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—172, 179

Alexander of Darmstadt—see Alexander Ludwig Georg, Prince of Hesse

Anna Ivanovna (1693-1740)—Duchess of Courland (1710-30), Empress of Russia (1730-40); Peter I's niece.—312

Anna Pavlouna (1795-1865)—daughter of Emperor Paul I of Russia, Alexander I's sister, whom Napoleon I proposed; from 1816, Queen of the Netherlands (wife of William II, Prince of Orange).—326

Applegarth, Robert (1833-1925)—cabinet-maker, a trade union leader, General Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (1862-71), member of the London Trades Council; member of the General Council of the International (1865, 1868-72); delegate to the Basle Congress of the International (1869); one of the Reform League leaders; subsequently left the working-class movement.—380

August(us) II (the Strong) (1670-1733)—King of Poland (1697-1706, 1709-33) and Elector of Saxony as Frederick Augustus I (1694-1733).—312

August(us) III (1696-1763)—King of Poland (1734-63) and Elector of Saxony (from 1733) as Frederick Augustus II; son of Augustus II.—312

Aveling, Edward (1851-1898)—English journalist, socialist; one of the translators of Volume I of Capital into English.—216
Bagnagatti, G.—secretary of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1865).—20

Bangya, János (Johann) (1817-1868)—Hungarian journalist and army officer; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary; Kossuth's emissary abroad after the defeat of the revolution and at the same time a secret police agent; later served in the Turkish army under the name of Mehemed Bey.—92, 93

Bars, Franciszek (1760-1812)—Polish lawyer, stood for reforms; a refugee after the second partition of Poland (1793); took part in the preparation of the uprising under Kościuszko (1794); representative of Kościuszko's insurgents in the French Convention.—320-21

Barton, John (1789-1852)—British economist; represented the classical school of political economy.—147

Bastiat, Frédéric (1801-1850)—French economist; preached harmony of class interests in bourgeois society.—32, 95, 207, 260, 261, 262

Beales, Edmond (1803-1881)—English lawyer, radical, President of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; supported the North during the American Civil War; President of the Reform League (1865-69).—97

Becker, Bernhard (1826-1891)—German journalist, follower of Lassalle, President of the General Association of German Workers (1864-65); subsequently supported Eisenachers; delegate to the Hague Congress of the International (1872).—92-96

Becker, Johann Philipp (1809-1886)—German revolutionary, took part in the German and Swiss democratic movement in the 1830s and 1840s and in the 1848-49 revolution; organised sections of the International in Switzerland and Germany; delegate to the London (1865) Conference and all the congresses of the International, editor of Der Vorbote (1866-71); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—95, 358, 366, 388, 390, 395, 397, 398, 439-40

Beethoven, Ludwig van (1770-1827)—German composer.—390

Beluze, Jean Pierre (1821-1908)—French petty-bourgeois socialist, cabinet-maker, follower of Cabot, director of the Crédit au Travail bank (1862-68); one of the founders of L'Association, organ of the cooperative movement; member of the International, subsequently left the working-class movement.—82-83, 396

Benj, Józef (1794-1850)—Polish general, took part in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31 and the revolutionary struggle in Vienna in 1848; a leader of the Hungarian revolutionary army (1848-49); after the defeat of the revolution emigrated to Turkey.—197

Benedek, Ludwig von (1804-1881)—Austrian general, took part in the suppression of the peasant uprising in Galicia in 1846 and of the national liberation movements in Italy and Hungary in 1848 and 1849; commanded a corps during the Italian war of 1859; chief of staff of the Austrian army in 1860; commander-in-chief of the Austrian army during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—166, 167, 171, 175, 176, 177, 179-81

Benoit, Gedeon—Prussian diplomat; secretary of the Prussian embassy in Warsaw, an envoy (1763-76).—316

Bernis, François Joachim Pierre de (1715-1794)—French statesman, diplomat and writer, abbé, cardinal from 1758; Foreign Minister (1757-58).—313

Besson, Alexander—mechanic, French refugee in London, member of the
General Council of the International (1866-68), Corresponding Secretary for Belgium, a leader of the French branch in London, belonged to the group of petty-bourgeois republicans.—423

Bismarck-Schönhausen, Otto, Prince von (1815-1898)—statesman of Prussia and Germany, diplomat; Ambassador to St. Petersburg (1859-62) and Paris (1862); Prime Minister of Prussia (1862-72, 1873-90), Chancellor of the North German Confederation (1867-71) and of the German Empire (1871-90); carried through the unification of Germany by counter-revolutionary means.—62, 71, 165, 225, 360, 395, 416, 438

Blackmore (or Blackmoor)—participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, London; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—21, 352, 354

Blind, Karl (1826-1907)—German journalist, democrat; took part in the Baden revolutionary movement in 1848-49; a leader of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in London in the 1850s; National-Liberal in the 1860s.—22-25, 87

Bobczynski, Konstantin—took part in the Polish insurrection of 1863, then emigrated to London; member of the General Council of the International (1865-68), Corresponding Secretary for Poland (from May 1866); participant in the London (1865) Conference; moved to Birmingham in 1866.—411

Bocquet, Jean Baptiste—French democrat, Republican, took part in the 1848 revolution in France and emigrated to London after its defeat; participant in the meeting held on September 28, 1864 in St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—20, 363

Boisguillebert, Pierre Le Pesant, sieur de (1646-1714)—French economist, forerunner of Physiocrats; father of French classical political economy.—274

Bollet, Heinrich—German refugee in London, member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1865); participant in the London (1865) Conference.—20, 100, 366

Bonaparte—see Napoleon I

Bonaparte—see Napoleon III

Bonaparte, Joseph (1768-1844)—Napoleon I's eldest brother, King of Naples (1806-08) and of Spain (1808-13).—323

Bonaparte, Prince Napoléon Joseph Charles Paul (1822-1891)—Napoleon III's cousin; adopted the name of Jérôme after the death of his elder brother (1847); went by the name of Plon-Plon and the Red Prince.—36

Booth, John Wilkes (1839-1865)—American actor, supporter of the South in the American Civil War, assassin of President Abraham Lincoln.—99

Bordage, P.—member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864 to 1866), participant in the London (1865) Conference, member of the French branch in London.—20, 100, 363

Borkheim, Sigismund Ludwig (1826-1885)—German democratic journalist; took part in the 1849 Baden-Palatinate uprising, emigrated after its defeat; London merchant from 1851; was on friendly terms with Marx and Engels.—94

Bo(j)ulgakov, Yakov Ivanovich (1743-1809)—Russian diplomat, Ambassador to Poland (1790-December 1792).—319

Bourbons—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15, 1815-30), in
Spain (1700-1808, 1814-68, 1874-1931 and since 1975), in Naples (1735-1806, 1815-60) and in Parma (1798-1859).—311, 312, 322

Bowring, Sir John (1792-1872)—English politician, linguist and man of letters, free trader.—390

Breitschweri, Otto Ludwig (pseudonym L. Otto) (1836-1890)—German journalist; member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20

Bright, John (1811-1889)—English manufacturer and politician, a Free Trade leader and a founder of the Anti-Corn Law League; leader of the Left wing of the Liberal Party from the early 1860s; held several ministerial posts.—439

Brissot de Warville, Jacques Pierre (1754-1793)—French journalist, took an active part in the French Revolution; member of the National Convention, a Girondist leader.—28

Broglie, Charles-François, comte de (1719-1781)—French diplomat, after 1852 ambassador at the court of the King of Poland and Elector of Saxony, Augustus III, for some years; chief of the secret diplomatic service of Louis XV.—314-15

Bronner, Eduard—German physician, democrat, deputy to the Baden Constituent Assembly (1849), emigrated to England.—23

Buckley, James—British trade-unionist, member of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1869).—20, 100

Burkhard, A.—German refugee in Manchester, Secretary of the Board of Directors of the Schiller Institute in the 1860s.—404

Burns, Robert (1759-1796)—Scottish poet, democrat.—381

Cabot, Étienne (1788-1856)—French writer, utopian communist, author of Voyage en Icarie.—31

Carpenter, William Benjamin (1813-1885)—English naturalist and physician.—390

Carter, James—a prominent figure of the English workers' movement, barberg; member of the General Council of the International (October 1864 to 1867) and Corresponding Secretary for Italy (1866-67); participant in the London (1865) Conference, the Geneva (1866) and Lausanne (1867) congresses of the International.—20, 100, 352, 353, 354, 358, 368, 387, 411, 412, 413, 423

Catherine II (1729-1796)—Empress of Russia (1762-1796).—160, 199, 314, 316, 319, 320

Cato, Marcus Porcius (95-46 B.C.)—Roman statesman and philosopher, leader of the aristocratic republican party.—25

Caulaincourt, Armand Augustin Louis, marquis de, from 1808 Duke of Vien-za (1772-1827)—French general and statesman, Ambassador to Russia (1807-11), Foreign Minister (1813-14, 1815).—326

