Sir,

In an article entitled "‘The International’ Society" you say:

"Beside their strict economies, the infatuated workers provide the members of the Council with every desirable comfort for leading a pleasant life in London."³

I would point out to you that, with the exception of the General Secretary, who receives a salary of 10 shillings per week, all the members of the Council carry out their duties gratuitously, and have always done so.

I demand that you insert these lines in your next issue.

If your paper continues to spread such lies, legal action will be taken against it.

Yours faithfully,

K. Marx

London, August 17, 1871

First published in Der Volkstaat, No. 68, August 23, 1871

Printed according to the rough manuscript, verified with the newspaper

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

---

³ "La Société ‘l’Internationale’", L’International, No. 3031, August 17, 1871.—Ed.
Karl Marx

[TO THE EDITOR OF PUBLIC OPINION]²⁴⁴

PRIVATE LETTER

Sir,

I not only request you to insert the enclosed reply in your next number,ᵃ but I demand an ample and complete apology in the same place of your paper where you have inserted the libel.ᵇ

I should regret being forced to take legal proceedings against your paper.

Yours obediently,

K. M.

Written on August 19, 1871

Reproduced from the rough manuscript


---

ᵃ See this volume, p. 393.—Ed.
ᵇ “A German View of the Internationale”, Public Opinion, No. 517, August 19, 1871.—Ed.
Sir,—

In your publication of to-day you translate from the Berlin *National-Zeitung*, a notorious organ of Bismarck’s, a most atrocius libel against the International Working Men’s Association,\(^a\) in which the following passage occurs:

"‘Capital,' says Karl Marx, ‘trades in the strength and life of the workman;' but this new Messiah himself is not a step farther advanced; he takes from the mechanic the money paid him by the capitalist for his labour, and generously gives him in exchange a bill on a State that may possibly exist a thousand years hence. What edifying stories are told about the vile corruption of Socialist agitators, what a shameful abuse they make of the money confided to them, and what mutual accusations they throw in each other’s faces, are things we have abundantly learned by the Congresses and from the organs of the party. There is here a monstrous volcano of filth, from whose eruptions nothing better could issue than a Parisian Commune."\(^b\)

In reply to the venal writers of the *National-Zeitung*, I consider it quite sufficient to declare that I have never asked or received one single farthing from the working class of this or any other country.

Save the general Secretary, who receives a weekly salary of ten shillings, all the members of the General Council of the “International” do their work *gratuitously*. The financial accounts

---


\(^b\) "*A German View of the Internationale*, Public Opinion, No. 517, August 19, 1871.—*Ed.*
of the General Council, annually laid before the General Congresses of the Association, have always been sanctioned unanimously without provoking any discussion whatever.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Karl Marx

Haverstock Hill, Aug. 19, 1871

Published in the Public Opinion, No. 518, August 26, 1871

Reproduced from the newspaper, verified with the rough manuscript
Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GAULOIS

Brighton, August 24, 1871

Sir,

Since you have published extracts from the report of a conversation I had with one of the correspondents of The New York Herald, I hope that you will also publish the following statement, which I have sent to The New York Herald. I am sending you this statement in its original form, that is, in English.

Yours faithfully,

Karl Marx

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK HERALD

London, 17 August 1871

Sir,

In the Herald of August 3rd, I find a report of a conversation I had with one of your correspondents. I beg to say that I must decline all and every responsibility for the statements attributed to me in that report, whether such statements refer to individuals connected with the late events in France, or to any political or economical opinions. Of what I am reported to have said, one part I said differently, and another I never said at all.

Yours obediently,

Karl Marx

First published in Le Gaulois, No. 1145, August 27, 1871
Printed according to the newspaper

---
a G. C., "La Commune jugée par Karl Marx", Le Gaulois, No. 1140, August 22, 1871.—Ed.
b This letter was published in English in Le Gaulois. The covering letter, written in French, is published in English in this volume.—Ed.
c "The International", The New York Herald, No. 12765, August 3, 1871.—Ed.
Brighton, August 25, 1871

My dear Sir:

In the first instance I must beg you to excuse my prolonged silence. I should have answered your letter long ago if I had not been quite overburdened with work, so much so that my health broke down, and my doctor found it necessary to banish me for a few months to this sea-bathing place, with the strict injunction to do nothing.

I shall comply with your wish after my return to London when a favorable occasion occurs for rushing into print.

I have sent a declaration to The New York Herald, in which I decline all and every responsibility for the trash and positive falsehoods with which its correspondent burdens me. I do not know whether the Herald has printed it.

The number of the Communal refugees arriving in London is on the increase, while our means of supporting them is daily on the decrease, so that many find themselves in a very deplorable state. We shall make an appeal for assistance to the Americans.

To give you an inkling of the state of things that under the République Thiers prevails in France, I will tell you what has happened to my own daughters.

My second daughter, Laura, is married to Monsieur Lafargue, a medical man. They left Paris a few days before the commencement of the first siege for Bordeaux, where Lafargue’s father lived. The latter, having fallen very ill, wanted to see his son, who

---

a See this volume, p. 395.—Ed.
c François Lafargue.—Ed.
attended him, indeed was at his sick bed until the time of his death. Lafargue and my daughter then continued to stay at Bordeaux, where the former possesses a house. During the time of the Commune, Lafargue acted as Secretary to the Bordeaux branches of the International, and was also sent as a delegate to Paris, where he stayed six days to make himself acquainted with the state of things there. During all the time he was not molested by the Bordeaux police. Toward the middle of May my two unmarried daughters set out for Bordeaux, and thence together with the family Lafargue to Bagnères de Luchon, in the Pyrenees, near the Spanish frontier.... There the eldest daughter, who had suffered from a severe attack of pleurisy, took the mineral waters and underwent regular medical treatment. Lafargue and his wife had to attend to a dying baby, and my youngest daughter amused herself as much in the charming environs of Luchon as the family afflictions permitted. Luchon is a place of resort for patients and for the beau monde, and above all places the least fitted for political intrigue. My daughter Madame Lafargue had, moreover, the misfortune to lose her child, and shortly after its burial—in the second week of August—who should appear at the dwelling place? The illustrious Kératry, well known by the infamies he committed during the Mexican war, and the equivocal part he played during the Franco-Prussian war, first as Prefect of Police at Paris, and later as a soi-disant General in Brittany, and now Prefect of the Haute-Garonne, and M. Delpech, Procureur General of Toulouse—both these worthies being accompanied by gendarmes.

Lafargue had received a hint the evening before, and had crossed the Spanish frontier, having provided himself with a Spanish passport at Bordeaux.

Although the son of French parents, he was born in Cuba, and is therefore a Spaniard. A domiciliary visit was made at the dwelling place of my daughters, and they themselves were subjected to a severe cross examination by the two mighty representatives of the République Thiers. They were charged with carrying on an insurrectional correspondence. That correspondence consisted simply in letters to their mother, the contents of which were of course not flattering to the French Government, and in copies of some London newspapers! For about a week their house was watched by gendarmes. They had to promise to leave

---

a High society.—*Ed.*

b So-called.—*Ed.*
France, where their presence was too dangerous, as soon as they could make the preparations necessary for their departure, and in the mean time they were to consider themselves as people placed under the *haute surveillance* of the police. Kératry and Delphech had flattered themselves with the hope of finding them unprovided with passports, but fortunately they were possessed of regular English passports. Otherwise they would have had to share the infamous treatment of the sister of Delescluze and other French ladies as innocent as themselves. They have not yet returned, and are probably waiting for news from Lafargue.

Meanwhile the Paris papers told the most incredible lies; the *Gaulois*, for instance, transforming my three daughters into three brothers of mine, well known and dangerous agents of the International Propaganda, though I have no brothers. At the same time that *La France*, a Paris organ of Thiers, gave a most varnished tale of the events at Luchon, and asserted that Monsieur Lafargue might quietly return to France without incurring any danger, the French Government requested the Spanish Government to arrest Lafargue as a *member* of the *Paris Commune*! to which he had never belonged, and to which, as a resident of Bordeaux, he could not belong. Lafargue was in fact arrested, and under the escort of gendarmes marched to Barbastro, where he had to take his night quarters in the town prison, thence to Huesca, whence the Governor, on telegraphic order from the Spanish Minister of the Interior, had to forward him to Madrid. According to *The Daily News* of the 24th August, he has at last been set free.

The whole proceedings at Luchon and in the papers were nothing but shabby attempts of Mr. Thiers & Co. to revenge themselves upon me as the author of the address of the General Council of the International on the Civil War. Between their revenge and my daughters stood the English passport, and Mr. Thiers is as cowardly in his relations to foreign powers as he is unscrupulous in regard to his disarmed countrymen.

---

*a* Strict surveillance.—Ed.

*b* E. Cardon, “Les nouvelles qui nous arrivent...”, *Le Gaulois*, No. 1133, August 14, 1871.—Ed.

c “Luchon, 8 aout 1871”, *La France*, No. 213, August 12, 1871.—Ed.

d Práxedes Mateo Sagasta.—Ed.

e “The International Society”, *The Daily News*, No. 7900, August 24, 1871.—Ed.

f The extant fragment of the manuscript has “and in Spain” instead of “and in the papers”.—Ed.

g See this volume, pp. 307-59.—Ed.
As to Cluseret, I do not think that he was a traitor, but certainly he undertook to play a part for which he lacked the mettle, and thus he did great harm to the Commune. I know nothing as to his whereabouts. And now addio!

Your old friend,

*Karl Marx*

Published in *The Sun*, September 9, 1871 | Reproduced from the newspaper
Sir,

The passage of the Address of the General Council of the International Working Men’s Association, *On the Civil War in France*, which gave the signal to shouts of moral indignation on the part of the London press, was this: “The real murderer of the Archbishop is Thiers.”

From the enclosed letter, addressed to M. Bigot, the counsel for M. Assi at the Versailles Court-martial, by M. Eugène Fondeville, who is ready to confirm his statements by affidavit, you will see that the Archbishop himself actually shared my view of the case. At the time of the publication of the “Address”, I was not yet informed of the interview of M. Fondeville with M. Darboy, but even then the correspondence of the Archbishop with M. Thiers revealed his strange misgivings as to the good faith of the Chief of the French Executive. Another fact has now been placed beyond doubt—viz., that at the time of the execution of the hostages the Communal government had already ceased to exist, and ought, therefore, no longer be held responsible for that event.

I am, etc.,

*Karl Marx*[^b]

London, August 29

[^a]: See this volume, p. 352.—*Ed.*

[^b]: Marx’s letter is written in English. Fondeville’s letter reproduced by Marx was published in the newspaper in French.—*Ed.*
Sir,

I am taking the liberty of writing to you to inform you of the existence of certain documents relating to the events of the Commune and to ask you if you would kindly take advantage of the privileges of your profession and your capacity as defence counsel for one of the accused to have them produced in court.

Around 15 April a Paris newspaper reproduced a letter written to The Times in which a certain person stated that he had visited the hostages at Mazas and accused the Commune of behaving barbarously towards them. Strongly desirous of ascertaining the truth of such assertions, I went to the prison where I became convinced of the contrary. That day I talked with Messieurs Darboy, Bonjean and Deguerry, and M. Petit, secretary to the Archbishop, who could give you some information on this subject, since he is alive. Subsequently I made frequent visits to them and a few days before the collapse of the Commune Messieurs Darboy and Bonjean entrusted me with some manuscripts the gist of which I give you below.

Here is a brief résumé of the Darboy document. It is entitled "My Arrest, my Detention, and my Reflections at Mazas". From this it emerges that apart from his arrest, for which he blames the Commune, he places the full responsibility for his detention on the government of Versailles; he accuses it, above all, of sacrificing the hostages to reserve itself a sort of right to take reprisals in the future. In so doing he refers partly to his written requests and partly to the approaches made by his friends to M. Thiers, approaches and talks which led to nothing but refusals, notably that of M. Lagarde. He affirms that it was a question of exchanging the hostages not only for Blanqui, but also for the body of General Duval. He declares in addition that he was well treated and he praises at length the conduct of citizen Garau, the governor of Mazas. He already foresees his death and this is what he writes on the subject: "It is known that Versailles does not want either an exchange or a reconciliation; on the other hand, if the Commune had the power to arrest us, it does not have the power to have us set at liberty, because to set us at liberty without an exchange at this time would start a revolution in Paris that would overthrow the Commune."

As for M. Bonjean, he gave me a long treatise on agricultural economy which he had composed in prison, two letters for his family, and a kind of journal of his detention. Although this document is not as valuable from the point of view of the defence as that of M. Darboy, it proves that the hostages were treated humanely at Mazas.

Since it is pointless to insist on the importance of such documents, I shall now explain to you under what circumstances I was deprived of them.

Obliged to leave the Ministry of Public Works on the morning of Monday, 22 May, I had to take refuge in the only establishment that was open, in the Rue du Temple; it was there that I deposited my briefcase and my papers. On Thursday the 25th the Versailles captured this quarter, and I wanted to put these documents in a safe place before going home. The owner of the hotel, whom I thought I could trust, gave me a wall safe in a room on the second floor, the key to which I took with me. Apart from the items mentioned above, I also deposited five letters from MacMahon which had been handed to me at the Prefecture of Police, many official documents, including a certificate saying that I was a delegate at Neuilly during the armistice of 25 April, two currency bills, a letter from London addressed to M. Thiers, and some photographs of various members of the Commune.

On 27 May I sent two men to the Rue du Temple who were to bring me, together with my briefcase, the papers deposited in the safe. In answer to their
request the owner of the hotel replied that since many of his neighbours had said several times that a member of the Commune had taken refuge at his place, he had thought it prudent to force open the safe and burn the papers.

The briefcase was brought to me. It too had been forced open, and my private papers, such as the certificates and others, had been taken. Now despite the fact that the owner of the hotel confirmed to me personally that the documents had been destroyed, I am persuaded of the contrary, and the news that I have had from Paris assures me that the person to whom I confided them is still in possession of them, or handed them to the police a short time ago.

I am sending you information to institute a search for the above-mentioned documents, and the customary salutations. The letter has been sent to Bigot on 19 August 1871.

E. Fondeville,
Householder in St. Macaire

Written on August 29, 1871
First published in The Examiner,
No. 3318, September 2, 1871
Printed according to the newspaper, verified with the manuscript
Mr. Editor,

Having read in today's *Daily News* that M. Renaut is attributing to the *International* a manifesto inviting the French peasants to burn all the châteaux they can, etc., Mr. John Hales, the General Secretary of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, immediately sent this telegram to M. L. Bigot, Assi's defence counsel:

"Incendiary proclamation attributed to the International is a fabrication. We are ready to make a sworn affidavit before an English magistrate."

I now hasten to warn the French public through your respected newspaper that *all the manifestos printed in Paris in the name of the International since the entry of the French government troops into Paris—that all these manifestos without a single exception are fabrications.*

I make this declaration to you not only on my word of honour, but I am ready to give you an affidavit sworn before an English magistrate.

I have reason to believe that these vile creations do not even emanate directly from the police, but from Monsieur B..., an

---

* a "Trial of the Communist Prisoners", *The Daily News*, No. 7905, August 30, 1871.—*Ed.*

* b Marx gives the English word "the affidavit" in the parentheses after the French one.—*Ed.*

* c Most likely, Ch. Bradlaugh.—*Ed.*
individual attached to one of these Parisian newspapers which *The Standard* (Tory newspaper) in one of its latest issues describes as organs of the demi-monde.

Yours faithfully,

*Karl Marx*

First published in *Le Soir*, No. 862, September 3, 1871, and in other bourgeois newspapers and also in the newspapers *L'Internationale*, No. 139, September 10, 1871, *Der Volksstaat*, No. 74, September 13, 1871, and others

Printed according to the manuscript, verified with the text in *Le Soir*

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

---

Sir,

In your number of the 2nd September, your Berlin correspondent publishes "the translation of an interesting article on the International, which has appeared in the Cologne Gazette," a which article charges me with living at the expense of the working classes. Up to the 30th August, the date of your correspondent's letter, no such article appeared in the Cologne Gazette, from which paper, therefore, your correspondent could not translate it. On the contrary, the article in question appeared, more than a fortnight ago, in the Berlin National Zeitung b; and an English translation of it, literally identical with the one given by your correspondent, figured in the London weekly paper, Public Opinion c, as far back as the 19th August. The next number of Public Opinion contained my reply to these slanders d, and I hereby summon you to insert that reply, of which I enclose a copy, in the next number of your paper. The Prussian government have reasons of their own why they push, by every means in their power, the spreading of such infamous calumnies through the English press. These articles are but the harbingers of impending government prosecutions against the "International".—

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Karl Marx

Haverstock-hill, Sept. 4, 1871

Published in The Evening Standard, Reproduced from the newspaper September 6, 1871

---
a "The International", The Evening Standard, No. 14692, September 2, 1871.—Ed.
b "Die Internationale", National-Zeitung, No. 351, July 30, 1871, Morning edition.—Ed.
c "A German View of the Internationale", Public Opinion, No. 517, August 19, 1871.—Ed.
d See this volume, p. 393.—Ed.
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

[PROPOSITIONS TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL
CONCERNING
PREPARATIONS FOR THE LONDON CONFERENCE]²⁵²

Financial account.
1) To find a room for the meetings of the Conference.
2) To find an hotel where the members of the Conference can stay—propose the same as last, Leicester Square.
3) A Committee to be appointed to arrange these two points.
4) That the entire Council assist at the meetings of the Conference, with the right of taking part in the debate, but that a certain number of the Council only be delegated with the right of voting—such number to be fixed by the Council when the number of delegates to the Conference shall be known.
5) That the Frenchmen now resident in London who are acknowledged members of the International, provide for the representation of France at the Conference by three delegates.
6) That if the members of any Country should not be represented at the Conference, the Corresponding Secretary for that Country be appointed to represent them.

Written not later than September 5, 1871
Adopted at the General Council meeting of September 5, 1871
First published, in Russian, in the book
The London Conference of the First International, 1936

Reproduced from Engels' manuscript
1) That after the close of the Conference, no branch be acknowledged as belonging to the Association by the General Council and by the Central Councils of the various countries until its annual contribution of 1d per head for the current year shall have been remitted to the General Council.

2) α) For those countries in which the regular organization of the Association may for the moment become impossible by Government interference, the delegates of each Country are invited to propose such plans of organization as may be compatible with the peculiar circumstances of the Case. β) The Association may be re-formed under other names, γ) but all secret organizations are formally excluded.

3) The General Council will submit to the Conference a report of its administration of the affairs of the International since the last Congress.

5) The General Council will propose to the Conference to discuss the propriety of issuing a reply, to the various governments which have prosecuted and are now prosecuting the International; the Conference to name a Committee to be charged with drawing up this reply after its close.

4) Resolution of Congress of Basle to be inforced:

That to avoid confusion the Central Councils of the various countries be instructed to designate themselves henceforth as

---

* The following text is crossed out in the manuscript: "No exception to this rule shall be allowed until it be proved to the satisfaction of the General Council that the branch in question has been prevented by existing legal obstacles from complying with the rule." — Ed.
Federal Councils with the name attached of the country they represent; and that the local branches or their Committees designate themselves as branches or Committees of their respective localities.²⁵⁴

6)²⁶¹

7) That all delegates of the General Council appointed to distinct missions shall have the right to attend, and be heard at, all meetings of federal councils and local committees or branches, without however being thereby entitled to vote thereat.

8) That the General Council be instructed to issue a fresh edition of the Statutes including the resolutions of the Congresses having relation thereto; and inasmuch as a mutilated French translation has hitherto been in circulation in France, and re-translated into Spanish and Italian, that it provide an authentic French translation which is to be forwarded to Spain and Italy also. German—Holland.²

3 languages printed side by side.

Written between September 5 and 12, 1871
Reproduced from the manuscript

First published, in Russian, in the book
The London Conference of the First International, 1936

Unрезали текст шестого пункта в рукописи: "Что в всех странах, где ассоциация регулярно организована, федеральные советы отправляют регулярные отчеты о суммах, взимаемых и полученных в форме местных или уездных взносов." — Ed.

²⁶¹ Пункт шестой в рукописи изъят скрещиванием. "Что в всех странах, где ассоциация организована регулярно, федеральные советы отправляют регулярные отчеты о суммах, взимаемых и полученных в форме местных или уездных взносов." — Ed.

²⁶² Конец предложения непонятен. Это выглядит так: "... Испания и Италия, также Германия." — Ed.
THE LONDON CONFERENCE
OF THE
INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION

September 17-23, 1871
Marx: The dispute has its origin in the formation of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy in Geneva, founded by Bakunin and others. He reads the two communications from the General Council to the Alliance of 1868 and March 1869, in the second of which the dissolution of the Alliance and the communication on the number of its sections and their numerical strength are laid down as conditions for their admission into the International. These conditions were never met, the Alliance was never really dissolved; it has always maintained a sort of organisation. The organ of the Geneva sections, L’Égalité, 11 December 1869, blamed the General Council for failing to do its duty by not replying to its articles, whereupon the General Council replied that it was not its duty to join in newspaper polemics, but that it was prepared to answer requests or complaints made by the Romance Federal Council, and this circular was communicated to all the sections; every one of them approved the conduct of the General Council. The Swiss Council disowned L’Égalité, with whose editorial board it had broken off; the editorial board was changed, and subsequently the organ of the Alliance adherents

---

b P. Robin, "Réflexions", L’Égalité, No. 47, December 11, 1869.—Ed.
c The reference is to a set of articles published in Le Progrès in November 1869.—Ed.
was the *Progrès* and later the *Solidarité*. Then came the Congress of Locle where the two parties, the Romance Federation of Geneva and that of the mountains (the Alliance), were openly divided.\(^{257}\)

The General Council left things as they were, only forbidding the new council to set itself up as a Romance council alongside the other. Guillaume, who had preached abstention from all politics, contrary to our Statutes,\(^{\text{a}}\) the moment the war broke out published a proclamation demanding in the name of the International the formation of an army to come to the aid of France,\(^{\text{b}}\) which is even more contrary to our Statutes.

Recorded by F. Engels

First published, in Russian, in the book *The London Conference of the First International*, 1936

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

---


\(^{\text{b}}\) J. Guillaume, “Mani?este aux Sections de l'Internationale”, *La Solidarité*, No. 22, September 5, 1870.—*Ed.*
1) In order to avoid any misunderstanding the resolution of the Basle Congress¹ shall be strictly observed, whereby the central councils in the various countries where the Association has regular organisations shall call themselves Federal Councils or Committees of their respective countries, and the local sections or committees shall call themselves sections or committees of their respective areas.

2) Conference instructs the General Council to publish a new edition of the Rules, with authentic translations into French and German printed opposite the English text.² All translations into other languages must be approved by the General Council prior to publication.

3) At the suggestion of the General Council, Conference recommends the formation of women's sections among female workers. It is understood that this in no way affects the existence of mixed sections including both sexes.

4) Conference invites the General Council to enforce Clause 5 of the Rules³ ordering general statistical surveys of the working class, and the resolutions of the Geneva Congress to the same effect.⁴ Working men's societies or branches which refuse to

---

provide the information requested shall be reported to the General Council, which shall give a ruling on them.

5) All the delegates appointed by the General Council to special missions shall be entitled to be present and to be heard at all meetings of the federal councils, district or local committees, and local branches, without, however, having a vote.

6) After the closure of Conference no branch shall be considered by the General Council and the Federal Councils to belong to the Association until it has paid to the General Council its contribution of 10c. per member for the current year.

Recorded on September 19 or 20, 1871
First published in MEGA₂, Bd. I/22, Berlin, 1978
Printed according to the manuscript
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time
1) Lorenzo matter of principle—this decided.

2) Abstention impossible. Newspaper politics is also politics; all abstaining papers attack the government. The only question is how and how far to get involved in politics. This depends on circumstances and cannot be prescribed.

   2) Abstention nonsensical; one should abstain because bad people might be elected—so no contributions because the treasurer might abscond. So, no newspaper because the editor is just as likely to sell himself as the deputy.

3) Political freedoms—particularly of association, assembly and press—our means of agitation; is it unimportant whether these are taken from us or not? And should we not resist if they are attacked?

4) Abstention preached, because otherwise one is recognising the status quo. The status quo exists and se fiche pas mal about our recognition. If we use the means offered us by the status quo to protest against the status quo, is that recognition?

3) Abstention impossible. The Workers' Party as a political party exists and wants to act politically, and to preach abstention to it is to ruin the International. The mere contemplation of conditions, of political suppression for social ends forces the workers into

---

a It could care no less.—Ed.
b Clauses 2,3,4, marked by Engels with a brace in the manuscript, were written as an insertion into the text on the right side.—Ed.
c Then follows the phrase "after the Commune" crossed out by Engels.—Ed.
politics; the preachers of abstention are driving them into the arms of bourgeois politicians. After the Commune, which put the political action of the workers on the agenda, abstention impossible.

4) We want the abolition of classes. Sole means is political power in the hands of the proletariat—and we should not go into politics? All abstentionists call themselves revolutionaries. Revolution is the highest act of politics, and anyone who wants it must also want the means of preparing revolution, educate the workers for it, and see to it that he is not cheated again by Favre and Pyat the following day. It is purely a question of which politics— the exclusively proletarian, not as the tail of the bourgeoisie.

Written on September 20 or 21, 1871
First published, in French, in the magazine Cahiers du Bolchévisme. Revue bimensuelle publiée par le C.C. du Parti communiste français (S.F.I.C.), No. 20, 1934
Printed according to the manuscript
Published in English for the first time
Absolute abstention from politics is impossible; all the abstentionist newspapers go in for politics, too. It only depends how one does it and what sort of politics. Moreover, for us abstention is impossible. The workers' party already exists as a political party in most countries. It is not up to us to ruin it by preaching abstention. The experience of real life and the political oppression imposed on them by existing governments—whether for political or social ends—force the workers to concern themselves with politics, whether they wish to or not. To preach abstention would be to push them into the arms of bourgeois politics. Especially in the aftermath of the Paris Commune, which placed the political action of the proletariat on the agenda, abstention is quite impossible.

We seek the abolition of Classes. What is the means of achieving it? The political domination of the proletariat. And when everyone is agreed on that, we are asked not to get involved in politics! All abstentionists call themselves revolutionaries, even revolutionaries par excellence. But revolution is the supreme act of politics; whoever wants it must also want the means, political action, which prepares for it, which gives the workers the education for revolution and without which the workers will always be duped by the Favres and the Pyats the day after the struggle. But the politics which are needed are working class politics; the workers' party must be constituted not as the tail of some bourgeois party, but as an independent party with its own objective, its own politics.

The political freedoms, the right of assembly and association and the freedom of the press, these are our weapons—should we
fold our arms and abstain if they seek to take them away from us? It is said that every political act implies recognition of the status quo. But when this status quo gives us the means of protesting against it, then to make use of these means is not to recognise the status quo.

First published in full, in Russian, in the magazine *The Communist International*, No. 29, 1934

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the French
Karl Marx

RESOLUTION OF THE LONDON CONFERENCE RELATING TO THE SPLIT IN ROMANCE SWITZERLAND

With regard to this split:

1. First and foremost, the Conference must consider the demurrers put forward by the Federal Committee of the Societies of the Mountains, which do not belong to the Romance Federation (see the letter of 4 September submitted to the Conference by the Federal Committee of that section):

   First demurrer:

   "The General Congress," they say, "convened in accordance with the Rules, can alone be competent to judge such a serious matter as the split in the Romance Federation."

Considering:

That when conflicts arise between the societies or branches of a national group, or between groups of different nationalities, the General Council shall have the right to decide on the split, pending appeal to the next Congress, which will take the final decision (see clause VII of the resolutions of the Congress of Basel);

That according to resolution VI of the Congress of Basel, the General Council also has the right to suspend a section of the International until the next Congress;

That these rights of the General Council have been recognised, albeit only in theory, by the Federal Committee of the dissident branches of the Mountains, since Citizen Robin has repeatedly appealed to the General Council in the name of this Committee to come to a final decision on this question (see the minutes of the General Council);

---

That the rights of Conference, while not equal to those of a General Congress, at any rate exceed those of the General Council;

That it is in fact the Federal Committee of the dissident branches of the Mountains, not the Federal Committee of the Romance Federation, which through Citizen Robin has requested that a conference be convened to reach a final decision on this split (see the minutes of the General Council of 25 July 1871).

For these reasons:
The Conference declares the first demurrer invalid.

Second demurrer:

"It would be," they say, "a breach of elementary justice to pass sentence on a federation which has not been given the opportunity to defend itself... Today (4 September 1871) we learn indirectly that an extraordinary Conference is to be held in London on 17 September. [...] It was the duty of the General Council to inform all the regional groups of it; we do not know why it has maintained silence with regard to us."

Considering:

That the General Council had instructed all its secretaries to give notice of the convening of a conference to the sections of the respective countries which they represent;

That Citizen Jung, the corresponding secretary for Switzerland, did not inform the Committee of the Jura branches for the following reasons:

In flagrant breach of the decision of the General Council of 29 June 1870, this Committee, as it still does in its last letter addressed to the Conference, continues to call itself the Committee of the Romance Federation.

This Committee had the right to appeal against the decision of the General Council at a future Congress, but it did not have the right to ignore the decision of the General Council.

Consequently it had no legal existence as far as the General Council was concerned, and Citizen Jung did not have the right to recognise it by inviting it direct to send delegates to the Conference;

Citizen Jung has not received from the Committee any answers to questions put to it in the name of the General Council; since the admission of Citizen Robin to the General Council the requests of the above-mentioned Committee have always been conveyed to the General Council through Citizen Robin, and never by the corresponding secretary for Switzerland.

---

a November 8, 1870.—Ed.
Considering further:
That on behalf of the above-mentioned Committee Citizen Robin had requested that the conflict be referred first to the General Council and then, on the refusal of the General Council, to a Conference; that the General Council and its corresponding secretary for Switzerland therefore had every reason to suppose that Citizen Robin would inform his correspondents of the convening of a conference, which they themselves had requested;

That the commission of inquiry set up by the Conference to study the Swiss split has heard Citizen Robin as a witness; that all the documents submitted to the General Council by the two parties have been passed on to the commission of inquiry; that it is impossible to concede that the above-mentioned Committee had only been informed of the convening of a conference on 4 September, seeing that in August it had already approached Citizen M...a with an offer to send him to the Conference as a delegate;

For these reasons:
The Conference declares the second demurrer invalid.

Third demurrer:

"A decision," they say, "annulling the rights of our Federation would have the most disastrous consequences for the existence of the International in our country."

Considering:
That no one has asked for the rights of the above-mentioned Federation to be annulled,

The Conference declares the third demurrer invalid.

2) The Conference confirms the decision of the General Council of 29 June 1870.

At the same time, in view of the persecutions which the International is at present undergoing, the Conference appeals to the feelings of fraternity and union which more than ever ought to animate the working class;

It invites all the brave working men of the Mountain sections to rejoin the sections of the Romance Federation. In case such an amalgamation should prove impracticable it decides that the federated Mountain sections shall henceforth name themselves the "Jurassian Federation".

The Conference gives warning that henceforth the General Council will be bound to publicly denounce and disavow all would-be organs of the International which, following the precedents of the

---

a Malon.— Ed.
Progrès and the Solidarité, should discuss in their columns, before the middle-class public, questions exclusively reserved for the local or Federal Committees and the General Council, or for the private and administrative sittings of the Federal or General Congresses.

London, September 26, 1871

Moved on September 21, 1871

First published in L'Égalité, No. 20, October 21, 1871

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the French
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF DELEGATES OF
THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

ASSEMBLED AT LONDON FROM 17TH TO 23RD SEPTEMBER 1871
(CIRCULAR ISSUED BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL
OF THE ASSOCIATION)

I.

COMPOSITION OF GENERAL COUNCIL

The Conference invites the General Council to limit the number
of those members whom it adds to itself, and to take care that
such adjunctions be not made too exclusively from citizens
belonging to the same nationality.

II.

DESIGNATIONS OF NATIONAL COUNCILS, ETC.

1.—In conformity with a Resolution of the Congress of Basel
(1869), the Central Councils of the various countries where the
International is regularly organised, shall designate themselves
henceforth as Federal Councils or Federal Committees with the
names of their respective countries attached, the designation of
General Council being reserved for the Central Council of the
International Working Men's Association.

2.—All local branches, sections, groups and their committees are
henceforth to designate and constitute themselves simply and
exclusively as branches, sections, groups and committees of the
International Working Men's Association with the names of their
respective localities attached.

3.—Consequently, no branches, sections, or groups will hence-
forth be allowed to designate themselves by sectarian names such
as Positivists, Mutualists, Collectivists, Communists, etc., or to form
separatist bodies under the name of sections of propaganda etc.,

a The French and German editions have respectively: "National or regional
Councils, local branches, sections, groups and their respective Committees" and
"National Councils, local branches, sections, groups and their Committees".—Ed.
pretending to accomplish special missions, distinct from the common purposes of the Association.

4.—Resolutions 1 and 2 do not, however, apply to affiliated Trades' Unions.

III.

DELEGATES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

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

IV.

CONTRIBUTION OF 1D. PER MEMBER TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL

1.—The General Council shall cause to be printed adhesive stamps representing the value of one penny each, which will be annually supplied, in the numbers to be asked for, to the Federal Councils or Committees.

2.—The Federal Councils or Committees shall provide the local Committees, or, in their absence, their respective sections, with the number of stamps corresponding to the number of their members.

3.—These stamps are to be affixed to a special sheet of the livret or to the Rules which every member is held to possess.

4.—On the 1st of March of each year, the Federal Councils or Committees of the different countries shall forward to the General Council the amount of the stamps disposed of, and return the unsold stamps remaining on hand.

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

V.

FORMATION OF WORKING WOMEN'S BRANCHES

The Conference recommends the formation of female branches among the working class. It is, however, understood that this resolution does not at all interfere with the existence or formation of branches composed of both sexes.

— The German edition has "(Groschen)" after "1d.", and the French one has "10 [centimes]" instead of "1d." here and below.— Ed.
VI.

GENERAL STATISTICS OF THE WORKING CLASS

1.—The Conference invites the General Council to enforce art. 5 of the original Rules relating to a general statistics of the working class, and the resolutions of the Geneva Congress, 1866, on the same subject.

2.—Every local branch is bound to appoint a special committee of statistics, so as to be always ready, within the limits of its means, to answer any questions which may be addressed to it by the Federal Council or Committee of its country, or by the General Council. It is recommended to all branches to remunerate the secretaries of the committees of statistics, considering the general benefit the working class will derive from their labour.

3.—On the first of August of each year the Federal Councils or Committees will transmit the materials collected in their respective countries to the General Council which, in its turn, will have to elaborate them into a general report, to be laid before the Congresses or Conferences annually held in the month of September.

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

VII.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF TRADES' UNIONS

The General Council is invited to assist, as has been done hitherto, the growing tendency of the Trades' Unions of the different countries to enter into relations with the Unions of the same trade in all other countries. The efficiency of its action as the international agent of communication between the national Trades' societies will essentially depend upon the assistance given by these same societies to the General Labour Statistics pursued by the International.

The boards of Trades' Unions of all countries are invited to keep the General Council informed of the directions of their respective offices.

---

VIII.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS

1.—The Conference invites the General Council and the Federal Councils or Committees to prepare, for the next Congress, reports on the means of securing the adhesion of the agricultural producers to the movement of the industrial proletariat.

2.—Meanwhile, the Federal Councils or Committees are invited to send agitators to the rural districts, there to organise public meetings, to propagate the principles of the International and to found rural branches.

IX.

POLITICAL ACTION OF THE WORKING CLASS

Considering the following passage of the preamble to the Rules:

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

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

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

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

---

c Procès-verbaux du Congrès de l’Association Internationale des Travailleurs réuni à Lausanne du 2 au 8 septembre 1867, Chaux-de-Fonds, 1867.—Ed.
accomplishment of our ultimate end—the economical emancipation of the working class;”

That false translations of the original Statutes have given rise to various interpretations which were mischievous to the development and action of the International Working Men's Association;

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

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

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

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

The Conference recalls to the members of the International:

That in the militant state of the working class, its economical movement and its political action are indissolubly united.

X.

GENERAL RESOLUTION AS TO THE COUNTRIES WHERE THE REGULAR ORGANISATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL IS INTERFERED WITH BY THE GOVERNMENTS

In those countries where the regular organisation of the International may for the moment have become impracticable in consequence of government interference, the Association, and its

---

a K. Marx, “Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections” (present edition, Vol. 21, p. 127).—Ed.

b See K. Marx, Provisional Rules of the Association (present edition, Vol. 20).—Ed.

c The German and French editions have “false” instead of “various”.—Ed.

d The German edition has “based on it” instead of “resulting from it”.—Ed.

e The German and French editions have “its exploiters” instead of “landlords and capitalists”.—Ed.
local groups, may be reformed under various other names, but all secret societies properly so called are and remain formally excluded.

XI.
RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO FRANCE

1.—The Conference expresses its firm conviction that all persecutions will only double the energy of the adherents of the International, and that the branches will continue to organize themselves, if not by great centres, at least by workshops and federations of workshops corresponding with each other by their delegates.

2.—Consequently, the Conference invites all branches vigorously to persist in the propaganda of our principles in France and to import into their country as many copies as possible of the publications and Statutes of the International.

XII.
RESOLUTION RELATING TO ENGLAND

The Conference invites the General Council to call upon the English branches in London to form a Federal Committee for London which, after its recognition by the provincial branches and affiliated societies, shall be recognised, by the General Council, as the Federal Council for England.

XIII.
SPECIAL VOTES OF THE CONFERENCE

1.—The Conference approves of the adjunction of the members of the Paris Commune whom the General Council has added to its number.

2.—The Conference declares that German working men have done their duty during the Franco-German war.

3.—The Conference fraternally thanks the members of the Spanish Federation for the memorandum presented by them on the organisation of the International by which they have once more proved their devotion to our common work.

---

a The German and French editions have "trade unions" instead of "societies".—Ed.
4.—The General Council shall immediately publish a declaration to the effect that the International Working Men’s Association is utterly foreign to the so-called conspiracy of Netschayeff who has fraudulently usurped its name.

XIV.

INSTRUCTION TO CITIZEN OUTINE

Citizen Outine is invited to publish in the journal *L'Égalité* a succinct report, from the Russian papers, of the Netschayeff trial. Before publication, his report will be submitted to the General Council.

XV.

CONVOCATION OF NEXT CONGRESS

The Conference leaves it to the discretion of the General Council to fix, according to events, the day and place of meeting of the next Congress or Conference.

XVI.

ALLIANCE DE LA DÉMOCRATIE SOCIALISTE.
(THE ALLIANCE OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY)

Considering that the “Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste” has declared itself dissolved (see letter to the General Council d.d. Geneva, 10th August 1871 signed by citizen N. Joukowsky, secretary to the “Alliance”),

That in its sitting of the 18th September (see No. II of this circular) the Conference has decided that all existing organisations of the *International* shall, in conformity with the letter and the spirit of the general rules, henceforth designate and constitute themselves simply and exclusively as branches, sections, federations, etc., of the International Working Men’s Association with the names of their respective localities attached;

That the existing branches and societies shall therefore no longer be allowed to designate themselves by sectarian names such as Positivists, Mutualists, Collectivists, Communists, etc., or to form separatist bodies under the names of sections of propaganda, Alliance

---

*a* The German and French editions have “usurped and exploited”.—*Ed.*

*b* The German and French editions have “or Conference instead of it”.—*Ed.*
de la Démocratie socialiste, etc., pretending to accomplish special missions distinct from the common purposes of the Association;

That henceforth the General Council of the International Working Men’s Association will in this sense have to interpret and apply article 5 of the administrative resolutions of the Basel Congress: “The General Council has the right either to accept or to refuse the affiliation of any new section or group,” etc.;

The Conference declares the question of the “Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste” to be settled.

XVII.

SPLIT IN THE FRENCH-SPEAKING PART OF SWITZERLAND

1.—The different exceptions taken by the Federal Committee of the Mountain sections as to the competency of the Conference are declared inadmissible. (This is but a resumé of article 1 which will be printed in full in the Egalité of Geneva.)

2.—The Conference confirms the decision of the General Council of June 29th, 1870.

At the same time, in view of the persecutions which the International is at present undergoing, the Conference appeals to the feelings of fraternity and union which more than ever ought to animate the working class;

It invites the brave working men of the Mountain sections to rejoin the sections of the Romance Federation;

In case such an amalgamation should prove impracticable it decides that the dissident Mountain sections shall henceforth name themselves the “Jurassian Federation”.

The Conference gives warning that henceforth the General Council will be bound to publicly denounce and disavow all organs of the International which, following the precedents of the Progrès and the Solidarité, should discuss in their columns, before

\[\text{a} \] The French edition has “from the purpose common to the mass of militant proletariat united within the International Working Men's Association” instead of “from the common purposes of the Association”.—Ed.

\[\text{b} \] Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte-rendu du IVe Congrès International, tenu à Bâle, en septembre 1869, Brussels, 1869.—Ed.

\[\text{c} \] The German and French editions have “pending appeal to the next congress” instead of “etc.”.—Ed.

\[\text{d} \] See this volume, pp. 419-22.—Ed.

\[\text{e} \] The German and French editions have “all would-be organs”.—Ed.
the middle-class public, questions exclusively reserved for the local or Federal Committees and the General Council, or for the private and administrative sittings of the Federal or General Congresses.

**NOTICE**

The resolutions not intended for publicity will be communicated to the Federal Councils or Committees of the various countries by the corresponding secretaries of the General Council.

By order and in the name of the Conference,

The General Council:


Corresponding Secretaries:

A. Serraillier .......... for France.

Karl Marx .......... Germany and Russia.

F. Engels .......... Italy and Spain.

A. Herman .......... Belgium.

J. P. MacDonnell .......... Ireland.

Le Moussu .......... for the French branches of the United States.

Walery Wróblewski .......... for Poland.

Hermann Jung ...... for Switzerland.

T. Mottershead ........ Denmark.

Ch. Rochat .......... Holland.

J. G. Eccarius..... United States.

Leo Frankel .......... Austria and Hungary.

F. Engels, Chairman—Hermann Jung, Treasurer

John Hales, Gen. Secretary

256, High Holborn, W.C.,

October 17, 1871

Drafted, edited and prepared for the press between October 8 and 23, 1871

Published as a pamphlet in English, German and French and in several press organs of the International in November-December 1871

Reproduced from the English pamphlet, verified with the German and French editions
London, N. W., September 23, 1871

Mesdames:
I have the honor to send you, for insertion in your Weekly—if you judge the contribution sufficiently interesting for your readers—a short relation of my daughter Jenny on the persecutions she and her sisters, during their stay at Bagnères de Luchon (Pyrenees),\(^a\) had to undergo at the hands of the French Government. This tragico-comical episode seems to me characteristic of the Republic-Thiers.

The news of my death was concocted at Paris by the *Avenir libéral*,\(^b\) a Bonapartist paper.

Since Sunday last a private Conference of the delegates of the International Workingmen’s Association is sitting at London. The proceedings will terminate to-day.

With my best thanks for the highly interesting papers you had the kindness to send me,

I have the honor, Mesdames, to remain,

Yours most sincerely,

*Karl Marx*

First published in the *Woodhull & Claflin’s Weekly*, No. 23/75, October 21, 1871

Reproduced from the weekly

---

\(^{a}\) See this volume, pp. 622-32.—*Ed.*

FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS
Karl Marx

DRAFTS OF *THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE*\textsuperscript{285}
Written by K. Marx between the middle of April and May 23, 1871

First published in full, in English and Russian, in *Marx-Engels Archives, Vol. III (VIII), 1934*
THE GOVERNMENT OF DEFENCE

Four months after the commencement of the war, when the Government of Defence had thrown a sop to the Paris National Guard by allowing them to show their fighting capabilities at Buzenval, the Government considered the opportune moment come to prepare Paris for capitulation. To the assembly of the maires of Paris for capitulation, Trochu, in presence of supported by Jules Favre and others of his colleagues, revealed at last his “plan”. He said literally:

“The first question, addressed to me by my colleagues on the evening of the 4th September, was this: Paris can it stand, with any chance of success, a siege against the Prussian army? I did not hesitate to answer in the negative. Some of my colleagues here present will warrant the truth of these my words, and the persistence of my opinion. I told them in these very terms that, under the existing state of things, the attempt of Paris to maintain a siege against the Prussian army would be a folly. Without doubt, I added, this might be a heroical folly, but it would be nothing else... The events have not given the lie to my prevision.”

Hence Trochu’s plan, from the very day of the proclamation of the Republic, was the capitulation of Paris and of France. In point of fact he was the commander in chief of the Prussians. In a letter to Gambetta, Jules Favre himself confessed so much that the enemy to be put down, was not the Prussian soldier, but the Paris “demagogue revolutionist”. The high-sounding promises to the people, by the Government of Defence, were therefore as many deliberate lies. Their “plan” they systematically carried out by entrusting the defence of Paris to Bonapartist generals, by

---

a “Paris au jour le jour”, Le Figaro, No. 74, March 19, 1871.—Ed.
disorganizing the National Guard and by organizing famine under the maladministration of Jules Ferry. The attempts of the Paris workmen on the 5th of October, the 31st of October etc. to supplant these traitors by the Commune, were put down as conspiracies with the Prussian.\textsuperscript{286} After the capitulation the mask was thrown off (cast aside). The capitulards\textsuperscript{165} became a government by the grace of Bismarck.\textsuperscript{118} Being his prisoners, they stipulated with him a general armistice the conditions of which disarmed France and rendered all further resistance impossible. Resuscitated at Bordeaux as the Government of the Republic, these very same capitulards through Thiers, their ex-Ambassador, and Jules Favre, their Foreign minister, fervently implored Bismarck, in the name of the majority of the so-called National Assembly, and long before the rise of Paris, to disarm and occupy Paris and put down "its canaille", as Bismarck himself sneeringly told his admirers at Frankfurt on his return from France to Berlin.\textsuperscript{a} This occupation of Paris by the Prussians—such was the last word of the "plan" of the government of defence. The cynical effrontery with which, since their instalment at Versailles, the same men fawn upon and appeal to the armed intervention of Prussia, has dumbfounded even the venal press of Europe. The heroic exploits of the Paris National Guard, since they fight no longer under but against the capitulards, have forced even the most sceptical to brand the word "traitor" on the brazen fronts of the Trochu, Jules Favre et Co. The documents seized by the Commune, have at last furnished the juridical proofs of their high treason.\textsuperscript{b} Amongst these papers there are letters of the Bonapartist sabreurs\textsuperscript{c} to whom the execution of Trochu’s "plan" had been confided, in which these infamous wretches crack jokes at and make fun of their own "defence of Paris". (cf. for instance the letter of Alphonse Simon Guiod, supreme commander of the artillery of the army of defence of Paris and Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour, to Suzanne, General of division of artillery, published by the \textit{Journal officiel} of the Commune.\textsuperscript{d})

It is, therefore, evident, that the men who now form the

\textsuperscript{a} Report from Germany in the column "Révélations", \textit{La Situation}, No. 156, March 21, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} "Le Gouvernement de la Défense nationale", \textit{La Situation}, No. 189, April 29, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} Stout soldiers.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{d} See \textit{Journal officiel} (Paris), No. 115, April 25, 1871. Marx refers to the item "Le Gouvernement de la Défense nationale", \textit{La Situation}, No. 189, April 29, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}
government of Versailles, can only be saved from the fate of convicted traitors by civil war, the death of the Republic and a monarchical restoration under the shelter of Prussian bayonets.

But—and this is most characteristic of the men of the Empire as well as of the men who but on its soil and within its atmosphere could grow into mock-tribunes of the people—the victorious republic would not only brand them as traitors, it would have to surrender them as common felons to the criminal court. Look only at Jules Favre, Ernest Picard, and Jules Ferry, the great men, under Thiers, of the government of defence!

A series of authenticated judiciary documents spreading over about 20 years, and published by M. Millière, a representative to the National Assembly, proves that Jules Favre, living in adulterous concubinage with the wife of a drunkard resident at Algiers, had, by a most complicated concatenation of daring forgeries, contrived to grasp in the name of his bastards, a large succession that made him a rich man and that the connivance only of the Bonapartist tribunals saved him from exposure in a law-suit undertaken by the legitimate claimants. Jules Favre, then, this unctuous mouthpiece of family, religion, property, and order, has long since been forfeited to the Code Pénal. Lifelong penal servitude would be his unavoidable lot under every honest government. Ernest Picard, the present Versailles home minister, appointed by himself on the 4th of September Home minister of the government of defence, after he had tried in vain to be appointed by L. Bonaparte, this Ernest Picard is the brother of one Arthur Picard. When, together with Jules Favre and Co., he had the impudence to propose this worthy brother of his as a candidate in the Seine et Oise for the Corps législatif, the Imperialist government published two documents, a report of the Prefecture of Police (31 July, 1867) stating that this Arthur Picard was excluded from the Bourse as an “escroc”, and another document of the 11 December 1868, according to which Arthur had confessed the theft of 300,000 fcs, committed by him as a director of one of the branches of the Société Générale, rue Palestro, No. 5. Ernest made not only his worthy Arthur the editor in chief of a

---

a See J.-B. É. Millière, “Le Faussaire”, Le Vengeur, No. 6, February 8, 1871.— Ed.
b Jeanne Charmont, who lived separate from her husband, Vernier.— Ed.
c In the final version of The Civil War in France Marx corrected the inaccuracy: Ernest Picard was Minister of Finance in the Government of National Defence (see this volume, p. 314).— Ed.
d Swindler.— Ed.
e See “Le Sieur Picard”, La Situation, No. 168, April 4, 1871.— Ed.
paper of his own, the Électeur libre, founded under the Empire and continued to this day, a paper, in which the republicans are daily denounced as "robbers, bandits, and partageux", but once become the home minister of the "Defence", Ernest employed Arthur as his financial medium between the home office to the Stock Exchange, there to discount the State secrets entrusted to him. The whole "financial" correspondence between Ernest and Arthur has fallen into the hands of the Commune. Like the lachrymose Jules Favre, Ernest Picard, the Joe Miller of the Versailles Government, is a man forfeited to the Code Pénal and the galleys!

To make up this trio, Jules Ferry, a poor briefless barrister before 4 September, not content to organize the famine of Paris, had contrived to job a fortune out of this famine. The day on which he would have to give an account of his peculations during the Paris siege would be his day of judgment!

No wonder then that these men who can only hope to escape the hulks in a monarchy, protected by Prussian bayonets, who but in the turmoil of civil war can win their ticket of leave, that these desperadoes were at once chosen by Thiers and accepted by the Rurals as the safest tools of the Counterrevolution!

No wonder that when in the beginning of April captured National Guards were exposed at Versailles to the ferocious outrages of Piétri's "lambs" and the Versailles mob, M. Ernest Picard, "with his hands in his trousers pockets, walked from group to group cracking jokes" while "on the balcony of the Prefecture Madame Thiers, Madame Jules Favre and a bevy of similar Dames, looking in excellent health and spirits", exulted in that disgusting scene. No wonder then, that while one part of France winces under the heels of the conquerors, while Paris, the heart and head of France, daily sheds streams of its best blood in self-defence against the home traitors, ... the Thiers, Favres et Co. indulge in revelries at the Palace of Louis XIV, such f.i. as the grand fête given by Thiers in honour of Jules Favre on his return from Rouen (whither he had been sent to conspire with (fawn upon) the Prussians). It is the cynical orgy of evaded felons!

---

a Supporters of the division of property.—Ed.
b See this volume, p. 314.—Ed.
c "The Advance of the Insurgents on Versailles", The Daily News, No. 7781, April 7, 1871.—Ed.
If the Government of Defence first made Thiers their Foreign Ambassador, going a begging at all Courts of Europe there to barter a king for France for their intervention against Prussia, if, later on, they sent him on a travelling tour throughout the French provinces, there to conspire with the châteaux\(^a\) and secretly prepare the General elections which together with the Capitulation would take France by surprise—Thiers, on his side, made them his ministers and high functionaries. They were safe men.

There is one thing rather mysterious in the proceedings of Thiers, his recklessness in precipitating the revolution of Paris. Not content to goad Paris by the Antirepublican demonstrations of his rurals, by the threats to \textit{decapitate} and \textit{decapitalize} Paris,\(^b\) (by Dufaure's (Thiers' minister of justice) law of the 10th of March on the \textit{échéances}\(^c\) of bills which impended bankruptcy on the Paris commerce\(^{180}\)), by appointing Orleanist ambassadors, by the transfer of the Assemblée to Versailles, by an imposition of a new tax on newspapers, by the confiscation of the Republican Paris journals, by the revival of the State of Siege, first proclaimed by Palikao and annulled with the downfall of the Imperialist government on the 4th of September, by appointing Vinoy, the \textit{Décembriseur}\(^1\) and Exsenator governor of Paris, Valentin, the Imperialist Gendarme Prefect of Police, and Aurelle de Paladines, the jesuit General Commander in chief of the Paris National Guard—he opened the civil war with feeble forces, by Vinoy's attack on the Buttes Montmartre, by the attempt first to rob the National Guards of Cannons which belonged to them and which were only left to them by the Paris convention, because they were their property, and thus to disarm Paris.

Whence this feverish eagerness \textit{d'en finir}\(^d\)? To disarm and put down Paris was of course the first condition of a monarchical counterrevolution, but an astute intriguer like Thiers could only risk the future of the difficult enterprise in undertaking it without due preparation, with ridiculously insufficient means, except under the sway of some overwhelmingly urgent move. The motive was this. By the agency of Pouyer-Quertier, his finance minister, Thiers had concluded a loan of two milliards to be paid immediately down and some more milliards to follow at certain terms. In this loan transaction a truly royal \textit{pot-de-vin} (drink-

\(^a\) Manors (i.e. big landlords).—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) See "The scanty news from the capital of Revolution...", \textit{The Daily News}, No. 7774, March 30, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^c\) The days of payment.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^d\) To put an end to it.—\textit{Ed.}
money) was reserved for those grand citizens Thiers, Jules Favre, Ernest Picard, Jules Simon, Pouyer-Quertier etc. But there was one hitch in the transaction. Before definitively sealing the treaty, the contractors wanted one guarantee—the *tranquillization of Paris.*\(^{182}\) Hence the reckless proceedings of Thiers. Hence the savage hatred against the Paris workmen perverse enough to interfere with this fine job.

As to the Jules Favres, Picards etc, we have said enough to prove them the worthy accomplices of such a jobbery. As to Thiers himself, it is notorious that during his two ministries under Louis Philippe he realized 2 millions, and that during his premiership (dating March 1840) he was taunted from the tribune of the Chambre of Deputies with his Bourse peculations, in answer to which he shed tears, a commodity he disposes of as freely as Jules Favre and the celebrated comedian Frédéric Lemaître. It is no less notorious that the first measure taken by M. Thiers to save France from the financial ruin, fastened upon her by the war, was—to endow himself with a yearly salary of 3 Millions of francs, exactly the sum L. Bonaparte got in 1850 as an equivalent from M. Thiers and his troop in the *Legislative Assembly* for allowing them to abolish the general suffrage.\(^{287}\) This endowment of M. Thiers with 3 millions was the first word of "the economic republic" the vista of which he had opened to his Paris electors in 1869. As to Pouyer-Quertier, he is a cottonspinner at Rouen. In 1869, he was the leader of the millowners’ conclave that proclaimed a general reduction of wages necessary for the "conquest" of the English market—an intrigue, then baffled by the *International.*\(^{288}\) Pouyer-Quertier, otherwise a fervent and even servile partisan of the Empire, found only one fault with it, its commercial treaty with England\(^{216}\) damaging to his own shop interests. His first step as M. Thiers’ finance minister was to denounce that "hateful" treaty and to pronounce the necessity of reestablishing the old protective duties for his own shop. His second step was the *patriotic* attempt to strike Alsace by the reestablished old protective duties on the pretext that in this case no international treaty stood in the way of their re-introduction. By this masterstroke his own shop at Rouen would have got rid of the dangerous competition of the rival shops at Mulhausen.\(^{a}\) His last step was to make a present to his son-in-law, M. Roche Lambert, of the receiveur-generalship of the Loiret, one of the rich booties falling into the lap of the governing bourgeois, and which Pouyer-Quertier had

---

\(^a\) Mulhouse.—*Ed.*
found so much fault with his Imperialist predecessor M. Magne, endowing his own son with that big jobbing place. This Pouyer-Quertier was then exactly the man for the perpetration of the above-said job.

30 March, Rappel. Jules Ferry, ex-mayor of Paris, issued a circular on March 28, ordering the town dues officials to stop forthwith all collections for the city of Paris.\(^a\)

Small state-rogueries,—a little character ... cankering conscience ... everlasting suggester of Parliamentary intrigue ... petty expedients and devices ... rehearsing his homilies of liberalism, of the “libertés nécessaires”\(^{174}\) ... eagerly bent on ... strong reasons to weigh against the chances of failure ... cogent arguments which counterpoise ... kind of heroism in exaggerated baseness ... lucky parliamentary stratagems...

M. E. Picard is a swindler, who throughout the siege speculated on the Bourse over the defeats of our armies.

massacre, treason, arson, assassination, calumny, lies.\(^b\)

In his speech to the assembly of maires etc. (25th April) Thiers says himself that the

“assassins of Clément Thomas and Lecomte” are a handful of criminals\(^c\) “like those who may justly be regarded as having been accomplices in these crimes through abetting and assistance, that is, a very small number of individuals”.\(^d\)

Dufaure

Dufaure wants to put down Paris by press prosecutions in the provinces. Monstrous to bring journals before a jury because preaching “Conciliation”.

Dufaure plays a great part in the Thiers intrigue. By his law of the 10th of March, he roused all the indebted commerce of

\(^a\) Marx wrote this paragraph in French except for the words “for the city of Paris”.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) Marx wrote this and the preceding paragraph in French.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^c\) The following text in the paragraph is in French.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^d\) “Méditation des municipalités de la Seine”, \textit{Le Rappel}, No. 684, April 28, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}
Paris. By his law on Paris house-rents, he menaced all Paris. Both laws were to punish Paris for having saved the honour of France and delayed the surrender to Bismarck for 6 months. Dufaure is an Orleanist, and a "Liberal", in the parliamentary sense of the word. Consequently, he has always been the minister of repression and of the State of Siege.

He accepted his first portefeuille on the 13 May, 1839, after the defeat of the dernière prise d'armes of the Republican party, was therefore the minister of the pitiless repression of the July government of that day.

Cavaignac, forced on the 29th October (1848) to raise the state of siege, called into his ministry two ministers of Louis Philippe (Dufaure, for the Interior, and Vivien). He appointed them on the demand of the rue Poitiers (Thiers), which demanded guarantees. He thus hoped to secure the support of the dynasties for the impending election of president. Dufaure employed the most illegal means to secure Cavaignac's candidature. Intimidation and electoral corruption had never been exercised on a larger scale. Dufaure inundated France with defamatory prints against the other candidates, and especially of Louis Bon., what did not prevent him to become later on Louis Bonaparte's minister. Dufaure became again the minister of the state of siege of 13 June 1849 (against the demonstration of the National Guard against the bombardment of Rome etc by the French army). He is now again the minister of the state of siege, proclaimed at Versailles (for department of Seine et Oise). Power given to Thiers to declare any department whatever in a state of siege. Dufaure, as in 1839, as in 1849, wants new repressive laws, new press laws, a law to "abridge the formalities of the Courts Martial". In a circular to the Procureurs-Généraux he denounces the cry of "conciliation" as a press crime to be severely prosecuted. It is characteristic of the French magistrature that only one single Procureur Général (that of Mayenne) wrote to Dufaure to

"resign... I cannot serve an Administration which orders me, in a moment of civil war, to rush into party struggles and prosecute citizens whom my conscience holds innocent, for uttering the word conciliation."
He belonged to the "Union libérale" in 1847 which conspired against Guizot, as he belonged to the "Union libérale" of 1869 which conspired against Louis Bonaparte. 291

With respect to the law of 10 March and the law of houserents, it ought to be remarked that both Dufaure's and Picard's, both advocates, best clients are amongst the houseproprietors and the big bourses averse to losing anything by the siege of Paris.

Now as after the Revolution of February 1848, these men tell the Republic, as the executioner told Don Carlos, "Je vais t'assassiner, mais c'est pour ton bien". (I shall murder thee, but for thy own good.)

Lecomte and Clément Thomas

After Vinoy's attempt to carry the Buttes Montmartre (on the 18th March, they were shot in the gardens of the Château Rouge, 4 o'clock, 18th) General Lecomte and Clément Thomas were taken prisoners and shot by the same excited soldiers of the 81st of the line. It was a summary act of Lynch justice performed despite the instances of some delegates of the Central Committee. Lecomte, an epauletted cut-throat, had four times commanded his troop, on the place Pigalle, to charge an unarmed gathering of women and children. Instead of shooting the people, the soldiers shot him. Clément Thomas, an ex-quartermaster, a "general" extemporized at the eve of the June massacres (1848) 133 by the men of the National, whose gérant a he had been, had never dipped his sword in the blood of any other enemy but that of the Paris working class. He was one of the sinister plotters who deliberately provoked the June insurrection and one of its most atrocious executioners. When on the 31 October 1870, the Paris Proletarian National Guards surprised the "Government of Defence" at the Hôtel de Ville and took them prisoners, these men, who had [been] appointed by themselves, these gens de paroles, b as one of them, Picard, called them recently, gave their word of honour that they would make place to the Commune. Thus allowed to escape

a Responsible editor.—Ed.
b Men of their word.—Ed.
scot free, they launched Trochu's Bretons\(^ {185} \) on their too-confident captors. One of them, however, M. Tamisier, resigned his dignity as commander in chief of the National Guard. He refused to *break* his word of honour. Then the hour had again struck for Clément Thomas. He was appointed in Tamisier’s place commander in chief of the National Guard. He was the true man for Trochu’s “plan”. He never made war upon the Prussians; he made war upon the National Guard, whom he disorganized, disunited, calumniated, weeding out all its officers hostile to Trochu’s “plan”, setting one set of National Guards against the other, and whom he sacrificed in “sorties” so planned as to cover them with ridicule. Haunted by the spectres of his June victims, this man, without any official charge, must needs again reappear on [the] theatre of war of the 18th of March, where he scented another massacre of the Paris people. He fell a victim of Lynch justice in the first moment of popular exasperation. The men who had surrendered Paris to the tender mercies of the *Décembriseur* Vinoy, in order to kill the Republic and pocket the pots-de-Vin stipulated by the Poyuer-Quertier contract, shouted now: Assassins, Assassins! Their howl was re-echoed by the press of Europe so eager for the blood of the “Proletarians”. A farce of hysterical “sensibility” was enacted in the rural Assemblée,\(^ {178} \) and, as now as before, the corpses of their friends were most welcome weapons against their enemies. Paris and the Central Committee were made responsible for an accident out of their control. It is known how in the days of June 1848 the “men of order” shook Europe with the cry of indignation against the Insurgents because of the assassination of the Archbishop of Paris.\(^ {a} \) Even at that time they knew perfectly well from the evidence of M. Jacquemet, the vicaire général of the Archbishop, who had accompanied him to the barricades, that the Bishop had been shot by the troops of “Cavaignac”, and not by the insurged,\(^ {b} \) but his dead corpse served their turn. M. Darboy, the present Archbishop of Paris, one of the hostages taken by the *Commune* in self-defence against the savage atrocities of the Versailles government, however seems, as appears from his letter to Thiers,\(^ {c} \) to have strange misgivings \( [\text{that}] \) *Papa Transnonain*\(^ {169} \) be eager to speculate in his dead body, as an object of holy indignation. There passed hardly a day, in which the

\(^{a}\) D. A. Affre.—*Ed.*

\(^{b}\) The reference is to Jacquemet’s statement of June 26, 1848, published in *La Situation*, No. 185, April 25, 1871.—*Ed.*

\(^{c}\) G. Darboy, “Prison de Mazas, le 8 avril 1871”, *Le Rappel*, No. 669, April 13, 1871.—*Ed.*
Versailles journals did not announce his execution, which the continued atrocities, and violation of the rules of war on the side of "order", would have sealed on the part of every government but that of the Commune. The Versailles government had hardly realized a first military success, when Captain Desmarets, who at the head of his gendarmes assassinated the chivalrous Flourens, has been decorated by Thiers. Flourens had saved the lives of the "defence men" on the 31st October. Vinoy, the runaway (runagate), was appointed grand cross of the Legion of Honour, because he had our brave comrade Duval, when taken prisoner, shot inside the redoubts, because as a second instalment, he had shot some dozen captive troops of the line who had joined the Paris people and inaugurated this civil war by the "methods of December". General Galliffet—"the husband of that charming Marchioness whose costumes at the masked balls were one of the wonders of the Empire", as a London penny a liner delicately puts it, "surprised" near Rueil a captain, lieutenant, and private of National Guards, had them at once shot, and immediately published a proclamation to glorify himself in the deed. These are a few of the murders officially narrated and gloried in by the Versailles government. 25 soldiers of the 80th Regiment of the line shot as "rebels" by the 75th.

"Every man wearing the uniform of the regular army who was captured in the ranks of the Communists was straightway shot without the slightest mercy. The government troops were perfectly ferocious."  

"M. Thiers communicated the encouraging particulars of Flourens' death to the Assembly."

Versailles 4 April. Thiers, that misshapen dwarf, reports on his prisoners brought to Versailles (in his proclamation):

"Never had more degraded countenances of a degraded democracy met the afflicted gaze of honest men." (Piétri's men!)

"Vinoy protests against any mercy to insurgent officers or line men."

On the 6th of April decree of the Commune on reprisals (and hostages):

---

a Notice on the proclamation of General de Galliffet, April 3, 1871, The Daily News, No. 7783, April 10, 1871.— Ed.


c "Every man wearing...", The Daily Telegraph, No. 4932, April 5, 1871.— Ed.

d L. A. Thiers' proclamation of April 4, 1871, The Daily News, No. 7779, April 5, 1871.— Ed.

e "Versailles, April 5", The Daily News, No. 7781, April 7, 1871.— Ed.
"Considering that the Versailles government openly treads underfoot the laws of humanity and those of war, and that it has been guilty of horrors such as even the invaders of France have not dishonoured themselves by ... it is decreed etc." (There follow the points.)

April 5. Proclamation of the Commune:

"Every day the banditti of Versailles slaughter or shoot our prisoners, and every hour we learn that another murder has been committed... The people even in its anger, detests bloodshed, as it detests civil war, but it is its duty to protect itself against the savage attempts of its enemies, and whatever it may cost it shall be an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth."b

"The police who are fighting against Paris have 10 fcs a day."

Versailles, 11 April. Most horrible details of the coldblooded shooting of prisoners, not deserters, related with an evident gusto by general officers and other eyewitnesses.

In his letter to Thiers, Darboy protests

"against the atrocious excesses which add to the horror of our fratricidal war".c

In the same strain writes Deguerry (curé de la Madeleine):

"These executions rouse great wrath in Paris and may well lead to terrible reprisals". "Thus, a decision has already been taken to execute two of the numerous hostages they hold for every new execution. Judge for yourself how pressing and absolutely necessary is that which, [I] as a priest, am asking you to do.”

e

In midst of these horrors Thiers writes to the Prefects:

"L'assemblée siège paisiblement." (Elle aussi a le cœur léger.)

---

a Decree of April 5, 1871 on reprisals and hostages, The Daily News, No. 7781, April 7, 1871. The phrase in parentheses is in German in the original. See also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 96, April 6, 1871.—Ed.

b The Commune’s Proclamation of April 5, 1871 is quoted according to “The Civil War in France” in The Daily News, No. 7781, April 7, 1871. See also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 96, April 6, 1871. Marx wrote the next sentence in French.—Ed.

c G. Darboy, “Prison de Mazas, le 8 avril 1871”, Le Rappel, No. 669, April 13, 1871.—Ed.

d Beginning from here Marx quotes in French.—Ed.

e G. Deguerry, “A Messieurs les membres du gouvernement à Versailles”, Le Rappel, No. 669, April 13, 1871.—Ed.

f “The Assembly’s sitting proceeds peacefully.” (It also takes everything light-hearted.) A reference to Ollivier’s statement that he will take the responsibility for the war “with a light heart”, which he made on the eve of the declaration of war on Prussia and which was cited in Th. Astrie, “L’homme rouge”, La Situation, No. 176, April 14, 1871.—Ed.
Thiers and la commission des quinze of his ruralss had the cool impudence to "deny officially" the "pretended summary executions and reprisals attributed to the troops of Versailles".\(^a\)

But Papa Transnonain, in his circular of 16th April on the bombardment of Paris:

"If some cannon-shots have been fired, it is not the deed of the army of Versailles, but of some insurgents wanting to make believe that they are fighting, while they do not dare show themselves."

Thiers has proved that he surpasses his hero, Napoleon I, at least in one thing—lying bulletins. (Of course, Paris bombards itself, in order to be able to calumniate M. Thiers!)

To these atrocious provocations of the Bonapartist blacklegs, the Commune has contented itself to take hostages and to threaten reprisals, but its threats have remained a dead letter! Not even the Gendarmes maskeraded into officers, not even the captive sergents de ville, upon whom explosive bombs have been seized, were placed before a court martial. The Commune has refused to soil its hands with the blood of these bloodhounds!

A few days before the 18th March, Clément Thomas laid before the war minister Le Flô a plan for the disarmament of three quarters of the National Garde.

"The flower of the canaille," he said, "has crowded round Montmartre and is working hand-in-glove with Belleville."\(^b\)

The National Assembly

The assembly elected on February 8 under the pressure of the enemy, to whom the men of the Versailles government had surrendered all the forts and handed over defenceless Paris, this Assembly of Versailles has been called for the sole purpose, which is clearly stated in the Convention itself\(^c\) signed at Versailles on January 28, namely, to decide whether the war could be continued or a peace concluded, and in the latter case to arrange for peace terms and ensure the earliest possible evacuation of French territory.\(^d\)

\(^a\) "La commission des Quinze...", Le Rappel, No. 673. April 17, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) "La Sociale publie une curieuse lettre...", Le Vengeur, No. 21, April 19, 1871. Marx quotes in French in the original and gives the French phrase "three quarters" in the previous sentence.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^c\) On the armistice and the capitulation of Paris.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^d\) Marx wrote this paragraph in French.—\textit{Ed.}
Chanzy. Archbishop of Paris etc.

Liberation of Chanzy took place almost simultaneously with the retreat of Saisset. The Royalist journalists were unanimous in decreeing the death of the General. They desired to fix that amiable proceeding on the Reds. Three times he had been ordered to execution, and now he was really going to be shot.

After the Vendôme affair^: There was consternation at Versailles. An attack on Versailles was expected on 23 March, for the leaders of the Communal agitation had announced that they would march on Versailles, if the Assembly took any hostile action. The assembly did not. On the contrary, it voted as urgent a proposition to hold Communal Elections at Paris etc. By the concessions the Assembly admitted its powerlessness. At the same time Royalist Intrigues at Versailles. Bonapartist Generals and the Duc d'Aumale.294

Favre avowed he had received a letter from Bismarck, announcing that unless order were restored by the 26 March Paris would be occupied by the German troops. Reds saw plainly through his little artifice. The Vendôme affair was provoked by the forger, that infamous jesuit J. Favre, who on (21 March?) mounted the tribune of the Assembly of Versailles to insult the people who had rescued him from insignificance, and to rouse Paris against the departments.

30 March, Proclamation of the Commune:

"Today, the criminals, whom you did not even want to pursue, are abusing your magnanimity to organise a hotbed of monarchist conspiracy at the very gates of the city. They have been inciting to civil war. They have resorted to every means of corruption, they have acted as accomplices with everyone, and have gone to the extent of begging foreigners for aid."

Thiers

On the 25th April, in his reception of the maires, adjuncts, and municipal councillors of the suburban communes of the Seine, Thiers said:

"The republic is there. The chief of the executive power is only a common citizen."d

---

^ See this volume, pp. 511-12, 528-30.—Ed.

b Beginning from here Marx writes in French to the end of the quotation.—Ed.

c Quoted according to "Proclamation de la Commune" [March 29, 1871], Le Rappel, No. 655, March 30, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 1 (89), March 30, 1871.—Ed.

d "Méditation des municipalités de la Seine", Le Rappel, No. 684, April 28, 1871. Marx quotes these two sentences in French.—Ed.
The progress of France from 1830 to 1871, according to M. Thiers, consists in this: In 1830 Louis Philippe was “the best of Republics”. In 1871 the ministerial fossil of Louis Philippe’s reign, little Thiers himself, is the best of Republics.

M. Thiers commenced his regime by an usurpation. By the National Assembly he was appointed chief of the ministry of the Assembly; he appointed himself chief of the executive of France.

The Assembly and the Paris Revolution

The Assembly, summoned at the dictate of the Foreign invader, was, as is clearly laid down in the Versailles convention of the 28th January, but elected for one single purpose: To decide the continuation of war or settle the conditions of peace. In their calling the French people to electoral urns, the Capitulards of Paris themselves plainly defined that specific mission of the Assembly and this accounts to a great part for its very constitution. The continuation of the war having become impossible through the very terms of the armistice humbly accepted by the capitulards, the Assembly had in fact but to register a disgraceful peace and for this specific performance the worst men of France were best.

The Republic was proclaimed on the 4th of September, not by the pettifoggers who installed themselves at the Hôtel de Ville as a government of defence, but by the Paris people. It was acclaimed throughout France without a single dissentient voice. It conquered its own existence by a five months’ war whose cornerstone was the prolonged resistance of Paris. Without this war, carried on by the Republic and in the name of the Republic, the Empire would have been restored by Bismarck after the capitulation of Sedan, the pettifoggers with M. Thiers at their head would have had to capitulate not for Paris, but for personal guarantees against a voyage to Cayenne,¹⁸³ and the rural Assembly would never have been heard of. It met only by the grace of the Republican revolution, initiated at Paris. Being no constituent Assembly, as M. Thiers himself has repeated to nauseousness, it would, if not as a mere chronicler of the passed incidents of the Republican Revolution, not even have had the right to proclaim the destitution of the Bonapartist dynasty. The only legitimate power, therefore, in France is the Revolution itself, centring in Paris. That revolution was not made against Napoleon the little, but against the social and political conditions which
engendered the Second Empire, which received their last finish under its sway, and which, as the war with Prussia glaringly revealed, would leave France a cadaver, if they were not superseded by the regenerating powers of the French working class. The attempts of the Rural Assembly, holding only an Attorney’s Power from the Revolution to sign the disastrous bond handed over by its present “executive” to the Foreign invader, its attempt to treat the Revolution as its own capitulard, is, therefore, a monstrous usurpation. Its war against Paris is nothing but a cowardly Chouannerie under the shelter of Prussian bayonets. It is a base conspiracy to assassinate France, in order to save the privileges, the monopolies and the luxuries of the degenerate, effete, and putrefied classes that have dragged her to the abyss from which she can only be saved by the Herculean hand of a truly social Revolution.

**Thiers’ Finest Army**

Even before he became a “statesman”, M. Thiers had proved his lying powers as a historian. But the vanity, so characteristic of dwarfish men, has this time betrayed him into the sublime of the ridiculous. *His* army of order, the dregs of the Bonapartist soldatesque, freshly reimported, by the grace of Bismarck, from Prussian prisons, the Pontifical Zouaves, the Chouans of Charette, the Vendeans of Cathelineau; the “municipals” of Valentin, the exsergeants de ville of Piétri and the Corsican Gendarmes of Valentin who under L. Bonaparte were only the spies of the army but under M. Thiers form its warlike flower, the whole under the supervision of epauletted *mouchards* and under the command of the runaway Decembrist Marshals who had no honour to lose—this motley, ungainly, hangdog lot, M. Thiers dubs “the finest army France ever possessed”! If he allows the Prussians still to quarter at St. Denis, it is only to frighten them by the sight of the “finest army” of Versailles.

---

*a* Spies.— *Ed.*

*b* Quoted according to Th. Astrie, “L’homme rouge”, *La Situation*, No. 176, April 14, 1871.— *Ed.*
Small state rogueries. Everlasting suggester of Parliamentary intrigues, M. Thiers was never anything else but an “able” journalist and a clever “word fencer”, a master of parliamentary roguery, a virtuoso in perjury, a craftsman in all the small stratagems, base perfidies, and subtle devices of Parliamentary party-warfare. This mischievous gnome charmed the French bourgeoisie during half a century because he is the truest intellectual expression of their own class-corruption. When in the ranks of the opposition he over and over rehearsed his stale homily of the “libertés nécessaires”, to stamp them out when in power. When out of office, he used to threaten Europe with the sword of France. And what were his diplomatic performances in reality? To pocket in 1841 the humiliation of the London treaty, to hurry on the war with Prussia by his declamations against German unity, to compromise France in 1870 by his begging tour at all the Courts of Europe, to sign in 1871 the Paris capitulation, to accept a “peace at any price” and implore from Prussia a concession: leave and means to get up a civil war in his own downtrodden country. To a man of his stamp the underground agencies of modern society remained of course always unknown, but even the palpable changes at its surface he failed to understand. F.i. any deviation from the old French protective system he denounced as a sacrilege and, as a minister of Louis Philippe, went the length of treating disdainfully the construction of railways as a foolish chimera and even under Louis Bonaparte he eagerly opposed every Reform of the rotten French army organization. A man without ideas, without convictions, and without courage.

A professional “Revolutionist” in that sense, that in his eagerness of display, of wielding power and putting his hands into the National Exchequer, he never scrupled, when banished to the banks of the opposition, to stir the popular passions and provoke a catastrophe to displace a rival; he is at the same time a most shallow man of routine, etc. The working class he reviled as “the vile multitude”. One of his former colleagues in the legislative assemblies, a contemporary of his, a capitalist, and however a member of the Paris Commune, M. Beslay thus addresses him in a public address:

“The subjugation (asservissement) of labour to capital, such is the ‘cornerstone’ of your politics (policy), and the day you saw the Republic of Labour installed
at the Hôtel-de-Ville, you have never ceased to cry to France 'They are criminals!'"  

No wonder that M. Thiers has given orders by his home minister Ernest Picard to prevent "the International Association" from communicating with Paris. (Sitting of Assembly. 28 March.)

Circular of Thiers, to prefects and sub-prefects.

"The good workmen, so numerous as compared to the bad ones, ought to know, that if bread flies again from their mouths, they owe it to the adepts of the International, who are the tyrants of labour, of which they pretend themselves the liberators."  

Without the International... (Now for the story of money.) (He and Favre transferred their money to London.) It is a proverb that if rogues fall out truth comes out. We can therefore not better finish the picture of Thiers than by the words of the London Moniteur of the master of his Versailles generals. Says the Situation in its number of the 21 March:

"M. Thiers has never been minister without pushing the soldiers to the massacre of the people, he the parricide, the man of incest, the peculator, the plagiarist, the traitor, the ambitious, the impotent".

Shrewd in cunning devices, and artful dodges.

Banded with the republicans before the Revolution of July, he slipped into his first ministry under Louis Philippe by ousting Laffitte, his old protector. His first deed was to throw his old collaborator Armand Carrel into prison. He insinuated himself with Louis Philippe as a spy upon and the goal-accoucheur of the Duchesse of Berry, but his activity centred in the massacre of the insurgent Paris Republicans in the Rue Transnonain and the September Laws against the press, to be then cast aside as an instrument become blunted. Having intrigued himself again into power in 1840, he planned the Paris fortifications opposed as an

---

a Ch. Beslay, "Au citoyen Thiers...", Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 64, April 28, 1871. Marx gives the word "cornerstone" in French.— Ed.


c L. A. Thiers, [Circulaire à préfets et sous-préfets. Versailles, 28 mars 1871], Le Rappel, No. 655, March 30, 1871. Marx gives the previous sentence in French.— Ed.

d This sentence is incomplete in the manuscript. It is followed by two German sentences in parentheses.— Ed.
attempt on the liberty of Paris by the whole democratic party, except
the Bourgeois Republicans of the National. M. Thiers replied to
their outcry from the Tribune of the Chambre des Députés:

"What? To fancy that any works of fortification could endanger freedom?... This is to be completely out of touch with reality. And first of all, you calumniate any government whatever in assuming that it could one day try to maintain itself by bombarding the capital. Do you really think that after it had pierced with its bombs the dome of Les Invalides or the Pantheon, after it had swept the homes of your families with its fire, it could come before you and ask you to confirm it in office? But it would be a hundred times more impossible after its victory than before."

Indeed, neither the government of Louis Philippe nor that of
the Bonapartist Regency dared to withdraw from Paris and
bombard it. This employment of the fortifications was reserved to
M. Thiers, their original plotter.

When King Bomba of Naples bombarded Palermo in January
1848, M. Thiers again declared in the Chambre of Deputies:

"You know, gentlemen, what is happening in Palermo: you all shake with
horror on hearing that during 48 hours a large town has been bombarded. By
whom? Was it by a foreign enemy exercising the rights of war? No, gentlemen, it
was by its own government. And why? Because that unfortunate town demanded its rights.
Well than, for demanding its rights, it has had 48 hours of bombardment. [...] Allow
me to appeal to the opinion of Europe. It will be a service to mankind to rise and, from
what is perhaps the greatest tribune in Europe, voice a few words of indignation against
such acts. Gentlemen, there was a cry of general indignation in all parts of the world
when, 50 years ago, in order to avoid a long siege the Austrians, exercising the rights
of war, wanted to bombard Lille, when later, exercising the same rights of war, the
English bombarded Copenhagen, and when, just recently, the Regent Espartero, who
had rendered services to his country, wanted to bombard Barcelona in order to suppress an
insurrection."

Little more than a year later, Thiers acted the most fiery
apologist of the bombardment of Rome by the troops of the
French republic, and exalted his friend, General Changarnier,
for sabring down the Paris National Guards protesting against this
breach of the French Constitution.

A few days before the Revolution of February 1848, fretting at
the long exile from place to which Guizot had condemned him,
scenting the growing commotion of the masses, which he hoped
would enable him to oust his rival and impose himself upon Louis
Philippe, Thiers exclaimed in the Chambre of Deputies:

---

a L. A. Thiers' speech at the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies on January 13, 1841, Le Vengeur, No. 14, April 12, 1871. Marx quotes from it in French.— Ed.
b L. A. Thiers' speech at the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies on January 31, 1848, Le Rappel, No. 673, April 17, 1871; Le Vengeur, No. 21, April 19, 1871. Marx
quotes in French.— Ed.
"I am of the party of the Revolution not only in France, but in the whole of Europe. I wish the government of the Revolution to remain in the hands of moderate men... But when that government falls into the hands of ardent minds, even into those of Radicals, I shall, for all that, not desert my cause. I shall always be of the party of the Revolution."

To put down the February Revolution was his exclusive occupation from the day when the Republic was proclaimed to the Coup d’Etat.

The first days after the February explosion he anxiously hid himself, but the Paris workmen despised him too much to hate him. Still, with his notorious cowardice which made Armand Carrel answer to his boast "he would one day die on the banks of the Rhine", “Thou wilst die in a gutter”—he dared not play a part on the public stage before the popular forces were broken down through the massacre of the insurgents of June. He confined himself first to the secret direction of the Conspiracy of the Reunion of the Rue de Poitiers290 which resulted in the Restoration of the Empire, until the stage had become sufficiently clear to reappear publicly on it.

During the siege of Paris, on the question whether Paris was about to capitulate, Jules Favre answered that, to utter the word capitulation, the bombardment of Paris was wanted!b This explains his melodramatic protests against the Prussian bombardment, and why the latter was a mock bombardment, while the Thiers bombardment is a stern reality.

Parliamentary mountebank.

He is for 40 years on the stage. He has never initiated a single useful measure in any department of state or life. Vain, sceptical, epicurean: He has never written or spoken for things. In his eyes the things themselves are only pretexts for the display of his pen or his tongue. Except his thirst for place and pelf and display there is nothing real about him, not even his chauvinism.

In the true vein of vulgar professional journalists he now sneers in his bulletins [at] the bad looks of his Versailles prisoners, now communicates that the rurals are “à leur aise”,c now covers

---

a L. A. Thiers’ speech at the sitting of the Chamber of Deputies on February 2, 1848, Le Moniteur universel, No. 34, February 3, 1848. Marx quotes from it in French.— Ed.

b See “If the contest between M. Thiers and the Commune…”, The Standard, No. 14572, April 15, 1871.— Ed.

c At ease.— Ed.
himself with ridicule by his bulletin on the taking of "Moulin-Saquet" (4 of May), where 300 prisoners were taken.

"The rest of the insurgents has fled in a wild flight, leaving 150 dead and wounded on the field of battle", and snappishly adds: "Such is the victory the Commune can celebrate in its bulletins tomorrow.... Paris will soon be delivered from the terrible tyrants oppressing it." a

Paris—the "Paris" of the mass of the Paris people fighting against him is not "Paris". "Paris—that is the rich, the capitalist, the idle" b (why not the cosmopolitan stew?). This is the Paris of M. Thiers. The real Paris, working, thinking, fighting Paris, the Paris of the people, the Paris of the Commune is a "vile multitude". There is the whole case of M. Thiers, not only for Paris, but for France. The Paris that shews its courage in the "pacific procession" and Saisset's "escapade", that throngs now at Versailles, at Rueil, at St. Denis, at St. Germain-en-Laye, followed by the cocottes sticking to the "men of religion, family, order, and property" (the Paris of the really "dangerous", of the exploiting and lounging classes) ("the francs-fileurs" 208) and amusing itself by looking by the telescope at the battle going on, for whom "the civil war is but an agreeable diversion"—that is the Paris of M. Thiers, as the emigration of Coblenz 210 was the France of M. de Calonne. In his vulgar journalist vein he knows not even to observe sham dignity, but he murders the wives and girls, and children found under the ruins of Neuilly not to swerve from the etiquette of "legitimacy". He must needs illuminate the municipal elections he has ordered in France by the conflagration of Clamart burnt by petroleum bombs. The Roman historians finish off Nero's character by telling us that the monster gloried in being a rhymester and a comedian. But lift a professional mere journalist and parliamentary mountebank like Thiers to power, and he will outnero Nero.

He acts only his part as the blind tool of class interests in allowing the Bonapartist "generals" to revenge themselves on Paris; but he acts his personal part in the little byplay of bulletins, speeches, addresses, in which the vanity, vulgarity, and lowest taste of the journalist creep out.

---

a "Voici, sur le même fait, le bulletin...", Le Rappel, No. 692, May 6, 1871. Marx gives a French quotation.—Ed.
b "The Commune of Paris...", The Times, No. 27028, April 4, 1871.—Ed.
He compares himself with Lincoln and the Parisians with the rebellious slaveholders of the South. The Southerners fought for the slavery of labour and the territorial secession from the United States. Paris fought for the emancipation of labour and the secession from power of Thiers state parasites, of the would-be slaveholders of France!

In his speech to the maires:

"You may rely upon my word, which I have never broken!"
"The Assembly is one of the most liberal ever elected by France."

He will save the Republic

"provided order and labour are not continuously threatened by those who claim to be the special guardians of the Republic's weal".\(^a\)

At the April 27 sitting of the Assembly, he said:

"The Assembly is more liberal than he is."\(^b\)

He whose rhetorical trumpcard was always the denunciation of the Vienna treaties, he signs the Paris treaty,\(^297\) not only the dismemberment of one part of France, not only the occupation of almost \(1/2\) of it, but the milliards of indemnity, without even asking Bismarck to specify and prove his war expenses! He does not even allow the Assembly at Bordeaux to discuss the paragraphs of his capitulation!

He who upbraided throughout his life the Bourbons because they came back in the rear of Foreign armies and because of their undignified behaviour to the allies occupying France after the conclusion of peace,\(^99\) he asks nothing from Bismarck in the treaty but one concession: 40,000 troops to subdue Paris\(^175\) (as Bismarck stated in the Diet). Paris was for all purposes of internal defence and Foreign aggression fully secured by his armed National Guard, but Thiers superadded at once to the capitulation of Paris

\(^{a}\) "Méditation des municipalités de la Seine", Le Rappel, No. 684, April 28, 1871. Marx quotes from it in French; the phrase "He will save the Republic" is in German.—Ed.

\(^{b}\) Marx gives the first part of the sentence in German and quotes from the speech in French.—Ed.
to the Foreigner the character of the capitulation of Paris to himself and Co. This stipulation was a stipulation for civil war. That war itself he opens not only with the passive permission of Prussia, but by the facilities she lends him, by the captive French troops she magnanimously despatches him from German dungeons! In his bulletins, in his and Favre's speeches in the Assembly, he crawls in the dust before Prussia and threatens Paris every eight days with her intervention, after having failed to get it, as stated by Bismarck himself.\(^a\) The Bourbons were dignity itself compared to this mountebank, this grand apostle of Chauvinism!

---

After the downbreak of Prussia (Tilsit peace 1807), its government felt that it could only save itself and the country by a great social regeneration. It naturalized in Prussia—on a small scale, within the limits of a feudal monarchy—the results of the French revolution. It liberated the peasant etc.

298 After the Crimean defeat, which, however Russia might have saved her honour by the defence of Sebastopol and dazzled the Foreigner by her diplomatic triumphs at Paris, laid open at home the rottenness of her social and administrative system, her government emancipated the serf and her whole administrative and judicial system.

299 In both countries the daring social reform was fettered and limited in its character because it was octroyed from the throne and not conquered by the people. Still there were great social changes doing away with the worst privileges of the ruling classes and changing the economical basis of the old society. They felt that the great malady could only be cured by heroic measures. They felt that they could only answer to the victors by social reforms, by calling into life elements of popular regeneration. The French catastrophe of 1870 stands unparalleled in the history of the modern world! It shewed official France, the France of Louis Bonaparte, the France of the ruling classes and their state parasites—a putrescent cadaver. And what is the first attempt of the infamous men, who had got at her government by a surprise of the people and who continue to hold it by a conspiracy with the Foreign invader, what is their first attempt? To assassinate, under Prussian patronage, by L. Bonaparte's soldatesque and Piétri's police, the glorious work of popular regeneration commenced at Paris, to summon all the old legitimist spectres, beaten by the July

\(^a\) See report from Germany under the general heading "Révélations", *La Situation*, No. 156, March 21, 1871.—*Ed.*
Revolution, the fossil swindlers of Louis Philippe, beaten by the revolution of February, and celebrate an orgy of counterrevolution! Such heroism in exaggerated self-debasement is unheard of in the annals of history! But, what is most characteristic, instead of arousing a general shout of indignation on the part of official Europe, and America, it evokes a current of sympathy and of fierce denunciation of Paris! (fossiles, vilains, hommes tarés) This proves that Paris, true to its historical antecedents, seeks the regeneration of the French people in making it the champion of the regeneration of old society, making the social regeneration of mankind the national business of France! It is the emancipation of the producing class from the exploiting classes, their retainers and their state parasites who prove the truth of the French adage, that “les valets du diable sont pire que le diable himself.”

18 March. Government laid

“stamp of 2 centimes on each copy of every periodical, whatever its nature”. “forbidden to found new journals until the raising of the state of siege”.

The different fractions of the French bourgeoisie had successively their reigns, the great landed proprietors under the Restoration (the old Bourbons), the capitalists under the parliamentary monarchy of July (Louis Philippe), while its Bonapartist and republican elements kept rankling in the background. Their party feuds and intrigues were of course carried on on pretexts of public welfare, and a popular revolution having got rid of these monarchies, the other set in. All this changed with the Republic (February). All the fractions of the Bourgeoisie combined together in the Party of Order, that is the party of [landed] Proprietors and Capitalists, bound together to maintain the economic subjugation of labour and the repressive state machinery supporting it. Instead of a monarchy, whose very name signified the prevalence of one bourgeois fraction over the other, a victory on one side and a defeat on the other (the triumph of one side and the humiliation of the other), the Republic was the anonymous joint-stock-company of the combined bourgeois fractions, of all the exploiters of the people clubbed together, and indeed, Legitimists, Bonapartists, Orleanists, Bourgeois Republicans, Jesuits, and Voltaireans, embraced each other. No longer hidden by the shelter of the crown,

a Fossils, villains, ill-famed men.—Ed.
b “The Devil's valets are worse than the Devil himself”.—Ed.
no longer able to interest the people in their party feuds by maskerading them into struggles for popular interest, no longer subordinate the one to the other. Direct and confessed antagonism of their class rule to the emancipation of the producing masses,—order the name for the economical and political conditions of their class rule and the servitude of labour, this anonymous or republican form of the bourgeois regime—this Bourgeois Republic, this Republic of the Party of Order is the most odious of all political regimes. Its direct business, its only raison d'etre is to crush down the people. It is the terrorism of class rule. The thing is done in this way. The people having fought and made the Revolution, proclaimed the Republic, and made room for a National Assembly, the Bourgeois whose known Republican professions are a guarantee for their "Republic", are pushed on the foreground of the stage by the majority of the Assembly, composed of the vanquished and professed enemies of the Republic. The Republicans are entrusted with the task to goad the people into the trap of an insurrection to be crushed by fire and sword. This part was performed by the party of the National with Cavaignac at their head after the Revolution of February (by the June Insurrection). By their crime against the masses, these Republicans lose then their sway. They have done their work and, if yet allowed to support the party of order in its general struggle against the Proletariat, they are at the same time displaced from the government, forced to fall back in the last ranks, and only allowed "on sufferance". The combined royalist bourgeois then become the fathers of the Republic, the true rule of the "Party of Order" sets in. The material forces of the people being broken for the time being, the work of reaction—the breaking down of all the concessions conquered in four revolutions—begins piece by piece. The people is stunned to madness not only by the deeds of the party of order, but by the cynical effrontery with which it is treated as the vanquished, with which in its own name, in the name of the Republic, that low lot rules it supreme. Of course, that spasmodic form of anonymous class despotism cannot last long, can only be a transitory phase. It knows that it is seated on a revolutionary volcano. On the other hand, if the party of order is united in its war against the working class, in its capacity of the party of order, the play of intrigue of its different fractions the one against the other, each for the prevalence of its peculiar interest in the old order of society, each for the Restoration of its own pretender and

* Meaning of existence.—Ed.
personal ambitions, sets in in full force as soon as its rule seems secured (guaranteed) by the destruction of the material revolutionary forces. This combination of a common war against the people and a common conspiracy against the Republic, combined with the internal feuds of its rulers, and their play of intrigues, paralyses society, disgusts and bewilders the masses of the middle class and "troubles" business, keeps them in a chronic state of disquietude. All the conditions of despotism are created (have been engendered) under this regime, but despotism without quietude, despotism with parliamentary anarchy at its head. Then the hour has struck for a Coup d'État, and the incapable lot has to make room for any lucky pretender, making [an] end of the anonymous form of class rule. In this way Louis Bonaparte made an end of the Bourgeois Republic after its 4 years of existence. During all that time Thiers was the "âme damnée" of the party of order, that in the name of the Republic made war upon the Republic, a class war upon the people, and, in reality, created the Empire. He played exactly the same part now as he played then, only then but as a parliamentary intriguer, now as the Chief of the Executive. Should he not be conquered by the Revolution, he will now as then be a baffled tool. Whatever countervailing government will set in, its first act will be to cast aside the man who surrendered France to Prussia and bombarded Paris.