Champagny, Jean-Baptiste Nompère de, duc de Cadore (1756-1834)—French statesman and diplomat, Ambassador to Vienna (1801-04), Minister of the Interior (1804-07); Foreign Minister (1807-April 1811).—326

Charles II (1630-1685)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1660-85).—311

Charles VI (1685-1740)—Holy Roman Emperor (1711-40).—312, 313

Charles X (1757-1836)—King of France (1824-30).—196

Charles XII (1682-1718)—King of Sweden (1697-1718).—312

Charras, Jean Baptiste Adolphe (1810-1865)—French military leader and politician, moderate republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; took part in suppressing the June 1848 uprising of the Paris workers; opposed Louis Bonaparte;
banished from France after the coup d’état of December 2, 1851.—327

Chatham—see Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham

Cherbuliez, Antoine Élisée (1797-1869)—Swiss economist, tried to combine Sismondi’s theory with elements of Ricardo’s theory.—147

Chodžko, Leonard (1800-1871)—Polish politician, member of the Polish mission to Paris during the 1830-31 insurrection.—321

Choiseul, Étienne François, duc de, comte de Stainville (1719-1785)—French statesman and military leader; Foreign Minister (1758-61 and 1766-70), and at the same time War Minister (1761-70) and Naval Minister (1761-66); de facto leader of all French policy.—313, 317

Christmas—a Director of the Industrial Newspaper Company.—380

Cialdini, Enrico, Duke of Gaeta (1811-1892)—Italian general; took part in the national liberation war (1848-49), the Crimean (1853-56) and Italian (1859) wars; commanded a corps during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—172, 173, 175

Clam-Gallas, Edward, Count (1805-1891)—Austrian general, Hungarian by birth; commanded a corps during the Italian war of 1859 and Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—179

Clare, John (1793-1864)—English poet, son of a farmhand, agricultural labourer.—381

Clariol (or Clarion)—delegate of the Paris Composers’ Society to the London (1865) Conference of the International.—397

Collet, Joseph—French journalist, republican, a refugee in London, editor of The International Courier, member of the General Council of the International (1866-67).—429

Condillac, Étienne Bonnot de (1715-1780)—French philosopher and economist, follower of Locke.—242, 278

Cope, James—British trade-unionist, Committee member of the London Boot-Closers’ Society, member of the London Trades Council, the General Council of the International (1865-67), participant in the London (1865) Conference.—396

Cornelius, D.—member of the Central Council of the International.—21

Coulson, Edwin (Edward)—British trade-unionist, Secretary of the London branch of the Operative Bricklayers’ Society; member of the London Trades Council, of the Central Council of the International (1865-66) and of the Executive Committee of the Reform League.—100, 380, 396

Cowley, Henry Wellesley, Earl of (1804-1884)—British diplomat, Ambassador to Paris (1852-67).—429

Cremer, Sir William Randal (1838-1908)—active participant in the British trade-union and pacifist movement, reformist; a founder of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (1860); member of the London Trades Council, the British National League for the Independence of Poland, the Land and Labour League, participant in the inaugural meeting of the International, held at St. Martin’s Hall (September 28, 1864); member of the General Council of the International (1864-66) and its General Secretary, delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866) of the International; member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League; opposed revolutionary tactics, subsequently Liberal M.P.—21, 100, 337, 339, 340, 351, 353-55, 357-58, 363-64, 365-67, 370, 376, 380, 384, 385, 396, 411, 412

Crespelle (or Crespel)—member of the General Council of the International (1866-67), member of the
French branch in London where he upheld the General Council's policy.—339

Crétineau-Joly, Jacques (1803-1875)—French conservative historian; champion of legitimate monarchy.—326

Cucchiari, Domenico (1806-1900)—Italian general, commanded a division in the Italian war of 1859 and an Italian corps on the side of Prussia in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—174

Czartoryski, Fryderyk Michal, prince (1696-1775)—Polish statesman; the head of the noble family, entrusted with the great seal of Lithuania (in 1752); tried to carry out reforms with Russia's help.—314

Darwin, Charles Robert (1809-1882)—English naturalist, founder of the theory of evolution by natural selection.—217, 225, 390

Davis, Jefferson (1808-1889)—American politician, big planter, Democrat; took an active part in the war with Mexico (1846-48); U.S. Secretary of War (1853-57); an organiser of the Southern slave-holders' revolt; President of the Confederate States of America (1861-65).—99

Davison, A.—Secretary of the Board of Directors of the Schiller Institute in Manchester at the end of the 1860s.—420

Davout (Davoust), Louis Nicolas, duke of Auerstädt and prince of Eckmühl (1770-1823)—marshal of France, participated in the wars of Napoleonic France, supreme ruler of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw and commander-in-chief of the Polish army (1807).—324

Defoe, Daniel (c. 1661-1731)—English writer and journalist; author of The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe.—381

Delacroix de Contaut, Charles (1741-1805)—French statesman and diplomat; member of Convention; Foreign Minister (1795-97).—321

Dell, William—interior decorator; active in the British working-class and democratic movement; member of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, member of the General Council of the International (1864-69) and its Treasurer (1865, 1866-67); participated in the London (1865) Conference; a leader of the Reform League.—20, 100, 195, 351, 352, 423

Della Rocca—see Morozzo della Rocca, Enrico

Denoual, Jules—French democrat, participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, London; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—20, 363, 393

De Paepe, César (1841-1890)—Belgian socialist, composer, subsequently physician; one of the founders of the Belgian section of the International (1865); member of the Belgian Federal Council; delegate to the London (1865) Conference, the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses, and to the London (1871) Conference of the International; following the Hague Congress (1872) supported the Bakuninists for some time; a founder of the Belgian Workers' Party (1885).—385, 389, 397, 401

Destutt de Tracy, Antoine Louis Claude, comte de (1754-1836)—French economist, philosopher; advocate of constitutional monarchy.—294

Dick, Alexander—British trade-unionist; member of the Amalgamated Bak-
ers; member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864-February 1865); in connection with his removal to New Zealand (1865) was appointed Corresponding Secretary of the International for that country.—20

Diderot, Denis (1713-1784)—French philosopher of the Enlightenment, atheist; leader of the Encyclopaedists.—160

Dombrowski (Dabrowski), Jan Henryk (1755-1818)—Polish general, took part in the uprising of 1794 under Kościuszko; organised Polish legions in the French army; participated in the Napoleonic campaigns of 1806-07, 1809 and 1812.—321, 322, 323

Dronke, Ernst (1822-1891)—German journalist, “true socialist”, later member of the Communist League and an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung; emigrated to England after the 1848-49 revolution; supporter of Marx and Engels; subsequently gave up politics.—92

Dujonquoy—owner of the New York Hotel in London (1865).—339

Dumesnil-Marigny, Jules (1810-1885)—French economist and journalist; member of the International (1865); participant in the London (1865) Conference of the International.—397

Duncker, Franz Gustav (1822-1888)—Berlin publisher and politician; belonged to the Party of Progress; founder and editor of the Volks-Zeitung.—208, 215

Dunoyer, Barthélemy Charles Pierre Joseph (1786-1862)—French economist and politician.—31

Duplex, François—French refugee in Switzerland, bookbinder; a founder of the French section of the International in Geneva; delegate to the London (1865) Conference and the Geneva (1866) and Lausanne (1867) congresses of the International.—385, 397

Dupont, Eugène (c. 1831-1881)—prominent figure in the French and international working-class movement; musical instrument maker; took part in the June 1848 uprising in Paris; from 1862 on, lived in London; member of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1872), Corresponding Secretary for France (1865-71), participant in the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866); Chairman of the Lausanne Congress (1867) and delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868), the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872); associate of Marx and Engels; became a member of the British Federal Council of the International in 1872; moved to the USA in 1874.—20, 100, 339, 340, 364, 369, 413, 423

Durando, Giacomo (1807-1894)—Italian general; commanded an Italian corps on the side of Prussia during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—174

Dutton, Ralph—member of the Central Council of the International, participated in the discussion on the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—411

Eccarius, Johann Georg (John George) (1818-1889)—prominent figure in the international and German working-class movement, tailor; member of the League of the Just, later of the Communist League; a founder of the German Workers’ Educational Society in London; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin’s Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-72), Council’s General Secretary (1867-71), Corresponding Secretary for America (1870-72); delegate to all the Internation-
al's congresses and conferences; was associate of Marx; in the spring of 1872 joined the reformist leaders of the British trade unions.—20, 97, 100, 339, 367, 368, 380, 411, 413, 423, 439, 446

Edelsheim (from 1868 Edelsheim-Gyulai), Leopold Wilhelm (1826-1893)—Austrian general, commander of a cavalry division during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—177, 180

Edward III (1312-1377)—King of England (1327-77).—254, 288

Elliott, Ebenezer (1781-1849)—English poet, son of a smith; depicted the condition of the English workers.—381

Engel, Ernst (1821-1896)—German statistician, head of the royal Prussian statistical bureau in Berlin (1860-82).—45