Thiers had many grievances against L. Bonaparte. The latter had used him as a tool and a dupe. He had frightened him by his arrest after the Coup d'État. He had annulled him by putting down the parliamentary regime, the only one under which a mere state-parasite, like Thiers, a mere talker can play a political part. Last not least, Thiers having been the historic shoeblack of Napoleon had so long described his deeds as to fancy he had enacted them himself. The legitimate caricature of Nap. I was in his eyes not Nap. the little, but little Thiers. With all that there was no infamy committed by L. B. which had not been backed by Thiers, from the occupation of Rome by the French troops to the war with Prussia.

Only a man of his shallow head can fancy for one moment, that a Republic with his head on its shoulders, with a National

---

a The tool.— Ed.

b The reference is to Thiers' Histoire de la Révolution française and Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire.— Ed.
Assembly half-Legitimist, half-Orleanist, with an army under Bonapartist leaders, will, if victorious, not push him aside.

There is nothing more grotesquely horrid than a Tom Pouce affecting to play the Timur Tamerlane. With him the deeds of cruelty are not only a matter of business, but a thing of theatrical display, of phantastical vanity. To write his "bulletins", to show his "severity", to have "his" troops, "his" strategy, "his" bombardments, "his" petroleum-bombs, to hide "his" cowardice under the coldbloodedness with which he allows the Decembrist blacklegs to take their revenge on Paris! This kind of heroism in exaggerated baseness! He exults in the important part he plays and the noise he makes in the world! He quite fancies to be a great man! and how gigantic (titanic) he, the dwarf, the parliamentary dribbler, must look in the eyes of the world! In midst the horrid scenes of this war, one cannot help smiling at the ridiculous capers Thiers Vanity cuts! M. Thiers is a man of lively imagination, there runs an artist's vein through his blood, and an artist's vanity able to gull him into a belief of his own lies, and a belief in his own grandeur.

Through all the speeches, bulletins etc. of Thiers, runs a vein of elated vanity.

that affreux* Triboulet.

Splendid Bombardment (with petroleum bombs) from Mont Valérien on one part of the houses in the Ternes within the rampart, with a grandiose conflagration and a fearful thunder of cannon shaking all Paris. Bombs purposely thrown into Ternes and the Champs Elysées quarters.

Explosive bombs, petroleum bombs.

The Commune

The glorious British penny a liner has made the splendid discovery that this is not what we use to understand by

---

*a Atrocious.—Ed.
self-government. Of course, it is not. It is not the self-administration of the towns by turtle-soup gullets, jobbing vestries, and ferocious workhouse guardians. It is not the self-administration of the counties by the holders of broad acres, long purses and empty heads. It is not the judicial abomination of “the Great Unpaid”\(^{301}\). It is not political self-government of the country through the means of an oligarchic club and the reading of *The Times* newspaper. It is the people acting for itself by itself.

Within this war of cannibals the most disgusting, the “literary” shrieks of the hideous gnome seated at the head of the government!

The ferocious treatment of the Versailles prisoners was not interrupted one moment, and their coldblooded assassination was resumed so soon as Versailles had convinced itself that the Commune was too humane to execute its decree of reprisals!

The *Paris Journal* (at Versailles) says that 13 line soldiers made prisoners at the railway station of Clamart were shot offhand, and all prisoners wearing the line uniforms who arrive in Versailles will be executed whenever doubts about their identity are cleared up!

M. Alexander Dumas, fils, tells that a young man exercising the functions, if not bearing the title, of a general, was shot after having marched (in custody) a few hundred yards along a road.

5 May, Mot d’Ordre: According to the *Liberté*, which is published in Versailles, “all regular army soldiers found at Clamart among the insurgents were shot on the spot” (by Lincoln Thiers!) (Lincoln acknowledged the belligerent rights). “These are the men denouncing on the walls of all French communes the Parisians as assassins!” The banditti!\(^{a}\)

*Desmaret.*

A deputation of the Commune went to Bicêtre (April 27) to investigate the case of four National Guards of the 185th field battalion and there saw one survivor (badly wounded) Scheffer.

“The wounded man said that on April 25 he and three of his comrades were overtaken at Belle Epine, near Villejuif, by a detachment of mounted Chasseurs, who told them to surrender. As it was quite impossible to put up any resistance against the forces that surrounded them, they laid down their arms and gave up.

\(^{a}\) The first half of the paragraph, to the parenthesis, is in French in the original.— *Ed.*
The soldiers surrounded them and took them prisoner without resorting to violence or threats against them. They had been prisoners for a few minutes, when a captain of the mounted Chasseurs appeared and threw himself upon them revolver in hand. Without saying a word he fired at one of them and killed him outright; then he also fired at Guardsman Scheffer, who was shot in the chest and fell by his comrade. The other two guardsmen, terrified at this sneaking attack, tried to escape but the wild captain ran after the two prisoners and killed them both with revolver shots. After these savage and outrageous acts the Chasseurs retired with their chief, leaving their victims lying on the ground."

New York Tribune outdoes the London papers.

M. Thiers' "most liberal and most freely elected National assembly that ever existed in France" is quite of a piece with his "finest army that France ever possessed". The municipal elections, carried on under Thiers himself on the 30th of April, show their relations to the French people! Of 700,000 councillors (in round numbers) returned by the 35,000 communes still left in mutilated France, 200 are Legitimists, 600 Orleanists, 7,000 avowed Bonapartists, and all the rest Republicans or Communists. (Versailles Cor. Daily News, 5 May.) Is any other proof wanted that this Assembly with the Orleanist mummy Thiers at its head represent only an usurpatory minority?

Paris

M. Thiers represented again and again the Commune as the instrument of a handful of "convicts" and "ticket of leave men", of the scum of Paris. And this "handful" of desperadoes holds in check since more than 6 weeks the "finest army that France ever possessed" led by the invincible Mac Mahon and inspired by the genius of Thiers himself!

The exploits of the Parisians have not only refuted him. All elements of Paris have spoken.

"You must not confuse the movement of Paris with the seizure of Montmartre, which was only its opportunity and starting point; this movement is general and profound in the conscience of Paris; the greatest number even of those who, for

---

a [Rapport de la Commission d'enquête de la Commune], Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 65, April 29, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 118, April 28, 1871. These two paragraphs are in French in the original.—Ed.

b The following text is crossed out in the manuscript: "This senile chambre introuvable,\textsuperscript{177} chosen on a false pretext, consists almost exclusively of Legitimists\textsuperscript{176} and Orleanists.—Ed.

\textsuperscript{176}
Who says this? The delegates of the Syndical chambres, men who speak in the name of 7-8,000 merchants and industrials. They have gone to tell it at Versailles... The Ligue de la réunion républicaine... the manifestation of the Francs Maçons... etc.

The Province

Les provinciaux espiègles.

If Thiers fancied one moment that the provinces were really antagonistic to the Paris movement, he would do all in his power to give the provinces the greatest possible facilities to become acquainted with that movement and all “its horrors”. He would solicit them to look at it in its naked reality, to convince themselves with their own eyes and ears of what it is. Not he! He and his “defence men” try to keep the provinces down, to prevent their general rising for Paris, by a wall of lies as they kept out the news from the provinces in Paris during the Prussian siege. The Provinces are only allowed to look at Paris through the Versailles camera obscura. (Nothing but the lies and slanders of the Versailles journals reach the departments and reign there unrivalled.)

Pillages and murders of 20,000 ticket of leave men dishonour the capital.

“The League considers it to be its primary duty to shed light on the facts and restore normal relations between the province and Paris.”

As they were, when besieged in Paris, thus they are now in besieging it in their turn.

“As in the past, the lie is their favourite weapon. They suppress and confiscate the journals of the capital, intercept reports, and sift the letters, in such a way that the province is reduced to having the news that it pleases Jules Favre, Picard and Company to let it have, without it being possible to verify its truth.”

---

a “Rapport des délégués des chambres syndicales. Au syndicat de l’Union nationale”, quoted according to A. Vacquerie, “Une poignée de factieux”, Le Rappel, No. 669, April 13, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 102, April 12, 1871. Marx gives a French quotation.— Ed.

b Provincial wags. Quoted from “Ceci est vraiment merveilleux...”, Le Rappel, No. 669, April 13, 1871.— Ed.

c The sentence in parentheses is in French.— Ed.

d “Le comité de l’Union républicaine pour les droits de Paris...”, Le Rappel, No. 673, April 17, 1871. Marx gives a French quotation.— Ed.

e “La circulaire de M. Thiers”, Le Vengeur, No. 21, April 19, 1871. Marx gives a French quotation in the original and uses the English phrase “sift the letters”. — Ed.
Thiers' bulletins, Picard's circulars, Dufaure's... The placards in the Communes. The felon press of Versailles and the Germans. The \textit{petit Moniteur}. The reintroduction of passports for travelling from one place to another. An army of \textit{mouchards} spread in every direction. Arrests (in Rouen etc under Prussian authority) etc. Thousands of commissioners of police scattered in the environs of Paris have been ordered by the prefect of the gendarmerie, Valentin, to confiscate journals of any trend published in the insurgent city, and to burn them publicly, as used to be done in the heyday of the Holy Inquisition.

Thiers' government first appealed to the provinces to form battalions of National Guards and send them to Versailles against Paris.

"The Province," as the \textit{Journal de Limoges} says, "showed its discontent by refusing the battalions of \textit{volontaires} which were asked from it by Thiers and his \textit{ruraux}.

The few Breton idiots, fighting under a white flag, every one of them wearing on his breast a Jesus heart in white cloth and shouting "vive le roi!" are the only "provincial" army gathered round Thiers.

\textit{The elections, Vengeur 6 May.}

\textit{M. Dufaure's presslaw (8 April)\textsuperscript{214}} confessedly directed against the "excesses" of the Provincial press.

Then the numerous \textit{arrestations} in the Province. It is placed under the \textit{laws of suspects}.

\textit{April 23 Havre:} The municipal council has despatched three of its members to Paris and Versailles with instructions to offer mediation, with the view of terminating the civil war on the basis of the maintenance of the Republic, and the granting of municipal franchises to the whole of France... \textit{23 April delegates from Lyon received by Picard and Thiers—"war at any price" is their reply.}

---

\textsuperscript{a} The reference is to the \textit{Moniteur des Communes}.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Spies.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} Marx gives the French sentence in the original.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{d} The manuscript contains the following text written above this sentence: "made an anxious appeal ... before having got a prisoner army from Bismarck."—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{e} Communication from the Limoges paper \textit{La Défense républicaine} in \textit{Le Mot d'Orde}, No. 65, April 29, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{f} "Long live the King!"—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{g} Quoted in French from "Qui, c'en est fait...", \textit{Le Vengeur}, No. 38, May 6, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}
The address of the Lyons delegates\textsuperscript{a} is handed to the Assembly by Greppo on April 24.\textsuperscript{304}

The municipalities of the provincial towns committed the great impudence to send their deputations to Versailles in order to call upon them to grant what demanded by Paris; not one Commune of France has sent an address approving of the acts of Thiers and the ruralists; the provincial papers, like these municipal councils, as Dufaure complains in his circular against Conciliation to the Procureur Général,

"put on the same footing the Assembly elected by universal suffrage, and the self-styled Paris Commune; reproach the former for having failed to recognise the municipal rights of Paris etc"\textsuperscript{b}

and what is worse, these municipal councils, f. i. that of Auch,

"have unanimously demanded that it should at once propose an armistice with Paris;\textsuperscript{c} and that the Assembly chosen on the 8-th of February, dissolves itself because its mandate had expired". (Dufaure, l'assemblée de Versailles, April 26)

It ought to be remembered that these were the old municipal councils,\textsuperscript{305} not those elected on 30th April. Their delegations so numerous, that Thiers decided no longer to receive them personally, but address them to a ministerial subaltern.

Lastly the elections of 30 April the final judgment of the Assembly and the electoral surprise from which it had sprung. If then, the provinces have till now only made a passive resistance against Versailles without rising for Paris, to be explained by the strongholds the old authorities hold here still, the trance in which the Empire merged and the war maintained the Province. It is evident that it is only the Versailles army, government, and Chinese wall of lies, that stand between Paris and the provinces. If that wall falls, they will unite with it.

It is most characteristic, that the same men (Thiers et Co.) who in May 1850 abolished by a parliamentary conspiracy (Bonaparte aided them, to get them into a snare, to have them at his mercy, and to proclaim himself after the coup d'état as the restorator of

\textsuperscript{a} "Adresse des Délégués de Lyon à l'Assemblée nationale et à la Commune de Paris", Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 63, April 27, 1871. Marx gives this sentence and the end of the previous one in French and the words "is their reply" in German.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} J. Dufaure, [Circulaire aux procureurs généraux. Versailles, 23 avril 1871], Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 62, April 26, 1871. Marx gives a French quotation.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{c} Marx gives this part of the quotation in French.— Ed.
the universal suffrage against the party of order and its Assembly) the *universal suffrage*, because under the Republic it might still play them freaks, are now its fanatical adepts, make it their "legitimate" title against Paris, after it had received under Bonaparte such an organization as to be the mere plaything in the hand of the Executive, a mere machine of cheat, surprise, and forgery on the part of the Executive. *Congrès de la Ligue des Villes*³⁰⁶ (*Rappel 6 May!*)

**Trochu, Jules Favre, and Thiers' Provincials**

It may be asked how these superannuated parliamentary mountebanks and intriguers like Thiers, Favre, Dufaure, Garnier-Pagès (only strengthened by a few rascals of the same stamp) continue to reappear, after every revolution, on the surface, and usurp the executive power? these men that always exploit and betray the Revolution, shoot down the people that made it, and sequestrate the few liberal concessions conquered from former governments? (which they opposed themselves?)

The thing is very simple. In the first instance, if very unpopular, like Thiers after the February Revolution, popular magnanimity spares them. After every successful rising of the people the cry of conciliation, raised by the implacable enemies of the people, is reechoed by the people in the first moments of the enthusiasm at its own victory. After this first moment men like Thiers and Dufaure eclipse themselves as long as the people hold material power and work in the dark. They reappear as soon as it is disarmed and are acclaimed by the bourgeoisie as their *chefs de file.*

Or, like Favre, Garnier Pagès, Jules Simon etc (recruited by a few younger ones of similar stamp) and Thiers himself after the 4th of September, were the "respectable" republican opposition under Louis Philippe: afterwards the parliamentary opposition under L. Bonaparte. The reactionary regimes they have themselves initiated when raised to power by the Revolution, secure for them the ranks of the opposition, deporting, killing, exiling the true Revolutionists. The people forget their past, the middle class look upon them as their men, their infamous past is forgotten,

---

³⁰⁶ *File-leaders.— Ed.*
and thus they reappear to recommence their treason and their work of infamy.

Night of 1 to 2 May: the village of Clamart had been in the hands of the military, the railway station in those of the insurgents. (this station dominates the Fort of Issy.) By a surprise (their patrouilles being let in by a soldier on guard, the watchword having been betrayed to them) the 23 Battalion of Chasseurs got in, surprised the garrison most of them sleeping in their bed, made only 60 prisoners, bayoneted 300 of the insurgents. Dazu\(^a\) line soldiers afterwards shot offhand. Thiers in his circular to the Prefects, civil and military authorities of 2 May has the impudence to say:

"It (the Commune) arrests generals (Cluseret!) only to shoot them, and institutes a committee of public safety which is utterly unworthy!"\(^b\)

Troops under General Lacretelle took the redoubt of Moulin Saquet situated betwixt Fort Issy and Montrouge, by a coup de main.\(^c\) The garrison was surprised by treachery on the part of the commandant Gallien, who had sold the password to the Versailles troops. 150 of the Federals bayonet and over 300 of them made prisoners.

M. Thiers, says the Times correspondent, was weak when he ought to have been firm (the coward is always weak as long as he has to apprehend danger for himself) and firm, when everything was to be gained by some concessions.\(^d\) (the rascal is always firm, when the employment of material force bleeds France, gives great airs to himself, but when he, personally, is safe. This is his whole cleverness. Like Anthony, Thiers is an "honest man".\(^e\))

\(\text{Thiers' bulletin on Moulin-Saquet (4 May)}\)\(^f\)

\(^a\) Moreover.— Ed.
\(^b\) L. A. Thiers, [Circulaire à toutes les autorités civiles et militaires. Versailles, 2 mai 1871], Journal officiel (Versailles), No. 123, May 3, 1871.— Ed.
\(^c\) Sudden attack.— Ed.
\(^d\) "The Commune of Paris...", The Times, No. 27055, May 5, 1871.— Ed.
\(^e\) W. Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, Act III, Scene II.— Ed.
\(^f\) Then follows the French text to the end of the section.— Ed.
"Deliverance of Paris from the hideous tyrants who oppress it" ("the Versaillese were disguised as National Guards") ("most of the Federals were asleep and were killed or taken in their sleep").

"Blanqui thrown into jail dying, Flourens cut to pieces by the gendarmes, Duval shot by Vinoy, they had them in their hands on the 31st of October, and did nothing to them."

---

*Voici, sur le même fait, le bulletin...", *Le Rappel*, No. 692, May 6, 1871. The following passage, written by Marx in French, is crossed out in the manuscript: "Picard 'our artillery does not bombard; true, it cannonades'" (Moniteur des communes, journal de Picard).—Ed.
THE COMMUNE

A) MEASURES FOR THE WORKING CLASS

Nightwork of journeymen bakers suppressed. (20 April)\(^a\)

The private jurisdiction, usurped by the Seigneurs of mills etc (manufacturers) (employers, great and small) being at the same time judges, executors, gainers and parties in the disputes, that right of a penal code of their own, enabling them to rob the labourers' wages by fines and deductions, as punishment etc, abolished in public and private workshops; penalties impended upon the employers in case they infringe upon this law; fines and deductions extorted since the 18th of March to be paid back to the workmen; (27 April).\(^b\)

Sale of pawned articles at Pawn Shops suspended; (29 March).\(^c\)

A great lot of workshops and manufactures have been closed in Paris; their owners having run away. This is the old method of the industrial capitalists, who consider themselves entitled “by the spontaneous action of the laws of political economy” not only to make a profit out of labour, as the condition of labour, but to stop it altogether and throw the workmen on the pavement—to produce an artificial crisis whenever a victorious revolution threatens the “order” of their “system”. The Commune, very wisely, has appointed a Communal commission which in cooperation with delegates chosen by the different trades will inquire into the ways of handing over the deserted workshops and manufactures to cooperative workmen societies with some indemnity for

---

\(^a\) [Arrêté sur la suppression du travail de nuit dans les boulangeries. Paris, 20 avril 1871], L'Avant-Garde, No. 451, April 22, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 111, April 21, 1871.—Ed.

\(^b\) [Arrêté sur l'abolition des amendes ou retenues sur les salaires. Paris, 27 avril 1871], Journal officiel (Paris), No. 119, April 29, 1871.—Ed.

\(^c\) Decree of March 29, 1871 suspending the sale of pawned articles, The Daily News, No. 7776, April 1, 1871.—Ed.
the capitalist deserters; (16 April)\(^a\) (this commission has also to make statistics of the abandoned workshops);

Commune has given order to the mairies to make no distinction between the *femmes* called illegitimate, the mothers and widows of national guards, as to the indemnity of 75 centimes\(^b\);

the public prostitutes till now kept for the “men of order” at Paris but for their “safety” kept in penal servitude under the arbitrary rule of the police; the Commune has liberated the prostitutes from this degrading slavery, but swept away the soil upon which, and the men by whom, prostitution flourishes. The higher prostitutes—the cocottes—were, of course, under the rule of order, not the slaves, but the masters of the police and the governors.

There was, of course, no time to reorganize public instruction (education); but by removing the religious and clerical element from it, the Commune has taken the initiative in the mental emancipation of the people. It has appointed a Commission for the organization of education (primary and professional) (28 April). It has ordered that all tools of instruction like books, maps, paper etc be given gratuitously by the schoolmasters who receive them in their turn from the respective mairies to which they belong. No schoolmaster is allowed on any pretext to ask payment from his pupils for these instruments of instruction. (28 April)\(^c\)

**Pawnshops**\(^d\): under all receipts issued by Mont de Piété before April 25, 1871, the pawned clothes, furniture, linen, books, bedding and implements of labour, valued at not more than 20 francs, may be reclaimed free of charge, beginning from May 12. (May 7)\(^e\)

---

2) MEASURES FOR THE WORKING CLASS, BUT MOSTLY FOR THE MIDDLE CLASSES

**Houserent for the last 3 quarters up to April wholly remitted:** Whoever had paid any of these 3 quarters shall have right of

\(^a\) Decree of April 16, 1871 on handing over the workshops and manufacturies to cooperative workmen societies, *The Daily News*, No. 7790, April 18, 1871; see also *Journal officiel* (Paris), No. 107, April 17, 1871.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) See “Un groupe de citoyennes nous écrit...”, *Le Vengeur*, No. 21, April 19, 1871.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) The source from which Marx cites it has not been established. See *Arrêté sur la commission d’organisation de l’enseignement. Paris, 28 avril 1871*, *Journal officiel* (Paris), No. 119, April 29, 1871.—*Ed.*

\(^d\) Then follows the French text except for “not more”, written in German.—*Ed.*

\(^e\) *Décret sur le mont-de-piété. Paris, 6 mai 1871*, *Journal officiel* (Paris), No. 127, May 7, 1871.—*Ed.*
setting that sum against future payments. The same law to prevail in the case of furnished apartments. No notice to quit coming from landlords to be valid for 3 months to come. (29 March)\(^a\)

échéances (Payment of bills of exchange due): (expiration of bills): all prosecutions for bills of exchange fallen due suspended. (12 April)\(^b\)

All commercial papers of that sort to be repaid in repayment spread over two years, to begin next July 15, the debts being not chargeable with interest. The total amount of the sums due divided in 8 equal coupures, payable by trimestre (first trimester to be dated from July 15). Only on these partial payments when fallen due judicial prosecutions permitted. (16 April)\(^c\) The Dufaure laws on leases and bills of exchange entailed the bankruptcy of the majority of the respectable shopkeepers of Paris.\(^d\)

The notaries, huissiers, auctioneers, bum-bailiffs and other judicial officers making till now a fortune of their functions transformed into agents of the Commune receiving from it fixed salaries like other workmen\(^e\);

As the Professors of the Ecole de Médecine have run away, the Commune appointed a Commission for the foundation of free universities, no longer state parasites; given to the students that had passed their examination means to practise independent of Doctor titles; (titles to be conferred by the faculty).

Since the judges of the Civil tribunal of the Seine, like the other magistrates always ready to function under any class government, had run away, Commune appointed an advocate to do the most urgent business until the reorganization of tribunals on the basis of general suffrage; (26 April)

3) GENERAL MEASURES

Conscription abolished. In the present war every able man (National Guard) must serve. This measure excellent to get rid of all traitors and cowards hiding in Paris (29 March).

---

\(^a\) Decree of March 29, 1871 on the remission of rents, The Daily News, No. 7775, March 31, 1871.— Ed.

\(^b\) [Décrit sur la suspension des poursuites pour échéances. Paris, 12 avril 1871], Le Rappel, No. 670, April 14, 1871.— Ed.

\(^c\) Bailiffs.— Ed.

\(^d\) The source from which Marx cites it has not been established. See [Décret sur les traitements publics. Paris, 2 avril 1871], Journal officiel (Paris), No. 92, April 2, 1871.— Ed.

\(^e\) Decree of March 29, 1871 on abolishing conscription, The Daily News, No. 7776, April 1, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 1 (89), March 30, 1871.— Ed.
Games of hazard suppressed. (2 April)\(^a\)

Church separated from State; the religious budget suppressed; all clerical estates declared national properties, (3 April).\(^b\)

The Commune, having made inquiries consequent upon private informations, found that beside the old Guillotine the "government of order" had commanded the construction of a new guillotine (more expeditious and portable), and paid in advance. The Commune ordered both the old and the new guillotine to be burned publicly on the 6th of April.\(^c\) The Versailles journals, reechoed by the press of order all over the world, narrated the Paris people, as a demonstration against the bloodthirstiness of the Communals, had burnt these guillotines! (6 April) All political prisoners were set free at once after the Revolution of the 18th of March.\(^d\) But the Commune knew that under the régime of L. Bonaparte and his worthy successor of the Government of Defence many people were simply incarcerated on no charge whatever as political suspects. Consequently it charged one of its members—Protot—to make inquiries.\(^e\) By him 150 people set free who being arrested since six months, had not yet undergone any judicial examination; many of them, already arrested under Bonaparte, had been for a year in prison without any charge or judicial examination. (9 April) This fact, so characteristic of the Government of Defence, enraged them. They asserted the Commune had liberated all felons. But who liberated convicted felons? The forger Jules Favre. Hardly got into power, he hastened to liberate Pic and Taillefer, condemned for theft and forgery in the affaire of the Etendard.\(^f\) One of these men, Taillefer, daring to return to Paris, has been reinstated into his convenient abode. But this is not all. The Versailles government has delivered in the Maisons Centrales all over France convicted thieves on the condition of entering M. Thiers' army!

Decree on the demolition of the column of the place Vendôme\(^2\) as

---

\(^a\) See "Le jeu de hasard", Le Petit Journal, No. 3014, April 3, 1871.— Ed.

\(^b\) Decree of April 2, 1871 separating the church from the state, The Daily Telegraph, No. 4931, April 4, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 93, April 3, 1871.— Ed.

\(^c\) "La Guillotine", La Situation, No. 176, April 14, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 100, April 10, 1871.— Ed.

\(^d\) "Amnistie pleine et entière...", La Cloche, No. 385, March 21, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 79, March 20, 1871.— Ed.

\(^e\) [Arrêté de la commission de justice. Paris, 31 mars 1871], Le Rappel, No. 666, April 10, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 91, April 1, 1871.— Ed.

\(^f\) Central prisons.— Ed.
"a monument of barbarism, symbol of brute force and false glory, an affirmation of militarism, a negation of international right". (12 April)\textsuperscript{a}

\textit{Election of Frankel} (German member of the International) to the Commune declared valid: “considering that the flag of the Commune is that of the Universal Republic and that foreigners can have a seat in it”; (4 April)\textsuperscript{b} Frankel afterwards chosen a member of the executive of the Commune; (21 April)

The \textit{Journal officiel} has inaugurated the publicity of the sittings of the Commune. (15 April)

Decree of Pascal Grousset for the protection of Foreigners against requisitions. Never a government in Paris so courteous to Foreigners. (27 April)\textsuperscript{c}

The Commune has abolished political and professional oaths. (May 4)\textsuperscript{d}

\textit{ Destruction of the monument} called “Chapelle expiatoire de Louis XVI” rue d’Anjou St. Honoré (erected by the Chambre introuvable\textsuperscript{177} of 1816) (7 May).\textsuperscript{e}

\textbf{4) MEASURES OF PUBLIC SAFETY}

Disarmament of the “loyal” National Guards; (30 March)\textsuperscript{f}

Commune declares incompatibility between seats in its ranks and at Versailles; (29 March)\textsuperscript{g}

\textit{Decree of Reprisals.}\textsuperscript{h} Never executed. Only the fellows arrested, \textit{Archbishop of Paris and Curé of the Madeleine}; whole staff of the

---

\textsuperscript{a} [Décret sur la démolition de la colonne Vendôme. Paris, 12 avril 1871], \textit{Le Rappel}, No. 670, April 14, 1871; see also \textit{Journal officiel} (Paris), No. 103, April 13, 1871.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} “Rapport de la Commission des élections”, \textit{La Situation}, No. 169, April 5, 1871; see also \textit{Journal officiel} (Paris), No. 90, March 31, 1871.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{c} Decree of April 26, 1871 on the protection of foreigners, \textit{The Daily News}, No. 7799, April 28, 1871; see also \textit{Journal officiel} (Paris), No. 117, April 28, 1871.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{d} The source used by Marx has not been established. See [Décret sur l’abolition du serment politique et du serment professionnel. Paris, 4 mai 1871], \textit{Journal officiel} (Paris), No. 125, May 5, 1871.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{e} The source used by Marx has not been established. See [Arrêté sur la destruction de la chapelle dite expiatoire de Louis XVI. Paris, 5 mai 1871], \textit{Journal officiel} (Paris), No. 126, May 6, 1871. This paragraph, except for the first four words, is in French in the original.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{f} “Progress of the revolution in Paris”, \textit{The Daily News}, No. 7775, March 31, 1871.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{g} “The Central Committee still continues...”, \textit{The Daily News}, No. 7776, April 1, 1871.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{h} Decree of April 5, 1871 on reprisals and hostages, \textit{The Daily News}, No. 7781, April 7, 1871; see also \textit{Journal officiel} (Paris), No. 96, April 6, 1871.— Ed.

\textsuperscript{i} G. Darboy and G. Deguerry.— Ed.
college of Jesuits; Incumbents of all the principal churches; Part of these fellows arrested as hostages, part as conspirators with Versailles, part because they tried to save church property from the clutches of the Commune. (6 April)

"The Monarchists wage war like savages; they shoot prisoners, they murder the wounded, they fire on ambulances, troops raise the butt-end of their rifles in the air and then fire traitorously." (Proclamation of Commune)

In regard to these decrees of Reprisals to be remarked:
In the first instance men of all layers of the Paris society—after the exodus of the capitalists, the idlers, and the parasites—have interposed at Versailles to stop the Civil war—except the Paris clergy. The Archbishop and the curé de [la] Madeleine have only written to Thiers because averse to "the effusion of their own blood" in their quality as hostages.

Secondly: After the publication by the Commune of the Decree of reprisals, the taking of hostages etc, the atrocious treatment of the Versailles prisoners by Piétri's lambs and Valentin's Gendarmes did not cease, but the assassination of the captive Paris soldiers and National Guard was stopped to set in with renewed fury so soon as the Versailles Government had convinced itself that the Commune was too humane to execute its decree of the 6th of April. Then the assassination set again in wholesale. The Commune did not execute one hostage, not one prisoner, not even some Gendarme officers who under the disguise of National Guards had entered Paris as spies and were simply arrested.

Surprise of the Redoute of Clamart (2 May). Railway Station in the hands of the Parisians, massacre, bayonetting, the 22nd Battalion of Chasseurs (Galliffet?) shoots line soldiers offhand without any formality. (2 May)

Redoubt of Moulin Saquet, situated between Fort Issy and Montrouge, surprised in the night by treachery on the part of the commandant Gallien who had sold the password to the Versailles troops. Federals surprised in their beds asleep—massacred great part of them. (4 May?)

25 April 4 National guards (this constated by Commissarries

---

a Proclamation of the Commune of April 5, 1871 to the inhabitants of Paris, The Daily Telegraph, No. 4933, April 6, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 95, April 5, 1871.— Ed.

b G. Darboy, "Prison de Mazas, le 8 avril 1871", Le Rappel, No. 669, April 13, 1871; G. Deguerry, "A Messieurs les membres du gouvernement à Versailles", the same issue.— Ed.
sent to Bicêtre where the only survivor of the 4 men, à Belle Epine, près* Villejuif. His name Scheffer.) These men being surrounded by horse Chasseurs, on their order, unable to resist, surrendered, disarmed, nothing done to them by the soldiers. But then arrives the captain of the Chasseurs, and shoots them down one after the other with his revolver. Left them on the soil. Scheffer fearfully wounded survived.

13 soldiers of the line made prisoners at the railway Station of Clamart were shot offhand, and all prisoners wearing the line uniforms who arrive in Versailles will be executed whenever doubts about their identity are cleared up. (Liberté at Versailles.)

Alexander Dumas fils, now at Versailles, tells that a young man exercising the functions, if not bearing the title, of a general, was shot, by order of a Bonapartist general, after having marched in custody a few 100 yards along a road... Parisian troops and National Guards surrounded in houses by Gendarmes, [who] inundate the house with Petroleum and then fire it. Some cadavers of National Guards (calcínés*) have been transported by the ambulance of the press of the Ternes. (Mot d'ordre 20 April) "They have no right to ambulances."

Thiers. Blanqui. Archbishop. General Chanzy. (Thiers said his Bonapartists should have liked to be shot.)

Visitation in Houses, etc. Casimir Bouis, appointed chairman of a commission of inquiry in the doings of the dictators of 4 September. (14 April) Private houses invaded and papers seized, but no furniture has been carried away and sold by auction. (Papers of the fellows of 4 September, of Thiers etc and Bonapartist policemen), f. i. in Hôtel of Lafont, inspecteur-général des prisons. (11 April) The houses (properties) of Thiers et Co. as traitors sealed but only the papers confiscated.

Arrests among themselves: This shocks the bourgeois who wants political idols and "great men" immensely.

"It is provoking" (Daily News, 6 May. Paris Correspondence), "however, and discouraging, that whatever be the authority possessed by the Commune, it is continually changing hands, and we know not to-day with whom the power may...

---

a Near.—Ed.
b [Rapport de la Commission d'enquête de la Commune], Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 65, April 29, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 118, April 28, 1871.—Ed.
c Charred.—Ed.
d "Les gendarmes usent...", Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 56, April 20, 1871.—Ed.
e Marx gives this part of the sentence in French.—Ed.
f "Considérant qu'il est important...", Le Rappel, No. 672, April 16, 1871. Marx then gives the German sentence in parentheses.—Ed.
rest to-morrow... In all these eternal changes one sees more than ever the want of a presiding mind. The Commune is a concourse of equivalent atoms, each one jealous of another and none endowed with supreme control over the others.”

Journal suppression!214

5) FINANCIAL MEASURES

(See Daily News. 6 May)b

Principal outlay for war!
Only 8,928 fcs. from confiscationsc—all taken from ecclesiastics etc.
Vengeur 6 May.d

---

b Ibid. See also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 124, May 4, 1871.—Ed.
c Marx gives the French word.—Ed.
d Concerning the financial account of the Commune see “Et maintenant...”, Le Vengeur, No. 38, May 6, 1871.—Ed.
The Commune had been proclaimed at Lyons, then Marseilles, Toulouse etc after Sedan. Gambetta tried his best to break it down.\footnote{307}

The different movements at Paris in the beginning of October aimed at the establishment of the Commune, as a measure of defence against the Foreign invasion, as the realisation of the rise of the 4th of September. Its establishment by the movement of the 31 October failed only because Blanqui, Flourens and the other then leaders of the movement believed in the gens de paroles\footnote{a} who had given their parole d'honneur\footnote{b} to abdicate and make room to a Commune freely elected by all the arrondissements of Paris. It failed because they saved the lives of those men so eager for the assassination of their savours. Having allowed Trochu and Ferry to escape, they [were] surprised then by Trochu's Bretons. It ought to be remembered that on the 31st of October the selfimposed “government of defence” existed only on sufferance. It had not yet gone even through the farce of a plebiscite.\footnote{308}

Under the circumstances, there was of course nothing easier than to misrepresent the character of the movement, to decry it as a treasonable conspiracy with the Prussians, to improve the dismissal of the only man amongst them who would not break his word,\footnote{c} for strengthening Trochu's Bretons who were for the Government of the Defence what the Corsican spadassins\footnote{d} had been for

\footnote{a}{Men as good as their word.— Ed.}
\footnote{b}{Word of honour.— Ed.}
\footnote{c}{F.A.L. Tamisier.— Ed.}
\footnote{d}{Bravos.— Ed.}
L. Bonaparte by the appointment of Clément Thomas as Commander-in-Chief of the National Guard; there was nothing easier for these old panic-mongers than—appealing to the cowardly fears of the middle class [before] working bataillons who had taken the initiative, throwing distrust and dissension amongst the working bataillons themselves, by an appeal to patriotism—to create one of those days of blind reaction and disastrous misunderstandings by which they have always contrived to maintain their usurped power. As they had slipped into power the 4th of September by a surprise, they were now enabled to give it a mock sanction by a plebiscite of the true Bonapartist pattern during days of reactionary terror.

The victorious establishment at Paris of the Commune in the beginning of November 1870 (then already initiated in the great cities of the country and sure to be imitated all over France) would not only have taken the defence out of the hands of traitors and imprinted its enthusiasm as the present heroic war of Paris shows, it would have altogether changed the character of the war. It would have become the war of republican France, hoisting the flag of the social Revolution of the 19th century, against Prussia, the banner bearer of the conquest and counterrevolution. Instead of sending the hackneyed old intriguer a begging at all courts of Europe, it would have electrified the producing masses in the old and the new world. By the escamotage of the Commune on October 31, the Jules Favre and Co secured the capitulation of France to Prussia and initiated the present civil war.

But this much is shown: The revolution of the 4th September was not only the reinstalment of the Republic because the place of the usurper b had become vacant by his capitulation at Sedan,—it not only conquered that republic from the Foreign invader by the prolonged resistance of Paris although fighting under the leadership of its enemies—that revolution was working its way in the heart of the working classes. The republic had ceased to be a name for a thing of the past. It was impregnated with a new world. Its real tendency veiled from the eye of the world through the deceptions, the lies and the vulgarizing of a pack of intriguing lawyers and word fencers, came again and again to the surface in the spasmodic movements of the Paris working classes (and the South of France) whose watchword was always the same: the Commune!
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a Thiers.—Ed.
b Napoleon III.—Ed.
The Commune—the positive form of the Revolution against the Empire and the conditions of its existence—first essayed in the cities of Southern France, again and again proclaimed in the spasmodic movements during the siege of Paris and escamotés by the sleights of hand of the Government of Defence and the Bretons of Trochu, the "plan of capitulation" hero—was at last victoriously installed on the 26th March, but it had not suddenly sprung into life on that day. It was the unchangeable goal of the workmen's revolution. The capitulation of Paris, the open conspiracy against the Republic at Bordeaux, the Coup d'État initiated by the nocturnal attack on Montmartre, rallied around it all the living elements of Paris, no longer allowing the defence men to limit it to the insulated efforts of the most conscious and revolutionary portions of the Paris working class.

The government of defence was only undergone as a pis aller of the first surprise, a necessity of the war. The true answer of the Paris People to the Second Empire, the Empire of Lies—was the Commune.

Thus also the rising of all living Paris—with the exception of the pillars of Bonapartism and its official opposition, the great capitalists, the financial jobbers, the sharpers, the loungers, and the old state parasites—against the government of Defence does not date from the 18th of March, although it conquered on that day its first victory against the conspirators, it dates from the 28 January, from the very day of the capitulation. The National Guard—that is all the armed manhood of Paris—organized itself and really ruled Paris from that day, independently of the usurpatory government of the capitulards installed by the grace of Bismarck. It refused to deliver its arms and artillery, which was its property and only left them in the capitulation because its property. It was not the magnanimity of Jules Favre that saved these arms from Bismarck, but the readiness of armed Paris to fight for its arms against Jules Favre and Bismarck. In view of the Foreign invader and the peace negotiations Paris would not complicate the situation. It was afraid of civil war. It observed a mere attitude of defence and [was] content with the de facto self-rule of Paris. But it organized itself quietly and steadfastly for resistance. (Even in the terms of the capitulation itself the capitulards had unmistakeably shown their tendency to make the surrender to Prussia at the same time the means of their domination over Paris. The only concession of Prussia, they insisted upon,
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a A makeshift.—Ed.
a concession, which Bismarck would have imposed upon them as a condition, if they had not begged it as a concession—was 40,000 soldiers for subduing Paris. In the face of its 300,000 national guards,—more than sufficient for securing Paris from an attempt by the Foreign enemy, and for the defence of its internal order—the demand of these 40,000 men—a thing which was besides avowed—could have no other purpose. On its existing military organization it grafted a political federation according to a very simple plan. It was the alliance of all the National Guards put in connection the one with the other by the delegates of each company, appointing in their turn the delegates of the battalions, who in their turn appointed general delegates, generals of legions, who were to represent an arrondissement and to cooperate with the delegates of the 19 other arrondissements. Those 20 delegates, chosen by the majority of the battalions of the National Guard, composed the Central Committee, which on the 18th of March initiated the greatest revolution of this century and still holds its post in the present glorious struggle of Paris. Never were elections more sifted, never delegates fuller representing the masses from which they had sprung. To the objection of the outsiders that they were unknown—in point of fact, that they only were known to the working classes, but no old staggers, no men illustrated by the infamies of their past, by their chase after pelf and place—they proudly answered: “So were the 12 Apostles” and they answered by their deeds.

THE CHARACTER OF THE COMMUNE

The centralized state machinery which, with its ubiquitous and complicated military, bureaucratic, clerical and judiciary organs, entoils (inmeshes) the living civil society like a boa constrictor, was first forged in the days of absolute monarchy as a weapon of nascent modern society in its struggle of emancipation from feudalism. The seigniorial privileges of the medieval lords and cities and clergy were transformed into the attribute of a unitary state power, displacing the feudal dignitaries by salaried state functionaries, transferring the arms from medieval retainers of the landlords and the corporations of townish citizens to a standing army, substituting for the checkered (party coloured) anarchy of conflicting medieval powers the regulated plan of a state power, with a systematic and hierarchic division of labour. The first
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\(^{a}\) “To the objection...”, *The Daily News*, No. 7776, April 1, 1871.—*Ed.*
French Revolution with its task to found national unity (to create a nation) had to break down all local, territorial, townish and provincial independences. It was, therefore, forced to develop, what absolute monarchy had commenced, the centralization and organization of state power, and to expand the circumference and the attributes of the state power, the number of its tools, its independence of, and its supernaturalist sway of real society which in fact took the place of the medieval supernaturalist heaven with its saints. Every minor solitary interest engendered by the relations of social groups was separated from society itself, fixed and made independent of it and opposed to it in the form of state interest, administered by state priests with exactly determined hierarchical functions.

This parasitical [excrescence upon] civil society, pretending to be its ideal counterpart, grew to its full development under the sway of the first Bonaparte. The restoration and the monarchy of July added nothing to it but a greater division of labour, growing at the same measure in which the division of labour within civil society created new groups of interest, and, therefore, new material for state action. In their struggle against the Revolution of 1848, the parliamentary republic of France and the governments of all continental Europe, were forced to strengthen, with their measures of repression against the popular movement, the means of action and the centralization of that governmental power. All revolutions thus only perfected the state machinery instead of throwing off this deadening incubus. The fractions and parties of the ruling classes which alternately struggled for supremacy, considered the occupancy (Control) (seizure) and the direction of this immense machinery of government as the main booty of the victor. It centred in the creation of immense standing armies, a host of state vermin, and huge national debts. During the time of the absolute monarchy it was a means of the struggle of modern society against feudalism, crowned by the French revolution, and under the first Bonaparte it served not only to subjugate the Revolution and annihilate all popular liberties, it was an instrument of the French revolution to strike abroad, to create for France on the Continent instead of feudal monarchies more or less states after the image of France. Under the Restoration and the Monarchy of July it became not only a means of the forcible-class domination of the middle class, and a means of adding to the direct economic exploitation a second exploitation of the people by assuring to their families all the rich places of the State household.

During the time of the Revolutionary struggle of 1848 at last it
served as a means of annihilating that Revolution and all aspirations at the emancipation of the popular masses. But the state parasite received only its last development during the second Empire. The governmental power with its standing army, its all directing bureaucracy, its stultifying clergy and its servile tribunal hierarchy, had grown so independent of society itself, that a grotesquely mediocre adventurer with a hungry band of desperadoes behind him sufficed to wield it. It did no longer want the pretext of an armed Coalition of old Europe against the modern world founded by the Revolution of 1789. It appeared no longer as a means of class domination, subordinate to its parliamentary ministry or legislature. Humbling under its sway even the interests of the ruling classes, whose parliamentary show-work it supplanted by self-elected Corps Légitimists and self-paid senates, sanctioned in its absolute sway by universal suffrage, the acknowledged necessity for keeping up “order”, that is the rule of the landowner and the capitalist over the producer, cloaking under the tatters of a maskerade of the past, the orgies of the corruption of the present and the victory of the most parasite fraction, the financial swindler, the debauchery of all the reactionary influences of the past let loose—a pandemonium of infamies—the state power had received its last and supreme expression in the Second Empire. Apparently the final victory of this governmental power over society, it was in fact the orgy of all the corrupt elements of that society. To the eye of the uninitiated it appeared only as the victory of the Executive over the legislative, as the final defeat of the form of class rule pretending to be the autocracy of society under its form pretending to be a superior power to society. But in fact it was only the last degraded and the only possible form of that class rule, as humiliating to those classes themselves as to the working classes which they kept fettered by it.

The 4th of September was only the revindication of the Republic against the grotesque adventurer that had assassinated it. The true antithesis to the Empire itself—that is to the state power, the centralized executive, of which the Second Empire was only the exhausting formula—was the Commune. This state power forms in fact the creation of the middle class, first a means to break down feudalism, then a means to crush the emancipatory aspirations of the producers, of the working class. All reactions and all revolutions had only served to transfer that organized power—that organized force of the slavery of labour—from one hand to the other, from one fraction of the ruling classes to the other. It had served the ruling classes as a means of subjugation and of
pelf. It had sucked new forces from every new change. It had served as the instrument of breaking down every popular rise and served it to crush the working classes after they had fought and been ordered to secure its transfer from one part of its oppressors to the others. This was, therefore, a Revolution not against this or that, legitimate, constitutional, republican or Imperialist form of State Power. It was a Revolution against the State itself, this supernaturalist abortion of society, a resumption by the people for the people, of its own social life. It was not a revolution to transfer it from one fraction of the ruling classes to the other, but a Revolution to break down this horrid machinery of Class domination itself. It was not one of those dwarfish struggles between the executive and the parliamentary forms of class domination, but a revolt against both these forms, integrating each other, and of which the parliamentary form was only the deceitful bywork of the Executive. The Second Empire was the final form of this State usurpation. The Commune was its definite negation, and, therefore the initiation of the social Revolution of the 19th century. Whatever therefore its fate at Paris, it will make le tour du monde. It was at once acclaimed by the working class of Europe and the United States as the magic word of delivery. The glories and the antediluvian deeds of the Prussian conqueror seemed only hallucinations of a bygone past.

*It was only the working class that could* formulate by the word "Commune" and initiate by the fighting Commune of Paris—this new aspiration. Even the last expression of that state power in the Second Empire although humbling for the pride of the ruling classes and casting to the winds their parliamentary pretentions of self-government, had been only the last possible form of their class rule. While politically dispossessing them, it was the orgy under which all the economic and social infamies of their régime got full sway. The middling bourgeoisie and the petty middle class were by their economical conditions of life excluded from initiating a new revolution and induced to follow in the tracks of the ruling classes or [be] the followers of the working class. The peasants were the passive economical basis of the Second Empire, of that last triumph of a State separate of and independent from society. Only the Proletarians, fired by a new social task to accomplish by them for all society, to do away with all classes and class rule, were the men to break the instrument of that class rule—the State, the centralized and organized governmental power usurping to be the
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It will go round the world.—*Ed.*
master instead of the servant of society. In the active struggle against them by the ruling classes, supported by the passive adherence of the peasantry, the Second Empire, the last crowning at the same time as the most signal prostitution of the State—which had taken the place of the medieval church—had been engendered. It had sprung into life against them. By them it was broken, not as a peculiar form of centralized governmental power, but as its most powerful, elaborated into seeming independence from society expression, and, therefore, also its most prostitute reality, covered by infamy from top to bottom, having centred in absolute corruption at home and absolute powerlessness abroad.\footnote{Marx added the following two paragraphs on the upper margin of the manuscript.—Ed.}

Parliamentarism in France had come to an end. Its last term and fullest sway was the parliamentary Republic from May 1848 to the Coup d'État. The Empire that killed it, was its own creation. Under the Empire with its Corps Législatif and its Senate—and in this form it has been reproduced in the military monarchies of Prussia and Austria—it had been a mere farce, a mere bywork of Despotism in its crudest form. Parliamentarism then was dead in France and the workmen's Revolution certainly was not to awaken it from the death.

But this one form of class rule had only broken down to make the Executive, the governmental state machinery the great and single object of attack to the Revolution.

The Commune—the reabsorption of the State power by society, as its own living forces instead of as forces controlling and subduing it, by the popular masses themselves, forming their own force instead of the organized force of their suppression—the political form of their social emancipation, instead of the artificial force (appropriated by their oppressors) (their own force opposed to and organized against them) of society wielded for their oppression by their enemies. The form was simple like all great things. The reaction of former Revolutions—the time wanted for all historical developments, and in the past always lost in all Revolutions in the very days of popular triumph, whenever it had rendered its victorious arms, to
be turned against itself—[the Commune] first displaced the army by the National guard.

"For the first time since the 4th September the republic is liberated from the government of its enemies... to the city a national militia that defends the citizens against the power (the government) instead of a permanent army that defends the government against the citizens" (Proclamation of Central Committee of 22 March).\(^a\)

(the people had only to organize this militia on a national scale, to have done away with the Standing armies; the first economical conditio sine qua non\(^b\) for all social improvements, discarding at once this source of taxes and state debt, and this constant danger to government usurpation of class rule—of the regular class rule or an adventurer pretending to save all classes); at the same time the safest guarantee against Foreign aggression and making in fact the costly military apparatus impossible in all other states; the emancipation of the peasant from the bloodtax and the most fertile source of all state taxation and state debts. Here already the point in which the Commune is a bait for the peasant, the first word of his emancipation. With the "independent police" abolished, and its ruffians supplanted by servants of the Commune. The general suffrage, till now abused either for the parliamentary sanction of the Holy State Power, or a play in the hands of the ruling classes, only employed by the people to choose the instruments of parliamentary class rule once in many years, adapted to its real purposes, to choose by the communes their own functionaries of administration and initiation. [Gone is] the Delusion as if administration and political governing were mysteries, transcendent functions only to be trusted to the hands of a trained caste, state parasites, richly paid sycophants and sinecurists, in the higher posts, absorbing the intelligences of the masses and turning them against themselves in the lower places of the hierarchy. Doing away with the state hierarchy altogether and replacing the haughty masters of the people by its always removable servants, a mock responsibility by a real responsibility, as they act continuously under public supervision. Paid like skilled workmen, 12 pounds a month, the highest salary not exceeding 240 £ a year, a salary somewhat more than \(\frac{1}{5}\), according to a great scientific authority, Professor Huxley, to satisfy a clerk for the Metropolitan School Board.\(^193\) The whole sham of state mysteries and state pretensions
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\(^a\) [Proclamation du Comité central de la Garde nationale. Paris, 22 mars 1871], *Le Rappel*, No. 650, March 25, 1871; see also *Journal officiel* (Paris), No. 84, March 25, 1871.— Ed.

\(^b\) The necessary condition.— Ed.
A paragraph from the manuscript of the First Draft of *The Civil War in France*
was done away by a Commune, mostly consisting of simple working men, organizing the defence of Paris, carrying war against the Pretorians of Bonaparte, securing the *approvisionnement* of that immense town, filling all the posts hitherto divided between Government, police, and Prefecture, doing their work publicly, simply, under the most difficult and complicated circumstances, and doing it, as Milton did his *Paradise Lost*, for a few pounds, acting in bright daylight, with no pretensions to infallibility, not hiding itself behind circumlocution office, not ashamed to confess blunders by correcting them. Making in one order the public functions,—military, administrative, political—*real workmen's functions*, instead of the hidden attributes of a trained caste; (keeping order in the turbulence of civil war and revolution) (initiating measures of general regeneration). Whatever the merits of the single measures of the Commune, its greatest measure was its own organisation, extemporized with the Foreign Enemy at one door, and the class enemy at the other, proving by its life its vitality, confirming its thesis by its action. Its appearance was a victory over the victors of France. Captive Paris resumed by one bold spring the leadership of Europe, not depending on brute force, but by taking the lead of the Social Movement, by giving body to the aspirations of the working class of all countries.

With all the great towns organized into Communes after the model of Paris no government could repress the movement by the surprise of sudden reaction. Even by this preparatory step the time of incubation, the guarantee of the movement, won. All France organized into self-working and self-governing communes, the standing army replaced by the popular militias, the army of state parasites removed, the clerical hierarchy displaced by the schoolmaster, the state judges transformed into Communal organs, the suffrage for the National representation not a matter of sleight of hand for an allpowerful government, but the deliberate expression of organized communes, the state functions reduced to a few functions for general national purposes.

Such is the Commune—*the political form of the social emancipation*, of the liberation of labour from the usurpation of the (slaveholding) monopolists of the means of labour, created by the labourers themselves or forming the gift of nature. As the state machinery and parliamentarism are not the real life of the ruling classes, but only the organized general organs of their dominion, the political guarantees and forms and expressions of the old order of things, so the Commune is not the social movement of the working class and therefore of a general regeneration of mankind but the
organized means of action. The Commune does not [do] away with the class struggles, through which the working classes strive to the abolition of all classes and, therefore, of all class rule (because it does not represent a peculiar interest. It represents the liberation of "labour", that is the fundamental and natural condition of individual and social life which only by usurpation, fraud, and artificial contrivances can be shifted from the few upon the many), but it affords the rational medium in which that class struggle can run through its different phases in the most rational and human way. It could start violent reactions and as violent revolutions. It begins the **emancipation of labour**—its great goal—by doing away with the unproductive and mischievous work of the state parasites, by cutting away the springs which sacrifice an immense portion of the national produce to the feeding of the state-monster, on the one side, by doing, on the other, the real work of administration, local and national, for workingmen's wages. It begins therefore with an immense saving, with economical reform as well as political transformation.

The communal organization once firmly established on a national scale, the catastrophes it might still have to undergo, would be sporadic slaveholders' insurrections, which, while for a moment interrupting the work of peaceful progress, would only accelerate the movement, by putting the sword into the hand of the Social Revolution.

The working class know that they have to pass through different phases of class struggle. They know that the superseding of the economical conditions of the slavery of labour by the conditions of free and associated labour can only be the progressive work of time, (that economical transformation) that they require not only a change of distribution, but a new organization of production, or rather the delivery (setting free) of the social forms of production in present organized labour (engendered by present industry) of the trammels of slavery, of their present class character, and their harmonious national and international coordination. They know that this work of regeneration will be again and again relented and impeded by the resistances of vested interests and class egotisms. They know that the present "spontaneous action of the natural laws of capital and landed property"—can only be superseded by "the spontaneous action of the laws of the social economy of free and associated labour", by a long process of development of new conditions, as was the "spontaneous action of the economic laws of slavery" and the "spontaneous action of the economical laws of serfdom". But they know at the same time that
great strides may be taken at once through the Communal form of political organization and that the time has come to begin that movement for themselves and mankind.

PEASANTRY

(War indemnity.) Even before the instalment of the Commune, the Central Committee had declared through its Journal officiel: "The greater part of the war indemnity should be paid by the authors of war." This is the great "conspiracy against Civilization"b the men of order are most afraid of. It is the most practical question. With the Commune victorious, the authors of the war will have to pay its indemnity; with Versailles victorious, the producing masses who have already paid in blood, ruin, and contributions, will have again to pay, and the financial dignitaries will even contrive to make a profit out of the transaction. The liquidation of the war costs is to be decided by the civil war. The Commune represents on this vital point not only the interests of the working class, the petty middle class, in fact, all the middle class with the exception of the bourgeoisie (the wealthy capitalists) (the rich landowners, and their state parasites). It represents above all the interests of the French peasantry. On them the greater part of the war taxes will be shifted, if Thiers and his "Rurals"178 are victorious. And people are silly enough to repeat the cry of the "Rurals" that they—the great landed proprietors—represent the peasant, who is, of course, in the naivety of his soul exceedingly anxious to pay for these good "landowners" the milliards of the war indemnity who made him already pay the milliard of the Revolution indemnity!199

The same men deliberately compromised the Republic of February by the additional 45 Centimes tax on the peasant,200 but this they did in the name of the Revolution, in the name of the "provisional government", created by it. It is now in their own name that they wage a civil war against the Communal Republic to shift the war indemnity from their own shoulders upon those of the peasant! He will of course be delighted by it!

The Commune will abolish Conscription, the party of order will fasten the bloodtax on the peasant. The party of order will fasten upon him the tax-collector for the payment of a parasitical and
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a [V.] Grêlier, "Le comité central de la garde nationale est décidé...", Journal officiel (Paris), No. 80, March 21, 1871.— Ed.  
b Quoted from "The Commune of Paris...", The Times, No. 27028, April 4, 1871.— Ed.
costly state machinery, the Commune will give him a cheap government. The party of order will continue [to] grind him down by the townish usurer, the Commune will free him of the incubus of the mortgages lasting upon his plot of land. The Commune will replace the parasitical judiciary body eating the heart of his income—the notary, the *huissier* a etc.—by Communal agents doing their work at workmen’s salaries, instead of enriching themselves out of the peasants’ work. It will break down this whole judiciary cobweb which entangles the French peasant and gives abodes to the judiciary bench and maires of the bourgeois spiders that suck its blood! The party of order will keep him under the rule of the gendarme, the Commune will restore him to independent social and political life! The Commune will enlighten him by the rule of the schoolmaster, the party of order force upon him the stultification by the rule of the priest! But the French peasant is above all a man of reckoning! He will find it exceedingly reasonable that the payment of the clergy will no longer [be] exacted from him by the tax-collector, but will be left to the “spontaneous action” of his religious instincts!

The French peasant had elected L. Bonaparte President of the Republic, but the party of Order (during the anonymous Regime of the Republic under the assembly constituant, and législatif) was the creator of the Empire! What the French peasant really wants, he commenced to show in 1849 and 1850 by opposing his maire to the Government’s prefect, his schoolmaster to the government’s parson, himself to the government’s gendarme! The nucleus of the reactionary laws of the Party of Order in 1849—and peculiarly in January and February 1850 201—were specifically directed against the French Peasantry! If the French peasant had made L. Bonaparte president of the Republic because in his tradition all the benefits he had derived from the first Revolution were phantastically transferred on the first Napoleon, the armed risings of Peasants in some departments of France and the gendarme hunting upon them after the Coup d’Etat proved that that delusion was rapidly breaking down! The Empire was founded on the delusions artificially nourished and traditional prejudices, the Commune would be founded on his living interests and his real wants!

The hatred of the French peasant centres on the “rural”, the men of the Château, the men of the Milliard of indemnity and the townish capitalist, maskeraded into a landed proprietor, whose

a Bailiff.—Ed.
encroachment upon him marched never more rapidly than under the Second Empire, partly fostered by artificial state means, partly naturally growing out of the very development of modern agriculture. The “rurals” know that three months rule of the Republican Commune in France would be the signal of the rising of the peasantry and the agricultural Proletariat against them. Hence their ferocious hatred of the Commune! What they fear even more than the emancipation of the townish proletariat is the emancipation of the peasants! The peasants would soon acclaim the townish proletariat as their own leaders and seniors! There exists of course in France as in most continental Countries a deep antagonism between the townish and rural producers, between the industrial Proletariat and the peasantry. The aspirations of the Proletariat, the material basis of its movement is labour organized on a grand scale, although now despotically organized, and the means of production centralized, although now centralized in the hands of the monopolist, not only as a means of production, but as a means of the exploitation and enslavement of the producer. What the proletariat has [to] do is to transform the present capitalist character of that organized labour and those centralized means of labour, transform them from the means of class rule and class exploitation into forms of free associated labour and social means of production. On the other hand, the labour of the peasant is insulated, and the means of production are parcelled, dispersed. On these economical differences rests superconstructed a whole world of different social and political views. But this peasantry proprietorship has long since outgrown its normal phase, that is the phase in which it was a reality, a mode of production and a form of property which responded to the economical wants of society and placed the rural producers themselves into normal conditions of life. It has entered its period of decay. On the one side a large prolétariat foncier (rural proletariat) has grown out of it whose interests are identical with those of the townish wages labourer. The mode of production itself has become superannuated by the modern progress of agronomy. Lastly—the peasant proprietorship itself has become nominal, leaving to the peasant the delusion of proprietorship, and expropriating him from the fruit of his own labour. The competition of the great farm producers, the bloodtax, the statetax, the usury of the townish mortgagee and the multitudinous pilfering of the judiciary system thrown around him, have degraded him to the position of a Hindoo Ryoit, while expropriation—even expropriation from his nominal proprietorship—and, his degradation into a rural proletarian is an every
day's fact. What separates the peasant from the proletarian is, therefore, no longer his real interest, but his delusive prejudice. If the Commune, as we have shown, is the only power that can give him immediate great boons even in its present economical conditions, it is the only form of government that can secure to him the transformation of his present economical conditions, rescue him from expropriation by the landlord on the one hand, from grinding, trudging and misery on the pretext of proprietorship on the other, that can convert his nominal proprietorship of the land in the real proprietorship of the fruits of his labour, that can combine for him the profits of modern agronomy, dictated by social wants, and every day now encroaching upon him as a hostile agency, without annihilating his position as a really independent producer. Being immediately benefited by the communal Republic, he would soon confide in it.

UNION (LIGUE) RÉPUBLICAINE

The party of disorder, whose régime topped under the corruption of the Second Empire, has left Paris (Exodus from Paris), followed by its appurtenances, its retainers, its menials, its state parasites, its mouchards; its "cocottes", and the whole band of low bohème (the common criminals) that form the complement of that bohème of quality. But the true vital elements of the middle classes, delivered by the workmen's revolution from their sham representatives, have, for the first time in the history of French Revolution, separated from it and come out in its true colours. It is the "Ligue of Republican Liberty" acting the intermediary between Paris and the Provinces, disavowing Versailles and marching under the banners of the Commune.

THE COMMUNAL REVOLUTION AS THE REPRESENTATIVE
OF ALL CLASSES OF SOCIETY NOT LIVING UPON FOREIGN LABOUR

We have seen that the Paris Proletarian fights for the French Peasant, and Versailles fights against him; that the greatest anxiety of the "Rurals" is that Paris be heard by the Peasants and no longer separated by him through the blockade; that at the bottom of its war upon Paris is the attempt to keep the peasantry as its
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bondman and treat him as before as its matière “taillable à merci et miséricorde”\textsuperscript{a}.

For the first time in history the petty and moyenne middle class has openly rallied round the workmen’s Revolution, and pro-claimed it as the only means of their own salvation and that of France! It forms with them the bulk of the National guard, it sits with them in the Commune, it mediates for them in the Union Républicaine!

The principal measures taken by the Commune are taken for the salvation of the middle class—the debtor class of Paris against the creditor class! That middle class had rallied in the June insurrection (1848) against the Proletariat under the banners of the capitalist class, their generals, and their state parasites. It was punished at once on the 19th September 1848 by the rejection of the “concordats à l’amiable”.\textsuperscript{195} The victory over the June insurrection showed itself at once also as the victory of the creditor, the wealthy capitalist, over the debtor, the middle class. It insisted mercilessly on its pound of flesh.\textsuperscript{b} On the 13th June 1849 the national guard of that middle class was disarmed and sabred down by the army of the bourgeoisie! During the Empire the dilapidation of the State Resources, upon which the wealthy capitalist fed, this middle class was delivered to the plunder of the stockjobber, the Railway kings, the swindling associations of the Crédit Mobilier\textsuperscript{167} etc and expropriated by Capitalist Association (Joint-Stock Company). If lowered in its political position, attacked in its economical interests, it was morally revolted by the orgies of that regime. The infamies of the war gave the last shock and roused its feelings as Frenchmen. The disasters bestowed upon France by that war, its crisis of national downbreak and its financial ruin, this middle class feels that not the corrupt class of the would-be slaveholders of France, but only the manly aspirations and the herculean power of the working class can come to the rescue!

They feel that only the working class can emancipate them from priest rule, convert science from an instrument of class rule into a popular force, convert the men of science themselves from the panderers to class prejudice, place hunting state parasites, and allies of capital into free agents of thought! Science can only play its genuine part in the Republic of Labour.

\textsuperscript{a} As its subject “in its power and at its mercy”—Ed.

\textsuperscript{b} W. Shakespeare, \textit{The Merchant of Venice}, Act IV, Scene I.—Ed.
This civil war has destroyed the last delusions about "Republic" as the Empire the delusion of unorganized "universal suffrage" in the hands of the State Gendarme and the parson. All vital elements of France acknowledge that a Republic is only in France and Europe possible as a "Social Republic", that is a Republic which disowns the capital and landowner class of the State machinery to supersede it by the Commune, that frankly avows "social emancipation" as the great goal of the Republic and guarantees thus that social transformation by the Communal organisation. The other Republic can be nothing but the anonymous terrorism of all monarchical factions, of the combined Legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists to land in an Empire quelconque as its final goal, the anonymous terror of class rule which having done its dirty work will always burst into an Empire!

The professional republicans of the rural assembly are men who really believe, despite the experiments of 1848-51, despite the civil war against Paris—the republican form of class despotism a possible, lasting form, while the "party of order" demands it only as a form of conspiracy for fighting the Republic and reintroducing its only adequate form, monarchy or rather Imperialism, as the form of class despotism. In 1848 these voluntary dupes were pushed in the foreground till, by the insurrection of June, they had paved the way for the anonymous rule of all factions of the would-be slaveholders in France. In 1871, at Versailles, they are from beginning pushed in the background, there to figure as the "Republican" decoration of Thiers' rule and sanction by their presence the war of the Bonapartist generals upon Paris! In unconscious self-irony these wretches hold their party meeting in the Salle des Paumes (Tennis-Court) to show how they have degenerated from their predecessors in 1789! By their Schoelchers, etc., they tried to coax Paris in tendering its arms to Thiers and to force it into disarmament by the National Guard of "Order" under Saisset! We do not speak of the so-called Socialist Paris deputies like Louis Blanc. They undergo meekly the insults of a Dufaure and the rurals, dote upon Thiers' "legal" rights, and whining in presence of the banditti cover themselves with infamy!

---

\(^{a}\) Of some sort.—Ed.
If the workmen have outgrown the time of Socialist Sectarianism, it ought not be forgotten that they have never been in the leading strings of Comtism. This sect has never afforded the International but a branch of about half a dozen of men, and whose programme was rejected by the General Council. Comte is known to the Parisian workmen as the prophet in politics of Imperialism (of personal Dictatorship), of capitalist rule in political economy, of hierarchy in all spheres of human action, even in the sphere of science, and as the author of a new catechism with a new pope and new saints in place of the old ones.

If his followers in England play a more popular part than those in France, it is not by preaching their Sectarian doctrines, but by their personal valour, and by the acceptance on their part of the forms of workingmen class struggle created without them, as f. i. the trade unions and strikes in England which by the by are denounced as a heresy by their Paris coreligionists.

**THE COMMUNE (SOCIAL MEASURES)**

That the workmen of Paris have taken the initiative of the present Revolution and in heroic self-sacrifice bear the brunt of his battle, is nothing new. It is the striking fact of all French revolutions! It is only a repetition of the past! That the revolution is made in the name and confessedly for the popular masses, that is the producing masses, is a feature this Revolution has in common with all its predecessors. The new feature is that the people, after the first rise, have not disarmed themselves and surrendered their power into the hands of the Republican mountebanks of the ruling classes, that, by the constitution of the Commune, they have taken the actual management of their Revolution into their own hands and found at the same time, in the case of success, the means to hold it in the hands of the People itself, displacing the State machinery, the governmental machinery of the ruling classes by a governmental machinery of their own. This is their ineffable crime! Workmen infringing upon the governmental privilege of the upper 10,000 and proclaiming their will to break the economical basis of that class despotism, which for its own sake wielded the organized State force of society! This is it that has thrown the respectable classes in Europe as in the United States

---

^a A. Comte, *Cours de philosophie positive*, T. 1-6, Paris, 1830-1842.— *Ed.*
into the paroxysm of convulsions and accounts for their shrieks of abomination, it is blasphemy, their fierce appeals to assassination of the people, and this Billingsgate of abuse and calumny from their parliamentary tribunes and their journalistic servants' hall!

The greatest measure of the Commune is its own existence, working, acting under circumstances of unheard-of difficulty! The red flag, hoisted by the Paris Commune, crowns in reality only the government of workmen for Paris! They have clearly, consciously proclaimed the Emancipation of Labour, and the transformation of Society, as their goal! But the actual "social" character of their Republic consists only in this, that workmen govern the Paris Commune! As to their measures, they must, by the nature of things, be principally confined to the military defence of Paris and its approvisionment.

Some patronizing friends of the working class, while hardly dissembling their disgust even at the few measures they consider as "socialist" although there is nothing socialist in them except their tendency—express their satisfaction and try to coax genteel sympathies for the Paris Commune by the great discovery that after all workmen are rational men and whenever in power always resolutely turn their back upon Socialist enterprises! They do in fact neither try to establish in Paris a phalanstère not an Icarie. Wise men of their generation! These benevolent patronizers, profoundly ignorant of the real aspirations and the real movement of the working classes, forget one thing. All the Socialist founders of Sects belong to a period in which the working class themselves were neither sufficiently trained and organized by the march of capitalist society itself to enter as historical agents upon the world's stage, nor were the material conditions of their emancipation sufficiently matured in the old world itself. Their misery existed, but the conditions of their own movement did not yet exist. The utopian founders of sects, while in their criticism of present society clearly describing the goal of the social movement, the supersession of the wages system with all its economical conditions of class rule, found neither in society itself the material conditions of its transformation nor in the working class the organized power and the conscience of the movement. They tried to compensate for the historical conditions of the movement by phantastic pictures and plans of a new society in whose propaganda they saw the true means of salvation. From the moment the workingmen class movement became real, the phantastic utopias evanesced, not because the working class had given up the end aimed at by these Uto-
pists, but because they had found the real means to realize them, but in their place came a real insight into the historic conditions of the movement and a more and more gathering force of the military organization of the working class. But the last 2 ends of the movement proclaimed by the Utopians are the last ends proclaimed by the Paris Revolution and by the International. Only the means are different and the real conditions of the movement are no longer clouded in utopian fables. These patronizing friends of the Proletariat in glossing over the loudly proclaimed Socialist tendencies of this Revolution, are therefore but the dupes of their own ignorance. It is not the fault of the Paris proletariat, if for them the Utopian creations of the prophets of the workingmen movement are still the “Social Revolution”, that is to say, if the Social Revolution is for them still “utopian”.

Journal officiel of the Central Committee, 20 March:

“The proletarians of the capital, in midst the défaultes* and the treasons of the governing (ruling) classes, have understood (compris) that the hour was arrived for them to save the situation in taking into their own hands the direction (management) of public affairs (the state business).”

They denounce “the political incapacity and the moral decrepitude of the bourgeoisie” as the source of “the misfortunes of France”.

“The workmen, who produce everything and enjoy nothing, who suffer from misery in the midst of their accumulated products, the fruit of their work and their sweat, ... shall they never be allowed to work for their emancipation?... The proletariat, in face of the permanent menace against its rights, of the absolute negation of all its legitimate aspirations, of the ruin of the country and all its hopes, has understood that it was its imperious duty and its absolute right to take into its hands its own destinies and to assure their triumph in seizing the state power (en s’emparant du pouvoir).”

It is here plainly stated that the government of the working class is, in the first instance, necessary to save France from the ruins and the corruption impended upon it by the ruling classes, that the dislodgment of these classes from Power (of these classes who have lost the capacity of ruling France) is a necessity of national safety.

But it is no less clearly stated that the government by the

---

* Impotence.— Ed.

b “La Révolution du 18 mars”, Le Petit Journal, No. 3002, March 22, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 80, March 21, 1871.— Ed.
working class can only save France and do the national business, by working for its own emancipation, the conditions of that emancipation being at the same time the conditions of the regeneration of France.

It is proclaimed as a war of labour upon the monopolists of the means of labour, upon capital.

The chauvinism of the bourgeoisie is only the supreme vanity, giving a national cloak to all their own pretensions. It is a means, by permanent armies, to perpetuate international struggles, to subjugate in each country the producers by pitching them against their brothers in each other country, a means to prevent the international cooperation of the working classes, the first condition of their emancipation. The true character of that chauvinism (long since become a mere phrase) has come out during the war of defence after Sedan, everywhere paralysed by the Chauvinist bourgeoisie, in the capitulation of France, in the civil war carried on under that high Priest of Chauvinism, Thiers, on Bismarck's sufferance! It came out in the petty police intrigue of the Anti-German league, a Foreigners-hunting in Paris after the capitulation. It was hoped that the Paris people (and the French people) could be stultified into the passion of National hatred and by factitious outrages to the Foreigner forget its real aspiration and its home betrayers!

How has this factitious movement disappeared (vanished) before the breath of Revolutionary Paris! Loudly proclaiming its international tendencies—because the cause of the producer is every[where] the same and its enemy everywhere the same, whatever its nationality (in whatever national garb)—it proclaimed as a principle the admission of Foreigners into the Commune, it chose even a Foreign workman (a member of the International) into its Executive, it decreed [the destruction of] the symbol of French chauvinism—the Vendôme column!

And, while their bourgeois chauvins have dismembered France, and act under the dictatorship of the Foreign invasion, the Paris workmen have beaten the Foreign enemy by striking at their own class rulers, have abolished frontiers, in conquering the post as the vanguard of the workmen of all nations!

The genuine patriotism of the bourgeoisie—so natural for the real proprietors of the different "national" estates—has faded into a mere sham consequent upon the cosmopolitan character imprinted upon their financial, commercial, and industrial enter-

---

a See this volume, pp. 286-87.—Ed.
b Leo Frankel.—Ed.
prise. Under similar circumstances it would be exploded in all countries as it did in France.

**DECENTRALIZATION BY THE RURALS AND THE COMMUNE**

It has been said that Paris, and with it the other French towns, were oppressed by the rule of the peasants, and that its present struggle is for its emancipation from the rule of the peasantry! Never was a more foolish lie uttered!

Paris as the central seat and the stronghold of the centralized government machinery subjected the peasantry to the rule of the gendarmes, the tax collector, the Prefect, and the priest, and the rural magnates, that is to the despotism of its enemies, and deprived it of all life (took the life out of it). It repressed all organs of independent life in the rural districts. On the other hand, the government, the rural magnates, the gendarme and the priest, into whose hands the whole influence of the provinces was thus thrown by the centralized state machinery centring at Paris, brought this influence to bear for the government and the classes whose government it was, not against Paris [of] the government, the parasite, the capitalist, the idle, the cosmopolitan stew, but against the Paris of the workmen and the thinker. In this way, by the government centralization with Paris as its base, the peasants were suppressed by the Paris of the government and the capitalist, and the Paris of the workmen was suppressed by the provincial power handed over into the hands of the enemies of the peasants.

The *Versailles Moniteur* (29 March) declares

"that Paris cannot be a free city, because it is the capital".b

This is the true thing. Paris, the capital of the ruling classes and its government, cannot be a "free city", and the provinces cannot be "free", because such a Paris is the capital. The provinces can only be free with the Commune at Paris. The party of order is still less infuriated against Paris because it has proclaimed its own emancipation from them and their government, than because, by doing so, it has sounded the alarm signal for the emancipation of the peasant and the provinces from their sway.

*Journal officiel of the Commune, 1 April:*

"The revolution of the 18th March had not for its only object the securing to Paris of communal representation elected, but subject to the despotic tutelage of a

---

a *Moniteur des Communes.—Ed.*

b Quoted from "The Moniteur which is...", *The Daily News*, No. 7776, April 1, 1871.—*Ed.*
national power strongly centralized. It is to conquer, and secure independence for all the communes of France, and also of all superior groups, departments, and provinces, united amongst themselves for their common interest by a really national pact; it is to guarantee and perpetuate the Republic.... Paris has renounced her apparent omnipotence which is identical with her forfeiture, she has not renounced that moral power, that intellectual influence, which so often has made her victorious in France and Europe in her propaganda." \(^a\)

"This time again Paris works and suffers for all France, of which it prepares by its combats and its sacrifices the intellectual, moral, administrative and economic regeneration, the glory and the prosperity" (Programme of the Commune de Paris sent out by balloon). \(^b\)

Mr. Thiers, in his tour through the provinces, managed the elections, and above all, his own manifold elections. But there was one difficulty. The Bonapartist provincials had for the moment become impossible. (Besides, he did not want them, nor did they want him.) Many of the old Orleanist stagers had merged into the Bonapartist lot. It was, therefore, necessary, to appeal to the rusticated legitimist landowners, who had kept quite aloof from politics and were just the men to be duped. They have given the apparent character to the Versailles assembly, its character of the "chambre introuvable" \(^c\) of Louis XVIII, its "rural" character. In their vanity, they believed, of course, that their time had at last come with the downfall of the Second Bonapartist Empire and under the shelter of Foreign invasion, as it had come in 1814 and 1815. Still they are mere dupes. So far as they act, they can only act as elements of the "party of order", \(^d\) and its "anonymous" terrorism as in 1848-1851. Their own party effusions lend only the comical character to that association. They are, therefore, forced to suffer as president the jail-accoucheur of the Duchess of Berry \(^e\) and as their ministers the pseudo republicans of the government of defence. They will be pushed aside as soon as they have done their service. But—a freak of history—by this curious combination of circumstances they are forced to attack Paris because of revolting against "the République une et indivisible" (Louis Blanc expresses it so, \(^f\) Thiers calls it unity of France), while their very first exploit was to revolt against unity by declaring for the "decapitation and decapitalization" \(^g\) of Paris, by wanting the
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\(^{a}\) Quoted from "An article in the Journal officiel...", The Evening Standard, No. 14561, April 3, 1871.—Ed.

\(^{b}\) "Déclaration au peuple français. [Paris, 19 avril 1871]", The Daily News, No. 7793, April 21, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 110, April 20, 1871.—Ed.

\(^{c}\) "United and indivisible republic", quoted from L. Blanc’s letter to the editor of Le Siècle in The Daily News, No. 7797, April 26, 1871.—Ed.

\(^{d}\) "The scanty news from the capital of Revolution...", The Daily News, No. 7774, March 30, 1871.—Ed.
Assembly to throne in a provincial town. What they really want is to
go back to what preceded the centralized state machinery, become
more or less independent of its prefects and its ministers, and put
into its place the provincial and local domanial influence of the
Châteaux. They want a reactionary decentralization of France. What
Paris wants is to supplant that centralization which has done its
service against feodality, but has become the mere unity of an
artificial body, resting on gendarmes, red and black armies,
repressing the life of real society, lasting as an incubus upon it, giving
Paris an “apparent omnipotence” by enclosing it and leaving the
provinces outdoor—to supplant this unitarian France which exists
besides the French society—by the political union of French society
itself through the Communal organization.

The true partisans of breaking up the unity of France are
therefore the rural, opposite to the united state machinery so far
as it interferes with their own local importance (seigniorial rights),
so far as it is the antagonist of feudalism.

What Paris wants is to break up that factitious unitarian system,
so far as it is the antagonist of the real living union of France and
a mere means of class rule.

Comtist view

Men completely ignorant of the existing economical system are
of course still less able to comprehend the workmen’s negation of
that system. They can of course not comprehend that the social
transformation the working class aim at is the necessary, historical,
unavoidable birth of the present system itself. They talk in
deprecatory tones of the threatened abolition of “property”
because in their eyes their present class form of property—a
transitory historical form—is property itself, and the abolition of
that form would therefore be the abolition of property. As they
now defend the “eternity” of capital rule and the wages system, if
they had lived in feudal times or in times of slavery, they would
have defended the feudal system and the slave system as founded
on the nature of things, as springing from nature, fiercely
declared against their “abuses”, but at the same time from the
height of their ignorance answering to the prophecies of the
abolition by the dogma of their “eternity” righted by “moral
checks” (constraints).
They are as right in their appreciation of the aims of the Paris working classes, as is M. Bismarck in declaring that what the Commune wants is the Prussian municipal order.\(^a\)

Poor men! They do not even know that every social form of property has "morals" of its own, and that the form of social property which makes property the attribute of labour, far from creating individual "moral constraints" will emancipate the "morals" of the individual from its class constraints.

How the breath of the popular revolution has changed Paris! The revolution of February was called the Revolution of moral contempt! It was proclaimed by the cries of the people: "à bas les grands voleurs! à bas les assassins!"\(^b\) Such was the sentiment of the people. But as to the bourgeoisie, they wanted broader sway for corruption! They got it under Louis Bonaparte's (Napoleon the little) reign. Paris, the gigantic town, the town of historic initiative, was transformed in the Maison dorée of all the idlers and swindlers of the world, into a cosmopolitan stew! After the exodus of the "better class of people", the Paris of the working class reappeared, heroic, self-sacrificing, enthusiastic in the sentiment of its herculean task! No cadavers in the Morgue, no insecurity of the streets. Paris was never more quiet within. Instead of the Cocottes, the heroic women of Paris! Manly, stern, fighting, working, thinking Paris! Magnanimous Paris! In view of the cannibalism of their enemies, making their prisoners only dangerless!...

"What Paris will no longer stand is yet the existence of the Cocottes and Cocodès. What it is resolved to drive away or transform is this useless, sceptical and egotistical race which has taken possession of the gigantic town, to use it as its own. No celebrity of the Empire shall have the right to say, Paris is very pleasant in the best quarters, but there are too many paupers in the others."\(^c\)

(Vérité: 23 April)

"Private crime wonderfully diminished\(^d\) at Paris. The absence of thieves and cocottes, of assassins and street attacks: all the conservateurs have fled to Versailles!"

"There has not been signalized one single nocturnal attack even in the most distant and less frequented quarters since the citizens do their police business themselves."\(^e\)


\(^b\) "Down with big robbers! Down with the assassins!"— Ed.

\(^c\) "The really dangerous classes...", The Observer, No. 4170, April 23, 1871.— Ed.

\(^d\) "Life in Paris", The Daily News, No. 7791, April 19, 1871.— Ed.

\(^e\) "Manifeste", Le Vengeur, No. 30, April 28, 1871.— Ed.
Thiers on the Rurals

"This party knows only to employ three means: Foreign invasion, civil war and anarchy ... such a government will never be that of France." (Chambre des Députés of 5th Janvier 1833.)

Government of Defence

And this same Trochu said in his famous programme: "the governor of Paris will never capitulate" and Jules Favre in his circular: "Not a stone of our fortresses, nor a foot of our territories"; same as Ducrot: "I shall never return to Paris save dead or victorious." He found afterwards at Bordeaux that his life was necessary for keeping down the "rebels" of Paris. (These wretches know that in their flight to Versailles they have left behind the proofs of their crimes, and to destroy these proofs, they would not recoil from making of Paris a mountain of ruins bathed in a sea of blood) (Manifeste à la Province, by balloon).

"The unity which has been imposed upon us to the present, by the Empire, the Monarchy, and Parliamentary Government is nothing but centralization, despotic, despotism, oppression, and slavery."

---

a Quoted in La Tribune de Bordeaux, April 25, 1871.— Ed.
c J. Favre, "Circulaire adressée aux agents diplomatiques de France.... Le 6 septembre 1870", Journal officiel (Paris), No. 246, September 7, 1870.— Ed.
d A. Ducrot, "Soldat de la 2e armée de Paris!" [Order of November 28, 1870], Journal officiel (Paris), No. 329, November 29, 1870.— Ed.
e "Manifeste", Le Vengeur, No. 30, April 28, 1871.— Ed.
unintelligent, arbitrary and onerous. The political unity as desired by Paris, is a voluntary association of all local initiatives...” a central delegation from the Federal Communes... “End of the old governmental and clerical world, of military supremacy and bureaucracy and jobbing in monopolies and privileges to which the proletariat owed its slavery and the country its misfortunes and disasters.” (Proclamation of Commune 19 April.)

The Gendarmes and Policemen

20,000 Gendarmes drawn to Versailles from all France (a total of 30,000 under the Empire) and 12,000 Paris police agents,—basis of the finest army France ever had.

Republican Deputies of Paris

The Republican deputies of Paris “have not protested either against the bombardment of Paris, nor the summary executions of the prisoners, nor the calumnies against the People of Paris. They have on the contrary by their presence at the assembly and their mutisme given a consecration to all these acts supported by the notoriety the republican party has given those men. “Have become the allies and conscious accomplices of the monarchical party. Declares them traitors to their mandate and the Republic”. (Association générale des défenseurs de la République)
(9 May)

“Centralization leads to apoplexy in Paris and to absence of life everywhere else” (Lamennais).

“Everything now gravitates to one centre, and this centre is, so to say, the state itself” (Montesquieu).

Vendôme affair etc.

The Central Committee of the National Guard, constituted by the nomination of a delegate of each company, on the entrance of the Prussians into Paris, transported to Montmartre, Belleville and La Villette the cannon and mitrailleuses founded by the subscription of the National guards themselves, which cannon and mitrailleuses were abandoned by the government of the National defence, even in those quarters which were to be occupied by the Prussians.

---

*a “Déclaration au peuple français. [Paris, 19 avril 1871]”, The Daily News, No. 7793, April 21, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 110, April 20, 1871.— Ed.
*b Marx gives a German phrase in parentheses.— Ed.
*c Ch.-L. de Montesquieu, De l'Esprit des Loix, London, 1769, Liv. 23, Ch. 24. Marx gives a French quotation.— Ed.
On the morning of the 18th March the government made an energetic appeal to the National Guard, but out of 400,000 National Guard only 300 men answered.

On the 18th March, at 3 o'clock in the morning, the agents of police, and some bataillons of the line were at Montmartre, Belleville, and La Villette to surprise the guardians of artillery and to take it away by force.

The National Guard resisted, the soldiers of the line raised their rifle-butts in the air, despite the menaces and the orders of General Lecomte, shot the same day by his soldiers at the same time as Clément Thomas.

(“troops of the line threw the butts of their muskets in the air, and fraternized with the insurgents.”)\(^\text{b}\)

The bulletin of victory by Aurelle de Paladines was already printed, also papers found on the Decembrisation of Paris.\(^\text{c}\)

On the 19 March the Central Committee declared the state of siege of Paris raised,\(^\text{d}\) on the 20 Picard proclaimed it for the department of the Seine-et-Oise.

18 March (Morning: still believing in his victory) proclamation of Thiers, placarded on the walls:

“The Government has resolved to act. The Criminals who affect to institute a government must be delivered to regular justice, and the cannon taken away must be restored to the Arsenalas.”

Late in the afternoon, the nocturnal surprise having failed he appeals to the National Guards:

“The Government is not preparing a coup d'état. The Government of the Republic has not and cannot have any other aim than the safety of the Republic.”

He will only

“do away with the insurgent committee ... almost all unknown to the population”.\(^\text{e}\)

Late in the evening a third proclamation to the National Guard, signed by Picard and d'Aurelle:

\(^\text{a}\) Marx gives “raised their rifle-butts in the air” in French.— Ed.


\(^\text{c}\) I. e. a coup d'état like that of December 2, 1851. See “Paris in Insurrection”, The Daily News, No. 7765, March 20, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 78, March 19, 1871.— Ed.

\(^\text{d}\) “Au Peuple”, The Standard, No. 14550, March 21, 1871 (published in French).— Ed.

\(^\text{e}\) L. A. Theirs' proclamation of March 17, 1871 to the inhabitants of Paris and proclamation of March 18, 1871 to the National Guards, The Daily News, No. 7765, March 20, 1871.— Ed.
"Some misguided men ... resist forcibly the National Guard and the army.... The Government has chosen that your arms should be left to you. Seize them with resolution to establish the reign of law and to save the Republic from anarchy."\(a\)

(On the 17th Schoelcher tries to wheedle them into disarming.)

*Proclamation of the Central Committee of the 19 March:*

"the state of siege is raised. The people of Paris is convoked for its communal elections."

*Id. to the National Guards:*

"You have charged us to organize the defence of Paris and of your rights.... At this moment our mandate has expired; we give it back to you, we will not take the place of those whom the popular breath has just swept away."\(b\)

They allowed the members of the Government to withdraw quietly to Versailles (even such as they had in their hands like Ferry).

The communal elections convoked for the 22 March through the demonstration of the party of order removed to the 26th March.

21 March. The Assembly’s frantic roars of dissent against the words "*Vive la République*" at the end of a *Proclamation "To Citizens and Army (soldiers)"*.\(c\) Thiers: "It might be a very legitimate proposal etc." (Dissent of the rurals.) *Jules Favre* made a harangue against the doctrine of the Republic being superior to universal suffrage, flattered the rural majority, threatened the Parisians with Prussian intervention and provoked—*the demonstration of the Paris of Order*. Thiers: "come what may he would not send an armed force to attack Paris."\(d\) (had no troops yet to do it.)

The Central Committee was so unsure of its victory that it hastened to accept the mediation of the mayors and the deputies of Paris.... The stubbornness of Thiers allowed it (the Committee) to survive for a day or two, and by then it had come to realise its strength. Countless mistakes by the revolutionaries. Instead of rendering the police harmless, the doors were flung open to them; they went to Versailles, where they were welcomed as saviours; they let the 43rd of the line go; all the soldiers who had
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\(a\) E. Picard, L. J.-B. d'Aurelle de Paladines, "To the National Guards of the Seine", *The Daily News*, No. 7765, March 20, 1871.—*Ed.*

\(b\) "*Au Peuple*": "Aux Gardes nationaux de Paris", *The Standard*, No. 14550, March 21, 1871; see also *Journal officiel* (Paris), No. 79, March 20, 1871. Marx gives the last four words in French.—*Ed.*

\(c\) Proclamation of March 21, 1871 "To the Citizens and Soldiers", *The Daily News*, No. 7768, March 23, 1871.—*Ed.*

fraternised with the people were allowed to go home; they let the reactionaries organise themselves in the very heart of Paris; they left Versailles alone. Tridon, Jaclard, Varlin and Vaillant wanted them to go and drive the royalists out right away.... Favre and Thiers took urgent steps with the Prussian authorities to secure their assistance ... in putting down the insurgent movement in Paris.

Trochu and Clément Thomas concentrated on frustrating every attempt to arm and organise the National Guard. The march on Versailles was decided upon, prepared and undertaken by the Central Committee without the knowledge of the Commune and even directly contrary to its clearly expressed will....

Bergeret ... instead of blowing up the bridge at Neuilly, which the Federals were unable to hold because of Mont Valérien and the batteries installed at Courbevoie, allowed the royalists to take it, and there to entrench themselves strongly, thereby assuring themselves of a route of communication with Paris...a

As M. Littré said in a letter (Daily News, 20 April):

"Paris disarmed; Paris manacled by the Vinoys, the Valentins, the Paladines, the Republic was lost. This the Parisians understood. With the alternative of succumbing without fighting, and risking a terrible contest of uncertain issue, they chose to fight; and I cannot but praise them for it."b

The expedition to Rome,172 the work of Cavaignac, Jules Favre, and Thiers.

"A government which has all the internal advantages of a republican government and the external strength of a monarchist government. I mean a federal republic.... It is a society of societies, a new society, which grows through the addition of numerous new associated members until it becomes strong enough to assure the security of those who have banded together. This kind of republic ... can maintain its size without succumbing to internal corruption. The form of this society averts all difficulties" (Montesquieu. L'Esprit des Loix, 1.IX, Ch. 1).c

The Constitution of 1793§16

§ 78. Every commune of the Republic shall have a municipal administration.

Every district shall have an intermediate administration and every department a central administration. § 79. Municipal officers shall be elected by assemblies of the commune. § 80. The administrators shall be appointed by assemblies of electors in the departments and districts. § 81. One-half of the membership of the municipalities and the administrations shall be renewed every year.

Executive Council, § 62. Shall consist of 24 members. § 63. The electoral assembly of each department shall nominate one candidate. The Legislative Corps

---

a Marx wrote the last three paragraphs in French.—Ed.
c Marx gives a French quotation in the original.—Ed.
shall elect the members of the Council by general roll. § 64. One-half of it shall be renewed in the last month of the legislative session. § 65. The Council shall be charged with directing and supervising the general administration. § 66. It shall appoint not from its members the chief officers of the general administration of the Republic. § 68. These officers shall not constitute a council but shall act separately and shall have no direct connection with one another; they shall not exercise any personal authority. § 73. The Council shall recall and replace the officers it appoints.

Roused on the one hand by J. Favre's call to civil war in the Assembly—he told that the Prussians had threatened to interfere, if the Parisians did not give in at once,—encouraged by the forbearance of the people and the passive attitude towards them of the Central Committee, the "Party of Order" at Paris resolved on a coup de main which came off on the 22 March under the etiquette of a Peaceful Procession, a peaceable demonstration against the Revolutionary Government. And it was a peaceful demonstration of a very peculiar character.

"The whole movement seemed a surprise. There were no preparations to meet it."c

A riotous mob of "gentlemen", in their first rank the familiars of the Empire, the Heeckeren, Coëtlogon, and H. de Pène etc, illtreating and disarming national guards detached from advanced sentinels (sentries) who fled to the Place Vendôme whence the National Guards march at once to the Rue Neuve des Petits Champs. Meeting the rioters, they received order not to fire, but the rioters advance under the cry: "down with the Assassins! down with the Committee!"; insult the guards, grasp at their muskets, shoot with a revolver citizen Maljournal (lieutenant of the General Staff on the Place)d (membre du Comité central). General Bergeret calls upon them to withdraw (disband) (retire). During about 5 minutes the drums are beaten and the sommations (replacing the English reading of the riot acts) made. They reply by cries of insult. Two national guards fall severely wounded. Meanwhile their comrades hesitate and fire into the air. The rioters try to forcibly break through the lines and to disarm them. Bergeret commands fire and the cowards fly. The émeute is at once dispersed and the fire ceases. Shots were fired from houses on the national guard. Two of them, Wahlin and François were
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a These two paragraphs are in French in the original.— Ed.
b Sudden attack.— Ed.
d Marx gives the phrase in parentheses in French.— Ed.
e Summons.— Ed.
f Rebellion.— Ed.
killed, eight are wounded. The streets through which the “pacific”
disband are strewn with revolvers and sword-canes (many of them
picked up in the Rue de la Paix). Vicomte de Molinet, killed from
behind (by his own people) found with a dagger fixed by a chain.\textsuperscript{a}

\textbf{Rappel\textsuperscript{b} was beaten.} A number of cane swords, revolvers, and
daggers lay on the streets by which the “unarmed” demonstration
had passed. Pistol shots were fired before the insurgents received
orders to fire on the crowd. The manifesters were the aggressors
(witnessed by General Sheridan from a window).

This was then simply an attempt to do by the reactionists of
Paris, armed with revolvers, caneswords, and daggers, what Vinoy
had failed to do with his sergents-de-ville, soldiers, cannon and
mitrailleuse. That the “lower orders” of Paris allowed themselves
not even to be disarmed by the “gentlemen” of Paris, was really
too bad!

When on the 13th June 1849 the National Guards of Paris made
a really “unarmed” and “pacific” procession to protest against a
crime, the attack on Rome by the French troops, General
Changarnier was praised by his intimate Thiers for sabring and
shooting them down. The state of siege was declared, new laws of
repression,\textsuperscript{188} new proscriptions, a new reign of terror!\textsuperscript{c} Instead of
all that, the Central Committee and the workmen of Paris strictly
kept on the defensive during the encounter itself, allowed the
assailers, the gentlemen of the dagger, to return quietly home,
and, by their indulgence, by not calling them to account for this
daring enterprise, encouraged them so much, that two days later,
under the leadership of admiral Saisset, sent from Versailles,
[they] rallied again and tried again their hands at civil war.

And this Vendôme affair evoked at Versailles a cry of
“Assassination of unarmed citizens” reverberating throughout the
world. Be it remarked that even Thiers, while eternally reiterating
the assassination of the two generals, has not once dared to
remind the world of this “Assassination of unarmed citizens”.