Engels, Frederick (1820-1895).—24, 80, 81, 85-90, 93, 95, 214, 216, 239, 241, 253, 259, 345, 404, 420

Erlanger, Raphael, von—Frankfurt banker.—64

Ernst (1824-1899)—Austrian archduke, general, commanded a corps during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—181

F

Facey, Thomas Grant—British trade-unionist; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin’s Hall, London; member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864), member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League.—380

Favier, Jean-Louis (1711-1784)—French journalist; an agent of the secret diplomatic service of Louis XV; diplomat in Russia and other countries; several of his works were published by L. Ph. Séguir in Politique de tous les cabinets de l'Europe.—314, 316-17

Ferdinand II (1810-1859)—King of the Two Sicilies (1830-59).—312

Ferdinand, Karl Josef von Este (1781-1850)—Austrian archduke; field marshal, fought against Napoleonic France; commander-in-chief of the troops which invaded the Grand Duchy of Warsaw in 1809.—325

Ferrier, François Louis Auguste (1777-1861)—French economist, government official, advocate of mercantilism.—207

Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas (1804-1872)—German materialist philosopher.—26, 200

Flies, Eduard von (1802-1886)—Prussian general, commander of a cavalry brigade and then a division during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—179

Fontaine, Léon—Belgian journalist; active participant in the democratic movement; Central Council's Corresponding Secretary pro tem for Belgium (1865); delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868) of the International.—365, 401

Fontana, Giuseppe (1840-1876)—a leader of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864 to 1865); Corresponding Secretary for Italy (1864-65).—20, 353, 355, 357, 359

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-1837)—French utopian socialist.—26, 215, 231

Fox, Peter (André, Peter Fox) (d. 1869)—journalist, active member of the British democratic and working-class movement; Positivist; a leader of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin’s Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-69); General Secretary of the Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis I</td>
<td>(1768-1835)—Emperor of Austria (1804-35); Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire under the name of Francis II (1792-1806).—327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin, Benjamin</td>
<td>(1706-1790)—American physicist, economist, politician; took part in the war of the North American colonies for independence.—122, 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick II (the Great)</td>
<td>(1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86).—313-14, 315, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Augustus I</td>
<td>(1750-1827)—Elector of Saxony as Frederick Augustus III (1763-1806); King of Saxony (1806-27).—323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Charles</td>
<td>(Friedrich Karl Nikolaus), Prince (1828-1885)—Prussian general, commander-in-chief of the Prussian, and later of the allied Prussian and Austrian army in the Danish war of 1864; commander of the 1st Prussian Army in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—166, 177, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick William II</td>
<td>(1744-1797)—King of Prussia (1786-97).—318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick William III</td>
<td>(1770-1840)—King of Prussia (1797-1840).—165, 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick William</td>
<td>(Friedrich Wilhelm Nikolaus Karl) (1831-1888)—Crown Prince of Prussia and the German Empire; son of William I; general, commanded the 2nd Prussian Army during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866; King of Prussia and Emperor of Germany as Frederick III (1888).—166, 177, 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frémont, John Charles</td>
<td>(1813-1890)—American explorer and politician, belonged to the Left wing of the Republican Party; took an active part in the conquest of California during the Mexican war (1846-48); was nominated for the presidency in 1856; during the Civil War commander of the Northern Army in Missouri (till November 1861) and Virginia (1862).—24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fribourg, Ernest Edourd</td>
<td>—active figure in the French working-class movement; engraver, subsequently businessman; Right-wing Proudhonist; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; a leader of the International's Paris Section; delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866); in 1871 he published the book L'Association internationale des travailleurs which was hostile to the International and the Paris Commune.—82, 83, 329-31, 359, 385, 386, 393, 395-97, 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gablenz, Ludwig Karl Wilhelm, Baron von (1814-1874)—Austrian general, commanded a brigade during the Italian war of 1859 and a corps in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, Robert</td>
<td>—British manufacturer; in 1844 shortened the working day from 12 to 11 hours at his cotton mills in Preston.—304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garibaldi, Giuseppe</td>
<td>(1807-1882)—Italian revolutionary, democrat, chief organiser of the defence of the Roman Republic in April-June 1849; headed the struggle of the Italian people for national liberation and the unification of Italy in the 1850s and 1860s.—176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Geib, August (1842-1879)—German bookseller in Hamburg; Social-
Democrat; member of the General Association of German Workers; participant in the Eisenach Congress (1869); a founder of the Social-Democratic Workers’ Party; Treasurer of the party (1872-78), deputy to the Imperial Diet (1874-77).—223

Gérard, Balthasar (1558-1584)—fanatic Catholic who in 1584 assassinated Prince William of Orange, leader of the Netherland bourgeois revolution of the sixteenth century.—99

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory, later Peelite; a leader of the Liberal Party in the latter half of the nineteenth century; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55 and 1859-66) and Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886 and 1892-94).—5, 7

Gottraux, Jules—a Swiss, who became a British subject; member of the International.—429

Gounod, Charles François (1818-1893)—French composer.—390

Gray, Rodger W.—British mason, President of the Board of Directors of The Bee-Hive Industrial Newspaper Company; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin’s Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—20

Gross, Heinrich (d. 1765)—Russian diplomat, German by birth; Russian Ambassador to Warsaw in the 1850s-early 1860s; Minister Plenipotentiary to London in 1765. —314, 316

Grossmith, John—active member of the British democratic and working-class movement; member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1865).—20, 352

Grün, Karl Theodor Ferdinand (pen-name Ernst von der Haide) (1817-1887)—German journalist, “true socialist” in the mid-1840s.—28

Gustavus III (1746-1792)—King of Sweden (1771-92).—317

H

Hales, John (b. 1839)—British trade-unionist; weaver; member of the General Council of the International (1866-72) and its Secretary (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; headed the reformist wing of the British Federal Council from the beginning of 1872; expelled from the International in 1873.—411, 413, 438

Händel, Georg Friedrich (1685-1759)—German composer.—390

Hansen, N. P.—a Dane, member of the General Council of the International (December 1864 to 1867), participated in the London Conference of the International (1865); Corresponding Secretary for Denmark (1866), and for Denmark and Holland (1867).—20, 100, 423

Hartwell, Robert—active member of the British democratic and working-class movement, printer, former Chartist, an editor of The Bee-Hive; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin’s Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65); was on the Reform League’s Executive Committee.—21, 355

Hatzfeld(t), Sophie, Countess von (1805-1881)—German aristocrat, friend and supporter of Lassalle.—88, 94

Haufe, Albert F.—German tailor, lived in London, member of the Central Council of the International (1866).—163

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—German philosopher.—26, 257

Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856)—German revolutionary poet.—91
Helvétius, Claude Adrien (1715-1771)—French philosopher of the Enlightenment, atheist.—31

Henry VII (1457-1509)—King of England (1485-1509).—288

Herwarth von Bittenfeld, Karl Eberhard (1796-1884)—Prussian general, took part in the Danish war of 1864, commanded the Army of the Elbe in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—177, 180

Herwegh, Georg Friedrich (1817-1875)—German democratic poet, in the 1860s supported Lassalle.—87

Hess, Moses (1812-1875)—German radical journalist, one of the chief representatives of "true socialism" in the mid-1840s; member of the Communist League; after the split in the League he sided with the Willich-Schapper separatist group; a Lassallean in the 1860s; participant in the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International.—36, 89

Heydt, August, Baron von der (1801-1874)—Prussian conservative statesman; Elberfeld banker; Minister of Trade, Industry and Public Works (December 1848 to 1862).—223

Hobbes, Thomas (1588-1679)—English philosopher.—128

Hofstetten, Johann Baptist (d. 1887)—Bavarian army officer; a Lassallean; publisher and an editor of Der Social-Demokrat (1864-67).—219, 221, 223, 389

Hohenzollerns—dynasty of Brandenburg Electors (1415-1701), Prussian Kings (1701-1918) and German Emperors (1871-1918).—200

Hollinger, Fidelio—owner of a printshop in London which printed Das Volk.—23, 24

Holtorp, Emile—Polish refugee in London, member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864 to 1866), Corresponding Secretary for Poland (1864-65); dele-gate to the London (1865) Conference of the International, in 1866 joined the International Republican Committee set up by Mazzini.—20, 100, 351, 355, 370

Homer—semi-legendary Greek epic poet.—88

Hooson, Edward—active member of the co-operative movement in Manchester, took part in the Reform Movement.—337

Howell, George (1833-1910)—British mason, a reformist leader of the British trade unions; former 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; member of the General Council of the International (October 1864 to 1869); participant in the London (1865) Conference of the International; Secretary of the Reform League; opposed revolutionary tactics.—20, 100, 363, 366, 394, 396

Hugo, Victor Marie (1802-1885)—French writer; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, opposed Louis Bonaparte.—201

Huxley, Thomas Henry (1825-1895)—English naturalist, close associate of Charles Darwin and populariser of his teaching.—390