As in the medieval times the knight may use any weapon
whatever against the plebeian, but the latter must not dare even to
defend himself.

\textit{(27 March. Versailles. Thiers:)}

\textsuperscript{a} “\textit{Le Journal officiel de Paris raconte... }, \textit{Le Rappel}, No. 650, March 25,
1871.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} Retreat.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{c} Marx gives a detailed analysis of the events of June 13, 1849 in his \textit{The Class
Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850}, Ch. 2 (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 71-100).—\textit{Ed.}
"I give a formal contradiction to those who accuse me of leading the way for a monarchical settlement. *I found the Republic an accomplished fact. Before God and men I declare I will not betray it*."

After the second rising of the party of Order, the Paris people took no reprisals whatever. The Central Committee even committed the great blunder, against the advice of its most energetic members, not to march at once at Versailles, where, after the flight of Adm. Saisset and the ridiculous collapse of the National Guard of Order, Consternation ruled supreme, there being not yet any forces of resistance organized.

After the election of the Commune, the party of order tried again their forces at the ballot-box, and, when again beaten, effected their Exodus from Paris. During the election, handshaking and fraternization of the Bourgeois (in the courts of the Mayoralities) with the insurgent National Guards, while among themselves they talk of nothing but "decimation en masse", "mitrailleuses", "frying at Cayenne", "wholesale fusillades".

"The runaways of yesterday think to-day by flattering the men of the Hôtel de Ville to keep them quiet until the Rurals and Bonapartist generals, who are gathering at Versailles will be in a position to fire on them."b

Thiers commenced the armed attack on the National Guard for the second time in Affair of April 2. Fighting between Courbevoie and Neuilly, close to Paris. National Guards beaten, bridge of Neuilly occupied by Thiers' soldiers. Several thousands of National Guards, having come out of Paris and occupied Courbevoie and Puteaux and the bridge of Neuilly, routed. Many prisoners taken. Many of the insurgents immediately shot as rebels. Versailles troops began the firing.

Commune:

"The Government of Versailles has attacked us. Not being able to count upon the army, it has sent Pontifical Zouaves of Charette, Bretons of Trochu, and Gendarmes of Valentin, in order to bombard Neuilly."c

On 2nd April the Versailles Government had sent forward a division chiefly consisting of *Gendarmes, Marines, Forest Guard, and Police*. Vinoy with two brigades of infantry, and Galliffet at the
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a Mass decimation.—Ed.


c Proclamation of the Commune of April 2, 1871 to the National Guards, *The Daily Telegraph*, No. 4931, April 4, 1871; see also *Journal officiel* (Paris), No. 93, April 3, 1871.—Ed.
head of a brigade of cavalry and a battery of artillery advanced upon Courbevoie.

Paris. April 4. Millière (Declaration)

"the people of Paris was not making any aggressive attempt ... when the government ordered it to be attacked by the ex-soldiers of the Empire, organized as pretorian troops," under the Command of ex-Senators."\(^a\)

\(^a\) J.-B. E. Millière’s declaration of April 4, 1871, *The Daily Telegraph*, No. 4933, April 6, 1871.— *Ed.*
The republic proclaimed on the 4th September by the Paris workmen was acclaimed through all France without a single voice of dissent. Its right of life was fought for in a 5 months’ defensive war (centring in) based upon the resistance of Paris. Without that war of defence waged in the name of the Republic, William the "Conqueror" would have restored the Empire of his "good brother" Louis Bonaparte. The cabal of barristers, with Thiers for their statesman, and Trochu for their general, installed themselves at the Hôtel-de-Ville at a moment of surprise, when the real leaders of the Paris working class were still shut up in Bonapartist prisons and the Prussian army was already marching upon Paris. So deeply were the Thiers, the Jules Favre, the Picard then imbued with the belief in the historical leadership of Paris, that to legitimate their title as the government of national defence they founded their claim exclusively upon their having been chosen in the elections to the Corps Législatif, in 1869, as the *Deputies of Paris.*

In our Second address on the late war, five days after the advent of those men, we told you what they were. If they had seized the government without consulting Paris, Paris had proclaimed the republic in the teeth of their resistance. And their first step was to send Thiers begging about at all courts of Europe there to buy if possible Foreign mediation, bartering the Republic for a king. Paris did bear with their assumption of power, because they highly professed on their solemn vow to wield that power for the single purpose of *national defence.* Paris, however, was not to be
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1) GOVERNMENT OF DEFENCE.
TROCHU, FAVRE, PICARD, FERRY

a See this volume, pp. 268-69.—Ed.
seriously defended without arming the working class, organizing
them into a National Guard, and training their ranks through the
war itself. But Paris armed was the social Revolution armed. The
victory of Paris over its Prussian besieger would have been a
victory of the Republic over French class rule. In this conflict
between national duty and class interest, the Government of
national Defence did not hesitate one moment to turn into a
government of national defection. In a letter to Gambetta, Jules
Favre confessed that what Trochu stood in defence of, was not the
Prussian soldier, but the Paris workman. Four months after the
commencement of the siege, when they thought the opportune
moment come for breaking the first word of capitulation, Trochu,
in the presence of Jules Favre and others of his colleagues,
addresses the reunion of the maires of Paris in these terms:

“The first question, addressed to me by my colleagues, on the very evening of the 4th September, was this: Paris, can it, with any chance of success, stand a siege
against the Prussian army? I did not hesitate to answer in the negative. Some of my
colleagues here present will warrant the truth of my words, and the persistence of my
opinion. I told them, in these very terms, that under the existing state of things, the
attempt of Paris to maintain a siege against the Prussian army would be a folly.
Without doubt, I added, it might be a heroic folly, but it would be nothing more....
The events (managed by himself) have not given the lie to my prevision.”

(This little speech of Trochu’s was after the armistice published
by M. Corbon, one of the maires present.)
Thus, on the very
evening of the proclamation of the Republic, Trochu’s “plan”,
known to his colleagues, was nothing else but the capitulation of
Paris and France. To cure Paris of its “heroic folly”, it had to
undergo a treatment of decimation and famine, long enough to
screen the usurpers of the 4th of September from the vengeance of
the December men. If the “national defence” had been more
than a false pretence for “government”, its self-appointed
members would have abdicated on the 5th of September, publicly
revealed Trochu’s “plan”, and called upon the Paris people to at
once surrender to the conqueror or take the work of defence in its
own hands. Instead of this the imposters published high-sounding
manifestoes wherein Trochu “the governor will never capitulate”
and Jules Favre the Foreign minister “not cede a stone of our
fortresses, nor a foot of our territory”. Through the whole time
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a “Paris au jour le jour”, Le Figaro, No. 74, March 19, 1871.—Ed.
b L. J. Trochu, [Proclamation aux habitants de Paris. Paris, 6 janvier 1871],
Journal officiel (Paris), No. 7, January 7, 1871.—Ed.
c J. Favre, “Circulaire adressée aux agents diplomatiques de France ... Le 6 septembre 1870”, Journal officiel (Paris), No. 246, September 7, 1870.—Ed.
of the siege Trochu’s plan was systematically carried out. In fact, the vile Bonapartist cut-throats, to whose trust they gave the generalship of Paris, cracked in their intimate correspondence ribald jokes at the well-understood farce of the defence. (See f.i. the correspondence of Alphonse Simon Guiod, supreme commander of the artillery of the army of defence of Paris and Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour, to Suzanne, General of Division of Artillery, published by the Journal officiel of the Commune.) The mask of imposture was dropped at the capitulation of Paris. The “government of national defence” unmasked itself as the “government of France by Bismarck’s prisoners”—a part which Louis Bonaparte himself at Sedan had considered too infamous even for a man of his stamp. On their wild flight to Versailles, after the events of the 18th March, the capitulards have left in the hands of Paris the documentary evidence of their treason, to destroy which, as the Commune says in its Manifesto to the Provinces,

“they would not recoil from battering Paris into a heap of ruins washed in a sea of blood”.

Some of the most influential members of the government of defence had moreover urgent private reasons of their own to be passionately bent upon such a consummation. Look only at Jules Favre, Ernest Picard, and Jules Ferry!

Shortly after the conclusion of the armistice, M. Millière, one of the representatives of Paris to the National Assembly, published a series of authentic legal documents in proof that Jules Favre, living in concubinage with the wife of a drunkard, resident at Algiers, had, by a most daring concoction of forgeries, spread over many years, contrived to grasp, in the name of the children of his adultery, a large succession which made him a rich man, and that, in a law-suit undertaken by the legitimate heirs, he only escaped exposure through the connivance of the Bonapartist tribunals. Since those dry legal documents were not to be got rid of by any horsepower of rhetorics, Jules Favre, in the same heroism of self-abasement, remained for once tongue-tied until the turmoil of the civil war allowed him to brand the Paris people in the Versailles assembly as a band of “escaped convicts” in utter revolt against family, religion, order and property!
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\(a\) See Journal officiel (Paris), No. 115, April 25, 1871. Marx cites from the item “Le Gouvernement de la Défense nationale”, La Situation, No. 189, April 29, 1871.— Ed.

\(b\) “Manifeste”, Le Vengeur, No. 30, April 28, 1871.— Ed.

\(c\) J.-B. E. Millière, “Le Faussaire”, Le Vengeur, No. 6, February 8, 1871.— Ed.

\(d\) Jeanne Charmont, who lived separately from her husband Vernier.— Ed.
(Pic affaire.) This very forger had hardly got into power when he sympathetically hastened to liberate two brother-forgers, Pic and Taillefer, under the Empire itself convicted to the hulks for theft and forgery. One of these men, Taillefer, daring to return to Paris after the instalment of the Commune, was at once returned to a convenient abode; and then Jules Favre told all Europe that Paris was setting free all the felonious inhabitants of her prisons!

Ernest Picard, appointed by himself the home minister of the French Republic on the 4th of September, after having striven in vain to become the home minister of Louis Bonaparte, is the brother of one Arthur Picard, an individual expelled from the Paris bourse as a blackleg (Report of the Prefecture of Police d.d. 31 July 1867) and convicted on his own confession of a theft of 300,000 fcs while a director of one of the branches of the Société Générale, (see Report of the Prefecture of Police, 11 December 1868). Both these reports were still published at the time of the Empire. This Arthur Picard was made by Ernest Picard the rédacteur en chef of his "Electeur libre" to act, during the whole siege, as his financial go-between, discounting at the Bourse the state secrets in the trust of Ernest and safely speculating on the disasters of the French army, while the common jobbers were misled by the false news, and official lies, published in the "Electeur libre", the organ of the home minister. The whole financial correspondence between that worthy pair of brethren has fallen into the hands of the Commune. No wonder that Ernest Picard, the Joe Miller of the Versailles government, "with his hands in his trousers' pockets, walked from group to group cracking jokes", at the first batch of Paris National Guards made prisoners and exposed to the ferocious outrages of Piétri's lambs.

Jules Ferry, a penniless barrister before the 4th of September, contrived, as the Maire of Paris, to job during the siege a fortune out of the famine which was to a great part the work of his maladministration. The day on which he would have to give an account of his maladministration would be his day of judgement. The documentary proofs are in the hands of the Commune.

These men, therefore, are the deadly foes of the workingmen's

---

a See "Le Sieur Picard", La Situation, No. 168, April 4, 1871.— Ed.

b Marx corrected the inaccuracy in the final version of The Civil War in France: Ernest Picard was Minister of Finance in the Government of National Defence and the newspaper Electeur libre was the organ of the Ministry of Finance (see this volume, p. 314).— Ed.

c "The Advance of the Insurgents on Versailles", The Daily News, No. 7781, April 7, 1871.— Ed.
Paris, not only as parasites of the ruling classes, not only as the betrayers of Paris during the siege, but above all as common felons who but in the ruins of Paris, this stronghold of the French Revolution, can hope to find their tickets-of-leave. These desperadoes were exactly the men to become the ministers of Thiers.

In the "parliamentary sense" things are only a pretext for words serving as a snare for the adversary, an ambuscade for the people, or a matter of artistic display for the speaker himself.

Their master, M. Thiers, the mischievous gnome, has charmed the French bourgeoisie for almost half a century because he is the most consummate intellectual expression of their own class corruption. Even before he became a statesman, he had shown his lying powers as a historian. Eager of display, like all dwarfish men, greedy of place and pelf, with a barren intellect but lively fancy, epicurean, sceptical, of an encyclopedic facility for mastering the surface of things, and turning things into a mere pretext for talk, a wordfencer of rare conversational power, a writer of lucid shallowness, a master of small state roguery, a virtuoso in perjury, a craftsman in all the petty stratagems, cunning devices and base perfidies of parliamentary party warfare, national and class prejudices standing him in the place of ideas, and vanity in the place of conscience, in order to displace a rival, and to shoot the people, in order to stifle the Revolution, mischievous when in opposition, odious when in power, never scrupling to provoke revolutions, the history of his public life is the chronicle of the miseries of his country. Fond of brandishing with his dwarfish arms in the face of Europe the sword of the first Napoleon, whose historical shoeblack he had become, his Foreign policy always culminated in the utter humiliation of France, from the London Convention of 1841 to the Paris capitulation of 1871 and the present civil war he wages under the shelter of Prussian invasion. It need not be said that to such a man the deeper undercurrents of modern society remained a closed book, but even the most palpable changes on its surface were abhorrent to a brain all whose vitality had fled to the tongue. F.i. he never fatigued to denounce any deviation from the old French protective system as

---

\(^a\) See this volume, p. 314.— Ed.

\(^b\) The reference is to Thiers' *Histoire de la Révolution française* and *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire*.— Ed.
a sacrilege, railways he sneeringly derided, when a minister of Louis Philippe, as a wild chimera, and every reform of the rotten French army system he branded under Louis Bonaparte as a profanation. With all his versatility of talent and shiftiness of purpose, he was steadily wedded to the traditions of a fossilized routine, and never, during his long official career, became guilty of one single, even the smallest measure of practical use. Only the old world’s edifice may be proud of being crowned by two such men as Napoleon the little and little Thiers. The so-called accomplishments of culture appear in such a man only as the refinement of debauchery and the... of selfishness.

Banded with the Republicans under the restoration, Thiers insinuated himself with Louis Philippe as a spy upon and the jail-accoucheur of the Duchess of Berry, but his activity when he had first slipped into a ministry (1834-35) centred in the massacre of the insurgent Republicans at the rue Transnonain and the incubation of the atrocious September laws against the press.

Reappearing as the chief of the cabinet in March 1840, he came out with the plot of the Paris fortifications. To the [outcry] of the Republican party, against the sinister attempt on the liberty of Paris, he replied:

"What! To fancy that any works of fortification could endanger liberty! And first of all, you calumniate every Government whatever in supposing that it could one day try to maintain itself by bombarding the capital.... But it would be hundred times more impossible after its victory than before."

Indeed no French government whatever save that of M. Thiers himself with his ticket-of-leave ministers and his rural assembly ruminants could have dared upon such a deed! And this too in the most classic form; one part of his fortifications in the hands of his Prussian conquerors and protectors.

When King Bomba tried his hands at Palermo in January 1848, Thiers rose in the Chamber of Deputies:

"You know, gentlemen, what passes at Palermo: you all shook with horror" (in the "parliamentary" sense) "when hearing that during 48 hours a great town has been bombarded. By whom? was it by a Foreign enemy, exercising the rights of war? No, gentlemen, by its own government."
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a A blank space in the manuscript.—Ed.
b L. A. Thiers’ speech at the session of the Chamber of Deputies, January 13, 1841, Le Venguer, No. 14, April 12, 1871.—Ed.
c See this volume, p. 314.—Ed.
d Ferdinand II.—Ed.
(If it had been by its own government, under the eyes and on the sufferance of the Foreign enemy, all would, of course, have been right.)

"And why? Because that unfortunate town (city) demanded its rights. Well, then. For the demand of its rights, it has had 48 hours of bombardment."

(If the bombardment had lasted 4 weeks and more all would have been right.)

"...Allow me to appeal to the opinion of Europe. It is doing a service to mankind to come and make reverberate from the greatest tribune perhaps of Europe some words of indignation" (indeed! words!) “against such acts.... When the regent Esparterro, who had rendered services to his country” (what Thiers never did), “in order to suppress an insurrection, wanted to bombard Barcelona, there was from all parts of the world a general shriek of indignation.”

Well, about a year later this fine-souled man became the sinister suggester and the most fierce defender (apologist) of the bombardment of Rome by the troops of the French republic, under the command of the legitimist Oudinot.

A few days before the Revolution of February, fretting at the long exile from power to which Guizot had condemned him, smelling in the air the commotion, Thiers exclaimed again in the Chambre of Deputies:

"I am of the party of Revolution not only in France, but in Europe. I wish the government of the Revolution to remain in the hands of moderate men.... But if that government should pass into the hands of ardent men, even of the Radicals, I should not for all that desert (abandon) my cause. I shall always be of the party of the Revolution."

The Revolution of February came. Instead of displacing the Guizot cabinet by the Thiers cabinet as the little man had dreamt, it displaced Louis Philippe by the Republic. To put down that Revolution was M. Thiers’ exclusive business from the proclamation of the Republic to the Coup d’Etat. On the first day of the popular victory, he anxiously hid himself, forgetting that the contempt of the people rescued him from its hatred. Still, with his legendary courage, he continued to shy the public stage until after the bloody disruption of the material forces of the Paris proletariat by Cavaignac, the bourgeois republican. Then the scene was cleared for his sort of action. His hour had again struck. He became the leading mind of the “Party of Order” and its "Parliamentary Republic", that anonymous reign in which all the
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a L. A. Thiers’ speech at the session of the Chamber of Deputies, January 31, 1848, Le Rappel, No. 673, April 17, 1871; Le Vengeur, No. 21, April 19, 1871.—Ed.

b L. A. Thiers’ speech at the session of the Chamber of Deputies, February 2, 1848, Le Moniteur universel, No. 34, February 3, 1848.—Ed.
rival factions of the ruling classes conspired together to crush the working class and conspired against each other, each for the restoration of its own monarchy.

(The Restoration had been the reign of the aristocratic landed proprietors, the July monarchy the reign of the capitalist, Cavaignac's republic the reign of the "Republican" fraction of the bourgeoisie, while during all these reigns the band of hungry adventurers forming the Bonapartist party had panted in vain for the plunder of France, that was to qualify them as the saviours of "order and property, family and religion".

That Republic was the anonymous reign of coalesced Legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists, with the bourgeois Republicans for their tail.)

3) THE RURAL ASSEMBLY

If this rural assembly, meeting at Bordeaux, made this government, the "government of defence men" had beforehand taken good care to make that assembly. For that purpose they had dispatched Thiers on a travelling tour through the provinces, there to foreshadow coming events and make ready for the surprise of the general elections. Thiers had to overcome one difficulty. Quite apart from having become an abomination to the French people, the Bonapartists, if numerously elected, would at once have restored the Empire and embaled M. Thiers and Co. for a voyage to Cayenne. The Orleanists were too sparsely scattered to fill their own places and those vacated by the Bonapartists. To galvanize the Legitimist party, had therefore become unavoidable. Thiers was not afraid of his task. Impossible as a government of modern France, and therefore contemptible as rivals for place and pelf, who could be fitter to be handled as the blind tool of Counter-revolution, than the party whose action, in the words of Thiers, had always been confined to the three resources of "Foreign invasion, civil war, and anarchy". (Speech of Thiers at the Chambre of Deputies of January 5, 1833.) A select set of the Legitimists, expropriated by the Revolution of 1789, had regained their estates by enlisting in the servant hall of the first Napoleon, the bulk of them by the milliard of indemnity and the private donations of the Restoration. Even their seclusion from participation in active politics under the successive reigns of Louis Philippe and Napoleon the little, served as a lever to the reestablishment of their wealth as landed proprietors. Freed from

\[a\] See La Tribune de Bordeaux, April 25, 1871.—Ed.
court dissipation and representation costs at Paris, they had, out of the very corners of provincial France, only to gather the golden apples falling into their châteaux\(^a\) from the tree of modern industry, railways enhancing the price of their land, agronomy applied to it by capitalist farmers, increasing its produce, and the inexhaustible demand of a rapidly swollen town population securing the growth of markets for that produce. The very same social agencies which reconstituted their material wealth and remade their importance as partners of that jointstock company of modern slaveholders, screened them from the infection of the modern ideas and allowed them, in rustic innocence, nothing to forget and nothing to learn. Such people furnished the mere passive material to be worked upon by a man like Thiers. While executing the mission, entrusted to him by the government of Defence, the mischievous imp overreached his mandatories in securing to himself that multitude of elections which was to convert the defence men from his opponent masters into his avowed servants.

The electoral traps being thus laid, the French people was suddenly summoned by the capitulards of Paris\(^b\) to choose within 8 days a national assembly with the exclusive task by virtue of the terms of the convention of the 31st January, dictated by Bismarck,\(^c\) to decide on war or peace. Quite apart from the extraordinary circumstances, under which that election occurred, with no time for deliberation, with one half of France under the sway of Prussian bayonets, with its other half secretly worked upon by the government intrigue, with Paris secluded from the provinces, the French people felt instinctively that the very terms of the armistice, undergone by the capitulards, left France no alternative (choice) but that of a peace à outrance\(^d\) and that for its sanction the worst men of France would be the best. Hence the rural assembly emerging at Bordeaux.

Still we must distinguish between the old regime orgies and the real historical business of the rurals. Astonished to find themselves the strongest fraction of an immense majority, composed of themselves and the Orleanists, with a contingent of Bourgeois republicans and a mere sprinkling of Bonapartists, they verily believed in the long-expected advent of their retrospective millennium. There were the heels of the Foreign invasion trampling upon France, there was the downfall of the Empire and
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\(^a\) Manors.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^b\) At any price.—\textit{Ed.}
the captivity of a Bonapartiste, and there they were themselves. The wheel of history had evidently turned round to stop at the *Chambre introuvable* of 1816, with its deep and impassionate curses against the Revolutionary deluge and its abominations, with its "decapitation and decapitalization of Paris", its "decentralization" breaking through the network of state rule by the local influences of the *Châteaux* and its religious homilies and its tenets of antediluvian politics, with its *gentilhommerie*, flippancy, its genealogic spite against the drudging masses, and its *Oeil de Boeuf* views of the world. Still in point of fact they had only to act their part as joint-stock holders of the "party of order", as monopolists of the means of production. From 1848 to 1851, they had only to form a fraction of the interregnum of the "parliamentary republic", with this difference that then they were represented by their educated and trained parliamentary champions, the Berryer, the Falloux, the Larochejaquelein, while now they had to ask in their rustic rank and file, imparting thus a different tone and tune to the assembly, maskerading its bourgeois reality under feudal colours. Their grotesque exaggerations (homilies) serve only to set off the liberalism of their banditti government. Ensnared into an usurpation of powers beyond their electoral mandates, they live only on the sufferance of their selfmade rulers. The Foreign invasion of 1814 and 1815 having been the deadly weapon wielded against them by the bourgeois parvenus, they have in judicial blindness bestowed upon themselves the responsibility for this unprecedented surrender of France to the Foreigner by their bourgeois foes. And the French people astonished and insulted by the reappearance of all the noble Pourceaugnacs it believed buried long since, has become aware that beside making the Revolution of the 19th century it has to finish off the Revolution of 1789 by driving the ruminants to the last goal of all rustic animals—the shambles.

5) OPENING OF THE CIVIL WAR. 18 MARCH REVOLUTION. CLÉMENT THOMAS. LECOMTE. THE VENÔME AFFAIR

The disarmament of Paris, as a mere necessity of the counter-revolutionary plot, might have been undertaken in a more temporizing, circumspect manner, but as a clause of the urgent financial treaty with its irresistible fascinations, it brooked no delay. Thiers had therefore to try his hand at a *coup d'état*. He

---

opened the civil war by sending Vinoy, the Décembreur,\(^{181}\) at the head of a multitude of sergeants-de-ville and a few regiments of the line, upon the nocturnal expedition against the Montmartre Buttes. Thiers’ felonious attempt having broken down on the resistance of the National Guards and their fraternization with the soldiers, on the following day, in a manifesto, stuck to the walls of Paris, Thiers told the National Guards of his magnanimous resolve to leave them their arms\(^{a}\) with which, he felt sure, they would be eager to rally round the government against “the rebels”. Out of 300,000 national guards only 300 responded to his summons. The glorious workmen’s Revolution of the 18th March had taken undisputed possession (sway) of Paris.

The Central Committee, which directed the defence of Montmartre and emerged on the dawn of the 18th March as the leader of the Revolution, was neither an expedient of the moment nor the offspring of secret conspiracy. From the very day of the capitulation, by which the government of the national defence had disarmed France but reserved to itself a bodyguard of 40,000 troops for the purpose of cowing Paris, Paris stood on the watch. The national guard reformed its organization and entrusted its supreme control to a Central Committee, consisting of the delegates of the single companies, mostly workmen, with their main strength in the workmen’s suburbs, but soon accepted by the whole body save its old Bonapartist formations. On the eve of the entrance of the Prussians into Paris, the Central committee took measures for the removal to Montmartre, Belleville, and La Villette, of the cannon and mitrailleuses treacherously abandoned by the capitulards, even in those quarters which the Prussians were about to occupy. It thus made safe the artillery, furnished by the subscriptions of the National Guard, officially recognized as their private property in the convention of the 28th of January,\(^{318}\) and on that very title exempted from the general surrender of arms. During the whole interval from the meeting of the National Assembly at Bordeaux to the 18th of March, the Central Committee had been the people’s government of the capital, strong enough to persist in its firm attitude of defence despite the provocations of the Assembly, the violent measures of the Executive, and the menacing concentration of troops.\(^{b}\)

The defeat of Vinoy by the National Guard was but a check

\(^{a}\) E. Picard, L. J.-B. d'Aurelle de Paladines, “To the National Guards of the Seine”, *The Daily News*, No. 7765, March 20, 1871.— *Ed.*

\(^{b}\) Then follows a paragraph beginning with the words “The revolution of the 4th September” to “of a long bygone past”, which was crossed out by Marx since it occurs on the next page.— *Ed.*
given to the Counterrevolution plotted by ruling classes, but the Paris people turned at once that incident of their selfdefence into the first act of a social Revolution. The revolution of the 4th September had restored the Republic after the throne of the usurper had become vacant. The tenacious resistance of Paris during its siege, serving as the basis for the defensive war in the provinces, had wrung from the Foreign invader the recognition of that Republic, but its true meaning and purpose were only revealed on the 18th of March. It was to supersede the social and political conditions of class rule, upon which the old world's system rests, which had engendered the Second Empire and under its tutelage, ripened into rottenness. Europe thrilled as under an electric shock. It seemed for a moment to doubt whether its late sensational performances of state and war had any reality in them and were not the mere sanguinary dreams of a long bygone past. The traces of the long endured famine still upon their figures, and under the very eye of Prussian bayonets, the Paris working class conquered in one bound the championship of progress etc.

In the sublime enthusiasm of historic initiative, the Paris workmen's Revolution made it a point of honour to keep the proletarian clean of the crimes in which the revolutions and still more the counterrevolutions of their betters (natural superiors) abound.

**Clément Thomas. Lecomte etc.**

But the horrid "atrocities" that have sullied this Revolution?

So far as these atrocities imputed to it by its enemies are not the deliberate calumny of Versailles or the horrid spawn of the penny a liner's brain, they relate only to two facts—the execution of the Generals Lecomte and Clément Thomas and the Vendôme Affaire, of which we shall dispose in a few words.

One of the paid cut-throats selected for the (felonious handy work) execution of the nocturnal *coup de main* on Montmartre, General Lecomte had on the place Pigalle four times ordered his troops of the 81st of the line to charge an unarmed gathering, and on their refusal fiercely insulted them. Instead of shooting women and children, some of his own men shot him, when taken prisoner in the afternoon of the 18th March, in the gardens of the Château rouge. The inveterate habits acquired by the French *soldatesque* under the training of the enemies of the working class, are of

---

a Sudden attack.—Ed.
course not likely to change the very moment they change sides. The same soldiers executed Clément Thomas.

“General” Clément Thomas, a discontent ex-quarter-master-sergeant had, in the latter times of Louis Philippe’s reign, enlisted in the “republican” National newspaper, there to serve in the double quality of strawman (responsible Gérant) and bully. The men of the National having abused the February Revolution, to cheat themselves into power, metamorphosed their old quartermaster-sergeant into a “General” on the eve of the butchery of June, of which he, like Jules Favre, was one of the sinister plotters and became one of the most merciless executors. Then his generalship came to a sudden end. He disappears only to rise again to the surface on the 1st November 1870. The day before the government of defence, caught at the Hôtel de Ville, had, upon their word of honour, solemnly bound themselves to Blanqui, Flourens and the other representatives of the working class to abdicate their usurped power into the hands of a Commune to be freely chosen by Paris. They broke, of course, their word of honour, to let loose the Bretons of Trochu, who had taken the place of the Corsicans of L. Bonaparte, upon the people guilty of believing in their honour. M. Tamié one refusing to brand himself by such a breach of faith, tendering at once his resignation of the commandship-in-chief of the National Guard, “General” Clément Thomas was shuffled into his place. During his whole tenure of office he made war not upon the Prussians, but upon the Paris National Guard, proving inexhaustible in pretexts to prevent its general armament, in devices of disorganization by pitching its bourgeois element against its working men’s elements, of weeding out the officers hostile to Trochu’s “plan” and disbanding, under the stigma of cowardice, the very proletarian battalions whose heroism is now astonishing their most inveterate enemies. Clément Thomas felt proud of having reconquered his June preeminence as the personal enemy of the Paris working class. Only a few days before the 18th of March he laid before the war minister Le Flô a new plan of his own for finishing off “la fine fleur (the cream) of the Paris canaille.” As if haunted by the June spectres, he must needs appear, in the quality of an amateur detective, on the scene of action after Vinoy’s rout!

---

a Editor.— Ed.
b Of 1848.— Ed.
c “La Sociale publie une curieuse lettre...”, Le Venguer, No. 21, April 19, 1871. Canaille—mob.— Ed.
The Central Committee tried in vain to rescue these two criminals, Lecomte and Clément Thomas, from the soldiers' wild lynch justice, of which they themselves and the Paris workmen were as guilty as the Princess Alexandra of the people crushed to death on the day of her entrance in London. Jules Favre, with his forged Pathos, flung his curses upon Paris, the den of assassins. The Rural Assembly mimicked hysterical contortions of "sensible-rie". These men never shed their crocodile tears but as a pretext for shedding the blood of the people. To handle respectable cadavers as weapons of civil war has always been a favourite trick with the party of order. How did Europe ring in 1848 with their shouts of horror at the assassination of the Archbishop of Paris\(^b\) by the insurgents of June, and while they were fully aware from the evidence of an eyewitness: M. Jacquemet, the Archbishop's vicar, that the Bishop had been shot by Cavaignac's own soldiers!\(^c\) Through the letters to Thiers of the present Archbishop of Paris,\(^d\) a man with no martyr's vein in him, there runs the shrewd suspicion that his Versailles friends were quite the men to console themselves of his prospective execution in the violent desire to fix that amiable proceeding on the Commune! However, when the cry of "assassins" had served its turn, Thiers coolly disposed of it by declaring from the tribune of the National Assembly, that the "assassination" was the private deed of a few, "very few" obscure individuals.\(^e\)

The "men of order", the reactionists of Paris, trembling at the people's victory as the signal of retribution, were quite astonished by proceedings strangely at variance with their own traditional methods of celebrating a defeat of the people. Even the sergents-de-ville, instead of being disarmed and locked up, had the doors of Paris flung wide open for their safe retreat to Versailles, while the "men of order", left not only unhurt, were allowed to rally quietly and lay hold of the strongholds in the very centre of Paris. They interpreted, of course, the indulgence of the Central Committee and the magnanimity of the armed workmen as mere symptoms of conscious weakness. Hence their plan to try under the mask of an "unarmed" demonstration the work which four

\(^{a}\) Sentimentality.—\(Ed.\)
\(^{b}\) D. A. Affre.—\(Ed.\)
\(^{c}\) The reference is to Jacquemet's statement of June 26, 1848, published in La Situation, No. 185, April 25, 1871.—\(Ed.\)
\(^{d}\) G. Darboy, "Prison de Mazas, le 8 avril 1871", Le Rappel, No. 669, April 13, 1871.—\(Ed.\)
\(^{e}\) See "Méditation des municipalités de la Seine", Le Rappel, No. 684, April 28, 1871.—\(Ed.\)
days before Vinoy's cannon and mitrailleuses had failed in. Starting from their quarters of luxury, this riotous mob of "gentlemen", with all the "petits crevés" in their ranks and the familiars of the Empire, the Heeckeren, Coëtlogon, H. de Pène etc. at their head, fell in marching order under the cries of "down with the Assassins! down with the Central Committee! Vive l'Assemblée Nationale!" illtreating and disarming the detached posts of National Guards they met with on their progress. When then at last debouching in the place Vendôme, they tried, under shouts of ribald insults, to dislodge the National Guards from their headquarters and forcibly break through the lines. In answer to their pistol shots the regular sommations (the French equivalent of the English reading of the Riot acts) were made, but proved ineffective to stop the aggressors. Then fire was commanded by the general of the National Guard and these rioters dispersed in wild flight. Two national guards killed, eight dangerously wounded, and the streets, through which they disbanded (runaways fled), strewed with revolvers, daggers and cane-swords, gave clear evidence of the "unarmed" character of their "pacifist" demonstration. When, on the 13th June 1849, the National guards of Paris made a really "unarmed" demonstration of protest against the felonious assault on Rome by French troops, Changarnier, the general of the "party of order", had their ranks sabred, trampled down by cavalry and shot down, the state of siege was at once proclaimed, new arrests, new proscriptions, a new reign of terror set in. But the "lower orders" manage these things otherwise. The runaways of the 22nd March being neither followed up on their flight nor afterwards called to account by the judge of instruction (juge d'instruction), were able two days later to muster again an "armed" demonstration under Admiral Saisset. Even after the grotesque failure of this their second rising, they were, like all other Paris citizens, allowed to try their hands at the ballot-box for the election of the Commune, and when succumbing in this bloodless battle, they at last purged Paris from their presence by an unmolested Exodus, dragging along with them the cocottes, the lazzaroni and the other dangerous class of the capital.

\[\text{\footnotesize\(^a\) Fops.— Ed.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize\(^b\) J. Bergeret.— Ed.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize\(^c\) See "Le Journal officiel de Paris raconte...", Le Rappel, No. 650, March 25, 1871.— Ed.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize\(^d\) Marx gives a detailed analysis of the events of June 13, 1849 in his work The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850, Ch. II (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 71-100).— Ed.}\]
The "assassination of the unarmed citizens" on the 22nd of March is a myth which even Thiers and his ruralists have never dared to harp upon, entrusting it exclusively to the servant hall of European journalism.

If there is to be found fault with in the conduct of the Central Committee and the Paris workmen towards these "men of order" from 18th March to the time of their Exodus, it is an excess of moderation bordering upon weakness.

---

Look now to the other side of the medal!

After the failure of their nocturnal surprise of Montmartre, the party of order began their regular Campaign against Paris in the commencement of April. For inaugurating the civil war by the methods of December, the massacre in cold blood of the captured soldiers of the line and infamous murder of our brave friend Duval, Vinoy, the runaway, is appointed by Thiers Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour! Galliffet, the fancy-man of that woman so notorious for her shameless maskerades at the orgies of the Second Empire, boasts in an official manifesto of his cowardly assassination of Paris National Guards, their lieutenant and their captain, made by surprise and treason. Desmarèts, the gendarme, is decorated for his butchery-like chopping of the high-souled and chivalrous Flourens, the "encouraging" particulars of whose death are triumphantly communicated to the Assembly by Thiers. In the horribly grotesque exultation of a Tom Pouce playing the part of Timur Tamerlane, Thiers denies the "rebels" against his littleness all the rights and customs of civilized warfare, even the rights of "ambulances".

When the Commune had published on the 7 April its decree of reprisals, declaring it its duty to protect itself against the cannibal exploits of the Versailles banditti and to demand an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, the atrocious treatment of the Versailles prisoners, of whom Thiers says in one of his bulletins:

---

a "The wild tumults of...", The Daily News, No. 7779, April 5, 1871.— Ed.


c Marx sets forth Thiers' speech in the National Assembly on April 3, 1871 according to The Daily Telegraph, No. 4932, April 5, 1871.— Ed.

d The Proclamation of the Commune of April 5, 1871 is cited from The Civil War in France published in The Daily News, No. 7781, April 7, 1871; see also Journal officiel (Paris), No. 96, April 6, 1871.— Ed.
“never had more degraded countenances of a degraded democracy met the afflicted gazes of honest men”, a

did not cease, but the fusillades of the captives were stopped. Hardly however had he and his Decembrist generals become aware, that the Commune’s decree was but an empty threat, that even their spying gendarmes caught in Paris under the disguise of National Guards, that even their sergents-de-ville captured with explosive bombs upon them were spared, when at once the old regime set in wholesale and has continued to this day. The National Guards who had surrendered at Belle Epine to an overwhelming force of Chasseurs were then shot down one after the other by the captain of the peloton b on horseback; houses, to which Parisian troops and National guards had fled, surrounded by Gendarmes, inundated with petroleum, and then set on fire, the calcinated corpses being afterward transported by Paris ambulance; the bayoneting of the national guards surprised (Federals surprised in their beds asleep) by treason in their beds at the Redoubt of Moulin Saquet, the massacre (fusillades) of Clamart, prisoners wearing the line uniform shot offhand, all these high deeds flippantly told in Thiers bulletin,c are only a few incidents of this slaveholders’ rebellion! But would it not be ludicrous to quote single facts of ferocity in view of this civil war, fomented amidst the ruins of France, by the conspirators of Versailles from the meanest motives of class interest, and the bombardment of Paris under the patronage of Bismarck, in the sight of his soldiers! The flippant manner in which Thiers reports on these things in the bulletin, has even shocked the not oversensitive nerves of The Times.d All this is however “regular” as the Spaniards say. All the fights of the ruling classes against the producing classes menacing their privileges are full of the same horrors, although none exhibits such an excess of humanity on the part of the oppressed and few such an abasement.... Theirs has always been the old axiom of knight-errantry that every weapon is fair if used against the plebeian.

“L’assemblée siège paisiblement”, writes Thiers to the Prefects.c

---

a L. A. Thiers’ proclamation of April 4, 1871, The Daily News, No. 7779, April 5, 1871.— Ed.

b A company.— Ed.

c See “Voici, sur le même fait, le bulletin...”, Le Rappel, No. 692, May 6, 1871.— Ed.

d See “The Massacre at Clamart”, The Times, No. 27056, May 6, 1871.— Ed.

The Affaire at Belle-Epine

The affair at Belle-Epine, near Villejuif this: On the 25th April four national guards, being surrounded by a troop of mounted Chasseurs, who bid them to surrender and lay down their arms. Unable to resist, they obeyed and were left unhurt by the Chasseurs. Some time later then their captain, a worthy officer of Galliffet's, arrives in full gallop and shoots the prisoners down with his revolver, one after the other, and then trots off with his troop. Three of the guards were dead, one, named Scheffer, grievously wounded, survives, and is afterwards brought to the Hospital of Bicêtre. Thither the Commune sent a commission to take up the evidence of the dying man which it published in its report. When one of the Paris members of the Assemblée interpellated the war minister upon that report, the rurals drowned the voice of the deputy and forbid the minister to answer. It would be an insult to their "glorious" army—not to commit murder, but to speak of it.

The tranquillity of mind with which that Assembly bears with the horrors of civil war is told in one of Thiers' bulletins to his prefects: "L'assemblée siège paisiblement" (has the coeur léger like Ollivier) and the executive with its ticket-of-leave men shows by its gastronomical feats, given by Thiers and at the table of German princes, that their digestion is not troubled even by the ghosts of Lecomte and Clément Thomas.

6) THE COMMUNE

The Commune had, after Sedan, been proclaimed by the workmen of Lyons, Marseilles, and Toulouse. Gambetta did his best to destroy it. During the siege of Paris the ever recurrent workmen's commotions again and again crushed on false pretences by Trochu's Bretons, those worthy substitutes of L. Bonaparte's Corsicans, were as many attempts to dislodge the government of impostors by the Commune. The Commune then silently elaborated, was the true secret of the Revolution of the 4th of September. Hence on the very dawn of the 18th March, after the rout of the Counterrevolution, drowsy Europe started up from

---

a [Rapport de la Commission d'enquête de la Commune], Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 65, April 29, 1871.— Ed.
b Report of the National Assembly's Sitting of May 6, 1871, Journal officiel (Versailles), No. 127, May 7, 1871.— Ed.
c Carefree mind.— Ed.
its dreams of the Prussian Empire under the Paris thunderbursts of *Vive la Commune!*

What is the Commune, this sphinx so tantalizing to the Bourgeois mind?

In its most simple conception, the form under which the working class assume the political power in their social strong-holds, Paris and the other centres of industry.

"The proletarians of the capital," said the Central Committee in its proclamation of the 20 March, "have, in the midst of the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, understood that for them the hour had struck to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs.... They have understood that it was their imperious duty and their absolute right to take into their own hands their own destiny by seizing upon the political power" (state power).\(^b\)

But the proletariat cannot, as the ruling classes and their different rival fractions have done in the successive hours of their triumph, simply lay hold of the existent state body and wield this ready-made agency for their own purpose. The first condition for the holding of political power, is to transform the traditional working machinery and destroy it as an instrument of class rule. That huge governmental machinery, entoiling like a boa constrictor the real social body in the ubiquitous meshes of a standing army, a hierarchical bureaucracy, an obedient police, clergy and a servile magistrature, was first forged in the days of absolute monarchy as a weapon of nascent middleclass society in its struggles of emancipation from feudalism. The first French Revolution, with its task to give full scope to the free development of modern middleclass society, had to sweep away all the local, territorial, townish and provincial strongholds of feudalism, prepared the social soil for the superstructure of a centralized state power, with omnipresent organs ramified after the plan of a systematic and hierarchic division of labour.

But the working class cannot simply lay hold on the ready-made state machinery and wield it for their own purpose. The political instrument of their enslavement cannot serve as the political instrument of their emancipation.

The modern bourgeois state is embodied in two great organs, parliament and government. Parliamentary omnipotence had, during the period of the party of order republic, from 1848 to 1851, engendered its own negative—the Second Empire, and

---

\(^a\) "Long live the Commune!"—*Ed.*

\(^b\) "La Révolution du 18 mars", *Le Petit Journal*, No. 3002, March 22, 1871.—*Ed.*
Imperialism, with its mere mockery of parliament, is the regime now flourishing in most of the great military states of the continent. At first view apparently the usurpatory dictatorship of the governmental body over society itself, rising alike above and humbling alike all classes, it has in fact, on the European continent at least, become the only possible state form in which the appropriating class can continue to sway it over the producing class. The assembly of the ghosts of all the defunct French parliaments which still haunts Versailles, yields no real force save the governmental machinery as shaped by the Second Empire.

The huge governmental parasite, entailing the social body like a boa constrictor in the ubiquitous meshes of its bureaucracy, police, standing army, clergy and magistrature—dates its birth from the days of absolute monarchy. The centralized state power had at that time to serve nascent middleclass society as a mighty weapon in its struggles of emancipation from feudalism. The French Revolution of the 18th century, with its task to sweep away the medieval rubbish of seigniorial, local, townish, and provincial privileges, could not but simultaneously clear the social soil of the last obstacles hampering the full development of a centralized state power, with omnipresent organs wrought after the plan of a systematic and hierarchic division of labour. Such it burst into life under the first Empire, itself the offspring of the coalition wars of old semifeudal Europe against modern France. During the subsequent parliamentary regimes of the Restoration, the July Monarchy, and the party of order Republic, the supreme management of that state machinery with its irresistible allurements of place, pelf and patronage, became not only the butt of contest between the rival fractions of the ruling class, but at the same degree that the economic progress of modern society swelled the ranks of the working class, accumulated its miseries, organized its resistance and developed its tendencies at emancipation, that, in one word, the struggle of classes, the struggle between labour and capital assumed shape and form, the physiognomy and the character of the state power underwent a striking change. It had always been the power for the maintenance of order, i.e., the existing order of society, and, therefore, of the subordination and exploitation of the producing class by the appropriating class. But as long as this order was accepted as the uncontroversible and uncontested necessity, the state power could assume an aspect of impartiality. It kept up the existing subordination of the masses which was the unalterable order of things and a social fact undergone without contest on the part of the masses, exercised by
their “natural superiors” without solicitude. With the entrance of society itself into a new phase, the phase of class struggle, the character of its organized public force, the state power, could not but change also (but also undergo a marked change) and more and more develop its character as the instrument of class despotism, the political engine for forcibly perpetuating the social enslavement of the producers of wealth by its appropriators, of the economic rule of capital over labour. After each new popular revolution, resulting in the transfer of the direction of the state machinery from one set of the ruling classes to another, the repressive character of the state power was more fully developed and more mercilessly used, because the promises made, and seemingly assured by the Revolution, could only be broken by the employment of force. Besides, the change worked by the successive revolutions, sanctioned only politically the social fact, the growing power of capital, and, therefore, transferred the state power itself more and more directly into the hands of the direct antagonists of the working class. Thus the Revolution of July transferred the power from the hands of the landowners into those of the great manufacturers (the great capitalists) and the Revolution of February into those of the united fractions of the ruling class, united in their antagonism to the working class, united as "the party of order", the order of their own class rule. During the period of the parliamentary republic the state power became at last the avowed instrument of war wielded by the appropriating class against the productive mass of the people. But as an avowed instrument of civil war it could only be wielded during a time of civil war and the condition of life for the parliamentary republic was, therefore, the continuance of openly declared civil war, the negative of that very "order" in the name of which the civil war was waged. This could only be a spasmodic, exceptional state of things. It was impossible as the normal political form of society, unbearable even to the mass of the middle class. When therefore all elements of popular resistance were broken down, the parliamentary republic had to disappear (give way to) before the Second Empire.

The Empire, professing to rest upon the producing majority of the nation, the peasants, apparently out of the range of the class struggle between capital and labour (indifferent and hostile to both the contesting social powers), wielding the state power as a force superior to the ruling and ruled classes, imposing upon both an armistice, (silencing the political, and, therefore, revolutionary form of the class struggle), divesting the state power of its direct
form of class despotism by braking the parliamentary and, therefore, directly political power of the appropriating classes, was the only possible state form to secure the old social order a respite of life. It was, therefore, acclaimed throughout the world as the "saviour of order" and the object of admiration during 20 years on the part of the would-be slaveholders all over the world. Under its sway, coincident with the change brought upon the market of the world by California, Australia, and the wonderful development of the United States, an unsurpassed period of industrial activity set [in], an orgy of stockjobbery, finance swindling, Joint-Stock Company adventure—leading all to rapid centralization of capital by the expropriation of the middle class and widening the gulf between the capitalist class and the working class. The whole turpitude of the capitalist regime, gave full scope to its innate tendency, broke loose unfettered. At the same time an orgy of luxurious debauch, meretricious splendour, a pandemonium of all the low passions of the higher classes. This ultimate form of the governmental power was at the same time its most prostitute, shameless plunder of the state resources by a band of adventurers, hotbed of huge state debts, the glory of prostitution, a factitious life of false pretences. The governmental power with all its tinsel covering from top to bottom immersed in mud. The maturity of rottenness of the state machinery itself, and the putrescence of the whole social body, flourishing under it, were laid bare by the bayonets of Prussia, herself only eager to transfer the European seat of that regime of gold, blood, and mud from Paris to Berlin.

This was the state power in its ultimate and most prostitute shape, in its supreme and basest reality, which the Paris working class had to overcome, and of which this class alone could rid society. As to parliamentarism, it had been killed by its own triumph and by the Empire. All the working class had to do was not to revive it.

What the workmen had to break down was not a more or less incomplete form of the governmental power of old society, it was that power itself in its ultimate and exhausting shape—the Empire. The direct opposite to the Empire was the Commune.

In its most simple conception the Commune meant the preliminary destruction of the old governmental machinery at its central seats, Paris and the other great cities of France, and its superseding by real self-government which, in Paris and the great cities, the social strongholds of the working class, was the government of the working class. Through the siege Paris had got
rid of the army which was replaced by a National Guard, with its
bulk formed by the workmen of Paris. It was only due to this state
of things, that the rising of the 18th of March had become
possible. This fact was to become an institution, and the national
guard of the great cities, the people armed against governmental
usurpation, to supplant the standing army, defending the govern-
ment against the people. The commune to consist of the municipal
councillors of the different arrondissements, (as Paris was the
initiator and the model, we have to refer to it) chosen by the
suffrage of all citizens, responsible, and revocable in short terms.
The majority of that body would naturally consist of workmen or
acknowledged representatives of the working class. It was to be a
working, not a parliamentary body, executive and legislative at the
same time. The police agents, instead of being the agents of a
central government, were to be the servants of the Commune,
having, like the functionaries in all the other departments of
administration, to be appointed and always revocable by the
Commune; all the functionaries, like the members of the
Commune itself, having to do their work at workmen's wages. The
judges were also to be elected, revocable, and responsible. The
initiative in all matters of social life to be reserved to the
Commune. In one word, all public functions, even the few ones
that would belong to the Central Government, were to be
executed by communal agents, and, therefore, under the control
of the Commune. It is one of the absurdities to say, that the
Central functions, not of governmental authority over the people,
but necessitated by the general and common wants of the country,
would become impossible. These functions would exist, but the
functionaries themselves could not, as in the old governmental
machinery, raise themselves over real society, because the func-
tions were to be executed by communal agents, and, therefore,
always under real control. The public functions would cease to be
a private property bestowed by a central government upon its
tools. With the standing army and the governmental police the
physical force of repression was to be broken. By the disestablish-
ment of all churches as proprietary bodies and the banishment of
religious instruction from all public schools (together with
gratuitous instruction) into the recesses of private life, there to live
upon the alms of the faithful, the divestment of all educational
institutes from governmental patronage and servitude, the mental
force of repression was to be broken, science made not only
accessible to all, but freed from the fetters of government pressure
and class prejudice. The municipal taxation to be determined and
levied by the Commune, the taxation for general state purposes to be levied by communal functionaries, and disbursed by the Commune itself for the general purposes. (its disbursement for the general purposes to be supervised by the Commune itself.)

The governmental force of repression and authority over society was thus to be broken in its merely repressive organs, and where it had legitimate functions to fulfil, these functions were not to be exercised by a body superior to the society, but by the responsible agents of society itself.

7) SCHLUSS^a)

To fighting, working, thinking Paris, electrified by the enthusiasm of historic initiative, full of heroic reality, the new society in its throes, there is opposed at Versailles the old society, a world of antiquated shams and accumulated lies. Its true representation is that rural Assembly,^178 peopled with the gibberish ghouls of all the defunct regimes into which class rule had successively embodied itself in France, at their head a senile mountebank of parliamentarism, and their sword in the hands of the Imperialist capitulards,^165 bombarding Paris under the eyes of their Prussian conquerors.

The immense ruins which the second Empire, in its fall, has heaped upon France, is for them only an opportunity to dig out and throw to the surface the rubbish of former ruins, of Legitimism or Orleanism.

The flame of life is to burn in an atmosphere of the sepulchral exhalations of all the bygone emigration. (The very air they breathe is the sepulchral exhalation of all bygone emigrations.)

There is nothing real about them but their common conspiracy against life, their egotism of class interest, their wish to feed upon the carcass of French society, their common slaveholders' interests, their hatred of the present, and their war upon Paris.

Everything about them is a caricature, from that old fossil of Louis Philippe's regime, Count Jaubert exclaiming in the National assembly, in the palace of Louis XIV: "we are the state" ("The state, that is ourselves")^322 (they are in fact the State spectre in its secession from society) to the Republican fawners upon Thiers holding their reunions in the Jeu de Paumes (Tennis Court) to show their degeneracy from their predecessors in 1789.^310

Thiers at the head, the bulk of the majority split into these two groups of Legitimists and Orleanists, in the tail the Republicans of

^a Conclusion.— Ed.
“old style”. Each of these fractions intrigues for a restoration of its own, the Republicans for that of the parliamentary Republic—building their hopes upon the senile vanity of Thiers, forming in the meantime the Republican decoration of his rule and sanctioning by their presence the war of the Bonapartist generals upon Paris, after having tried to coax it into the arms of Thiers and to disarm it under Saisset! Knights of the sad figure, the humiliations they voluntarily bear with, show what Republicanism, as a special form of class rule, has come down to. It was in view of them that Thiers said to the assembled maires of the Seine and Oise: What could they more want? “Was not he, a simple citizen, at the head of the State.”\footnote{“Méditation des municipalités de la Seine”, *Le Rappel*, No. 684, April 28, 1871.—*Ed.*} Progress from 1830 to 1870 that then Louis Philippe was the best of Republics, and that now Louis Philippe’s Minister, little Thiers himself, is the best of Republics.

Being forced to do their real work—the war against Paris, through the Imperialist soldiers, Gendarmes, and police, under the sway of the retired Bonapartist generals, they tremble in their shoes at the suspicion that—as during their regime of 1848-51—they are only forging the instrument for a second Restoration of the Empire. The Pontifical Zouaves\footnote{108} and the Vendéans of Cathelineau and the Bretons of Charette\footnote{185} are in fact their “parliamentary” army, the mere phantasms of an army compared with the Imperialist reality. While fuming with rage at the very name of the Republic, they accept Bismarck’s dictates in its name, waste in its name the rest of French wealth upon the civil war, denounce Paris in its name, forge laws of prospective proscription against the rebels in its name, usurp dictation over France in its name.

Their title [is] the general suffrage, which they had always opposed during their own régimes from 1815 to 1848, abolished in May 1850, after it had been established against them by the Republic, and which they now accept as the prostitute of the Empire, forgetting that with it they accept the Empire of the Plebiscites! They themselves are impossible even with the general suffrage.

They reproach Paris for revolting against national unity, and their first word was the *decapitation* of that Unity by the decapitalization of Paris. Paris has done the thing they pretended to want, but it has done it, not as they wanted it, as a reactionary dream of the past, but as the revolutionary vindication of the future. Thiers, the
Chauvin, a threatens since the 18th March Paris with the “intervention of Prussia”, asked at Bordeaux for the “intervention of Prussia”, acts against Paris in fact only by the means accorded to him by Prussia. The Bourbons were dignity itself, compared to this mountebank of Chauvinism.

Whatever may be the name—in case they are victorious—of their Restoration, with whatever successful pretender at its head, its reality can only be the Empire, the ultimate and indispensable political form of the rule of their rotten classes. If they succeed to restore it, and they must restore it with any of their plans of restoration successful—they succeed only to accelerate the putrefaction of the old society they represent and the maturity of the new one they combat. Their dim eyes see only the political outwork of the defunct regimes and they dream of reviving them by placing a Henry the 5th or the Count of Paris at their head. They do not see that the social bodies which bore these political superstructures have withered away, that these regimes were only possible under now outgrown conditions and past phases of French society, and that it can only yet bear with Imperialism, in its putrescent state, and the Republic of Labour in its state of regeneration. They do not see that the cycles of political forms were only the political expression of the real changes society underwent.

The Prussians who in coarse war exultation of triumph look at the agonies of French society and exploit them with the sordid calculation of a Shylock, and the flippant coarseness of the Krautjunker, are themselves already punished by the transplantation of the Empire to the German soil. They themselves are doomed to set free in France the subterranean agencies which will engulf them with the old order of things. The Paris Commune may fall, but the Social Revolution it has initiated, will triumph. Its birthstead is everywhere.

[FRAGMENTS]

The Lies in Thiers' Bulletins

The immense sham of that Versailles, its lying character could not better be embodied and resumed than in Thiers, the professional liar, for whom the “reality of things” exists only in their “parliamentary sense”, that is as a lie.

---

a Jingo.— Ed.
b The country squire.— Ed.
In his answer to the Archbishop’s letter he coolly denies “the pretended executions and reprisals (!) attributed to the troops of Versailles”, and has this impudent lie confirmed by a commission appointed for this very purpose by his rurals. He knows of course their triumphant proclamations by the Bonapartist generals themselves. But in “the parliamentary sense” of the word they do not exist.

In his circular of the 16th April on the bombardment of Paris:

“If some cannon-shots have been fired, it is not the deed of the army of Versailles, but of some insurgents wanting to make believe that they are fighting, while they do not dare show themselves.”

Of course, Paris bombards itself, in order to make the world believe that it fights!

Later: “Our artillery does not bombard—but it cannonades, it is true.”

Thiers’ bulletin on Moulin-Saquet (4 May): “Deliverance of Paris from the hideous tyrants who oppress it” (by killing the Paris National Guards asleep).

The motley lot of an army—the dregs of the Bonapartist soldatesque released from prison by the grace of Bismarck, with the gendarmes of Valentin and the sergents-de-ville of Piétri for their nucleus, set off by the Pontifical Zouaves, the Chouans of Charette and the Vendeans of Cathelineau, the whole placed under the runaway Decembrist generals of capitulation, he dubs “the finest army France ever possessed”. Of course, if the Prussians quarter still at St. Denis, it is because Thiers wants to frighten them by the sight of that “finest of fine armies”.

If such is the “finest army”—the Versailles anachronism is “the most liberal and most freely elected assembly that ever existed in France”. Thiers caps his eccentricity by telling the maires etc that “he is a man, who has never broken his word”, of course in the parliamentary sense of word-keeping.

---

a “La commission des Quinze…”., Le Rappel, No. 673, April 17, 1871.— Ed.

b Cited in: “La Circulaire de M. Thiers”, Le Vengeur, No. 21, April 19, 1871.— Ed.

c “Voici, sur le mème fait, le bulletin…”, Le Rappel, No. 692, May 6, 1871.

Marx gives the quotations in this and the previous paragraph in French.— Ed.

d Quoted according to: Th. Astrie, “L’homme rouge”, La Situation, No. 176, April 14, 1871.— Ed.

e “Méditation des municipalités de la Seine”, Le Rappel, No. 684, April 28, 1871.— Ed.
He is the truest of Republicans and (Séance of 27 April): “The Assembly is more liberal than he himself.”

To the Maîres: “You can rely on my word which I have never broken”, in an unparliamentary sense, which I have never kept. “This Assembly is one of the most liberal ever elected by France.”

He compares himself with Lincoln and the Parisians with the rebellious slaveholders of the South. The Southerners wanted territorial Secession from the United States for the slavery of labour. Paris wants the secession of M. Thiers himself and the interests he represents from power for the emancipation of labour.

The revenge which the Bonapartist Generals, the Gendarmes and the Chouans wreak upon Paris is a necessity of the class war against labour, but in the little byplay of his bulletins Thiers turns it into a pretext of caricaturing his idol, the first Nap., and makes himself the laughing-stock of Europe by boldly affirming, that the French army through its war upon the Parisian has regained the renown it had lost in the war against the Prussian. The whole war thus appears as mere childplay to give vent to the childish vanity of a dwarf, elated at having to describe his own battles, fought by his own army, under his own secret commandship-in-chief.

And his lies culminate in regard to Paris and the province.

Paris which in reality holds in check for two months the finest army France ever possessed, despite the secret help of the Prussian, is in fact only anxious to be delivered from its “atrocious tyrants”, by Thiers, and therefore it fights against him, although a mere handful of criminals.

He does not tire of representing the Commune as a handful of convicts, ticket-of-leave men, scum. Paris fights against him because it wants to be delivered by him from “the affreux tyrants that oppress it”. And this “handful” of desperadoes holds in check for two months “the finest army that France ever possessed” led by the invincible MacMahon and inspired by the Napoleonic genius of Thiers himself!

The resistance of Paris is no reality, but Thiers’ lies about Paris are.

Not content to refute him by its exploits, all the living elements

---

a L. A. Thiers’ speech in the National Assembly on April 27, 1871, Le Rappel, No. 685, April 29, 1871. Marx cites the French text of the speech here and in the next paragraph.— Ed.

b Marx gives this quotation in French.— Ed.

c Atrocious.— Ed.
of Paris have spoken to him, but in vain, to dislodge him out of his lying world.

"You must not confound the movement of Paris with the surprise of Montmartre, which was only its opportunity and starting point; this movement is general and profound in the conscience of Paris; the greatest number even of those who by one reason or another keep back (stand aside), do for all that not disavow its social legitimacy."\(^a\)

By whom he was told this? By the delegates of the syndical chambers, speaking in the name of 7-8,000 merchants and Industrials. They went to tell it him personally at Versailles. Thus the *League of the Republican Union*, thus the *Masons' lodges*\(^b\) by their delegates and their demonstrations. But he sticks to it.

In his bulletin of Moulin-Saquet (4 May):

"300 prisoners taken ... the rest of the insurgents has fled like the wind, leaving 150 dead and wounded on the field of battle.... Such is the victory the Commune can celebrate in its bulletins. Paris will soon be delivered from the terrible tyrants oppressing it."\(^b\)

But the fighting Paris, the real Paris is not his Paris. His Paris is itself a parliamentary lie. "The rich, the idle, the capitalist Paris", the cosmopolitan stew, this is his Paris. That is the Paris which wants to be restored to him, the real Paris is the Paris of the "vile multitude". The Paris that shewed its courage in the "Pacific procession" and Sasset's stampeded, that throngs now at Versailles, at Rueil, at St. Denis, at St. Germain-en-Laye, followed by the cocottes, sticking to the "man of family, religion, order" and above all "of property", the Paris of the lounging classes, the Paris of the francs-fileurs, amusing itself by looking through telescopes at the battles going on, treating the civil war but as an agreeable diversion, that is the Paris of M. Thiers, as the emigration of Coblenz was the France of M. de Calonne and as the emigration at Versailles is the France of M. Thiers.

If the Paris, that wants to be delivered of the Commune by Thiers, his rural, Décembreiseurs and Gendarmes, is a lie, so is his "province" which through him and his rural wants to be delivered from Paris.

---

\(^a\) Quoted according to: A. Vacqueries, "Une Poignée de Factieux", *La Rappel*, No. 669, April 13, 1871.— *Ed.*

\(^b\) "Voici, sur le même fait, le bulletin...", *Le Rappel*, No. 692, May 6, 1871. Marx quotes from it in French beginning with the words "like the wind".— *Ed.*

\(^c\) "The Commune of Paris...", *The Times*, No. 27028, April 4, 1871.— *Ed.*

\(^d\) "The really dangerous classes...", *The Observer*, No. 4170, April 23, 1871.— *Ed.*
Before the definitive conclusion at Frankfort of the peace treaty, he appealed to the provinces to send their battalions of national guards and volunteers to Versailles to fight against Paris. The Province refused point blank. Only Bretagne sent a handful of Chouans "fighting under a white flag, every one of them wearing on his breast a Jesus heart in white cloth and shouting: "Vive le roi!" Thus is the provincial France listening to his summons so that he was forced to lend captive French troops from Bismarck, lay hold of the Pontifical Zouaves (the real armed representatives of his provincial France) and make 20,000 Gendarmes and 12,000 sergents-de-ville the nucleus of his army.

Despite the wall of lies, the intellectual and police blockade, by which he tried to (debar) fence off Paris from the provinces, the provinces, instead of sending him battalions to wage war upon Paris, inundated him with so many delegations insisting upon peace with Paris, that he refused to receive them any longer in person. The tone of the addresses sent up from the Provinces, proposing most of them the immediate conclusion of an armistice with Paris, the dissolution of the Assembly, "because its mandate had expired", and the grant of the municipal rights demanded by Paris, was so offensive that Dufaure denounces them in his "circular against conciliation" to the prefects. On the other hand, the rural assembly and Thiers received not one single address of approval on the part of the provinces.

But the grand défí the Provinces gave to Thiers' "lie" about the provinces were the municipal elections of the 30th April, carried on under his government, on the basis of a law of his Assembly. Out of 700,000 councillors (in round numbers) returned by the 35,000 communes still left in mutilated France, the united Legitimists, Orleanists and Bonapartists did not carry 8,000! The supplementary elections still more hostile! This showed plainly how far the National Assembly, chosen by surprise, and on false pretences, represents France, provincial France, France minus Paris!

---

a Report from La Défense républicaine of Limoges, Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 65, April 29, 1871.—Ed.

b "Long live the King!" "The Communal Delegation...", The Daily News, No. 7779, April 5, 1871.—Ed.

c J. Dufaure's speech in the National Assembly on April 26, 1871, Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 65, April 29, 1871.—Ed.

d J. Dufaure, [Circulaire aux procureurs généraux. Versailles, 23 avril 1871], Le Mot d'Ordre, No. 62, April 26, 1871.—Ed.

e Challenge.—Ed.
But the plan of an assembly of the municipal delegates of the great provincial towns at Bordeaux, forbidden by Thiers on the ground of his law of 1834 and an Imperialist one of 1855, forced him to avow that his "Provinces" are a lie, as "his" Paris is. He accuses them of resembling the "false" Paris, of being eagerly bent upon "laying the fundamentals of Communism and Rebellion". Again he has been answered by the late resolutions of the municipal councils of Nantes, Vienne, Chambéry, Limoux, Carcassonne, Angers, Carpentras, Montpellier, Privas, Grenoble etc. insisting upon peace with Paris,

"the absolute affirmation of the Republic, the recognition of the communal right which", as the municipal council of Vienne says, "those elected on February 8 promised in their circulars when they were candidates. To stop the external war, it (the National Assembly) ceded two provinces and promised Prussia five milliards. What ought it not to do to put an end to the civil war?"

(Just the contrary. The two provinces are not their "private" property, and as to the promissory note of 5 milliards, the thing is exactly that it shall be paid by the French people and not by them.)

If, therefore, Paris may justly complain of the Provinces that they limit themselves to pacific demonstrations, leaving it unaided against all the State forces ... the Province has in most unequivocal tones given the lie to Thiers and the Assembly to be represented there, has declared their Province a lie as is their whole existence, a sham, a false pretence.

----------

The General Council feels proud of the prominent part the Paris branches of the International have taken in the glorious revolution of Paris. Not, as the imbeciles fancy, as if the Paris, or any other branch of the International received its mot d'ordre from a centre. But the flower of the working class in all civilized countries belonging to the International, and being imbued with its ideas, they are sure everywhere in the working-class movements to take the lead.

----------

From the very day of the capitulation by which the government of Bismarck prisoners had signed the surrender of France, but in

---

a Beginning from here Marx quotes in French.— Ed.
b Orders.— Ed.
c The following text was written on three pages without any pagination; the second paragraph is marked “to p. 9”.— Ed.
return, got leave to retain a bodyguard for the express purpose of cowing Paris. Paris stood on its watch. The National guard reorganized itself and entrusted its supreme control to a central committee elected by all the companies, battalions, and batteries of the capital, save some fragments of the old Bonapartist formations. On the eve of the entrance of the Prussians into Paris, the central committee took measures for the removal to Montmartre, Belleville, and La Villette, of the cannon and mitrailleuses treacherously abandoned by the capitulards in the very quarters the Prussians were about to occupy.

Armed Paris was the only serious obstacle in the way of the counter-revolutionary conspiracy. Paris was, therefore, to be disarmed. On this point the Bordeaux assembly was sincerity itself. If the roaring rant of its rural s had not been audible enough, the surrender of Paris handed over by Thiers to the tender mercies of the triumvirat of Vinoy, the Décembriseur, Valentin, the Bonapartist Gendarme, and Aurelle de Paladines, the Jesuit General, would have cut off even the last subterfuge of doubt as to the ultimate aim of the disarmament of Paris. But if their purpose was frankly avowed, the pretext on which these atrocious felons initiated the civil war was the most shameless, the most barefaced (glaring) of lies. The artillery of the Paris National Guard, said Thiers, belonged to the State and to the State it must be returned. The fact was this. From the very day of the capitulation by which Bismarck's prisoners had signed the surrender of France but reserved to themselves a numerous bodyguard for the express purpose of cowing Paris, Paris stood on its watch. The national guard reorganized themselves and entrusted their supreme control to a central committee elected by their whole body, save some fragments of the old Bonapartist formations. On the eve of the entrance of the Prussians into Paris, their central committee took measures for the removal to Montmartre, Belleville, and La Villette of the cannon and mitrailleuses treacherously abandoned by the capitulards in the very quarters the Prussians were about to occupy. That artillery had been furnished by the subscriptions of the National Guard. As their private property it was officially recognized in the convention of the 28th January, and on that

---

very title exempted from the general surrender of arms, belonging to the government, into the hands of the conqueror. And Thiers dared initiate the civil war on the mendacious pretext that the artillery of the National Guard was state property!

The seizure of this artillery was evidently but to serve as the preparatory measure for the general disarmament of the Paris National Guard, and therefore of the Revolution of the 4th of September. But that revolution had become the legal status of France. Its republic was recognized in the terms of the capitulation itself by the conqueror, it was after the capitulation acknowledged by the Foreign powers, in its name the National Assembly had been summoned. The Revolution of the Paris workmen of the 4th of September was the only legal title of the National Assembly seated at Bordeaux and its Executive. Without it, the National Assembly had at once to give room to the Corps Législatif, elected by general suffrage and dispersed by the arm of the Revolution. Thiers and his ticket-of-leave men would have had to capitulate for safe conducts and securities against a voyage to Cayenne. The National Assembly, with its Attorney’s Power to settle the terms of peace with Prussia, was only an incident of the Revolution. Its true embodiment was armed Paris, that had initiated the Revolution, undergone for it a five months siege with its horrors of famine, that had made its prolonged resistance, despite Trochu’s “plan”, the basis of a tremendous war of defence in the provinces, and Paris was now summoned with coarse insult by the rebellious slaveholders at Bordeaux to lay down its arms and acknowledge that the popular revolution of the 4th September had had no other purpose but the simple transfer of power from the hands of Louis Bonaparte and his minions into those of his monarchical rivals, or to stand forward as the self-sacrificing champion of France to be saved from her ruin and to be regenerated only through the revolutionary overthrow of the political and social conditions that had engendered the Empire and under its fostering care, matured into utter rottenness. Paris, Paris emaciated by a five months’ famine, did not hesitate one moment. It heroically resolved to run all the hazards of a resistance against the French conspirators under the very eye of the Prussian army quartered before its gates. But in its utter abhorrence of civil war, the popular government of Paris, the Central Committee of the National Guard, continued to persist in its merely defensive attitude, despite the provocations of the Assembly, the usurpations of the Executive, and the menacing concentration of troops in and around Paris.
On the dawn of the 18th March Paris arose under thunderbursts of _Vive la Commune!_ What is the Commune, that sphinx so tantalizing to the bourgeois mind?

“The proletarians of the capital,” said the Central Committee in its manifesto of the 18th March, “have, in the midst of the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, understood that for them the hour has struck to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs.... They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to take into their own hands their own destinies by seizing the political power.”

But the working class cannot, as the rival factions of the appropriating class have done in their hours of triumph, simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.

The centralized state power, with its ubiquitous organs of standing army, police, bureaucracy, clergy and magistrature, organs wrought after the plan of a systematic and hierarchic division of labour, dates from the days of absolute monarchy when it served nascent middleclass society as a mighty weapon in its struggles for emancipation from feudalism. The French Revolution of the 18th century swept away the rubbish of seigniorial, local, townish and provincial privileges, thus clearing the social soil of its last medieval obstacles to the final superstructure of the state. It received its final shape under the First Empire, the offspring of the Coalition wars of old, semifeudal Europe against modern France. Under the following parliamentary regimes, the hold of the governmental power, with its irresistible allurements of place, pelf, and patronage, became not only the bone of contention between the rival factions of the ruling classes. Its political character changed simultaneously with the economic changes of society. At the same pace that the progress of industry developed, widened and intensified the class antagonism between capital and labour, the governmental power assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labour, of a political force organized to enforce social enslavement, of a mere engine of class despotism. On the heels of every popular revolution, marking a new progressive phase in the march (development) (course) of the struggle of classes, (class struggle), the repressive character of the state power comes out more pitiless and more divested of disguise. The Revolution of July, by transferring the management of the state machinery from the

---

a “La Révolution du 18 mars”, _Le Petit Journal_, No. 3002, March 22, 1871.— _Ed._
landlord to the capitalist, transfers it from the distant to the immediate antagonist of the working men. Hence the state power assumes a more clearly defined attitude of hostility and repression in regard of the working class. The Revolution of February hoists the colours of the “social Republic”, thus proving at its outset that the true meaning of state power is revealed, that its pretence of being the armed force of public welfare, the embodiment of the general interests of societies rising above and keeping in their respective spheres the warring private interests, is exploded, that its secret as an instrument of class despotism is laid open, that the workmen do want the republic, no longer as a political modification of the old system of class rule, but as the revolutionary means of breaking down class rule itself. In view of the menaces of “the Social Republic” the ruling class feels instinctively that the anonymous reign of the parliamentary republic can be turned into a jointstock company of their conflicting factions, while the past monarchies by their very title signify the victory of one faction and the defeat of the other, the prevalence of one section’s interests of that class over that of the other, land over capital or capital over land. In opposition to the working class the hitherto ruling class, in whatever specific forms it may appropriate the labour of the masses, has one and the same economic interest, to maintain the enslavement of labour and reap its fruits directly as landlord and capitalist, indirectly as the state parasites of the landlord and the capitalist, to enforce that “order” of things which makes the producing multitude, “a vile multitude” serving as a mere source of wealth and dominion to their betters. Hence Legitimists, Orleanists, Bourgeois Republicans and the Bonapartist adventurers, eager to qualify themselves as defenders of property by first pilfering it, club together and merge into the “Party of Order”, the practical upshot of that revolution made by the proletariat under enthusiastic shouts of the “Social Republic”. The parliamentary republic of the Party of Order is not only the reign of terror of the ruling class. The state power becomes in their hand the avowed instrument of the civil war in the hand of the capitalist and the landlord, not their state parasites, against revolutionary aspirations of the producer.

Under the monarchical regimes the repressive measures and the confessed principles of the day’s government are denounced to the people by the fractions of the ruling classes that are out of power, the opposition’s ranks of the ruling class interest the people in their party feuds, by appealing to its own interests, by their attitudes of tribunes of the people, by the revindication of popular
liberties. But in the anonymous reign of the republic, while amalgamating the modes of repression of old past regimes (taking out of the arsenals of all past regimes the arms of repression), and wielding them pitilessly, the different fractions of the ruling class celebrate an orgy of renegation. With cynical effrontery they deny the professions of their past, trample under foot their "socalled" principles, curse the revolutions they have provoked in their name, and curse the name of the republic itself, although only its anonymous reign is wide enough to admit them into a common crusade against the people.

Thus this most cruel is at the same time the most odious and revolting form of class rule. Wielding the state power only as an instrument of civil war, it can only hold it by perpetuating civil war. With parliamentary anarchy at its head, crowded by the uninterrupted intrigues of each of the fractions of the "order" party for the restoration of each own pet regime, in open war against the whole body of society out of its own narrow circle, the party of order rule becomes the most intolerable rule of disorder. Having in its war against the mass of the people broken all its means of resistance and laid it helplessly under the sword of the Executive, the party of order itself and its parliamentary regime are warned off the stage by the sword of the Executive. That parliamentary party of order republic can therefore only be an interreign. Its natural upshot is Imperialism, whatever the number of the Empire. Under the form of imperialism, the state power with the sword for its scepter, professes to rest upon the peasantry, that large mass of producers apparently outside the class struggle of labour and capital, professes to save the working class by breaking down parliamentarism and therefore the direct subserviency of the state power to the ruling classes, professes to save the ruling classes themselves by subduing the working classes without insulting them, professes, if not public welfare, at least national glory. It is therefore proclaimed as the "saviour of order". However galling to the political pride of the ruling class and its state parasites, it proves itself to be the really adequate regime of the bourgeois "order" by giving full scope to all the orgies of its industry, turpitudes of its speculation, and all the meretricious splendours of its life. The state thus seemingly lifted above civil society, becomes at the same time itself the hotbed of all the corruptions of that society. Its own utter rottenness, and the rottenness of the society to be saved of it, was laid bare by the bayonet of Prussia, but so much is this Imperialism the unavoidable political form of "order", that is, the "order" of bourgeois
society, that Prussia herself seemed only to reverse its central seat at Paris in order to transfer it to Berlin.

The Empire is not, like its predecessors, the legitimate monarchy, the constitutional monarchy and the parliamentary republic, one of the political forms of bourgeois society, it is at the same time its most prostitute, its most complete, and its ultimate political form. It is the state power of modern class rule, at least on the European continent.
July 1, 1871

Just after the arrest at Peter’s restaurant, Bower, the correspondent of The Morning Advertiser, and the other, the Times correspondent Dallas, and a Russian attaché were released, but Bower went back inside to fetch his (English) lady friend, who had already taken up with another gentleman, so that he pitched into him, assaulted him, was taken into custody, and locked up for that.

These 3 published a letter,\(^a\) which was in reality a fake. 1) that it was the members of the Commune who had been in the café with red and gold sashes and also whores, who showed their cards in the café, and 2) that Bower was arrested without reason (it was only the police commissars who were wearing red sashes but without gold fringes).

In The Telegraph Reid’s reports often altered. A very important letter was suppressed by them.

On 20th May, Reid had the newspaper. In The Telegraph of the 17 or 18th May Versailles correspondent stated that Courbet had with a hammer destroyed objects of art in Louvre.\(^b\) On the 20th, Reid showed this telegram to Courbet. Below follows Courbet’s letter to the editor of The Telegraph:

* "Sir,

"Not only have I not destroyed any works of art in the Louvre, but on the contrary it was under my care that all those which had been dispersed by various ministers in different buildings throughout the capital were collected, and restored to their proper

\(^a\) E. Bower, “A monsieur le rédacteur de La Vérité”, La Vérité, No. 225, May 19, 1871.— Ed.

\(^b\) “The Civil War around Paris”, The Daily Telegraph, No. 4971, May 20, 1871.— Ed.
places in the [Louvre] Museum. In like manner the Luxemburg was benefitted. It was I who preserved and arranged all the works of art removed from the house of M. Thiers. I am accused of having destroyed the Column Vendôme when the fact is on record that the decree for its destruction was passed 14th April and I was elected to the Commune on the 20, six days afterwards. I warmly urged the preservation of the bas-reliefs and proposed to form a Museum of them in the Court of the Invalides. Knowing the purity of the motives by which I have been actuated, I also know the difficulties one inherits in coming after a régime such as the Empire.*

"Greetings and fraternity

"G. Courbet

"Hôtel de Ville 20 May 71."

This letter was sent to The Telegraph by Reid but was not printed. See PAPERS for about April 10.12.

Tolain. The Times correspondent wished to know what the General Council would say to it—The Times suppressed our resolution.327

Reid was engaged by The Telegraph to send telegrams and is ready to swear that they were amended in printing to show the Commune in a bad light.

Adolphus Smith, Ex-correspondent of The Daily News to lecture on the Commune, Charing Cross Theatre, 3.7.71.328

Present at the demonstration on Rue de la Paix. In the Place Vendôme the rifles of the National Guard were stacked together in piles, and one Englishman, whom he referred to as (Leatham?) and who was in the front row of the procession, rushed out to seize a pile of rifles.

Jourde was in the burning Ministry of Finance until the very last and saved books and money. And he is alleged to have set it afire! An Englishman, who lives opposite, whom he can name, saw 2 bombs strike the roof, explode, and soon thereafter smoke, then flame, then gradually the whole building in flames.

Written down by Engels on July 1, 1871

First published, in Russian, in the magazine Kommunist, No. 2, Moscow, 1971

---

a The museum in the Luxemburg Palace in Paris.—Ed.
b Reid sent the letter to The Times, where it was printed under the title "M. Courbet, the painter" in its issue No. 27100 on June 27, 1871.—Ed.
c On March 22, 1871 (see this volume, pp. 324-25, 511-12, 528-30).—Ed.
1869

(Since Basle Congress)

September 28, 1869. Jung stated the receipt of a letter from General Cluseret of New York. It was addressed to the Congress but had arrived too late. 

Printing of Basle Congress Report. 

A letter from the Paper-stainers New York requesting the Council to use its influence to prevent an importation of men to defeat the men now on strike. Action taken thereupon. (later letter from Manchester, Edinburgh etc Trades Councils received, which had got letters from the General Council.)

5 October 1869. Letter from Varlin of Paris stating that a meeting of the Congress delegates had been held and that they had agreed to urge the affiliation of their societies.

Latham and Lampbord proposed in one of the former sittings by Odger. Postponed.

Hales (seconded by Lucraft). “That the Council proceed to establish an English Section of the International Working Men Association, with a platform based upon the Congressional Resolutions, to be called ‘The National Labour League and British Section of I.W.A.’.”

Weston announces that a conference would be held on October 13, at Bell Inn, to establish an Association for the agitation of the land-question and other workingmen’s measures.

---

a Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men’s Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland. From the 6th to the 11th September, 1869. London [1869].—Ed.

b See the appeal “A toutes les sections de l’Association Internationale des Travailleurs”, L’Internationale, No. 38, October 3, 1869.—Ed.
12 October, 1869. Proposition to establish an English section of the International carried.
19 October, 1869.
26 October, 1869. Mottershead elected.

Resolved "that a resolution be drawn up asking for the release of the (Irish) political prisoners and stating the opinion of the Council".

2 November.
Hales: "On the previous Wednesday (27 Oct.) the Land and Labour League had been established, many Council members were on the executive of that league, it was not necessary to go any farther (with English Section) at present.

9 November.
16 November. Article against the Council in Egalitéa (Opening of Irish question by Marx.) Resolutions proposed by Marx on Irish Political prisoners.
23 November. (Irish Debate.)
30 November. (The Resolutions on the Irish prisoners passed.)b

7 December.
14 December. Jung reads strictures from the Egalité against the Irish Resolutions of the Council (Schweitzer, Liebknecht etc.) [Monthly Reports.]c

1870

[1 January. Private Circular on Egalité etc. Irish Question etc. Reports etc.].d

4 January. Robert Hume appointed Correspondent (of Long Island United States) (3000 Cards sent to the German Committee. (Brunswick)).
Complaints of Progrès (Locle) and Egalité (Genève) against Zürich movement (Tagwacht) as too political.332

11 January. A letter from the Geneva Committee stated that the section did not approve of the proceedings of the Egalité. [The Editorial Committee resigned, their resignation accepted.]333

---

a See "L'Organisation de l'Internationale", L'Egalité, No. 43, November 13, 1869.— Ed.
c "Réflexions", L'Egalité, No. 47, December 11, 1869.— Ed.
d K. Marx, "The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland" (present edition, Vol. 21, p. 84).— Ed.
18 January.
25 January. Dupont's motion: "that any society in France nominating a corresponding secretary with General Council should be held as de facto affiliation." (Carried.)
1 February. The Central Council of Switzerland had appointed a new staff for "Égalité"!
   Serraillier received letter from Brussels, the Belgian General Council approved the answer of the General Council to the attack in the Égalité.a
8 February. Application of Prolétaires Positivistes Society.311
15 February. Dupont communicates on difference between the elder and younger branches at Lyons.334 (handed over to Sub-Committee.)238
22 February. At Naples search made at the meeting place of the International for papers, without a search-warrant being produced by the police officer. President, secretary and a lawyer who had protested against it as illegal, had been arrested.
   Le Réveil contained paragraph from a Spanish paper according to which the governments of Austria, Italy, and France are going to take rigorous measures against the International.
8 March. Report of the Sub-Committee on the Lyons Affair. b (Richard etc.)
15 March. Letter of the Prolétaires Positivistes at Paris. [They had been asked by Dupont for their rules and by-laws.]
   Admitted but not as "sect" and the discrepancy between their own programme and that of the International pointed out to them.
22 March. Russian Section in Geneva founded. Desired Marx to become their representative.
29 March.
4, 5, 6 April. Congress at La Chaux-de-fonds. c 256
5 April.
12 April. Jung letter from La Chaux-de-fonds. Split at the Congress. In consequence of a majority having voted for the admission of the Geneva Alliance the Geneva and La Chaux-de-fonds delegates had withdrawn and continued the Congress by

---

a K. Marx, "The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland" (present edition, Vol. 21, p. 84).—Ed.
b K. Marx, "Concerning the Conflict in the Lyons Section" (present edition, Vol. 21, p. 108).—Ed.
c This line is written in pencil.—Ed.
themselves. Jung instructed to write to both parties for full particulars.

19 April. Discrepancies (says Jung) between the statements of the two Swiss parties. The new committee numbered about 600, the old 2000 members.

26 April. (Letter from Guillaume to Jung.)

3 May. Resolution on pretended Conspiracy against Badinguet (plebiscite) [arrest of many members of Paris and Lyons sections].

10 May. Resolution against the London French branch. (10 May)—Jung proposed that in future all the names of the Council members should be signed to official documents whether the members were present or not.

17 May.

Resolution: "Considering: That by the Basle Congress Paris was appointed as the meeting place of this year's Congress of the I.W.A.; that the present French regime continuing the Congress will not be able to meet at Paris; that nevertheless the preparations for the meeting render an immediate resolution necessary; that art. 3 of the Statutes obliges the Council to change, in case of need, the place of meeting appointed by the Congress; that the Central Committee of the German Social Democratic Workingmen's Party has invited the General Council to transfer this year's Congress to Germany; the General Council has in its sitting of the 17 of May unanimously resolved that this year's Congress of the I.W.A. be opened on the 5th September next and meet at Mayence."

De Paepe, in letter to Serrailier, asked the opinion of the Council on the affairs of Switzerland.

Jung letter from Perret (Geneva) who wished the Council to decide upon the Swiss question.

24 May. (Row over the Beehive Resolutions.)

31 May. Parisians against the transfer to Mayence. Question Cluseret.—Osborne Ward introduced by Jung.—Jung introduced Duval as delegate from the Paris iron-founders on strike.

---


Council appoints deputation (Jung and Hales) to introduce him to the trade societies.—Credentials voted to Hume at New York.

7 June.
21 June. Address to the Trades Societies etc. on the Geneva affair.\(^a\)
28 June. Regional Congress at Rouen suppressed.

Letter from Geneva asked the Council to come to a decision as soon as possible. (Discussion over this affaire.)

(On the Alliance. See Weston’s Statement.)\(^336\) (Proposition adopted that Geneva Committee remains in its old faction; the new committee may choose a local name.)\(^b\)

Marx proposed that the General Council be transferred from London to Brussels. (this to be proposed to next Congress) (and that this proposition, to consider the removal of Council, be communicated to all Sections). Carried. Hales gave notice of motion to reconsider the question.

5 July. Parisians want refutation of the false statements of Aulois,\(^337\) the public prosecutor, but they had sent no papers etc. to the Council. Dupont complains of receiving no reply.

12 July. French branch. Lemaître.\(^338\) — Positivist branch send their contribution.—Money (voted by the Amalgamated Engineers to the Paris iron-moulders).—The proposition (Marx stated) was: “to write to the sections to ask them to consider the advisability of removing the Council from London. If they were favourable to a removal, then Brussels should be proposed etc.\(^c\)

Programme for Mayence Congress.\(^d\)

19 July. Geneva Committee thanks for the resolution of the Council. Jung written to La-Chaux-de-Fonds against their political abstentionism.—Anti-War Address of Paris Section.—Marx to draw up Anti-War Address.\(^e\)

26 July. Bebel and Liebknecht on German War Loan.

(North German Reichstag. Berlin)—(In their written declaration


\(^c\) K. Marx, “Confidential Communication to All Sections” (present edition, Vol. 21, p. 142).—Ed.

\(^d\) K. Marx, “Programme for the Mainz Congress of the International” (present edition, Vol. 21, p. 143).—Ed.

\(^e\) See this volume, pp. 3-8.—Ed.
(why they abstain from voting) declare themselves members of the International.)

2 August. Serraillier reads letter from Belgium: Council to be left at London; but gives notice that Belgium Congress Delegates will ask why Council interfered in the Swiss affair. Marx states that protest against War has been issued in Barmen, Munich, Breslau etc.—Jung on Swiss affair. Article in Solidarité. Guillaume's party has not sent a proper reply. The Parisians asked for a prompt settlement of this affair. Referred to Subcommittee. Marx proposes to ask sections to agree to postponement of Congress. Carried.

9 August. Jung [received] letter from Naples about Caporusso having betrayed them.

16 August. Third 1,000 of War Address printed. Letters from Switzerland and Germany (Central Committee) to leave Council at London and to empower it to postpone Congress to any time and place.

23 August. 15,000 German and 15,000 French copies of Address ordered to be printed at Geneva. Belgian Council's letter withdrawing observations on Swiss affair (see 2 August) and agreeing to postponement of Congress. Romance Council of Geneva also for postponement and Council to remain in London.

Resolution passed to postpone Congress.

August 30th. French Section formed at New York. Osborne Ward attended and spoke.

September 6. Marx had correspondence with German Social Democratic Party who say they will do their duty. Second War Address resolved upon.

September 9. Address carried.

September 13. Serraillier off to Paris.

September 20. Arrest of Braunschweigers. Expulsion from Mayence. Protests against annexation in Berlin, München, Augsburg, Nürnberg etc. Deputation of 5 to act with the Arundel Hall Committee in fitting up a demonstration for the French Republic and against annexation.

---

a See “Motiviertes Votum der Reichstagsabgeordneten Liebknecht und Bebel in Sachen der 120 Millionen Kriegenleihe”, Der Volksstaat, No. 59, July 29, 1870.—Ed.

b Beginning from here the notes are in Engels' hand.—Ed.

c “Le Conseil général de Londres...”, La Solidarité, No. 16, July 23, 1870.—Ed.

d See this volume, pp. 260-62.—Ed.

e Ibid., pp. 263-70.—Ed.
September 27. Stated that a deputation to Gladstone had been agreed upon for recognition of French Republic (by the joint Committee). 340

October 4.


October 25. The Belgian Internationale at last prints the beginning of the 2-d War Address. a—Heinemann's Meeting. Protest of the [German] Workers' Educational Society.342 Resolved that when questions of an internal administration are discussed none but members of Council be allowed to be present.

November 1. Letters from Patterson N. J. and New York that French and Germans there had issued a joint address against the war. 343 Letter from Aubrey (Rouen) about the Bonapartists still in power there and their doings.

November 8.—Meeting of Intervention Committee attended by Secretary. 344

November 15.—Mass Meeting in New York on the War announced as impending. 345

November 22. Letter from Brest, that all the 12 members of the Committee there had been arrested 2/10 October, and tried 27 October for conspiring against safety of State, 2 got 2 years, one 1 year (merely for holding a Defence meeting).—From the Bonaparte papers published it appeared that on the eve of the plebiscite the hunting down of the International was purposely organised.

November 29. The Trades Council of Manchester promises its moral support. Dupont appointed Representative for Lancashire. b

6 December. Marx proposed that the secretary should make out a list of the attendance of the members for the last 3 months. Carried.

13 December. Secretary read a list of the members and the number

---

a [K. Marx,] “Deuxième adresse du Conseil général de l'Association internationale des Travailleurs au sujet de la guerre”, L'Internationale, No. 93, October 23, 1870.— Ed.

b Then follows Marx's note in pencil: “The Romance Federal Committee in Geneva during the 1869-70 refused [the Alliance] affiliation to the Romance Federation of the International Association. The section was recognized by the General Council.” Beginning from here the notes are written by Marx.— Ed.
of times they had been absent since September. To be entered into the minutes, and in future the absent members to be noted down as well as those present.

20 December. Announcement of formation of Central Committee at New York.\(^{346}\) (See list of attendance) (after the last sitting of December). (From Sept.-December 1870 and from January-end of March, 1871.)

1871

3 January.

17 January. Birmingham Trades' Council joins. Felleisen to be asked in what position towards the International (These fellows for annexation.)\(^{347}\) Marx speaks against Odger's rant at St. James's Hall. (Favre et Co.)\(^{348}\) (against our Second Address).


31 January. Swiss (Geneva Romance Confédération) write that they had received letter from Spain to enter into close communication, but before doing so they desired to know whether the Spanish section was in relation with the Council; otherwise they would not communicate with them.

Engels appointed Spanish Secretary.

Engels resolution on the war (Franco-German) (and attitude of English Government).\(^{3}\)

7 February. Discussion of Franco-German War. Attitude of English government.

14 February. (Continuation of that discussion.)

21 February. Land Tenure Reform Association\(^{349}\) meeting the workingmen's party half ways in regard to the nationalisation of land. (Mill) Harris thought it was a move to break up the Land and Labour League.\(^{350}\)

28 February. Discussion of Land Tenure Reform Association. (Resolution to discuss their programme.)

Report of Citizen Serraillier. (Federal Paris Council during the siege.)

7 March. (Discussion on New York Central Committee) (Marx on Paris declaration of 1856).\(^{351}\)

14 March: Robin (Conference of delegates from all the sections to be convocated to London). (Rejected.) (Debate on declaration of 1856) (Irish Question).

---

\(^{a}\) See this volume, pp. 263-70.—\textit{Ed.}
21 March. Marx stated: when the war broke out letters sent to all the continental Sections that the congress could not be held at Mayence or Paris; all the sections that had answered had left it to the Council to choose time and place when and where the Council should meet. Robin said that letter had never been received at Paris. Declaration to be sent to the English papers against the false resolution (of excluding the Germans) attributed to the Paris Federal Council.\(^{a}\)

(Revolution of March 18.)

Section in the East of London.

28 March. Serraillier sent to Paris. 5£ voted for his wife.

Our German friends only prosecuted as Internationals (all other charges dropped).

Central Republican Meeting at Wellington Music Hall (to establish a Republican Club).\(^{b}\) —Wade moved the addition of "social and democratic" (26 for, 50 against). Resolutions for founding branches in the East End of London.

4 April. San Francisco (line) branch. Bethnal Green branch.

11 April. (Antwerp, etc. Cigarmakers (strike) lockout) (Action taken by Council).\(^{c}\)

18 April. (Tolain affair first brought before the Council.)

25 April. Expulsion of Tolain. Confirmed.\(^{d}\)

2 May. Applegarth and Odger (Eccarius moved that the rule of appending all names to Addresses should be suspended with regard to them. Mottershead against. Jung to speak about it with Applegarth, Eccarius with Odger).

9 May. Eccarius resignes General Secretaryship (Applegarth left to the Council the appending of his name. Odger should like to see the address beforehand).

New Zealand correspondence.\(^{e}\)

16 May. Hales elected General Secretary.

23 May. The English shall convoke meeting to urge the English Government not to act against the French Refugees. This was done and different meetings took place on that point.

30 May. Marx read Address "On Civil War" (Accepted).\(^{d}\)

6 June. Commune. English press. Mazzini. (Attempts of International Democratic Association\(^{f}\) to play a role.) (Citizen Cadiot appears on the scene.)

---

\(^{a}\) See this volume, pp. 286-87.— Ed.

\(^{b}\) Ibid., p. 294.— Ed.

\(^{c}\) Ibid., p. 297.— Ed.