I

Ivan III (1440-1505)—Grand Duke of Muscovy (1462-1505).—159

J

Janks, A.—member of the Central Council of the International (1865).—100

Jellachich (Jellacić), Josef, Count (1801-1859)—Austrian general, Ban of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia (1848-59); took part in suppressing
the 1848-49 revolution in Hungary and Austria.—199

**Johnson, Andrew** (1808-1875)—American statesman, Democrat: Senator (1858-62); supporter of the North in the American Civil War, Vice-President (1864) and President of the United States (1865-69); pursued a policy of compromise with the Southern planters.—99, 109, 365-66

**Jones, Ernest Charles** (1819-1869)—outstanding figure in the British working-class movement, political poet and journalist; a leader of the Left-wing Chartists; took part in the work of the International in the 1860s, an organiser of the Reform Movement, friend of Marx and Engels.—387, 356, 365, 384

**Jones, Richard** (1790-1855)—one of the last English classical political economists.—147

**Joséphine Beauharnais** (1763-1814)—Napoleon Bonaparte's wife (from 1796); was crowned in 1804, divorced in 1809.—326

**Jouffroy, Henri**—Prussian privy councillor, French by birth; author and translator of several books on political economy and law (1820s-40s).—261

**Jourdain, Gustave**—French democrat; a refugee in London after the 1848 revolution; member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20

**Jung, Hermann** (1850-1901)—prominent figure in the international and Swiss working-class movement, watchmaker; member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland (November 1864 to 1872); Treasurer of the General Council (1871-72); participant in the London Conference (1865), Chairman of the Geneva (1866), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses and of the London Conference (1871) of the International; member of the British Federal Council; supported Marx in the British Federal Council before the Hague Congress of 1872; later joined the reformists of the British trade unions.—20, 98, 100, 331, 335, 337, 339, 340, 353, 354-55, 356, 364, 365, 370, 376, 380, 387-89, 392, 400, 413, 414, 423

**K**

**Kant, Immanuel** (1724-1804)—German philosopher.—27, 29

**Karamzin, Nikolai Mikhailovich** (1766-1826)—Russian historian and writer.—198

**Kaub (Kolb), Karl (Charles)**—German worker, a refugee in London and after 1865 in Paris; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the Central Council of the International (November 1864 to 1865), participant in the London Conference of 1865; again was a member of the General Council in 1870-71.—20, 100, 363, 368, 380

**Kisseleff (Kiselev), Pavel Dmitrievich, Count** (1788-1872)—Russian statesman; fought in the war against Napoleon (1812); Governor of Moldavia and Wallachia (1829-34); from 1835 permanent member of secret committees on the peasant question; Minister of the Imperial Domains from 1837; advocate of moderate reforms; Ambassador to Paris (1856-62).—252

**Klapka, György (Georg)** (1820-1892)—general in the Hungarian revolutionary army (1848-49); commandant of the Komorn fortress (June-September 1849).—93

**Klimosch, H.**—member of the Central Council of the International (1865).—100

**Klings, Karl**—German metal-worker, member of the Communist League and then of the General Association
Kniaziewicz, Karol Ottom (1762-1842)—Polish military leader and politician; took part in the uprising under Kościuszko (1794); commander of a Polish legion in the Napoleonic army; French brigade general; commanded a division in 1812; participant in the 1830-31 insurrection; head of the Polish mission to Paris (1830-31).—322

Kolatschek, Adolph (1821-1889)—Austrian journalist and politician; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (1848-49), petty-bourgeois democrat; publisher of the journals Deutsche Monatsschrift (1850-51) and Stimmen der Zeit (1858-62); founded the newspaper Botschafter (1862).—94

Kościuszko, Thaddeus (Tadeusz Andrzej Bonawentura) (1746-1817)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement; leader of the 1794 uprising; took part in the war of the North American colonies for independence (1776-83).—318-20

Kossuth, Lajos (1802-1894)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation movement; head of the revolutionary government (1848-49); after the defeat of the revolution emigrated first to Turkey and later to England and the USA.—92

Kowarzin, Alexei Borisovich, Prince (1759-1829)—Russian statesman; Minister of the Interior (1807-11).—325

Kugelmann, Ludwig (1828-1902)—German physician; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany, member of the First International; delegate to the Lausanne (1867) and the Hague (1872) congresses of the International; Marx's regular correspondent (1862-74); friend of Marx and Engels.—202

Lacretelle, Jean Charles Dominique de (1766-1855)—French historian.—320

Lacroix—see Delacroix de Contaut, Charles

Lafarge, Paul (1842-1911)—prominent figure in the international and French working-class movement, member of the General Council of the International, Corresponding Secretary for Spain (1866-69); helped to organise the International's sections in France (1869-70), Spain and Portugal (1871-72); delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); a founder of the Workers' Party in France; disciple and associate of Marx and Engels; husband of Marx's daughter, Laura.—406, 411, 416, 423

Lafayette (La Fayette), Marie Joseph Paul, marquis de (1757-1834)—French general; took part in the war of the North American colonies for independence (1776-83); a leader of moderate constitutionalists (Feuillants) in the French Revolution; took part in the July Revolution of 1830.—196

Lake, George—British trade-unionist, carpenter, member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20

Lama, Domenico—President of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65).—20

Laplace, Pierre Simon (1749-1827)—French astronomer, mathematician and physicist.—217

Lassalle, Ferdinand (1825-1864)—German journalist, lawyer, petty-bourgeois socialist; took part in the
democratic movement of the Rhine Province (1848-49); founder of the General Association of German Workers (1863) and its President; one of the originators of the opportunist trend in the German working-class movement.—24, 25, 87, 88, 91, 94, 95, 207, 210, 215, 216, 225

Lassassie, F. de—French refugee in London, barber; member of the General Council of the International (1865-68); member of the French branch in London where he advocated the General Council's policy; participant in the London (1865) Conference of the International.—100

La Valette, Charles Jean Marie Félix, marquis de (1806-1881)—French statesman, Minister of the Interior (1865-67).—429

Lawrence, Matthew—British trade-unionist, President of the Operative Tailors' Protective Association in London; member of the General Council of the International (1866-68); delegate to the Geneva Congress of the International (1866).—412

Lefort, Henri (1835-1917)—French lawyer, journalist, republican; member of L'Association's Editorial Board; took part in the preparations for the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; dissociated himself from the International (March 1865).—82, 83, 329-32, 335, 358, 359, 363, 364, 393

Lelevel—see Lelewel, Joachim

Lelewel, Joachim (1786-1861)—Polish historian and revolutionary; took part in the 1830-31 insurrection in Poland; a leader of the democratic wing of Polish refugees (1847-48); member of the Committee of the Brussels Democratic Association, favoured the idea of Russo-Polish revolutionary alliance.—324, 325

Le Lubez, Victor (b. 1834)—French refugee in London; was connected with republican and radical elements in France and Britain; took part in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-66); Corresponding Secretary for France (1864-65); participant in the London (1865) Conference of the International; expelled from the Council by the Geneva Congress (1866) for intrigue and slander.—20, 97, 329, 331, 332, 335-36, 339, 351, 352, 354-56, 358, 359, 363-64, 380, 384, 387, 388, 389, 392, 393, 401, 411

Leopold II (1747-1792)—Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire (1790-92).—319

Leroux, Jules—French republican, printer; refugee in England; member of the Central Council of the International (October 1864-March 1865); member of the French branch in London.—20, 363

Lessner, Friedrich (1825-1910)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, tailor; member of the Communist League; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; prosecuted at the Cologne Communist Trial in 1852; a refugee in London from 1856; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London and of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1872), participant in the London Conference (1865), the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868), Basle (1869) and the Hague (1872) congresses of the International; member of the British Federal Council; later one of the founders of the British Independent Labour Party; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—20, 100, 339, 359, 380, 405, 413, 416
Leszczynski, Stanislaus (1677-1766)—palatine of Posen; King of Poland under the name of Stanislaus I (1704-11, 1733-36); Duke of Lorraine (from 1736); father-in-law of Louis XV of France.—312

Leverson, Montegue—active member of the British working-class movement; participant in the Polish meeting of March 1, 1865, in London.—97

Lewis, Leon—American journalist; in 1865, in London, was elected member of the Central Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for America; did not take part in the work of the Council.—370

Liebknecht, Wilhelm (1826-1900)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; member of the Communist League and of the International; delegate to the Basle Congress of the International (1869); deputy to the Imperial Diet from 1867; a founder and leader of the German Social-Democratic Party; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—94, 389, 438

Limousin, Charles Mathieu (1840-1909)—French working-class leader, printer, later journalist, follower of Proudhon; Secretary of the Board of L'Association; a leader of the Paris Section of the International; delegate to the London (1865) Conference of the International; active in the co-operative movement; published several journals.—82, 330, 331, 396

Longmaid, John—active member of the British working-class movement; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the Central Council of the International (1864-65); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League.—21, 100, 364

Longuet, Charles (1839-1903)—journalist, a prominent figure in the French working-class movement, Proudhonist; member of the General Council of the International (1866-67 and 1871-72); Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (1866); delegate to the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and the Hague (1872) congresses and the London Conference (1871); member of the Paris Commune, later emigrated to England; subsequently joined the opportunist group of Possibilists; married to Marx's daughter, Jenny.—339, 364