\(^{d}\) Ibid., pp. 307-59.— Ed.
13 June. (12 June. Reply to Favre's circular sent to Times.) Address on Civil War issued. (Citizen Baudry turns up.)
20 June. Odger and Lucraft leave (Scandal-sitting) (Holyoake-scandal).
   Declarations against the false Paris (International) manifestoes.
4 July. McDonnell elected.
   Correspondence of Cafiero. Robert Reid sent with Address as lecturer on the Commune to the Provinces.
   Major Wolff (Tibaldi etc.) Marx and "Pall Mall"!
11 July. Assi-Bigot affair, (Lumley, barrister, present) Address on Washburne.
   Rutson (Bruce) applies for the published documents of the International.
18 July. Richard Affair (not admitted as member) Elliot (rejected).
   Herman elected as Belgian secretary. Refugee—money question.
   Robin brings Swiss affair forward. Referred to a Conference.
   Private Conference Resolved upon (for 17 September).
1 August. Bishop of Malines, Catholic Workingmen's International Association. Washington section.
   Rochat's Proposition as to formation of Enquiry (through and from the Refugees) on the History of the Commune (Cohn.)
8 August. Deputation of Newcastle and London Engineers on the Newcastle Lockout. Deputation sent by General Council to

---

a See this volume, p. 361.—Ed.
b Ibid., pp. 367-68.—Ed.
c Ibid., p. 369.—Ed.
d Ibid., pp. 372-73.—Ed.
e Of The Civil War in France.—Ed.
f See this volume, p. 378.—Ed.
g Ibid., pp. 379-82.—Ed.
h Pius IX.—Ed.
i See this volume, pp. 607-08.—Ed.
j Ibid., p. 609.—Ed.
k V. A. Dechamps.—Ed.
Belgium etc. Warning to all international branches against importation of men into Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Applegarth's letter. Visitors to be excluded in future.
15 August. Branches at Liverpool and Loughborough in Leicestershire.

Conference to be confined to questions of organisation and policy.
22 August. (Canada Communard Exportation Scheme.)
29 August. Deputation from Refugees' Society. Quarrel.356
5 September. Marx, Engels, Hales, Jung resign as members of Refugees' Committee. Propositions as to Conference.

Written presumably in September 1871 Reproduced from the manuscript
First published, in Russian, in the book
9th September, 8 o'clock

Longuet in the Chair.
Marx proposes that as to Landeck the General Council has nothing to do with the question [whether] he still belongs to the International or not, and that he be referred to the French Internationals in London to settle this.—L. has, on the trial of the Internationals in Paris, eaten humble pie and promised not to belay to the International in future; but such questions cannot be settled by the Council.
Mottershead seconds.
Carried unanimously.

The Conference. Marx: A Conference is not composed of delegates of branches but of delegates of countries which come to confer with the Council under extraordinary circumstances and therefore very different from a Congress and has quite different powers. This has not to be forgotten. The first question will be 1) the money questions, the contributions have not come in as they ought to do. The Conference has no power to change the Statutes but it can enforce them. Therefore proposal No. 1 branches to pay before admittance.
Jung seconds. Adopted unanimously.
Marx: 2) (Countries where the International is suppressed to propose their own plans, and to be allowed other names but not secret.)
Eccarius seconds. Adopted unanimously.
Marx: 3) That some members be appointed to draw up the Report of Council to be submitted to Conference for last 2 years. Adopted as a matter of course.
Jung proposes, Eccarius seconds Marx to draw up the Report.
Marx: 4) To enforce the resolution of Congress of Basel, that
the Central Council to be called Federal Council, etc., etc.254
Serraillier seconds. Adopted unanimously.
Marx: 5) Reply to be issued to different governments to be
drawn up afterwards.
Engels seconds. Adopted unanimously.
[Marx:] 6) In regularly organized countries regular reports of local
and district taxation to be sent in.
This is withdrawn by Marx himself.
Marx: 7) All delegates of General Council to have the right to
attend and be heard at meetings of district councils and local
branches.
Serraillier seconds. Adopted unanimously.
Marx: 8) General Council to issue fresh edition of Statutes and
authentic French and German version, printed side by side; and
all other countries to have their translations approved by General
Council before publishing.
Jung seconds. Adopted unanimously.
Mottershead: That the Conference be asked to charge the
General Council with enforcing Art. V. of the Statutes relative to a
general statistics of the Working Classes and the resolution of the
Congress of Geneva on the same subject.a To carry this out it
might be resolved that trades unions etc who refuse to give the
information required, shall not be supported by the General
Council in case of strike.
McDonnell seconds. Adopted unanimously!
Marx: That the Sub-Committee meets at 8 at Marx’s on Monday
evening.
Adopted.

First published in part, in Russian, in the book The London Conference of the First
International, Moscow, 1936, and in full in The General Council of the First International,
1870-1871, Moscow, 1965

a K. Marx, Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men’s
Association (present edition, Vol. 20, Appendices); Resolutions of the Congress of
Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868. The International Working Men’s
Frederick Engels

MEETING OF SUB-COMMITTEE

Monday 11th September 1871 at 1 Maitland Park

Serraillier in the Chair. Engels appointed Secretary.

Proposed by Engels, seconded by Hales that the Bill of Mr. Truelove \(359 \£ 2511.6\) be passed, reserving the question of the price of the handbills and the 5th Thousand copies.\(^a\) Adopted unanimously.

Proposed by Engels, seconded by Eccarius: that Mr. Truelove be paid \(£10.\) — on account and the payment of the rest be delayed until he shall have handed in an account of copies sold. Adopted unanimously.

Proposed by Marx, seconded by Longuet: that the General Council be requested, to avoid all misunderstandings, to declare at the opening of the Conference: that a Conference is nothing but a meeting of delegates from various countries called to consult and decide together with the General Council, on administrative measures rendered necessary by extraordinary circumstances.\(^b\)

Hales proposed, Longuet seconded: that the General Council recommend the formation of an English Federal Council. Withdrawn to be submitted to General Council tomorrow.

Marx proposes, Jung seconds: that the formation of working women’s sections be recommended.\(^c\)

First published, in Russian, in the book

*The London Conference of the First International*, Moscow, 1936

---

\(^a\) Of the third edition of *The Civil War in France.*—*Ed.*

\(^b\) See this volume, p. 613.—*Ed.*

APPENDICES
[FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING
OF JANUARY 17, 1871]

Cit. Marx said as there were several English members present he had a very important statement to make. At the last meeting at St. James's Hall Odger spoke of the French Government contrary to truth. In our second address we said the brand of infamy attaches to some of the members of the provisional government from the Revolution of 1848. Odger said there was not a blame attached to them. Favre can only be received as the representative of the Republic, not as the spotless patriot Jules Favre. The way that is now talked about him put Favre in the foreground and the Republic almost out of sight. One example of Favre's doings. After the Revolution of 1848 Favre became Secretary of the Interior; on account of Flocon being ill, Ledru-Rollin chose Favre. One of the first things he did was to bring back the army to Paris, which afterwards enabled the bourgeoisie to shoot the work-people down. Later, when the people became convinced that the Assembly consisted of middle-class men, the people made a demonstration in favour of Poland on which occasion the people ran into the assembly. The president entreated Louis Blanc to speak to them and pacify them, which he did. A war with Russia would have saved the Republic. The first thing Jules Favre did a few days after was to ask for authority to prosecute Louis Blanc as an accomplice of the invaders. The Assembly thought he was instructed by the Government to do but all the other members of the Government denounced [this measure] as the private affair of Favre. The provisional government conspired to provoke the insurrection of June. After the people were shot down Favre

---

a See this volume, p. 269.—Ed.
proposed that the Executive Committee should be abolished. On the 27th he drew up the decree to transport the prisoners without trial; 15,000 were transported. In November the Assembly was compelled to examine some not yet transported. In Brest alone 1,000 had to be liberated. Of the most dangerous who were tried by a military commission many had to be liberated, others were only sentenced to short terms of imprisonment. Afterwards motions were made for an amnesty, Favre always opposed. He was one of the men who insisted for a commission of inquiry of the whole revolution except February. He was instrumental in the passing of the most infamous press laws that ever existed and of which Napoleon made good use. Favre had certain relations with the Bonapartists under the July monarchy and he used all his influence to get Napoleon into the National Assembly. He interested himself to bring about the expedition to Rome, which was the first step for the establishment of the Empire.

The account of the speech (without any mention of the author) was published in The Eastern Post No. 121, January 21, 1871.

January 24, 1871

Cit. Engels inquired whether any of the members had been at the meeting of the previous evening but there was no reply. He then stated as there was a difference of opinion amongst the members it would be advisable to discuss the question as to the attitude of the English working class on the present phase of the war at the meeting. He moved that the question be put on the order of the day.

Cit. Marx seconded the proposition, which was agreed to.

January 31, 1871

Cit. Engels said: following the advice of the Chairman of the last meeting and complying with an English custom, I have drawn up some resolutions principally as a basis for the debate. I am not particular as regards carrying them exactly as they are. These are the resolutions I have drawn up:

1. That the working-class movement in support of the French Republic ought to have concentrated its efforts, at the beginning, upon the enforcement of the recognition of the Republic by the British Government.

2. That the military intervention of England in favour of France, as understood by those proposing it, could have been of any use whatever at a certain moment only, which has long since passed away.

3. That England remains incapable, not only of interfering with effect in Continental affairs, but also of defending herself against

---

a The record has "Council", which was subsequently crossed out.—Ed.
b B. Lucraft.—Ed.
the Continental military despotism so long as she does not recover
the liberty of using her real war power—that is to say, her naval
power, which she can only recover by the renunciation of the
Declaration of Paris.\textsuperscript{351}

The policy adopted by the Council was laid in the second
address.\textsuperscript{a} On the 4th of September the Republic was declared, on
the 9th of September our address was issued in which it was said:
“The English workmen have already taken measures to overcome,
by a wholesome pressure from without, the reluctance of their
Government to recognise the French Republic.” Had the move-
ment been confined to that it might have succeeded, other
countries would have followed and it would have given France a
standing which Prussia could [not] have ignored. But there were
others who were not satisfied with this. I mean the Comtists,
Professor Beesly and his friends. Professor Beesly has on several
occasions stood up bravely, for the working class, he braved the
hostility of the middle classes in the Broadhead affair,\textsuperscript{366} but the
Comtists are not properly a working-class party. They advocate a
compromise to make wages-labour tolerable to perpetuate it; they
belong to a political sect who believe that France ought to rule the
world. In their last declaration, which was signed by several
members of the Council,\textsuperscript{367} they demanded that France should be
restored to the position it occupied before the war.\textsuperscript{b} Before the
war France was a military power. The Comtists asked for
intervention and as soon as it was done the working-class
movement split up. The opposition said that hitherto war had
postponed everything in the shape of social and political progress
and every war had given the aristocracy a new lease of life. There
is a great deal of truth in that. But on the other hand how could
people, who were not able to compel the Government to recognise
the Republic, force the same Government to go [to] war for the
Republic? Supposing England had gone to war. By withdrawing all
armed forces from Scotland, by depriving every other place of
soldiers and leaving only 10,000 in Ireland, some 30,000 men
could have been started and they would have been useful at a
certain moment. At one time the French and German forces were
about equal and Moltke was going to raise the siege, and at that
moment an English army might have turned the scales against the
Germans. But that moment had long since passed away; it was

\textsuperscript{a} See this volume, p. 269.—\textit{Ed.}

\textsuperscript{b} See J. M. Ludlow and others,\textit{[Remonstrance forwarded to Mr. Gladstone]},
\textit{The Times}, No. 26947, December 30, 1870.—\textit{Ed.}
when there was a sort of revival before Orléans, when Aurelle de Paladines gained his successes. An English force then would have had a good effect upon the French soldiers, it would have improved [their spirit]; then the Germans have been largely reinforced, and the Prussians have such a bad opinion of the army of this country that the English, had they gone over, would have been laughed at; all they could have done would have been to make Chanzy's retreat a little more orderly.

An English army on land can only act in alliance with other armies. This was done in the Peninsular War and it was done in the Crimea. England can best carry on war by supplying her allies with the materials of war. In the Crimea they had [to] borrow French soldiers to fill their trenches. It has always been found impossible to carry on a war far from home with a large army. Owing to the military system—the absence of conscription, the slow process of voluntary recruiting, the system of drill, the length of time it takes to make an English soldier efficient—the English army is based on long service, it is impossible to maintain a large army by the necessary reinforcements. If an army had been sent to France it could not have been kept up if it had met with any losses. The only thing England could have done to assist France would have been to declare war at the moment when Russia repudiated the Treaty of Paris. That point too was alluded to in our addresses. In the first the following is said: "In the background of this suicidal strife looms the dark figure of Russia. It is an ominous sign that the signal for the present war should have been given at the moment when the Moscovite Government had just finished its strategical lines of railway and was already massing troops in the direction of the Pruth." In the second: "As in 1865 promises were exchanged between Louis Bonaparte and Bismarck, so in 1870 promises have been exchanged between Gorchakov and Bismarck." But nobody has taken any notice of that. No sooner had Russia declared against the Treaty of Paris than Bismarck repudiated the Luxembourg Treaty. This proved the secret understanding. Prussia has never been anything else but the tool of Russia. That was the opportunity for England to step in. The French were not quite so low down as they have been since, and if England had declared war Prussia and Russia would have gone together and the rest of Europe would have gone together and France would have been relieved. Austria, Italy and

---

a See this volume, p. 7.— Ed.
b Ibid., p. 267.— Ed.
Turkey were ready, and if the Turks had not been interfered with
as in the war, they would have been able to hold their own while
the others helped the French to drive out the Prussians. But, when
this opportunity arose, the gentlemen who were going to help
France had nothing to say.

Now, the way in which Jules Favre has thrown up the sponge
for the whole of France, a thing he had no business to do, there is
no doubt, with the help of the French middle class, France will
have to submit and peace will be made. Then we shall see what
Russia will do. Russia and Prussia require war as much [as]
Napoleon to stem the popular movement at home, to preserve
their prestige and keep their positions.

The navy is the main power of England but by the Declaration
of 1856 a new naval code was established; it was laid down that
privateering should be done away with. The right of search was
abandoned, enemy's goods were made safe in neutral bottoms and
neutral goods in enemy's bottoms. There was a similar attempt
made once before by the Empress Catherine of Russia but
England refused till after the Crimean war. At the Conference
of Paris, by one stroke of the pen, Clarendon signed away
England's power to hurt Russia at sea. By whose instructions or
authority [he] did so has never come out. When it was brought
before the House of Commons Disraeli blinked at it, the question
was shirked. To cripple Russia it is necessary to stop her export,
her export trade. If the Russian aristocracy could not sell their
corn, their flax, in one word, their agricultural produce, to foreign
countries, Russia could not hold out for a year, and the bulk of
her trade is carried on in foreign bottoms. To make war on Russia
England must regain her hold of this power. It was abandoned on
the pretence of making private property as safe at sea as it was on
land. We have seen how the Prussians have respected private
property in France. The working class has no private property to
lose, it has therefore no interest in making [it] safe. But the
working class has interest in resuming the hold of this power and
to keep [it] intact till the Russian Empire is dissolved. The English
Empire like all other empires based upon ... will have to be
dissolved in due time but with that we have nothing to do at
present and that will proceed more peaceably perhaps. No other
country can oppose Russia the same as England can and she must

---

\(^a\) Apparently the words "in the Crimea" are omitted.— Ed.

\(^b\) A blank space in the record.— Ed.
keep this power at least till Poland is restored. Had war been declared against Russia it would have been the salvation of France, and Poland could have been restored. Now Russia will enter on a war of conquest, perhaps before a year is over, and Europe will have to fight minus France.

February 7, 1871

Cit. Engels. When I mentioned Ireland I only supposed that 10,000 would be the smallest force the Government would leave in Ireland. I did not take the sentiments of the Irish into account at all.

February 14, 1871

Cit. Marx. The recognition of the Republic was the first condition for all the rest; if that did not succeed all the rest must fail. France was internationally paralysed and at home, too, while Prussia had Russia at her back. The moment the Republic was proclaimed everybody in France became enthusiastically republican. Had the Republic been recognised then it would have had a chance to succeed. But when no recognition came they turned back. The propertied class had an interest rather to see Prussia victorious than the Republic. They are well aware that sooner or later the Republic must have become socialistic and therefore they intrigued against it, and these intrigues have done more for Prussia than Moltke and his generals. Well, no one has shown in this discussion that the recognition of the Republic was not the first point. Next, the Cannon Street meeting was not a meeting of the wealthy citizens of London, it was the small middle class who never had any influence. They may either support the great capitalists against the people or join the working class; they cannot do anything by themselves, but when they join the working class they must not be permitted to lead, because they are dangerous leaders. They hate the Republic and would not recognise it, but they were afraid of Prussia, therefore they were for war. Cit. Eccarius talked about protesting against the dismemberment of France; without threatening war [it] would have been useless; that had nothing to do with it. We protested in our address and the Germans protested but that was only a moral protest; the British Government could not protest until Prussia had been victorious and formally demanded those provinces, and it was impossible to believe that this Government would seriously oppose the dismemberment.

See this volume, pp. 263-70.—Ed.
Then Cit. Cohn seems to entertain strange notions about the working men’s agitation. When the workmen go to Gladstone to hear his opinion they must take that as an ultimate decision and give up. He also thinks that more could have been done if Parliament had been sitting. That was the best thing that Parliament was not sitting. The recognition of the Republic was a simple executive act. Had Parliament been sitting Gladstone would have shoved [it] off his own shoulders onto those of the majority and there would have been a thousand reasons to support him to one against it. A change of government might have necessitated an election and the Liberals don’t care about buying the free electors too often. I am quite sure, if the working men had persevered and not allowed doctrinal middle-class speakers to meddle, they might have succeeded. There was not half the energy thrown into this movement that there was some time since in a beer row. All things in England are carried by pressure from without. Cit. Milner spoke as if the Germans would be offended if the English insisted on the recognition of the French Republic. Quite the contrary: they believe the English have not gone far enough. Hundreds have been imprisoned and the only people they could look to for moral support were the English work-people but they did not get in the way they ought to have done. As to monarchy against republic, there was one monarchical army against another in the beginning; there was nothing about republic, and the French army was supposed to be the stronger. When all the French standing army disappeared everybody thought the French would have to give in, in a few days no monarchy could have assisted [against] the Prussians. It was the absence of a monarch alone, the Republic, that has done it for five months, and if there [had] been no treason and no intriguing they would have kept up longer.

The third point that has come out is that middle-class republics have become impossible in Europe. A middle-class government dare not interfere so far as to take the proper revolutionary measures for defence. It is only a political form to develop the power of the working class. The last elections in France and the proceedings of the middle class in Germany prove that they rather have a military despotism than a republic. In England there is the same fear. Republicanism and middle-class government can no longer go together.

I now come to the war itself. After the capitulation of Sedan

\[a\] On September 2, 1870.—Ed.
Bismarck was in a difficulty. The king\(^a\) had told the German Parliament and the French people that he only made war against Napoleon in self-defence. But after Sedan it was no [longer] more for defence than the French had been. I know that Bismarck worked as hard to bring about the war as Napoleon, the defence was only a pretext. But after Sedan he wanted a new pretext. The German middle class was doubtful whether it was not time to stop but Bismarck found that there was no recognised government to make peace with, therefore he must go to Paris to make peace. It was the height of impudence for him [to] say what government the French would recognise and what they would not but it answered his purpose. Money-makers are always worshippers of success, and the German middle class being afraid of the Republic, [he] secured their support, that of the aristocracy he was sure of beforehand. It was Bismarck's interest that England should not recognise the Republic because England was the only power that could oppose him, but he reckoned on Gladstone and the Court relations. To be mother-in-law of the Emperor of Germany\(^b\) was no small thing, so England followed in the footsteps of the Holy Alliance. When Gladstone was taxed by the working men's deputation about the haste with which Napoleon had been recognised, he baffled them by mixing up dates and confounding the recognition after the coup d'état by Palmerston with that of Derby after the plebiscite. He told the working men he had gone as far as he could, and he made a merit of not having broken off diplomatic relations. He could have gone as far as America. His colleagues, Bruce, Lowe and Cardwell, made hostile demonstrations against the Republic\(^{372}\) by stating that England could only employ moral force without. The only place where England can employ physical force is Ireland. Then the German press was ordered to insult England about selling stores to the French. When Bernstorff called Granville to account he equivocated and said he would inquire and then found it was all right and legal.\(^{373}\) He knew that before, only he had not the pluck to say so. Then the British Government, at the instance of Bernstorff, confiscated the French cable, which an English judge afterwards pronounced to be illegal.\(^{374}\) After the capitulation of Metz Russia thought it was time to show her partnership which was shown in the renunciation of the Treaty of Paris. Immediately after [this] came the repudiation of the Treaty of Luxembourg and the settlement of

\(^{a}\) William I.—Ed.  
\(^{b}\) A hint at the Queen Victoria.—Ed.
Rumania in the principalities,\(^a\) which were all insults to England. And what did Gladstone do? He sent a plenipotentiary extraordinary\(^b\) to Bismarck to ask his advice. Bismarck advised a conference in London and even Gladstone felt that it would be no use without France because without France the treaty breakers would be in the majority. But France could not be admitted without recognising the Republic, and therefore Bismarck had to prevent it. When Auberon Herbert asked Gladstone in the House he again shuffled out and falsified the facts and ignored the most important part.\(^c\) Pious people always do a deal of sinning. From the Blue Book it appears [that] when the English Government asked for a pass for Favre, Bismarck answered that France was internationally incapable of acting, before that was removed it would be useless to take any steps to admit her to Conference. Non-recognition was the means of isolating the English Government.

February 21, 1871

Cit. Marx then called the attention of the Council to the report of his speech in *The Eastern Post*\(^d\) and the slovenly way in which it was put together. If his name had not been misprinted he should have considered it his duty to write to the editor. The report stated “the moment the Republic was proclaimed everybody in France was enthusiastically republican, but no recognition came and a reaction set in”. There was no sense whatever in it. He had on the contrary stated that the Republic had been recognised by Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Belgium and other countries and that the enthusiasm of the people had been so great that the opponents had been obliged to pretend to be in favour of it; and he had particularly mentioned that the judge of the High Court of Blois had played the Republican. The report went on: “the bourgeoisie had no interest in making the Republic succeed, they are well aware that sooner or later the social question must be dealt with.” This was altogether different from what he had said, which was that the Republic must become socialistic. Then the report went

---

\(^a\) The entry is not exact. *The Eastern Post* report of this meeting, February 19, 1871, gives this passage as follows: “In quick succession followed the renunciation of the Treaty of Luxembourg and the stipulations about the principalities by Bismarck and the Prince of Rumania.”—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Lord Odo Russell.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) See the speeches of A. Herbert and W. Gladstone in the House of Commons on February 10, 1871, *The Times*, No. 26984, February 11, 1871.—*Ed.*

\(^d\) See “The International Working Men’s Association”, *The Eastern Post*, No. 125, February 19, 1871.—*Ed.*
on: "none of the advocates of a war have shown that the recognition of the Republic was the first condition to all the rest", which ought [to be] "not the first condition".

About his remarks upon what other speakers had said the reporter had not taken the trouble to say who spoke, so that it was difficult to distinguish who had spoken. The remark attributed to him about Cit. Cohn was tantamount to an insult. Further the report said that it was "the absence of a monarch that inspired the people"; he had distinctly stated "the absence of monarchy", which was quite a different affair. The devil should understand such reports. Then that England use "more force" without, which might be a misprint of "moral force".

Again it was reported that Bismarck had said, "the French had not recognised that Government and it was the height of impudence for him to say what Government should be recognised by the French". No mention was made that he [Marx] had said that everybody in France had recognised and obeyed the Government and that it was the height of impudence for Bismarck to say they had not.

Then it is reported that the admission of France to the Conference would be tantamount to recognition. This was a penny-a-liner's remark, not his [Marx's]; the conclusion was altogether falsified. It was because the Government was not recognised that it was internationally incapable. The report differs also from the Minutes. Such reports could only do injury, and if any more of that sort were published he should move that no more be printed.

March 7, 1871

Cit. Marx then recurred to the question of the Declaration of Paris. He said if the English working people did not speak out, that Declaration might be made an article of a treaty and the people of England must not be disarmed in their foreign policy, and there was no time to be lost: an English committee ought to be formed at once. For a maritime power the only way to make war was to make war against the foreign commerce of the enemy. America had not consented to that Declaration but the French had observed it and that was the reason the French fleet had done so little. Holland was now put forward to ask that that what was formerly only a declaration be made a part of the treaty. On the sea only goods could be destroyed but in a war in the interior an amount of fixed capital, such [as] bridges, buildings, etc., were crossed out in the MS.—Ed.
destroyed which it took years to replace. Letters of mark were another affair; they were the *francs tireurs*\(^{34}\) of the sea. The ruling class of this country had lost the power of national defence without, and at the moment when France was powerless England represented the West of Europe, and the working class of England must regain the power.

*March 14, 1871*

Cit. Marx then resumed the adjourned debate. He said it was of the greatest possible consequence to find an antagonist for the military powers of the Continent. They were again in the position of the Holy Alliance,\(^{375}\) and England was the only power that could oppose them and she could only do it by regaining her maritime rights. Confiscating their goods in neutral ships would ruin their foreign commerce in a few weeks and then the German middle class would not be quite so warlike, as it had lately been. This kind of warfare was more humane than war in its general aspects. By the Paris Declaration the military powers said virtually to England: you must make war in our way, not in yours. There had [been] much said against privateers but they were as good as *francs tireurs* and required less government power. When Butler had advocated war with England people had said America could not go to war without a navy, to which Butler had replied: we want no navy, we only require privateers. It was a matter of indifference with the present rulers of England whether they had that power or not but they would not always rule and [it] was necessary for a power of the English people to be employed for the benefit of the people of the Continent. Stuart Mill had been for the Declaration of Paris but some papers had been sent to him and he had now turned against it. The whole Black Sea Conference\(^{376}\) had turned upon getting this Declaration sanctioned. Before, it had only been privately agreed to by Palmerston and Clarendon but the protocol signed on the previous day as to stipulations seemed to include it.

Cit. Engels said it was hardly worthwhile to go on as Cit. Weston to whose remarks he wanted to reply was not present. As to the Paris Declaration, Cit. Marx had already pointed out that it had only been a private agreement. It had never been acknowledged by any statesman or Parliament, nobody had said that it was binding. In 1862 Cornewall Lewis had declared that it was not binding. In 1867 the present Lord Derby had declared in answer to Stuart Mill that it was only binding in a way but that self-defence overawed all compacts. It had never been ratified and
only rested on the authority of a private letter of a minister; no one was bound by it. This was clear from the fact that at every war the belligerent powers themselves had, by special agreements, bound themselves. But the Conference had signed a protocol that henceforth treaties and stipulations should be binding until they were relinquished by common consent.\(^a\) The war between France and Germany had proved that the present fortresses were insufficiently protected against bombardment and that by detached forts the fortresses themselves could be saved, and there were to be some forts erected in Poland. The Russian armaments were continued with unabated zeal and were on the last step from a peace to a war footing. The telegraph and sanitary companies were being organised. There was a Russian loan in the English market for £12,000,000, which was already oversubscribed and was probably the last English money Russia would get. We might have war before the summer was over—it did not look very peaceful. Referring to what had been said during the discussion, he said the only point that had been disputed was that an English army would not have been sufficient for intervention. The strong language of which Cit. Weston had spoken had not been used by him. He then showed again that England could only bring out a force of 30,000; only at the battle of the Alma the English had numbered 33,000 and that figure they had never reached again during the Crimean war. This was only equal to Prussian army corps, and [to] suppose that such a force could have turned the scales was absurd. The English were as brave as any and there was individual bravery in every country but the men had different qualifications and the mode they exercised them was different. Some were best for attack, others best for defence. The Irish were the best men for light infantry, the English for ...\(^b\) but the military authorities here treated the English like the Irish and the Irish like the English. The English system of training was so incomplete and antiquated that never until the present war had men been trained in outpost duty at Aldershot. It had been said that 100,000 Englishmen would not have put up with being locked up in Paris. What could soldiers like our volunteers have done to prevent it? The French had had enough of such soldiers, and if 400,000 Englishmen of the same class had been locked up as the French

\(^a\) Protocoles des Conférences tenue à Londres ... pour la révision des stipulations du Traité du 30 mars 1856 relatives à la neutralisation de la Mer Noire, séance du 17 janvier 1871, Annexe.—Ed.

\(^b\) A gap in the MS. The newspaper report further has “heavy infantry”.—Ed.
were in Paris and led by the same jackasses and traitors they would have done the same as the French had done.

In conclusion he said England could not wage war on equal terms with the Continental powers, nor was it desirable that she should. An English soldier costs £100 a year, a Prussian only £30, therefore Prussia could keep three soldiers where England could only keep one; hence she could never compete with the military powers and he hoped she never would try to do it.

The first and the second point of the proposition with which the discussion commenced were withdrawn and the third:—“That England remains incapable, not only of interfering with effect in Continental affairs, but also of defending herself against the Continental military despotism, so long as she does not recover the liberty of using her real war power, that is to say, her naval power, which she can recover only by the renunciation of the Declaration of Paris”—was carried unanimously.


Reproduced from the General Council's Minute Book
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[FROM THE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 21, 1871]

Cit. Engels then gave a description of the state of things in Paris. He said the letters received during the week from Paris, which Seraillier had already mentioned, had cleared up what had been incomprehensible before. It had appeared as if a few men had suddenly seized a number of cannon and kept them. The whole of the press and every one of the correspondents had written that these men must be [put] down but the French Government had temporised. The information received from our Paris Committee was [that] the National Guards paid for the making of these guns and liked to keep them. After the election they had found that the Republic was anything but safe under such an Assembly as had been elected. 378 When the Prussians had entered Paris the guns had been taken away to another part of the town to keep them out of their reach. Then the Government had laid claim to them and endeavoured to take them away from the National Guards. Aurelle de Paladines had been appointed Commander in Chief of the National Guards and prefect of the police. a Under Napoleon he had been Commander in Chief of the Gendarmerie and he was a partisan of the priests. At the bidding of Dupanloup, the bishop of Orleans, he had done five hours’ penance at Church while his army had been defeated in an action with the Germans. This had left no doubt as to the intentions of the Government.

a At the next meeting on March 28, 1871, Engels pointed out to the mistake made in the record of his speech on March 21: "Two Generals, Aurelle de Paladines and Valentin, were made into one. It was the latter who had been appointed Prefect of the Police".—Ed.
The National Guard had then prepared for resistance. Out of 260 battalions 215 had organised a Central Committee, men and officers combined. A delegate had been elected by each Company out of whom the local Committees of the arrondissements, or wards, had been formed, and they had elected the Central Committee. Out of twenty arrondissements only five had not elected any delegates. When the Assembly had removed to Versailles the Government had tried to clear Paris of the revolutionists and take the guns from them. The troops only just arrived in Paris had been meant to be employed under the command of Vinoy who had commanded the soldiers that shot down the people on the boulevards during the coup d'état in 1851. They had partly succeeded early in the morning but when the National Guards had discovered what had been done they had set to work to retake the guns and the soldiers had fraternised with the people. The town was now in the hands of the people, the troops that had not gone over had been withdrawn to Marseilles and the Assembly did not know what to do. None of the men of the Central Committee were known to fame, there were no Felix Pyats and men of that stamp in it, but they were well known among the working class. There were four members of the International in the Committee.\(^a\)

The Commune was to be elected the next day. They had announced that the liberty of the press should be respected but not the rotten Bonapartist press. The most important resolution passed was that the preliminaries of peace should be respected. The Prussians were still near and if they could be kept out of the quarrel the chances of success were increased.

The account of the speech was printed, without the author's name, in *The Eastern Post*, No. 130, March 25, 1871

This variant of the record was first published, in Russian, in the newspaper *Pravda*, No. 77, March 18, 1932

---

Cit. Engels said the question was not whether we support a republican movement but whether under present circumstances it would drive into our path. There were men like Peter Taylor and others who were simply for the Republic but it must be considered that the abolition of monarchy would involve the abolition of the State Church, the House of Lords and many other things. No republican movement could go on here without expanding into a working class movement and if such a movement was to take place it would be as well to know how it went on. Before our ideas could be carried into practice we must have the Republic. We must watch it and [it] was right for our members to take part in it and try to shape it. If it turned into a middle class affair it would become a clique. The working [class] could not but break with all established forms.

Cit. Engels said there was as much oppression in America as here, but the republic gave a fair field for the working classes to agitate. In the densely populated states the labor movement was organised but the extent of unoccupied land prevented [it from] getting stronger than it was.

Cit. Marx was convinced that no Republican movement could become serious without becoming social. The wire pullers of the present move of course intended no such thing.
Cit. Engels said he had another fact to communicate. The press had lately been full of the wonders done by the Association, but the last stated in a Paris paper was that Marx had been private secretary to Bismarck in 1857.\(^a\)

He further said it would not be well to allow the Paris affair to go on without saying something about it. As long as the Central Committee of the National Guards had managed the affair it had gone on well but after the election\(^381\) there had been talk and no action. The time for action against Versailles had been when it was weak but that opportunity had been lost and now it seemed that Versailles was getting the upper hand and driving the Parisians back. People would not put up long with being led into defeat. They lost ground, their ammunition was spent to little purpose and they were eating up their provisions. They could not be starved into submission as long as one side of Paris was open. Favre declined to take Prussian help.\(^382\) In June 1848 the fight had been over in four days but then the workpeople had had no cannon. It would not be over so quick now. Louis Napoleon had made the streets wide that they might be swept with cannon against the workpeople but now it was in their favor; they would sweep the streets with cannon against the other party. The workpeople 200,000 men far better organised than at any former insurrection. Their case was a bad one but the chances were not so good as a fortnight ago.

---

\(^a\) See "Nouvelles d'hier. Paris, 2 avril", La Province, No. 428, April 5, 1871. See also Marx's letter to Karl Liebknecht, about April 10, 1871, present edition, Vol. 44.—Ed.
Cit. Marx read a letter from the Secretary of the New York Committee giving the following list of Sections represented by delegates in the Committee:

1. General German Workingmen's Society (Labor Union No. 5).
2. French Section of the I.W.A. New York.
4. Social Political Workingmen's Society 1 Chicago
5. Ditto " " 2 Chicago
7. Irish section of the I.W.A. New York.
8. Social Democratic Society Williamsburgh N.Y. (German).

The Sections were reported as doing good work, the Irish is rapidly increasing and trying to enter into combination with the Irish Confederation of the United States. Progress has been made to establish a weekly German newspaper. The Workingmen's Union had decided that only delegates representing Labor, not capital should be admitted. The National Labor Union was losing ground among the New York Societies; several had refused to send delegates to the next Congress.

The Workingmen's Assembly of the State of New York had held its annual session at Albany and passed a resolution approving and endorsing the principles of the I.W.A. concluding "Workingmen of all Countries, unite!"

An address to the workingmen's Societies and Trades Union was in course of preparation and correspondence had been established with the Miners' Benevolent Association of Pennsylvania. The
organised political labor party had overthrown the Republican
ascendancy in New Hampshire in the recent election. A native
American Section had been founded and sent a delegate [to the New
York Committee]. A bill of exchange for two pounds sterling was
remitted as contribution for 293 members and payment for
Congress Reports.

Cit. Marx announced that letters had been received from Paris,
one of the 12th and one of 15th but they had only arrived on
Saturday. A Frenchman from the Commune who had come to
London to transact business with the Stock Exchange had paid him
[Marx] a visit to obtain his assistance. The expulsion of Tolain was
authentic,\(^b\) in consequence of which he proposed the following
resolution:

"Considering the Resolution of the Federal Council of the Paris
Sections expelling Citizen Tolain from the Association because,
after having been elected to the National Assembly as a
representative of the Working Classes, he has deserted their cause
in the most cowardly manner, which resolution the General
Council is called upon to confirm;

Considering that the place of every French member of the
International Workingmen's Association is undoubtedly on the
side of the Commune of Paris and not in the usurpatory and
counter-revolutionary Assembly of Versailles;

The General Council of the International Workingmen's Associa-
tion confirms the resolution of the Paris Federal Council and
declares that Citizen Tolain is expelled from the International
Workingmen's Association."

Eccarius seconded the resolution, it was carried unanimously.

Cit. Marx continued. He said he had pointed out to the delegate
of the Commune that it was a great blunder to leave us without
either letters\(^c\) or papers. This would be rectified in future as the
commercial communications between the Commune and London
would be kept up by a travelling agent who would also take charge
of our communications.

Serraillier and Dupont had been elected to fill up vacancies in
the 17th arrondissement, Serraillier had written that Dupont\(^d\) was
sure to be elected but he had not written since the election; he
might have written to Manchester.\(^{385}\) It appeared that more letters
had been written than had arrived.

---

\(^a\) A. Serraillier's letters were received on April 23.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^b\) See this volume, p. 297.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^c\) The end of the missing page from the Minute Book.—\textit{Ed.}
\(^d\) J. M. A. Dupont.—\textit{Ed.}
Felix Pyat and Vésinier were calumniating Serraillier and Dupont in Paris and when Serraillier had threatened to prosecute they had denied it. It was urgent to write at once to Paris to state the reasons why Pyat calumniated Serraillier and Dupont, and upon the motion of Citizen Mottershead Citizen Marx was instructed to write.386

The letters had been posted outside the line by Lafargue,387 they had therefore been delayed by rail, both the French and the Prussian Governments sifted the letters. Most of the information they contained was old but there were a few facts which the papers had not given. It was stated that the provinces knew as little what was going on in Paris as during the Siège. Except where the fighting was going on it had never been so quiet. A great part of the middle class had joined the National Guards of Belleville. The great Capitalists had run away and the small trades people went with the working class.388 No one could have an idea of the enthusiasm of the people, and the National Guards and the people at Versailles must be fools if they believed that they could enter Paris. Paris did not believe in a rising in the provinces and knew that superior forces were brought against it but there was no fear on that account, but there was fear of Prussian intervention and want of provisions. The decrees about rent and commercial bills were two master strokes: without them 3/4 of the trades people would have become bankrupt. The murder of Duval and Flourens had excited a sentiment of vengeance. The family of Flourens and the Commune had sent a legal officer to have the cause of their death certain, but in vain.389 Flourens had been killed in a house.

About the fabrication of telegrams there was some information. When Protot had gone through the accounts of the Government of National Defence he had discovered that money had been paid for the construction of an improved portable guillotine.390 The

---

386 Eugène Dupont.—*Ed.*
387 In the report published in *The Eastern Post* this sentence ends as follows: “and the shopkeepers have little love for the Versailles government”.—*Ed.*
388 *The Eastern Post* has: “for an authenticated statement of the cause of death, which would have involved an inquest, but the Versaillaise flatly refused”.—*Ed.*
389 *The Eastern Post* has: “Flourens did not fall in any encounter, he was literally assassinated in a home.”—*Ed.*
390 *The Eastern Post* has: “One of the first things the officers of the Commune did was to examine the papers and books of their predecessors. In the accounts of the Home Department of the Government of National Defence, there was an entry found of money having been paid for the construction of an improved portable guillotine. This new instrument for the slaughter of the Paris workmen was constructed while the patriots now conspiring at Versailles, pretended to defend Paris from Prussians.”—*Ed.*
The guillotine had been found and publicly burned by order of the Commune. The Gas Company had owed the municipality more than a mill, but had not shown any willingness to refund till their goods had been seized; then a bill to the amount had been given on the Bank of France. The telegrams and correspondents gave altogether different versions of these things. The greatest eyesore was that the Commune governed so cheap. The highest officials only received at the rate of 6000 fr.[per] year, the others only workman's wages.

The Address was to be ready at the next meeting.

First published in part in The Eastern Post, No. 135, April 29, 1871

Reproduced from the General Council's Minute Book, verified with The Eastern Post

---

a The Eastern Post has further: "The telegrams and the correspondents had it that the people burned them to save their heads against the Commune."—Ed.

b The Eastern Post describes this as follows: "The Gas Company being robbed is another little bit. The municipal account showed that the Gas Company had received upwards of a million out of the rates levied on the inhabitants of Paris, which was registered as owing; while the same Gas Company had a large balance in the Bank of France. When no response was made to refund, the Commune sent the brokers, and when the Company found that matters had become serious, that their cash-box and goods were seized, they gave a cheque in the Bank of France for the amounts, and their cash-box and goods were restored. These two cases may serve as samples."—Ed.

c The Eastern Post has: "The pay of ordinary functionaries is only equal to skilled workmen's wages, the salary of the highest officials is only at the rate of £240 a year. Surely they must be people, they cannot have any gentlemen among them—fancy a gentleman giving ministerial parties and Lord Mayor's dinner on £240 a year."—Ed.

d K. Marx, The Civil War in France (this volume, pp. 307-59).—Ed.
Cit. Engels then stated that the address\(^a\) was not ready yet. Cit. Marx had been seriously unwell and drawing up the address had made him worse. But it would be ready on Saturday and the Subcommittee\(^{238}\) could meet at Marx’s any time after five o’clock in the afternoon. A delegate from the Commune had been here, the reports were good. Strictness had to be employed not to let people pass without passports. It had been discovered that spies from Versailles had lounged about at their leisure. The main attack had failed. The Versailles army had tried to get in between the National Guards and the ramparts but now they could only attack in one place and that was where they had failed before. The defence was getting stronger. The Commune had lost a little ground [but] had regained Clamart. Even if the army succeeded at the ramparts there were the barricades afterwards and there had never been such a struggle before as the one impending. For the first time barricades would be defended by cannon, by military guns, and by regularly organised forces. The contending armies were nearly equal now. Versailles could get no troops from the country, they had to send some away to keep the towns in order. Thiers could not even allow the Town Councils to meet at Bordeaux and talk politics,\(^{306}\) he had to use Napoleon’s Law to prevent it.\(^{325}\)

Cit. Engels seconded the proposition.\(^{389}\) He said he knew too little of the promoters of the affair but there was no doubt about

\(^{a}\) K. Marx, *The Civil War in France* (pp. 307-59).—*Ed.*
Robert Owen. There were things to be found in his writings that had not been superseded yet. He had started from his own ideas, had been originally a manufacturer himself and the first that had stood up against his class to put a stop to the shameful system in which women and children had been employed in factories. He thought the International ought to be represented.

Cit. Engels objected to Mottershead\textsuperscript{390} that Locke had been a deist but Owen a materialist. Locke's philosophy had led the French to materialism. He doubted that Owen had been acquainted with the older French writers. He differed entirely from Mottershead. Owen's movement had commenced as early as 1809 and had been independent of anything previously written. In 1812 he had published his book on marriage\textsuperscript{a} and 1818 he had gone to the King's Congress at Aix-la-Chapelle to induce them to proclaim Communism. That later the movement had been more in the direction of religion was true to a certain extent but much had been said about social reform. Most of the Owenites had gone over to the middle classes. They had been Chartists but forced into the position of professional agitators and then they had become less reliable and not stuck [to] their principles. He should regret if the festival came off in such a way that we could not take part in it.

Cit. Engels said he had not meant that all the socialists were Chartists but some he had known had been.

First published, in Russian, in the book 

\textit{The First International during the Paris Commune}, Moscow, 1941 and in the book 

\textit{The General Council of the First International, 1870-1871}, Moscow, 1965

Reproduced from the General Council's Minute Book

\textsuperscript{a} Evidently a mistake in the date. The reference is to Owen's book \textit{The Marriage System of the New Moral World...}, Leeds, 1838.—\textit{Ed.}
Citizen Marx explained that he had been ill, and had not been able to finish the address upon which he was engaged, but he hoped to have it ready by Tuesday next. In reference to the struggle in Paris he said, “He was afraid the end was near, but if the Commune was beaten, the struggle would only be deferred. The principles of the Commune were eternal and could not be crushed; they would assert themselves again and again until the working classes were emancipated. The Commune of Paris was being crushed by the aid of the Prussians, they were acting as gendarmes for Thiers. The plot for its destruction was concocted between Bismarck, Thiers and Favre; Bismarck stated at Frankfort that Thiers and Favre had asked him to interfere. The result showed that he was willing to do anything he could to assist them, short of risking the lives of German soldiers—not that he valued life when there was anything to be got—but he wished to see France sink still lower so that he might be able to exact the more. He had allowed Thiers to have more soldiers than was stipulated in the Convention, and had only allowed food to go into Paris in limited quantities. It was only the old story. The upper classes always united to keep down the working class. In the 11th century there was a war between some French Knights and Norman Knights, and the Peasants rose in insurrection; the Knights immediately forgot their differences and coalesced to crush the movement of the Peasants. To show how the Prussians have been

---

a K. Marx, *The Civil War in France* (pp. 307-59).— Ed.
b Report from Germany in the column “Révélations”, *La Situation*, No. 156, March 21, 1871.— Ed.
doing Police work, it might be mentioned that 500 were arrested at Rouen which is occupied by the Prussians—upon the plea that they belonged to the International. The International was feared. In the French Assembly the other day, Count Jaubert—a dried up mummy—a minister of '34—a man noted for supporting measures against the Press\textsuperscript{169}—made a speech in which he said that after order was restored, the first duty of the Government must be to enquire into the working of the International, and put it down.”\textsuperscript{a}

First published in \textit{The Eastern Post}, No. 139, May 27, 1871

Reproduced from the General Council’s Minute Book, verified with \textit{The Eastern Post}

\textsuperscript{a} See H. F. Jaubert’s speech in the National Assembly, May 12, 1871, \textit{Journal officiel} (Versailles), No. 133, May 13, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}
Citizen Marx said the Council must disclaim all connection with the so-called International Democratic Association\(^{954}\) as it was started in opposition to the International Workingmen's Association which had to bear the responsibilities of acts absurd as they sometimes were.\(^{a}\) Another thing to which he wished to call the attention of the Council was the infamous lies circulated about the Commune by the English Press. They were lies fabricated by the French and Prussian police. They were afraid lest the truth should be known. It was asserted that Millière was one of the most furious members of the Commune. Now it was a fact that he never was a member of the Commune, but as he had been a deputy for Paris it was necessary to have an excuse for shooting him. The English press acted as police and bloodhounds for Thiers. Slanders against the Commune and against the International were invented to serve his bloody policy. The press knew full well the objects and principles of the International. It had given reports of the prosecutions against it in Paris under the Empire. It had had representatives at the various Congresses held by the Association, and had reported their proceedings, and yet it circulated reports to the effect that the Association included the Fenian Brotherhood, the Carbonari, ceased to exist 1830, the Marianne, Ditto 1854\(^{392}\) and other secret Societies, and asked if Colonel Henderson knew of the whereabouts of the General Council which was said to sit in London. These things were simply

\(^{a}\) The first sentence is omitted in the report published in *The Eastern Post.*—Ed.
invented to justify any action taken against the International. The upper classes were afraid of the principles of the International.

He wished also to call attention to the fact that Mazzini had written in *The Contemporary Review* denouncing the Commune.\(^a\) It was not so well known as it ought to be, but Mazzini had always been opposed to the Workmen’s movements. He denounced the insurgents of June 1848 when Louis Blanc, who then had more courage than he has now—answered him.\(^b\)

When Pierre Leroux—who had a large family—obtained employment in London Mazzini was the man to denounce him. The fact was, Mazzini, with his old-fashioned Republicanism knew nothing and accomplished nothing. In Italy he had created a military despotism by his cry for Nationality. With him the State—which was an imaginary thing, was everything, and Society—which was a reality—was nothing. The sooner the People repudiated such men the better.