Louis XIV (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715).—274, 311, 312
**Louis XV** (1710-1774)—King of France (1715-74).—59, 254, 287, 312, 317, 318

**Louis XVI** (1754-1793)—King of France (1774-92), executed during the French Revolution.—318

**Louis Napoleon**—see Napoleon III

**Louis Philippe** (1773-1850)—Duke of Orleans, King of the French (1830-48).—9

**Lucraft, Benjamin** (1809-1897)—a reformist leader of the British trade unions, furniture-maker; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International, held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin’s Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-71); delegate to the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International; member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League; in 1871 refused to sign the General Council’s address The Civil War in France and left the International.—21, 100, 365

**Lüning, Otto** (1818-1868)—German physician and writer, a “true socialist” in the mid-1840s, publisher of the Neue Deutsche Zeitung (1848-50), a National-Liberal from 1866.—24

**Luther, Martin** (1483-1546)—German theologian, writer, prominent figure of the Reformation; founder of Protestantism (Lutheranism) in Germany.—261

**Lyell, Charles** (1797-1875)—English chemist and geologist.—390

**M**

**McCulloch, John Ramsay** (1789-1864)—British economist who vulgarised David Ricardo’s theories.—293

**Malthus, Thomas Robert** (1766-1834)—English clergyman and economist, founder of the misanthropic theory of population.—27, 141

**Manteuffel, Edwin Hans Karl, Baron von** (1809-1885)—Prussian general; during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 commander of the Army on the Main, which operated against German states allied to Austria.—179

**Manteuffel, Otto Theodor, Baron von** (1805-1882)—Prussian conservative statesman, Minister of the Interior (November 1848-November 1850), Prime Minister and Foreign Minister (1850-58).—56, 58, 59, 63, 75, 223

**Mantz, Edwin Shelly**—member of the Central Council of the International (1865); Secretary of the Board of the Industrial Newspaper Company.—379, 380, 382-84

**Maria Fedorovna (Sophia Dorothea), princess of Württemberg** (1759-1828)—second wife (from 1776) of the heir-apparent to the Russian throne and Emperor (from 1796) Paul I; mother of Alexander I.—326

**Marie Louise** (1791-1847)—daugher of Francis I of Austria; married Napoleon I in 1810.—327

**Marie-Louise-Joséphine** (1782-1824)—wife of Duke Louis Bourbon of Parma; was placed by Napoleon at the head of the vassal kingdom of Etruria founded in 1801 and abolished in 1807.—323

**Marmont, Auguste Frédéric Louis Viesse, duc de** (1774-1852)—Marshal of France, fought in Napoleonic wars, sided with the Bourbons in April 1814.—325

**Martini.**—178

**Marx, Jenny** (née von Westphalen) (1814-1881)—Karl Marx’s wife.—25, 390-91, 439-40

Mazzini, Giuseppe (1805-1872)—Italian revolutionary, democrat, a leader of the Italian national liberation movement, headed the Provisional Government of the Roman Republic (1849); an organiser of the Central Committee of European Democracy in London (1850); when the International was founded in 1864, tried to bring it under his influence.—25, 393, 401

Meissner, Otto Karl (1819-1902)—Hamburg publisher; published Capital and some other works by Marx and Engels.—81, 84, 85, 207, 210, 214, 216, 224, 227, 229, 231, 238, 361-62

Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Jakob Ludwig Felix (1809-1847)—German composer.—390

Menenius, Agrippa (d. 493 B.C.)—Roman patrician.—106

Mercy d’Argenteau, Florimund, Count (1727-1794)—Austrian diplomat, minister to St. Petersburg (from 1761), Paris (1780) and London (1790).—317

Mitchell, Sir Andrew (1708-1771)—British diplomat and politician; envoy plenipotentiary to Berlin (1753-71).—316

Moltke, Helmuth Karl Bernhard, Count von (1800-1891)—Prussian military leader and writer; general, from 1871 field marshal; Chief of the Prussian (1857-71) and the imperial (1871-88) General Staff.—165

Montalembert, Charles Forbes René de Tryon, comte de (1810-1870)—French politician and journalist; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (1848-51); Orleanist, leader of the Catholic party; supported Louis Bonaparte during the coup d’état of December 2, 1851, but soon afterwards joined the opposition.—201

Moore, Samuel (1838-1911)—English lawyer, member of the International; translated into English Vol. I of Karl Marx’s Capital (in collaboration with Edward Aveling) and the Manifesto of the Communist Party; friend of Marx and Engels.—216, 259

Moreau, Jean Victor Marie (1763-1813)—French general; took part in the wars waged by the French Republic against European coalitions.—322

Morgan, William—shoemaker, active member of the British working-class movement; member of the General Council of the International (October 1864 to 1869); took part in the work of the Reform League.—20, 100, 355, 363-64, 380, 387, 396

Morisot—member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20

Morozzo della Rocca, Enrico (1807-1897)—Italian general, chief of Piedmontese General Staff in the Italian war of 1859; commander of an Italian corps on the side of Prussia during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—174

Morton, John Chalmers (1821-1883)—English agronomist, editor of the Agricultural Gazette (1844-88).—112

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus (1756-1791)—Austrian composer.—390

Napier, Sir William Francis Patrick (1785-1860)—English general and military historian; fought in the Peninsular war against Napoleon I (1803-14).—52

Napoleon I (Bonaparte) (1769-1821)—Emperor of the French (1804-14 and 1815), general before 1804, First Consul for life (1799-1804).—33, 165, 199, 321-27, 355

Napoleon III (Charles Louis Napoleon Bonaparte) (1808-1873)—Napoleon I’s nephew, President of the Second
Republic (1848-51), Emperor of the French (1852-70).— 32, 33, 36, 72, 89, 156, 157, 414

Néron (Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus) (37-68)—Roman Emperor (54-68).—9

Nesselrode, Karl Vasilyevich, Count (1780-1862)—Russian statesman and diplomat; Foreign Minister (1816-56); State Chancellor from 1845.—197

Newman, Francis William (1805-1897)—English philologist and writer, radical; wrote several books on religious, political and economic subjects.—110

Newman, Samuel Phillips (1797-1842)—American priest, economist and philologist.—278

Newman, William—see Newmarch, William

Newmarch, William (1820-1882)—English economist and statistician.—110

Nicholas I (1796-1855)—Emperor of Russia (1825-55).—196, 197, 324

Nieass, John D.—British plasterer; member of the London Trades Council and of the British National League for the Independence of Poland; participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin’s Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-71), its President (1864-67), took part in the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League; opposed revolutionary tactics; in 1871 refused to sign the General Council’s address, “The Civil War in France”, and left the Council.—21, 100, 351, 366, 369, 379, 380, 396, 408, 412, 416, 423

O’Donovan Rossa—wife of Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa, a leader of the Irish Fenians; organised the collection of funds for the families of the Irish political prisoners in 1865-66.—339

Ogiński, Michał Kleofas, Count (1765-1883)—Polish politician and diplomat; composer; participant in the uprising of 1794 under Kościuszko; represented groups of Polish refugees in France and in Turkey; returned to Poland in 1802; Russian Senator under Alexander I; author of memoirs.—320-21

Osborne, John—British plasterer; trade-unionist, participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held
on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-67); was active in the Reform League and the Land and Labour League.—20, 100

Ostrowski, Antoni Jan, Count (1782-1845)—Polish writer and politician, participant in the 1830-31 insurrection; a refugee; son and biographer of Tomasz Adam Ostrowski.—523

Ostrowski, Tomasz (Thomas) Adam, Count (1735-1817)—Polish statesman, president of the Senate of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw from 1811.—323

Otto, Ludwig—see Breitschwert, Otto Ludwig

Owen, Robert (1771-1858)—English utopian socialist.—11, 110, 231

P

Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount (1784-1865)—British statesman, a Tory at the beginning of his career; from 1830 onwards—a Whig; Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41 and 1846-51); Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58 and 1859-65).—12, 152

Paskiewitch (Paskevich), Ivan Fedorovich, Prince (1782-1856)—Russian field marshal; fought against Napoleon; participated in the suppression of the Polish insurrection of 1830-31 and the revolution in Hungary (1849).—196

Paul I (1754-1801)—Emperor of Russia (1796-1801).—199, 319, 322

Peter I (the Great) (1672-1725)—Tsar of Russia (1682-1721), Emperor of Russia (1721-25).—32, 199

Petersen, Peter—member of the Central Council of the International (November of 1864 to 1865).—20, 100

Pfänder, Karl (c. 1818-1876)—prominent figure in the German working-class movement, painter; emigrated to London in 1845; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, of the Communist League and of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1867; 1870-72); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—20, 100

Philip II (1527-1598)—King of Spain (1556-98).—99

Pichegru, Charles (1761-1804)—French general, took part in the wars of French Republic against the coalition of the European states (1794-95); took the command of the French army in Holland.—319

Pidgeon, W.—British trade-unionist, baker, participant in the inaugural meeting of the International held on September 28, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall, member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—21, 351

Pitt, L. K.—British priest, chaplain of the British trading station in St. Petersburg at the time of Catherine II and Paul I.—319

Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham (1708-1778)—British statesman, Whig; Foreign Secretary and Secretary of State for War (1756-61), Prime Minister (1766-68).—317, 319

Pompadour, Jeanne-Antoinette Poisson, marquise de (1721-1764)—mistress of Louis XV.—59, 254, 287

Poniatowski, Stanislaw August (1732-1798)—King of Poland as Stanislaus II Augustus (1764-95).—315, 316, 319

Pozzo di Borgo, Karl Osipovich, Count (1764-1842)—Russian diplomat of Corsican descent; envoy (1814-21) and Ambassador (1821-35) to Paris and then to London (1835-39).—199

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865)—French writer, economist and sociologist; a founder of anarchism; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848).—26-33, 89, 153, 215, 260
Pulz, Ludwig, Baron (b. 1823)—Austrian general; commander of a cavalry brigade during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—174

Q

Quesnay, François (1694-1774)—French economist, founder of the physiocratic school, physician.—293

R

Radetzky, Joseph, Count of Radetz (1766-1858)—Austrian field marshal; commander of the Austrian troops in Northern Italy from 1831; suppressed the national liberation movement in Italy in 1848-49; Governor-General of the Kingdom of Lombardy-Venetia (1850-57).—173, 199

Ramming, Wilhelm, Baron von Riedkirchen (1815-1876)—Austrian general, commander of a brigade in the Italian war of 1859, and of a corps in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—179-80

Ramsay, Sir George (1800-1871)—one of the last English classical political economists.—147

Rau, Karl Heinrich (1792-1870)—German economist.—207, 215

Raumer, Friedrich Ludwig Georg von (1781-1873)—German historian and politician; representative of narrative-romantic trend in German historiography.—33

Reybaud, Marie Roch Louis (1799-1879)—French writer and economist, liberal.—414

Ricardo, David (1772-1823)—English economist.—29, 95, 120, 147, 207, 208, 210, 225

Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de (1758-1794)—Jacobin leader, head of the revolutionary government (1793-94).—110

Rodbertus-Jagetzow, Johann Karl (1805-1875)—German economist, leader of the Centre Left in the Prussian National Assembly, subsequently theoretician of “state socialism”.—207

Roon, Albrecht Theodor Emil, Count von (1803-1879)—Prussian statesman and military leader; field marshal-general from 1873; War Minister (1859-73) and Navy Minister (1861-71); reorganised the Prussian army.—45, 50, 54

Roscher, Wilhelm (1817-1894)—German economist, founder of the historical trend in political economy.—207, 215

Rose, George (1744-1818)—British statesman, Tory; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1782-83 and 1784-1801).—145

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-1778)—French philosopher and writer of the Enlightenment.—32, 33, 160

Rulhière, Claude Carloman de (1735-1791)—French historian, author of 4-volume history of the 18th-century Poland published in Paris (1807).—313-14

Rumjanzev (Rumyantsev), Nikolai Petrovich (1754-1826)—Russian diplomat and statesman, Foreign Minister (1808-14), Chancellor from 1809; chairman of the Council of State (1810-12).—319, 325, 326

Rüstow, Friedrich Wilhelm (1821-1878)—German army officer and military novelist, democrat, refugee in Switzerland; Garibaldi’s chief of staff (1860); friend of Lassalle.—87

Rybczinski, Franciszek—Polish refugee in London, member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—20

S

Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de (1760-1825)—French utopian socialist.—26, 231
Salvatella, Narcisse—member of the Association of Mutual Progress (Mazzini organisation of Italian workers in London); member of the Central Council of the International (1865).—100

Savary, Anne Jean Marie René, duc de Rovigo (1774-1833)—French general and politician, Minister of Police (1810-14), Governor-General of Algeria (1831-33).—325

Sawaszkiewicz, Leon Leopold (1806-1870)—Polish politician and writer; active in the 1830-31 insurrection; a refugee in France, Belgium and England; author of a work on Poland’s history during the French revolution and Napoleonic wars; contributor to the newspaper La Tribune du Peuple.—320-24, 326, 327

Schantzenbach, Alexander—member of the Central Council of the International (1864).—21

Schapper, Karl (1812-1870)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; a leader of the League of the Just; member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; one of the leaders of the sectarian-adventurist group during the split in the Communist League (1850); again drew close to Marx in 1856; member of the Central Council of the International (1865); participant in the London Conference of 1865.—100
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— manufacture, large-scale industry and machines—258, 287-89, 295, 302-05, 306
— and control of labour process—258, 295
See also Absolute surplus-value; Child's labour; Factory legislation; Female labour; Intensity of labour; Labour; Wage labour; Workers' living and labour conditions under capitalism; Working day
Extended reproduction—128, 131
See also Reproduction

F
Factory legislation—72, 76, 142, 146, 228, 229, 255, 287, 289, 302-03, 307
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— female and child's labour, education—183-84, 187-89, 376, 386
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See also France’s wars against first and second European coalitions; Vienna Congress of 1814-15

Nation—73, 155-57, 176
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Production—9, 11, 29, 68, 70, 144-45, 147, 188, 190, 193, 216, 224, 236, 237, 258, 296-301, 302, 304-07, 423
See also Commodity production; Instruments (tools) of labour; Means of production; Productive forces; Relations of production
Productive and unproductive labour—188, 189, 296
Productive forces—9, 29, 70, 190, 293-96, 299, 301
Profit—119, 127, 132-38, 144, 145-46, 231-33, 303
See also Average profit; Average rate of profit; Interest (econ.); Rate of profit; Rent of land; Surplus-value
Property—26-28, 70, 216-17, 234, 245-46, 251, 267, 299
See also Appropriation; Landed property; Private property
Proudhonism, Proudhonists—26-33, 153, 215, 225
Prussia—42, 44, 45, 51, 54, 56, 59, 224
— feudalism and its survivals—56, 60
— in 1815-beginning of 1848—42, 64
— Provincial Diets—56, 59
— "New Era"—55, 56-60, 62, 63, 76
— reorganisation of the army—54, 58, 60-63, 67, 84-86
— constitutional conflict (1860s)—41-79, 84, 86
— and Bonapartism—72-74, 225
— and industry—65
— finances, budget, taxes—42
— nobility, aristocracy—73
— bureaucracy—56, 57, 59, 60, 65, 69, 71-73, 77, 213, 229
— political system—42, 59-60, 64
— constitutionalism—56, 59
— legislation—50, 328, 360
— factory legislation—72
— courts—59
— press, the—58, 59
— and Austria—200, 313, 314, 317-18, 322
— and England—313
— and Germany—60, 67, 200
— and Russia—55, 153-54, 159, 200, 313, 315, 316, 317-19, 324
See also Army, Prussian
Purchase and sale—132, 238-40, 269-70, 280-81, 302
Q
Quality and quantity—44, 240, 265, 272-73, 276, 283-84
R
Rate of profit—107-09, 135-38, 144, 208, 338
See also Average profit; Average rate of profit; Profit
Rate of surplus-value—131, 135-36, 250, 255-56, 286, 289-91, 302-03
See also Exploitation of labour-power by capital
Raw materials—133, 135, 147, 245, 284-85
Reform League, 1865—366, 394, 396, 407, 416, 435
Reform, social—69, 76-79
See also Factory legislation
Relations of production—28-29
See also Economic relations; Social, socio-economic formation
Relative surplus-value—212-20, 259, 291
See also Surplus-value
Religion—11, 32, 33
Rent of land—119, 134-36
See also Landed property; Nationalisation of land
Reproduction—129, 131, 236
See also Extended reproduction
Republic, bourgeois—19
Research (study)—28-29, 84, 85-86, 118, 208, 210-11, 212-13, 215, 217, 224, 225
— scientific—119-21, 208, 227, 231
— into economic conditions of various classes—208-09
— line of Marx’s economic research—105, 123, 208, 210-13, 224, 227, 231, 238, 240-41, 242-43, 246-48, 250, 257-58, 282-83
— of capital and money—231, 232, 238, 240-41
— of co-operation—209, 212, 224
— of manufacture—209, 224
— of big industry, machine production—209, 212-13, 224-25
— of accumulation of capital—128-29, 213, 236
— of circulation—238, 240-41
— of labour-power—211-12, 246-47
— of division of labour—209, 212, 224
— of value—118, 123, 240-41, 282-83
— of commodity—240-41, 246-47
— A. Smith’s studies—120
— various studies by Marx and Engels—85-86, 215

Revolution, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic—56-57, 69-71, 75-78, 200
See also French Revolution, 1789-94, Revolutions of 1848-49 in Europe; War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83
Revolution, proletarian, socialist
— essence and tasks—12, 129, 216
— prerequisites for—29, 148-49, 213, 216, 237, 307-08
— as form of class struggle—200-01
— international character—14, 441
— and party—78
— ways of carrying it out—12, 69-70, 441
— and army—193
— abolition of private ownership of means of production—112, 216-17
— and agrarian question—216-17
— and trade-union movement—149, 191-92
See also Communism; Dictatorship of the proletariat; Internationalism, proletarian; June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848; Revolution, social; Social relations
Revolution, social—200, 213, 216, 307
See also Revolution, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic; Revolution, proletarian, socialist; Social relations
Revolution of 1848-49 in Austria—197-200
See also Revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary
Revolution of 1848 in France—31, 72, 78, 152, 200
See also June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848
Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany—54, 56, 57, 62, 71, 152, 197
Revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary—155, 197-200
See also National liberation war of 1848-49 in Hungary
Revolution of 1848-49 in Italian states—199
See also Austro-Italian war, 1848-49
Revolutions of 1848-49 in Europe—10, 11, 78, 197
See also Revolution of 1848-49 (in different countries)
Rights of man—14, 15, 19, 77, 441, 442
See also Equality
Romania, Romanians—157, 287
See also Danubian principalities
Russia—32, 51, 158-61, 197, 198
— railways—199
— reform of 1861—199-200
— foreign policy and diplomacy—13, 97, 155, 156, 160, 161, 198, 199, 311, 312, 313-20, 321-27
— and Central Asia—119
— and the Caucasus—13, 199
— and Tsarist policy in Poland, 19th cent.—13, 152-54, 157, 159-61
— and Austria—312, 325
— and England—198
— and France—200, 311-21
— and Germany—197, 200, 314, 315
— and Prussia—154, 200, 313, 314, 315, 316, 318
— and Sweden—314, 317
— and Turkey—313, 316, 317, 325
— and the USA—112
See also Campaign of 1812; Working class in Russia

Saint-Simonism, Saint-Simonists—26, 231
Saxony—49
Schiller Institute, the—402-04, 417-20
Schleswig-Holstein question—94-95, 161
See also Danish war, 1864
Science—27, 28-31, 33, 91, 110, 119-21, 127-28, 217, 239
— and production—9, 10-11, 124-25, 147, 297-98, 299, 301, 305
— and agriculture—147
— and division of labour—299
— and religion—390
— military—85, 175-76
— of history—217
— socialism and communism—29, 215
— research—119-21, 208, 227, 231
— history of—27, 217, 299
— in bourgeois class society—32, 297, 299, 301, 305
— and working class—29, 41, 299, 305
— under communism—10-11
— in Germany—207-09, 224, 231
See also Communism, scientific; Philosophy; Political economy
Scotland—6, 111, 306
Serfdom—199-200, 209, 214, 234, 252-53
See also Feudalism
Serfs—11, 70, 132-33, 145, 160-61, 199-200, 217, 252, 287, 415
See also Feudal services; Peasantry

Seven Years’ War, 1756-63—312, 313-16
Silesia—214
Slavery—11, 14, 20, 128-29, 132, 143, 209, 234, 296, 441
See also Ancient Rome
Slave trade—20, 162, 252, 253
Socialism, doctrinaire—207-18, 225
Socialism in France—26, 32
Socialism in Germany—207
See also Communist League, the; Lassalleanism, Lassalleans
Socialism, utopian—29, 30
Social labour—11-12, 107, 108, 121, 122, 124-26, 189-90, 247, 267-68, 269-70, 274, 293-301, 304-05
See also Communism; Labour; Organisation of social labour and production; Wage labour
Social question—421, 432
See also Revolution, social; Social relations; Society
Social relations—224-25, 231, 232-33, 245-46, 267, 280-81
Social, socio-economic formation—20, 186, 188, 190, 246, 286
See also Mode of production; Relations of production; Social relations
Society—68, 69, 70, 124, 190, 208, 224-25, 231, 237, 247, 251, 265, 269, 274, 296
— and nature—245
— and production—70, 124, 216-17, 247
— and classes—68-71, 237
Society, bourgeois—9, 14, 70-71, 188, 231, 237, 360, 440, 441
— economic basis of—70-71, 234, 280
— social relations—225, 231, 232-33, 246, 280
— based on class antagonisms and opposition—9, 70-71, 190
— classes, social strata—68-69, 437
— proletariat—68, 187, 437
— and bourgeoisie—70-71
— and class struggle—69, 77
— inevitable downfall of—148, 216, 224-25, 237, 289
See also Capitalist mode of production; Corruption; Exploitation of labour-power by capital; Impoverishment of the working class; Pauperism; Productive forces; Rela-
tions of production; Workers' living and labour conditions under capitalism

Society of December 10, the—397
Society, primitive—296
See also Community
Spain—311, 324, 325
State, the—60, 62, 64-65, 126, 156-57, 158-60, 189, 190, 192-93, 360
See also Dictatorship of the proletariat; Republic, bourgeois
State boundaries—156-57
Statistics—142, 183, 186-87, 440
Strikes—103, 117, 365, 405, 407, 409, 412, 421, 437
See also First International; Working-class movement; Working-class movement (in different countries)
Suffrage—67, 69, 72-77, 210, 236, 432
Surplus labour—131-33, 140, 209, 233-35, 250-56, 258, 286, 287, 291, 293, 301-02
See also Corvée; Feudal services
Surplus produce—131
— development of the theory of surplus-value by Marx—208, 211, 229
— laws of—134, 208, 257, 289-90, 302-03
— as basis and goal of capitalist production—132, 134-35, 257, 290-91, 292, 295-96
— methods and means of its production—247-50, 256-57
— rate of—136, 255-56
— mass of—289
— capitalisation of—257
— transformed forms of—134-36, 211
— and laws regulating commodity exchange—242-44, 248, 279
— and labour productivity—212, 259, 293, 306
— and means of production—285, 302, 306
— and working day—131-34, 212, 257, 289-90, 303
— interpretation of, by bourgeois economists—242, 250, 278, 283, 286
See also Absolute surplus-value; Interest (econ.); Profit; Rate of surplus-value; Relative surplus-value; Rent of land
Sweden—156, 311, 312-13, 314, 317, 324, 325, 343-48
Switzerland—156, 222, 408-09
See also Working-class movement in Switzerland

Tactics of proletarian class struggle—75-79, 85-86
See also Class struggle; Working-class movement
Taxes—32, 60, 192, 376, 386
See also Consciousness; Production
Thirty Years' war, 1618-48—100, 311
Trade, commerce—9, 68, 71, 242-43, 275
See also Merchant's (commercial) capital; World market
Trade(s) unions, trade union movement—149, 190-91, 375-76, 386
— as school of class struggle—15-16, 149, 191-92, 338, 422
— and need to combine economic and political struggle—149, 191
— need to found international trade union association—422-23
— in England—149, 190-92, 394, 396, 407, 422, 431-36, 437
See also Economic struggle; Working-class movement (in different countries)

Truth—15, 127, 208, 217
Tsarism—161, 199
Turkey—159, 198, 311, 313, 316, 317, 324

U

Ukraine, Ukrainians—158-61
United States of America—10, 19-20, 112, 253-54, 301
— industry—301, 422
— agriculture—109, 112
— social and political system—19, 422
See also Bourgeoisie, US; US Civil War, 1861-65; War of North American colonies for independence, 1775-83; Working class in the USA; Working-class movement in the USA

Uprising, armed—53-54
See also Arming of the people; June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848; Peasant wars; Revolution, proletarian, socialist

US Civil war, 1861-65—6, 13, 19-20, 24, 64, 99-100, 115, 354, 355, 365-66, 407, 422

Use value—244, 245, 248, 251, 265, 267, 283

Usurer's capital—275

V

— analysis of—118, 120-21, 242
— importance of Marx's theory of value—239, 240
— its social substance—120-22, 265, 277
— and surplus-value—278-79
— form of—265-66, 268, 269
— magnitude of—122, 269
— and price—118, 125-27, 137-38, 268-69
— money form of—125, 268
— qualitative similarity and quantitative difference of commodities as values—240, 265, 269, 276, 282-84
— and labour productivity—124, 138, 293, 302-03
— and machinery—300-03
— and wages—106, 107, 119-20, 122-23, 137-38, 233
— process of its creation and increase—278-79, 283, 293-94
— distribution of—137
— and market price—106-07, 118, 126, 137

See also Commodity; Exchange(able) value; Law of value; Money; Price; Use value

Variable capital—147, 250, 256, 285, 289-90, 303

Vienna Congress of 1814-15—155

W

See also Exploitation of labour-power by capital; Labour; Social labour

Wages
— as converted form of value (price) of labour-power—127-33, 138-39, 143-45, 281
— and reproduction of labour-power—129-30, 144-46
— laws of—117
— as form of distribution—106-07, 114, 141, 143-44, 148
— real—104, 111
— piece—183, 186
— by the day—183, 186
— absolute and relative—199
— average—111-12, 143, 144-45, 183, 186
— national differences—105, 109-11, 113-14, 118, 145-47
— and money circulation—113-16
— and means of subsistence—106-08, 129-30
— of agricultural labourers—110-12, 145-47, 308
— of skilled workers—118, 138-39, 147, 281
— and working day—109-10, 140-42
— fluctuations of—104-06, 107, 109-10, 117-18, 142, 144-45, 146-48, 149, 338, 364
— workers' struggle for higher wages—103, 104-05, 129, 138-49
— legislative "regulation" of—287-88
— and value of commodity—118-19, 122-23, 137-38, 338
— and price of commodity—106-13, 118-20, 143-44, 149
— and money—113-16, 139-40, 143-44
— and profit—107-09, 137-38, 144, 145-46, 149, 231-32, 338
— and market price—143-44
— and intensity of labour—142-44
— and use of machinery—147-48
— and economic crises—115
— in Smith's theory—147
— in Ricardo’s theory—120, 147, 210
— critique of bourgeois definitions
  of—103-22
— critique of Lassallean “iron law of
  wages”—207, 210
Wallachia—157, 251-52, 287
  See also Danubian principalities
Wants (needs)—122, 145, 221, 245,
  251, 258, 277
War of Austrian succession, 1740-48—
  313
War of North American colonies for inde-
  pendence, 1775-83—19-20
War of Polish succession, 1733-35—312-
  13
War(s)—13, 43, 298, 426, 427
  See also Army; Art of war; Austro-
  Italian war, 1848-49; Austro-Halo-
  French war, 1859; Austro-Prussian war,
  1866; Campaign of 1812; Crimean
  war, 1853-56; Danish war, 1864;
  France’s wars against first and second
  European coalitions, 1792-97, 1798-
  1801; Napoleonic wars; Thirty Years’
  war, 1618-48; US Civil war, 1861-65;
  War of Austrian succession, 1740-48;
  War of North American colonies for
  independence, 1775-83
Wealth—29, 231, 265, 272-73, 308
  See also Accumulation of capital; Capit-
  al; Gold and silver; Money
Will—28, 105-06, 119, 166, 235, 254,
  267, 296
Worker—68, 188, 190, 289, 307
  — as productive force—190
  — workers’ separation from means of
    labour and production—20, 68,
    70-71, 129, 294, 299, 305
  — his interests—69-70, 75-78, 163
  — his reproduction—129, 131, 220,
    236
  — his income—107, 114-15
  — his wages—139
  — and wealth—308
  — competition among workers—191
  — and capitalist—247, 287-88
  — and machinery—141, 142, 301-04
  — “free”—209, 216, 234, 245, 251,
    255, 289, 296, 415
  — aggregate worker—251, 255, 294,
    297-99
  — detail worker—297-301, 304, 305
  See also Agricultural labourers; Exploita-
  tion of labour-power by capital;
  Labour; Labour(ing) power; Wage
  labour; Wages; Working class; Working
day
Workers’ living and labour conditions
  under capitalism—5, 6, 7, 9, 11-12,
  14, 68, 70, 119-20, 128-29, 142,
  254-55, 258, 287, 288, 294, 305, 415,
  422, 441
  See also Child’s labour; Economic crises;
  Exploitation of labour-power by capital;
  Female labour; Labour; Labour(ing)
  power; Pauperism; Worker; Working day
Workers’ societies—15-16, 183-84, 356-
  58, 369-73, 389, 401, 406, 408-09,
  421, 442-43
  See also First International, German
  Workers’ Educational Society in Geneva,
  1840s-60s; German Workers’ Educational
  Society in London, 1840-1918
Working class—12, 14, 68, 69, 77-78,
  237, 415, 441
  — essence—68, 128, 236, 280
  — number of—12, 191, 236
  — concentration in towns—308
  — the only consistent revolutionary
    class—77-78, 89
  — world-historic role—69, 192
  — goals—14, 69
  — material prerequisites for emancipa-
    tion of—12, 29
  — and party—12, 70
  — class solidarity—12-14, 15-16, 186,
    187, 437, 441
  — class consciousness—12, 71
  — and petty bourgeoisie—30, 69
  — attitude towards wars—426
  — and national question—15, 152,
    154, 156, 157, 193
  See also Agricultural labourers; Class
  struggle; Dictatorship of the proletariat;
  Internationalism, proletarian; Party, pro-
  letarian; Revolution, proletarian, social-
  ist; Worker; Working class (in different
  countries); Working-class movement
Working class in Belgium—289
  See also Working-class movement in
  Belgium
Working class in England—6, 10, 13,
  19-20, 68, 72, 109, 112, 118, 145-47,
  288, 407, 422
  See also Working class in Scotland;
Working-class movement in England

Working class in France—72-74, 77-78, 152
See also June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848; Working-class movement in France

Working class in Germany—35, 58, 67, 71, 74, 154, 193, 360, 415
See also Working class in Prussia; Working-class movement in Germany

Working class in Prussia—66, 73

Working class in Russia—154

Working class in Scotland—6, 111
See also Working-class movement in England

Working class in the USA—20, 105, 146
See also Working-class movement in the USA

Working-class movement—67, 70, 148-49
— its immediate and final aims—14; 148-49, 441
— struggle for working-class emancipation—12-13, 14, 20, 31, 69, 110, 149, 186, 187, 190, 415, 423
— its unity—14-16, 186
— political organisation as condition for its development—12, 15-16
— trade unions—16, 149, 190-92, 422
— emergence of—69, 70, 422
— necessity to combine workers economic and political struggle—14, 146, 148-49, 191-92, 441
— internationalism of—12-16, 186, 437, 441
— struggle for suffrage, and democratic demands; parliamentary activity of workers' representatives—67, 69, 73-74, 75-78, 191, 210, 235-36, 432
— and struggle against national oppression—15, 152, 154, 156, 157, 193
— at the time of First International—14-15, 422, 441

See also Association; Chartist movement; Class struggle; Communist League, the; First International; International solidarity of workers; Strikes; Tactics of proletarian class struggle; Trade(s) unions, trade union movement; Working class; Working-class movement (in different countries)

Working-class movement in Belgium—421, 436, 437
See also Working class in Belgium

Working-class movement in England
— Luddites—305
— in 1830-40s—77-78, 288
— in 1860s—252-53, 373, 422, 431-32, 437
— campaign against intervention in the USA—13, 19, 20
— struggle for workers' political rights—191, 375, 422, 432
— campaign for 10- and 9-hour working day—10-11, 72, 212, 235
— co-operative movement—11, 12
— press—378-83
See also Charist movement; First International in France; June insurrection of Paris proletariat, 1848

Working-class movement in Germany—12, 57, 58, 66, 71, 74, 75-76, 77, 78, 85-86, 210, 215, 360, 395, 421, 438
See also Communist League, the; First International in Germany; General Association of German Workers

Working-class movement in Italy—396, 401
See also First International in Italy

Working-class movement in Switzerland—395, 397, 398
See also First International in Switzerland

Working-class movement in the USA—20, 187, 191, 223, 289, 422, 436, 437
See also First International in the USA

— constituent parts—220, 234-35, 250-51, 286
— introduction of machines and intensification of labour—212, 221, 255, 302, 303
— and surplus-value—211-12, 289-90
— and rate of surplus-value—131, 290, 303
— and labour-power—131, 140-44
— and workers' health—141, 142, 212, 222, 235, 251, 253
— capitalists' striving to excessively lengthen working day—11, 110, 140, 142, 146, 220, 235, 251, 253, 256, 288, 302
— struggle for 10-hour working day in England—10, 11, 72, 109, 212, 222, 230, 235, 288, 307

— campaign for 8-hour working day—187, 223, 288, 422
See also Child's labour; Female labour; Labour (working) time; Surplus labour
World market—9, 109, 252, 271, 274, 275
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GLOSSARY OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Name</th>
<th>Modern Name</th>
<th>Original Name</th>
<th>Modern Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breslau</td>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>Neisse</td>
<td>Nysa Lužicka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Olmütz</td>
<td>Olomouc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantinopel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pardubitz</td>
<td>Pardubice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Düppel</td>
<td>Dybböl</td>
<td>Posen</td>
<td>Poznań</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eipel</td>
<td>Úpice</td>
<td>Ratibor</td>
<td>Racibórz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etsch</td>
<td>Adige</td>
<td>Reichenberg</td>
<td>Liberec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitschin</td>
<td>Jičín</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glatz</td>
<td>Kłodzko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glogau</td>
<td>Głogów</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirschberg</td>
<td>Jelenia Góra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iser</td>
<td>Jisera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivango род</td>
<td>Deblin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katzbach</td>
<td>Kocaba, Kaczawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komorn, Comorn</td>
<td>Komárom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modlin</td>
<td>Novo Georgievsk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldau</td>
<td>Vltava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Münchengrätz</td>
<td>Mnichovo Hradišť</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This glossary includes geographical names occurring in Marx's and Engels' articles in the form customary in the press of the time but differing from the national names or from those given on modern maps. The left column gives geographical names as used in the original: the right column gives the corresponding names used on modern maps and in modern literature.— Ed.