First published in *The Eastern Post*, No. 141, June 10, 1871

Reproduced from the General Council's Minute Book, verified with *The Eastern Post*

---


\(^b\) L. Blanc, *Des socialistes français à M. Mazzini*, Brussels, 1852.—*Ed.*
Citizen Marx said that he was glad to observe that the workmen on the continent were thoroughly outspoken upon the subject of the Commune. Meetings had been held in Geneva, Brussels, Munich, Vienna, and Berlin, denouncing the Thiers-Favre massacres. He also called attention to the fact that a number of so-called manifestoes had appeared in the French papers, purporting to be issued by the Paris section of the International. They were all forgeries issued by the French police for the purpose of entrapping the unwary, it shewed the dirty actions to which a despicable government could descend. a

First published in The Eastern Post, Reproduced from the newspaper No. 143, June 24, 1871

a See this volume, pp. 364-66.— Ed.
London, July 3 [1871]

I went straight to my business. The world, I said, seemed to be in the dark about the International, hating it very much, but not able to say clearly what thing it hated. Some, who professed to have peered further into the gloom than their neighbors, declared that they had made out a sort of Janus figure with a fair, honest workman's smile on one of its faces, and on the other a murderous, conspirator's scowl. Would he [Marx] light up the case of mystery in which the theory dwelt? The professor laughed, chuckled a little I fancied, at the thought that we were so frightened of him.

"There is no mystery to clear up, dear sir," he began, in a very polished form of the Hans Breitmann dialect, "except perhaps the mystery of human stupidity in those who perpetually ignore the fact that our association is a public one and that the fullest reports of its proceedings are published for all who care to read them. You may buy our rules for a penny, and a shilling laid out in pamphlets will teach you almost as much about us as we know ourselves.

R.—Almost—yes, perhaps so; but will not the something I shall not know constitute the all-important reservation? To be quite frank with you, and to put the case as it strikes an outside observer, this general claim of depreciation of you must mean something more than the ignorant ill-will of the multitude. And it is still pertinent to ask even after what you have told me, what is the International Society?

Dr. M.—You have only to look at the individuals of which it is composed—workmen.

R.—Yes, but the soldier need be no exponent of the statecraft that sets him in motion. I know some of your members, and I can believe that they are not of the

---

a R. Lander.—Ed.
stuff of which conspirators are made. Besides, a secret shared by a million men would be no secret at all. But what if these were only the instruments in the hands of a bold, and I hope you will forgive me for adding, not over-scrupulous conclave.

Dr. M.—There is nothing to prove it.

R.—The last Paris insurrection?

Dr. M.—I demand firstly the proof that there was any plot at all—that anything happened that was not the legitimate effect of the circumstances of the moment; or the plot granted, I demand the proofs of the participation in it of the International Association.

R.—The presence in the communal body of so many members of the association.

Dr. M.—Then it was a plot of the Freemasons, too, for their share in the work as individuals was by no means a slight one. I should not be surprised, indeed, to find the Pope\textsuperscript{a} setting down the whole insurrection to their account. But try another explanation. The insurrection in Paris was made by the workmen of Paris. The ablest of the workmen must necessarily have been its leaders and administrators; but the ablest of the workmen happen also to be members of the International Association. Yet the association as such may be in no way responsible for their action.

R.—It will still seem otherwise to the world. People talk of secret instructions from London, and even grants of money. Can it be affirmed that the alleged openness of the association's proceedings precludes all secrecy of communication?

Dr. M.—What association ever formed carried on its work without private as well as public agencies? But to talk of secret instruction from London, as of decrees in the matter of faith and morals from some centre of Papal domination and intrigue is wholly to misconceive the nature of the International. This would imply a centralized form of government for the International, whereas the real form is designedly that which gives the greatest play to local energy and independence. In fact the International is not properly a government for the working class at all. It is a bond of union rather than a controlling force.

R.—And of union to what end?

Dr. M.—The economical emancipation of the working class by the conquest of political power. The use of that political power to the attainment of social ends. It is necessary that our aims should be thus comprehensive to include every form of working class activity. To have made them of a special character would have been to adapt them to the needs of one section—one nation of

\textsuperscript{a} Pius IX.—\textit{Ed.}
workmen alone. But how could all men be asked to unite to further the objects of a few. To have done that the association must have forfeited its title of International. The association does not dictate the form of political movements; it only requires a pledge as to their end. It is a network of affiliated societies spreading all over the world of labor. In each part of the world some special aspect of the problem presents itself, and the workmen there address themselves to its consideration in their own way. Combinations among workmen cannot be absolutely identical in detail in Newcastle and in Barcelona, in London and in Berlin. In England, for instance, the way to show political power lies open to the working class. Insurrection would be madness where peaceful agitation would more swiftly and surely do the work. In France a hundred laws of repression and a mortal antagonism between classes seem to necessitate the violent solution of social war. The choice of that solution is the affair of the working classes of that country. The International does not presume to dictate in the matter and hardly to advise. But to every movement it accords its sympathy and its aid within the limits assigned by its own laws.

R.—And what is the nature of that aid?

Dr. M.—To give an example, one of the commonest forms of the movement for emancipation is that of strikes. Formerly, when a strike took place in one country, it was defeated by the importation of workmen from another. The International has nearly stopped all that. It receives information of the intended strike, it spreads that information among its members, who at once see that for them the seat of the struggle must be forbidden ground. The masters are thus left alone to reckon with their men. In most cases the men require no other aid than that. Their own subscriptions or those of the societies to which they are more immediately affiliated supply them with funds, but should the pressure upon them become too heavy and the strike be one of which the association approves, their necessities are supplied out of the common purse. By these means a strike of the cigar-makers of Barcelona was brought to a victorious issue the other day. But the society has no interest in strikes, though it supports them under certain conditions. It cannot possibly gain by them in a pecuniary point of view, but it may easily lose. Let us sum it all up in a word. The working classes remain poor amid the increase of wealth, wretched amid the increase of luxury. Their material privation dwarfs their moral as well as their physical stature. They
cannot rely on others for a remedy. It has become then with them an imperative necessity to take their own case in hand. They must revise the relations between themselves and the capitalists and landlords, and that means they must transform society. This is the general end of every known workmen's organization; land and labor leagues, trade and friendly societies, co-operative stores and co-operative production are but means towards it. To establish a perfect solidarity between these organizations is the business of the International Association. Its influence is beginning to be felt everywhere. Two papers spread its views in Spain, three in Germany, the same number in Austria and in Holland, six in Belgium, and six in Switzerland. And now that I have told you what the International is you may, perhaps, be in a position to form your own opinion as to its pretended plots.

R.—I do not quite understand you.

Dr. M.—Do you not see that the old society, wanting the strength to meet it with its own weapons of discussion and combination, is obliged to resort to the fraud of fixing upon it the imputation of conspiracy?

R.—But the French police declare that they are in a position to prove its complicity in the late affair, to say nothing of preceding attempts.

Dr. M.—But we will say something of those attempts, if you please, because they best serve to test the gravity of all the charges of conspiracy brought against the International. You remember the last "plot" but one. A plebiscite had been announced. Many of the electors were known to be wavering. They had no longer a keen sense of the value of the imperial rule, having come to disbelieve in those threatened dangers of society from which it was supposed to have saved them. A new bugbear was wanted. The police undertook to find one. All combinations of workmen being hateful to them, they naturally owed the International an ill-turn. A happy thought inspired them. What if they should select the International for their bugbear, and thus at one stroke discredit that society and curry favor for the imperial cause? Out of that happy thought came the ridiculous "plot" against the Emperor's life—as if we wanted to kill the wretched old fellow. They seized the leading members of the International. They manufactured evidence. They prepared their case for trial, and in the meantime they had their plebiscite. But the intended comedy was too obviously but a broad, coarse farce. Intelligent Europe, which witnessed the spectacle, was not deceived for a moment as to its character, and only the French peasant elector was befooled. Your
English papers reported the beginnings of the miserable affair; they forgot to notice the end. The French judges admitting the existence of the plot by official courtesy were obliged to declare that there was nothing to show the complicity of the International. Believe me, the second plot is like the first. The French functionary is again in business. He is called in to account for the biggest civil movement the world has ever seen. A hundred signs of the times ought to suggest the right explanation—the growth of intelligence among the workmen, of luxury and incompetence among their rulers, the historical process now going on of that final transfer of power from a class to the people, the apparent fitness of time, place, and circumstance for the great movement of emancipation. But to have seen these the functionary must have been a philosopher, and he is only a mouchard. By the law of his being, therefore, he has fallen back upon the mouchard's explanation—a "conspiracy". His old portfolio of forged documents will supply him with the proofs, and this time Europe in its scare will believe the tale.

R.—Europe can scarcely help itself, seeing that every French newspaper spreads the report.

Dr. M.—Every French newspaper! See, here is one of them (taking up La Situation), and judge for yourself of the value of its evidence as to a matter of fact. (Reads:) “Dr. Karl Marx, of the International, has been arrested in Belgium, trying to make his way to France. The police of London have long had their eye on the society with which he is connected, and are now taking active measures for its suppression.”

Two sentences and two lies. You can test the truth of one story by the evidence of your own senses. You see that instead of being in prison in Belgium I am at home in England. You must also know that the police in England are as powerless to interfere with the International Society as the society with them. Yet what is most regular in all this is that the report will go the round of the continental press without a contradiction, and could continue to do so if I were to circularize every journal in Europe from this place.

R.—Have you attempted to contradict many of these false reports?

Dr. M.—I have done so till I have grown weary of the labor. To show the gross carelessness with which they are concocted I may

---

a Police agent.—Ed.
b Report in the column “Dépêches Télégraphiques”, La Situation, No. 240, June 28, 1871.—Ed.
mention that in one of them I saw Felix Pyat set down as a member of the International.

R.—And he is not so?

Dr. Marx—The association could hardly have found room for such a wild man. He was once presumptuous enough to issue a rash proclamation in our name, but it was instantly disavowed,\textsuperscript{997} though, to do them justice, the press of course ignored the disavowal.

R.—And Mazzini, is he a member of your body?

Dr. Marx (laughing)—Ah, no. We should have made but little progress if we had not got beyond the range of his ideas.

R.—You surprise me. I should certainly have thought that he represented the most advanced views.

Dr. M.—He represents nothing better than the old idea of a middle-class republic. We seek no part with the middle class. He has fallen as far to the rear of the modern movement as the German professors, who, nevertheless, are still considered in Europe as the apostles of the cultured democratism of the future. They were so at one time—before '48, perhaps, when the German middle class, in the English sense, had scarcely attained its proper development. But now they have gone over bodily to the reaction, and the proletariat knows them no more.

R.—Some people have thought they saw signs of a positivist element in your organization.

Dr. M.—No such thing. We have positivists among us, and others not of our body who work as well. But this is not by virtue of their philosophy, which will have nothing to do with popular government, as we understand it, and which seeks only to put a new hierarchy in place of the old one.\textsuperscript{a}

R.—It seems to me, then, that the leaders of the new international movement have had to form a philosophy as well as an association for themselves.

Dr. M.—Precisely. It is hardly likely, for instance, that we could hope to prosper in our war against capital if we derive our tactics, say from the political economy of Mill. He has traced one kind of relationship between labor and capital. We hope to show that it is possible to establish another.

R.—And as to religion?

Dr. M.—On that point I cannot speak in the name of the society. I myself am an atheist. It is startling, no doubt, to hear such an avowal in England, but there is some comfort in the

\textsuperscript{a} See this volume, pp. 498, 504-05.—\textit{Ed.}
thought that it need not be made in a whisper in either Germany or France?

R.—And yet you make your headquarters in this country?

Dr. M.—For obvious reasons; the right of association is here an established thing. It exists, indeed, in Germany, but it is beset with innumerable difficulties; in France for many years it has not existed at all.

R.—And the United States?

Dr. M.—The chief centres of our activity are for the present among the old societies of Europe. Many circumstances have hitherto tended to prevent the labor problem from assuming an all-absorbing importance in the United States. But they are rapidly disappearing, and it is rapidly coming to the front there with the growth as in Europe of a laboring class distinct from the rest of the community and divorced from capital.

R.—It would seem that in this country the hoped for solution, whatever it may be, will be attained without the violent means of revolution. The English system of agitating by platform and press until minorities become converted into majorities is a hopeful sign.

Dr. M.—I am not so sanguine on that point as you. The English middle class has always shown itself willing enough to accept the verdict of the majority so long as it enjoyed the monopoly of the voting power. But mark me, as soon as it finds itself outvoted on what it considers vital questions we shall see here a new slave-owner's war.”

First published in *The World*, July 18, 1871

Reproduced from the newspaper
Citizen Engels said after the Pope\textsuperscript{a} should come the Anti-Pope,\textsuperscript{399} he had to report that Joseph Mazzini had been attacking the International\textsuperscript{b} in the columns of his Journal. After stating that he knew the Italian people loved him and he loved them, he proceeded:

"An association has arisen which threatens to subvert all order (the same words as used by the Pope) started many years ago, I refused from the first to belong [to] it. It is controlled by a Council sitting in London, the soul of which is Karl Marx, a man of acute intellect, but like that of Proudhon of a dissolving character, and of domineering temper, who is jealous of other people's influence. The Council itself, composed of men of different nationalities, can have no unity of purpose either to discuss the evils which afflict society, nor the unity of sentiment necessary to amend them. These are the reasons why I retired from the Association, and why the Italian branch of the Democratic Alliance (London) retired from it also. The three fundamental principles of the International are:—1st Negation of God, that is of all morality. 2nd Negation of Country, which it dissolves into a Conglomeration of Communes, whose inevitable fate it must be to quarrel among themselves, 3rd Negation of Property, thereby depriving every working-man of the fruits of his labour for the right to individual property is nothing but the right of every man to that which he has produced."

After descanting at length upon these points, he concluded by advising the Italian Working Class to organise themselves strongly under his banner in a counter-league against the Internationals, to have faith in the future of Italy, and to work for its future and glory, and to form among themselves Co-operative Stores (not

\textsuperscript{a} Pius IX.—\textit{Ed.}
\textsuperscript{b} G. Mazzini, "Agli operai italiani", \textit{La Roma del popolo}, No. 20, July 13, 1871; see also this volume, pp. 385-87.—\textit{Ed.}
Co-operative Workshops) so that all may get as much profit as possible.

It will be seen that upon one important point Mazzini contradicts himself, in one place he says "he refused to belong to the International from the first," and afterwards says he retired. How a man can retire from that to which he never belonged, the public must imagine. The fact is Mazzini never was a member of the International but he tried to turn it into a tool of his own. He drew up a programme which was submitted to the provisional Council but it was rejected, and after some further attempts made through Major Wolff, since discovered to be a police spy, towards the same end had failed, Mazzini refrained from all interference with the International until lately.

As to the charges against the International, they are either untrue or absurd, with regard to the first that it wants to make atheism compulsory, that is untrue, and was refuted in the Secretary's letter in reply to Jules Favre's circular. The second is absurd, for while the International recognises no country, it desires to unite, not dissolve. It is opposed to the cry for Nationality, because it tends to separate people from people, and is used by tyrants to create prejudices and antagonism, the jealousy existing between the Latin and Teuton races led to the late disastrous war, and was equally used by Napoleon and Bismarck. The third charge only betrays Mazzini's ignorance of the very elements of political economy. That individual property which assures to everyone the fruits of his own labour, the International does not intend to abolish, but on the contrary to establish. At present the fruits of the labour of the masses goes into the pockets of the few, and this system of capitalist production is what Mazzini proposes to leave unaltered, but which the International would destroy. It desires everyone to have the produce of his or her labour. The letters received from Italy prove that the Italian Workmen are with the International, and are not to be misguided by Mazzini's shallow sophistry.

First published in *The Eastern Post*, No. 148, July 29, 1871

Reproduced from the newspaper, verified with the General Council’s Minute Book

---

*a* J. Hales.—*Ed.*

*b* See this volume, pp. 361-63.—*Ed.*
Citizen Engels proposed "That a private Conference of the Association be called in London to meet on the third Sunday in September". He said that last year the Sections gave the General Council power to postpone the Annual Congress—because of the circumstances created by the war—and things were not much better now. It was impossible to hold a Congress in France. In Germany the Association was subject to prosecution and any member that had the courage to attend a Congress would do so at the risk of imprisonment. In Spain the Association was being persecuted, and in Belgium there was no freedom. So taking things altogether there were only two places where it would be possible to meet, England and Switzerland, and Citizen Robin had told them how in the latter country the members were divided among themselves. The position too was such, that if a Congress was summoned scarcely any of the sections could send delegates, at the same time it was necessary for the General Council to take counsel with the sections, as to the future policy, and to get its powers ratified, and such could only be done by holding a private Conference as he proposed.
Citizen Marx said there was one other subject to which he wished to allude. It appeared that at a meeting of the Land and Labour League a Mr. Shipton—whom he did not know but who had the reputation of being Mr. Odger's Lieutenant—had been criticising the address on the "Civil War in France" and had said that he (Dr Marx) had repudiated the Council. Such a remark only shewed Mr. Shipton's ignorance and didn't speak much for his perception even though he might be a dummy in the hands of Odger.—"Because he had avowed himself the author of the charges contained in the address, he had repudiated the Council"!—Why, that avowal was made by the sanction of the Council, so that men like Mr. Odger who were apologists for M. Thiers and Favre—should no longer have the power to say they did not know whether the charges were true or not that were made in the address. In the letter of avowal the men charged were distinctly challenged to indict him for libel so that the matter might be tested in a court of law, but it did not serve their purpose to do so, as they knew well what the result would be. Of course it was to be easily understood why Mr. Odger was not satisfied. He had exhibited an amount of ignorance in dealing with foreign politics that would not have been creditable to any ordinary reader of newspapers. He had said "The character of Jules Favre was irreproachable": Why, it was well known that he had been all his life the bitter opponent of the French Working Class, and of all Labour movements, he was the principal instigator of the massacres of June—'48;—he was the author of the expedition to

\[\text{See this volume, p. 370.}\ — \text{Ed.}\]
Rome in '49; he was the man who obtained the expulsion of Louis Blanc from France, and was one of the men who brought back Bonaparte; and yet Mr. Odger unblushingly stood up and said "Nothing could be said against the character of Jules Favre". Why, if Mr. Odger, who claimed to have been one of the foremost men of the International, had attended to his duties as a member, he must have known, such a statement had no ground whatever to rest upon. It was either made with a knowledge that it was false, or it betrayed an inexcusable ignorance. Mr. Odger knew nothing of the International for the last five years, as he had never attended to the duties, the Office of President was abolished by the Congress, because it was found to be a sham. Mr. Odger was the first—and only President of the International: he never attended to his duties—the Council got on quite as well without—therefore the office was abolished.

First published in *The Eastern Post*, No. 149, August 5, 1871
Reproduced from the newspaper, verified with the General Council’s Minute Book
Citizen Engels reported that the members of the Spanish Federal Council had great hopes from the change of Ministry which had just taken place in Spain. It was expected that the prosecutions against the International would cease, and then the Association would soon extend its ramifications throughout the length and breadth of the peninsula. A great change had taken place in the ranks of the Republican party. On the establishment of the Commune in Paris, the leaders of the Republican party in Spain—not knowing the social principles involved—went in for it. But as soon as they found out that it meant a struggle for more than municipal government they turned round and denounced it. This shocked the Spanish working-class, which formed the bulk of the Republican party. Having had their eyes opened, the people not wishing to be used as tools, had turned to the International. Citizen Engels also reported that Citizen Paul Lafargue, son-in-law to Dr. Marx, and formerly a member of the General Council, had been arrested in Spain and sent under an escort of gendarmes to Madrid. The government, however, finding nothing against him, had since liberated him.
Marx: The General Council has called a conference to consult the delegates of the various countries about the measures to be taken to guard against the risks which the Association is running in a large number of countries, and to set up a new organisation to meet the needs of the situation.

Secondly, to draw up a response to the various governments that are working unceasingly to destroy the Association by every means at their disposal.

And finally to reach a definitive solution to the Swiss conflict.

Other secondary questions will certainly be raised during the course of the conference and should be resolved.

Citizen Marx adds that it will be necessary to make a public declaration to the Russian government, which is trying to implicate the Association in a certain affair relating to a secret society whose main leaders are completely unconnected with or hostile to the Association.405

This conference is private, but when all the delegates have returned to their countries, the General Council will publish those resolutions which the Conference deems it necessary to publish.

First published, in Russian, in the book
The London Conference of the First International, 1936

Printed according to the minutes submitted by Rochat, verified with his rough notes
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time
Marx believes that these resolutions were not taken at the Congress of Basle—after verification he recognises that some decisions were taken in this sense—it was a pious wish—he also thought at that time—the thing possible—now he is persuaded that the Trades Unions will not accept this federation—The Trades Unions, he says, are an aristocratic minority—the poor workers cannot belong to them: the great mass of workers whom economic development is driving from the countryside into the towns every day—has long been outside the Trades Unions—and the most wretched mass has never belonged; the same goes for the workers born in the East End of London; one in 10 belongs to Trades Unions—peasants, day labourers never belong to these societies.

The Trades Unions can do nothing by themselves—they will remain a minority—they have no power over the mass of proletarians—whereas the International works directly on these men—it does not need their organisation in order to carry along the workers—the international idea appeals to them immediately—It is the only society to inspire complete confidence in the workers.

Language also stands in the way of an international association with the Trades Unions.

Marx does not share Steens’ fears—with regard to the Trades Unions. They have never been able to do anything without turning to us—even the best organised—those with branches in
the United States—they have remained outside the largest revolutionary movement in England—Since the International has been in existence—it has been different—if they wish to employ their strength—with our aid—they can achieve everything—they had a clause in their Rules prohibiting them from getting involved in politics—the only political moves they have made were under the influence of the International—The General Council has for several years been in contact with the TRADES UNIONS—there existed a committee—at present it is still in contact with three big cities—Manchester—Birmingham—Sheffield.

First published, in Russian, in the book *The London Conference of the First International*, 1936

Printed according to Martin's minutes, verified with the rough notes by Martin and Rochat

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time
[RECORD OF MARX’S SPEECH ON THE POLITICAL ACTION OF THE WORKING CLASS] 411

[FROM THE MINUTES OF THE SESSION OF THE LONDON CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION ON SEPTEMBER 20, 1871]

Citizen Lorenzo has called on us to observe the Regulations, and Citizen Bastelica has followed him in this course.—I take the original Rules and the Inaugural Address, and I read in the two that the General Council will be responsible for presenting a programme for discussion at the congresses.a

The programme which the General Council is presenting to the conference for discussion comprisesb—the organisation of the Association; and the Vaillant motion relates to this point—the claim of Lorenzo and Bastelica is therefore unfounded—

In almost all countries some members of the International, basing themselves on the mutilated formulation of the Rules passed by the Congress of Geneva,412 have indulged in propaganda in favour of abstention from politics, which the governments have taken great care not to interrupt. Even in Germany, Schweitzer and others in the pay of Bismarck tried to rally the sections round the policies of the government. In France this culpable abstention had allowed Favre, Picard and others to seize power on 4 September—this abstention enabled a dictatorial committee to set itself up in Paris on 18 March, composed largely of Bonapartists and intrigues who knowingly wasted the first days of the Revolution in inaction, when they should have spent them consolidating it.413

In America a congress held recently414 and composed of workers has resolved to deal seriously with the political question

---

b See this volume, p. 613.—Ed.
and to substitute workers like themselves to represent them, entrusted with defending the interests of their class, for these personalities who make a career out of being politicians.

In England it is less easy for a worker to enter Parliament. The Members receiving no subsidy, and the worker having nothing but the proceeds of his labour to live on, Parliament is closed to him, and the Bourgeoisie, stubbornly refusing to pay an allowance to Members, knows full well that this is the way to prevent the working class from being represented.

But it must not be thought that it is of minor importance to have workers in parliament. If their voices are stifled, like those of De Potter and Castiau, if they are ejected like Manuel—the effect of this severity and intolerance on the people is profound—Whereas if, like Bebel and Liebknecht, they are able to speak from this platform, the entire world can hear them—in one way or the other it means considerable publicity for our principles—To mention only one example—When, during the war taking place in France, Bebel and Liebknecht embarked on the struggle against it, and to disclaim all responsibility on behalf of the working class with regard to what was happening—the whole of Germany was shaken, and even Munich, this city where no-one would contemplate revolution unless it involved the price of beer, was the scene of great demonstrations demanding an end to the war.

The governments are hostile to us. We must answer them by using every possible means at our disposal, getting workers into parliament is so much gaining over them, but we must choose the right men and watch out for the Tolains.

He supports Citizen Vaillant’s motion with the Frankel amendment, which consists in prefacing it with a preamble explaining the reason for this declaration, that is stating that it is not just today that the Association asks the workers to engage in politics, but all the time.

First published, in Russian, in the magazine The Communist International, No. 29, 1934

Printed according to the Rochat’s minutes, verified with the rough notes of Martin and Rochat

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

---

a The paragraph in the draft notes by Martin begins as follows: “Since the July Revolution the bourgeoisie has always made every effort to unnoticeably create obstacles, in the workers’ way. Our newspapers are not reaching the masses—the speaker’s platform is the best means of publicity.”—Ed.

b See this volume, p. 297.—Ed.
Marx will not speak against Vaillant's motion because yesterday he spoke for it—he replies to Bastelica that from the beginning of the conference it had been decided that this question was entirely one of organisation and not of principle—as for the regulation invoked—he recalls [that it is necessary] to read the Rules and the Inaugural Address together—which he reads once again.a

He outlines the history of abstention—we must not get annoyed, he says, over the issue—the people who propagated this doctrine were sincere utopians—but those who are resuming the same path today are not—by adjourning politics until after the violent struggle they are hurling the people into the formalist, bourgeois opposition—which it is our duty to combat, as well as the powers-that-be—We must expose Gambetta, so that the people are not deceived all over again. He is of the same opinion as Vaillant—we must throw down a challenge to all the governments in response to their persecution of the International—which (...)

Reaction exists throughout the Continent, it is general and permanent—and even in the United States and in England in another form—

We must tell them—we know that you are the armed force opposing the proletariat—we shall act against you peacefully wherever possible—and take up arms when that is necessary—he believes that changes must be made in the framing of Vaillant's motion—which is why he is supporting Utin's motion.415

First published, in Russian, in the magazine The Communist International, No. 29, 1934

Printed according to Martin's minutes, verified with his rough notes

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

---

a One of the drafts continues as follows: "He combats the abstentionists, saying that they are sectarians."—Ed.
You know that in Germany the organisation of the Association is unable to exist under its own name, the laws not permitting any local society to affiliate with a foreign society, but the Association exists nevertheless and has experienced tremendous development under the name of the Socialist Democratic Party, whose membership of the Association already dates back a long way. But this membership was reaffirmed with great éclat at the Congress of Dresden. So there is no need to propose any measure or declaration for this country comparable to those approved for countries where the Association is persecuted.

If he [Marx] has spoken badly of the German students, he has no criticism to make of the workers; during the last war, which had become a matter of contention between the classes, the attitude of the German workers was quite beyond praise, moreover, the Socialist Democratic Party fully realised that this war had been undertaken by Bonaparte and Wilhelm more to stifle modern ideas than for ideas of conquest—the Committee of Brunswick had all been arrested and taken to a fortress on the Russian border, and most of its members are still prisoners today, charged with the crime of high treason. In the Reichstag itself, Bebel and Liebknecht, the representatives of the German working class, were not afraid to declare that they were members of the International Association and that they were protesting against the war, for which they refused to vote any subsidy—the government did not dare to have them arrested while the House was sitting, only when

\[\text{a See this volume, p. 271.—Ed.}\]
they emerged did the police seize them and carry them off to prison.

During the Commune the German workers did not cease, at meetings and through the newspapers that belong to them, to affirm their solidarity with the Revolutionaries of Paris. And when the Commune was crushed they held a meeting at Breslau which the Prussian police tried in vain to prevent; at this meeting, and at others in various towns in Germany, they acclaimed the Paris Commune.—Eventually, when Kaiser Wilhelm and his army staged their triumphal entry into Berlin, these conquering heroes were greeted by the populace with cries of “Long Live the Commune!”

When speaking about England Citizen Marx had forgotten to make the following statement.

You will know that between the English workers and the Irish workers there has existed of old very considerable antagonism the causes of which are actually very easy to enumerate. This antagonism has its origin in the differences of language and religion; and in the competition between Irish workers and English workers over wages.—In England this antagonism is the dam that holds back the flood of Revolution, hence it is skilfully exploited by the government and the upper classes, who are convinced that no bond would be able to unite the English and Irish workers.—It is true that in the political field no union would be possible; but it is not the same in the economic field, and on either side sections of the International are being formed which in this capacity ought to march simultaneously towards the same goal.—Before long the Irish sections will be very numerous.

First published, in Russian, in the book

*The London Conference of the First International, 1936*

Printed according to Rochat’s minutes, verified with Rochat’s and Martin’s rough notes

Translated from the French

Published in English for the first time

---

*a* See this volume, pp. 274-75.—*Ed.*

*b* The rough notes by Martin continue as follows: “The workers have shown that they are the only party with socialist aspirations in Germany.”—*Ed.*

*c* The rough notes by Martin have “long oppression of Ireland” after the word “religion”.—*Ed.*
Marx reads out the following motion.

In countries where the regular organisation of the International Association has become temporarily impracticable in consequence of government intervention, the Association and its local groups may reconstitute themselves under various designations, but any secret society in the strict sense is formally prohibited.\(^a\)

By secret organisation we do not mean secret societies in the strict sense, which, \textit{on the contrary}, must be fought against. In France and Italy, where the political situation is such that the right of assembly is an offence, there will be strong tendencies for men to become involved in secret societies, the results of which are always negative. Moreover, this type of organisation is opposed to the development of the proletarian movement because, instead of instructing the workers, these societies subject them to authoritarian, mystical laws which cramp their independence and distort their powers of reason\(^b\)—He seeks acceptance of the motion.

---

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 427-28.—\textit{Ed.}

\(^b\) The rough notes by Martin continue as follows: "Secret societies would annihilate the spirit of the International Association. This is good for the carbonari. They cannot suit the proletarian movement."—\textit{Ed.}
Madame:

The following private letter (originally written to a friend) may serve the public interest, if by means of it some light is thrown upon the arbitrary proceedings of the present French Government, who, with supreme contempt for personal security and liberty, do not scruple to arrest foreigners, as well as natives, on altogether false pretenses:

***Monsieur Lafargue, my brother-in-law, his wife\(^a\) and children, my youngest sister\(^b\) and myself, had spent the months of June and July at Bagnères de Luchon, where we intended remaining until the end of September. I hoped, by a prolonged stay in the Pyrenees, and by a daily use of the mineral waters for which Luchon is famous, to recover from the effects of a severe attack of pleurisy. *Mais dans la République-Thiers l'homme propose et la police dispose.*\(^c\) On the first or second day in August, M. Lafargue was informed by a friend that he might daily expect a domiciliary visit of the police, when, if found, he would surely be arrested, on the pretext that he had paid a short visit to Paris during the time of the Commune, had acted as emissary of the International in the Pyrenees, and last, but not least, because he is the husband of his wife, consequently the son-in-law of Karl Marx. Knowing that under the present government of lawyers the law is a dead letter, that persons are continually locked up, no reason whatever being assigned for their arrest, Mr. Lafargue follows the advice given him, crosses the frontier, and settles down

---

\(^a\) Laura Lafargue.—*Ed.*

\(^b\) Eleanor Marx.—*Ed.*

\(^c\) But in Thiers' Republic man proposes and the police dispose.—*Ed.*
at Bosost, a small Spanish town. Several days after his departure, on the 6th of August, Mad. Lafargue, her sister Eleanor and I visit M. Lafargue at Bosost. Mad. Lafargue, finding that her little boy\(^a\) is not well enough to leave Bosost on the same day (she was very anxious on the child’s account, having lost his brother a few days before), resolved to remain with her husband for a day or two. My sister Eleanor and I therefore returned alone to Luchon.

Without accident we succeeded in getting along the rugged Spanish roads, and safely reached Fos. There the French custom house officials ask us the usual questions and look into our carriage to see whether there are any contraband goods. As we have nothing but our cloaks with us, I tell the coachman to drive on, when an individual no other than the Procureur de la République\(^b\) M. le Baron Desagarre—steps forward saying “in the name of the Republic, follow me.” We leave our carriage and enter a small room, where we find a forbidding-looking creature—a most unwomanly woman—waiting to search us. Not wishing to let this coarse-looking person touch us, we offer to take off our dresses ourselves. Of this the woman will not hear. She rushes out of the room, whither she soon returns, followed by the Procureur de la République, who in the most ungentlemanly manner thus apostrophizes my sister: “If you will not allow this woman to search you, I shall do so.” My sister replies: “You have no right to come near a British subject. I have an English passport.” Seeing, however, that an English passport does not count for much, that the bearer of such a passport does not inspire M. le Baron Desagarre with much respect, for he looks as though he were in good earnest, ready to suit his actions to his words, we allow the woman to have her way. She unpicks the very seams of our dresses, makes us take off even our stockings. I fancy I can still feel her spider-like fingers running through my hair. Having only found a newspaper on me and a torn letter on my sister, she runs with these to her friend and ally, M. le Baron Desagarre. We are reconducted to our carriage—our own coachman, who had acted as our “guide” during our whole stay in the Pyrenees, and had grown much attached to us, is forced away, replaced by another coachman, two officers are installed in the carriage opposite us, and thus we are driven off, a cart-full of custom-house officers and police agents following us. After a time, finding, no doubt, that after all we are not such very dangerous characters, that we

\(^a\) Charles Étienne Lafargue.— Ed.

\(^b\) Attorney of the Republic (of the local court).— Ed.
do not make any attempts to murder our sentinels, our escort is left behind and we remain in the charge of the two officers in the carriage. Thus guarded, we are driven through village after village, through St. Béat, the inhabitants of which comparatively large town collect in crowds, evidently taking us to be thieves, or, at least, smugglers. At 8 o'clock, thoroughly tired out, we arrive at Luchon, cross the Quinconces, where hundreds of people are assembled to listen to the band, it being Sunday and the height of the season. Our carriage stops before the hotel of the Prefect, M. le Comte de Kératry. That personage not being at home, still guarded, we are kept waiting before his door for at least half an hour. At length orders are given for us to be taken back to our house, which we find surrounded by gendarmes. We at once go upstairs, wishing to refresh ourselves by washing our faces (we had been out since five o'clock in the morning), but as a gendarme and an agent in plain clothes follow us even into our bedroom, we return to the drawing-room, unrefreshed, to await the arrival of the Prefect. The clock strikes nine, ten; M. de Kératry has not come—he is listening to the band on the Quinconces, and, we hear, is determined to stay until the last chord of the music has died away. Meanwhile, quantities of mouchards drop in; they walk into the room as if it were their own and make themselves quite at home, settling down on our chairs and sofa. Soon we are surrounded by a motley crowd of police agents, which devoted servants of the Republic, it is easy to see, have served their term of apprenticeship under the Empire—they are masters of their honorable calling. They have recourse to impossible tricks and dodges to inveigle us into a conversation, but, finding all their efforts to do so are vain, they stare at us as only "professionals" can stare, until, at half-past ten, the Prefect puts in an appearance, flanked by the Procureur Général, M. Delpech, the Juge d'Instruction, Juge de Paix, the Commissaires of Toulouse and Luchon, etc. My sister is told to step into an adjoining room; the Commissaire of Toulouse and a gendarme accompany her. My interrogatory commences. I refuse to give any information concerning my brother-in-law and other relatives and friends. With regard to myself, I declare I am under medical treatment, and have come to Luchon to take the waters. For more than two hours M. de Kératry by turns exhorts, persuades and at length

---

a A park with trees planted in clumps of five according to a certain scheme.—Ed.
b Spies.—Ed.
threatens me, that if I choose to persist in my refusal to act as a witness, I shall be looked upon as an accomplice. "To-morrow," he says, "the law will compel you to give your deposition on oath; for, let me tell you, M. Lafargue and his wife have been arrested." At this I felt alarmed, because of my sister's sick child.

At length my sister Eleanor's turn comes. I am ordered to turn my back while she speaks. An officer is placed in front of me lest I should attempt to make some sign. To my annoyance I hear my sister is being led by degrees to say yes or no to the numberless questions put to her. Afterward I found out by what means she had been made to speak. Pointing to my written declaration, M. de Kératry (I could not see his gestures, my back being turned,) affirmed the contrary of what I had really said. Therefore, anxious not to contradict me, my sister had not refuted the statements said to have been made by me. It was half-past two before her examination was ended. A young girl of 16, who had been up since five A.M., had traveled nine hours on an intensely hot day in August, and only taken food quite early at Bosost, cross-examined until half-past two in the morning!

For the rest of that night the Commissaire of Toulouse and several gendarmes remained in our house. We went to bed, but not to sleep, for we puzzled our heads as how to get a messenger to go to Bosost to warn M. Lafargue, in case he had not yet been arrested. We looked out of the window. Gendarmes were walking about in the garden. It was impossible to get out of the house. We were close prisoners—not even allowed to see our maid and landlady. On the following day, landlady and servants were examined on oath. I was again questioned for more than an hour by the Procureur Général, M. Delpech, and the Procureur de la République. That tongue-valiant hero, M. le Baron Desagarre, read long extracts to me, pointing out the penalties I am liable to incur by persisting in my refusal to act as witness. The eloquence of these gentlemen was, however, lost on me. I quietly but firmly declared my resolution not to take the oath, and remained unshaken.

My sister's examination only lasted a few minutes this time. She also resolutely refused to take the oath.

Before the Procureur Général left us, we asked for permission to write a few lines to our mother, fearing the news of our arrest might get into the papers and alarm our parents. We offered to write the letter in French, under the very eyes of M. Delpech. It was only to consist of a few sentences, such as we are well, etc. The Procureur refused our request, on the pretext that we might
have a language of our own; that the words—we are well—might convey some hidden meaning.

These magistrates outdid Dogberry and Verges. The following is another instance of their utter imbecility. Having found, as our maid told us, a quantity of commercial letters belonging to M. Lafargue in which reference was made to the exportation of sheep and oxen, they exclaimed: "Oxen, sheep, intrigues, intrigues; sheep—Communists; oxen—Internationals."

For the remainder of that day and night we were again committed to the care of several gendarmes, one of whom ever sat opposite us while we were dining.

On the following day, the 8th, we had a visit from the Prefect and a person whom we supposed to be his Secretary. Of this interview a most inaccurate and fantastical account appeared in the France,\textsuperscript{a} and was from thence transferred into a great number of other papers. But to return to the Prefect.

M. de Kératry, after making a very lengthy preface, informed us most blandly that the authorities had been mistaken; that it had been found that there was no foundation for the charge made against M. Lafargue, who was innocent, and therefore at liberty to return to France. "As for your sister and yourself," said M. de Kératry, thinking, I suppose, that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, "there is much more against you than against M. Lafargue" (thus we were being suddenly transformed from witnesses into the accused), "and in all likelihood you will be expelled from France. However, an order from government for your liberation will come in the course of the day." Then, assuming a paternal tone, he said, "Anyhow, let me advise you to moderate your zeal in the future, 'pas trop de zèle!'" Upon which the supposed secretary said abruptly, "And the International is the association powerful in England?" "Yes," I answered, "most powerful, and so it is in all other countries." "Ah," exclaimed M. de Kératry, "the International is a religion!" Before he made his exit, M. de Kératry once more assured us, on his word of honor, that Paul Lafargue was free, and asked us at once to write to Bosost to tell him so, and to invite him to return to France. Now, I fancied I could see the red ribbon of the Légion d'Honneur adorning the buttonhole of De Kératry, and as I have a notion that the honor of the Knights of the Légion d'Honneur must be something very different to the honor of common mortals, I thought it best to be prudent, and so instead of advising

\textsuperscript{a} "Luchon, 8 août 1871", \textit{La France}, No. 213, August 12, 1871.—\textit{Ed.}
M. Lafargue to return to Luchon, I intended to do the contrary, and begged of a friend to send him the means wherewith to travel further into Spain.

Followed about by our shadows, the gendarmes, we waited in vain for the promised order for our release. At 11 o'clock at night, the Procureur de la République walked into our room; but instead of bringing us the order for our liberation, M. Desagarre asked us to get ready a trunk and to follow him into “une maison particulière.” I knew this proceeding was illegal—but what could we do? There were only a few women in the house with us, whereas the Procureur was accompanied by several gendarmes. Therefore, not wishing to afford the cowardly bully, M. Desagarre, the satisfaction of using brute force, we gave orders to our weeping maid to get ready our dresses, etc., and having attempted to console the daughter of our landlady by telling her we should soon return, we got into a carriage occupied by two gendarmes, in the dead of night, in a strange country, to be taken whither we knew not.

The gendarmerie barracks proved to be our destination; a bedroom having been shown us, our door having been duly barricaded outside, we were left alone. In this place we remained the following day until past five o'clock, when, determined to know what all this meant, I desired to have an interview with the Prefect. M. de Kératry came. I asked him how it was we had been taken to the gendarmerie after he had promised us our liberty.

“Thanks to my intercession,” answered he, “you have been allowed to spend the night at the gendarmerie. The government (M. Thiers) would have sent you to the prison of St. Godins, near Toulouse.” Then M. de Kératry handed me a letter containing 2,000 francs, which had been sent to M. Lafargue by his banker at Bordeaux, and which he, M. de Kératry, had hitherto detained; declared we were free, were not to be expelled from France, but, like Mr. Lafargue, at liberty to remain in the country.

This time we were imprudent enough to inform Mad. Lafargue of what M. de Kératry had said with regard to her husband.

On the 10th we received a laissez-passer to go over to Spain, but our English passport was not returned us. During ten days we applied for it in vain. M. de Kératry wrote he had sent it to Paris, and could not get it back, though he had repeatedly written for it.

We now saw we had only been turned out of the small gendarmerie of Luchon to be locked up in that great gendarmerie.

---

*To a special place.—Ed.*
the Republic-Thiers. We were still prisoners. Without a passport there was no getting out of France, in which country we were evidently to be kept, until some event or other should afford a pretext for again arresting us.

The police organs of Toulouse were daily accusing us of acting as emissaries of the International on the French and Spanish frontiers. "But," added they, "the Prefect is taking energetic measures in order to reassure (pour rassurer) the inhabitants of the Haute Garonne." Now, it is true, a laissez-passer to go over into Spain had been given us, but the experience of Mad. Lafargue in that country was not of a nature to encourage us to seek a refuge in the land of El Cid.

The facts we learned from Madame Lafargue carry us back to the 6th of August.

I mentioned above that our coachman had been compelled to leave us at Fos. Whereupon M. Desagarre, the Procureur de la République, and several "gentlemen" of the police, attempted to persuade him, in the most plausible manner, to return to Bosost, and on false pretenses to get M. Lafargue to go to Fos. Fortunately an honest man is more than a match for half a dozen police agents. The shrewd young fellow guessed there was some trick at the bottom of all this glib talk, and flatly refused to fetch M. Lafargue; consequently gendarmes and douaniers, with the Procureur at their head, set out on an expedition to Bosost. M. le Baron Desagarre, whose discretion is the better part of his valor, had previously declared he would not go to Fos to capture M. Lafargue without a sufficient escort; that he could do nothing with one or two gendarmes against a man like M. Lafargue, most likely given to the use of firearms. M. Desagarre was mistaken—not a bullet, but kicks and cuffs were reserved for him. On his return from Bosost he attempted to interfere with peasants celebrating their village feast. The brave mountaineers, who love their freedom as much as their own mountain air, gave the noble Baron a sound thrashing, and sent him about his business, a sadder if not a wiser man! But I am anticipating.

I was saying that M. Desagarre and his followers started for Bosost. They soon reached that town, and soon found out the hotel at which the Lafargues were staying, for the inhabitants of Bosost only possess two hotels, or rather inns. They are not yet sufficiently civilized to have the orthodox number of public houses. Now, while M. Desagarre is standing before the front

---

door of the Hotel Masse, M. Lafargue, aided by his good friends, the peasants, gets out of the house by the back gate, climbs the mountains and escapes along paths known only to guides, goats and English tourists—all the regular roads being guarded by Spanish carabiniers. The Spanish police had enthusiastically taken up the cause of their French brethren. Madame Lafargue is made to feel all the blessings arising from the International Association of the police. At 3 o'clock in the morning her bedroom is suddenly broken into, and in rush four Spanish officers, with their carbines pointed to the bed in which she and her child are sleeping. The poor sick baby, suddenly awakened, frightened, begins to scream; but that doesn't prevent the Spanish officers from looking in every hole and cranny of the room for M. Lafargue. Finally, convinced that their prey has escaped them, they declare they will carry off Madame Lafargue. At this the master of the hotel—a most worthy man—interferes, saying he is sure the Spanish government will not accord the extradition of a lady. He was right. Madame Lafargue was allowed to remain at Bosost, but was ever after subjected to the annoyance of being followed about by police agents. At the hotel a troop of spies established their headquarters. One Sunday even the Prefect and the Procureur de la République took the trouble to travel all the way from Luchon to Bosost for the purpose of seeing Madame Lafargue. As, however, they did not succeed in satisfying their curiosity, they consoled themselves by playing at rouge et noir, which, together with baccarat, forms the only serious occupation of the petits gras* from Versailles, now staying at the Pyrenees.

But I must not forget to explain how it was that M. de Kératry had not succeeded in seeing Madame Lafargue. The fact is, that a French peasant from Luchon had informed some Spanish friends of his at Bosost of M. de Kératry's intended visit, and they, of course, at once warned Madame Lafargue.

The French and Spanish population of the Pyrenees form a league, offensive and defensive, against their respective governments. In our case they acted as spies upon the official spies of the Prefect—though repeatedly stopped at the French frontiers, they were untiring in their attempts to bring us news. At length M. de Kératry gave orders to the effect that no one, not even guides, should be allowed to cross over to Bosost, unless provided with a proper pass. This measure, of course, did not prevent our having messages brought us as heretofore; it only served to embitter still

---

*a Young loafers and spendthrifts.—Ed.
more the peasants of the Pyrenees, already so hostile to the ruralsof Versailles.178

In other parts of France I have since heard that the peasants are quite as much opposed to their so-called representatives, the governing ruralsof M. Thiers fulfills a great revolutionary omission! By means of his prefects, priests, gardes champêtres* and gendarmes he will before long provoke a general rising of the peasantry!

Of M. Lafargue's, escape Madame Lafargue had informed us a few days after our release from the gendarmerie. Later on, we heard from a native of Bosost that M. Lafargue had been arrested at Huesca, and that the Spaniards had made the offer of his extradition to the French government. On the very day we received this news our English passport was returned us by the Juge de Paix. So, in order to put an end to the state of anxiety in which we knew Madame Lafargue must be placed, tied down as she was to Bosost by her sick child, not knowing what had become of her husband, we at once made up our minds to travel to Huesca, in order to beg the Governor of that district to let us know the real intentions of the Spanish government with respect to M. Lafargue. On reaching St. Sebastian we heard to our joy that M. Lafargue had been set at liberty. So we immediately returned to England.

I cannot conclude this letter without giving a short sketch of the treatment to which Madame C—, our landlady, and the servant were subjected on the 6th of August, during our absence; for, compared with them, we had always been treated with great courtesy. At 11 o'clock in the morning, the Prefect, Procureur Général, Procureur de la République, etc., made a raid upon our house. Enraged at not being able to lay hands on M. Lafargue, they vented their wrath on Madame C—, an invalid, suffering from heart disease in an advanced stage, and upon our maid. That poor girl was treated most roughly, because she would not tell where her master had gone.

This, the Prefect, however, succeeded in learning from a boy, employed by Madame C— as gardener, and whom he straightway sent up to Fos, there to lay in wait for us behind a hedge, in order to give warning of our arrival to the Procureur de la République & Co.

If, during his campaign against the Prussians, M. de Kératry had employed the same art of protecting his flanks and rear from surprise, of surprising detachments of the enemy by establishing

---

*a Rural police.—*Ed.
videttes and sending out scouts, things would have gone better in Brittany—that is to say, if one may judge from the success of De Kératry's tactics at Fos!

Our landlady was not allowed to light a fire in her own kitchen; was ordered, instead of sleeping in her bed, to lie down on the floor. With the latter order she, however, refused to comply. Catching hold of her son, a child not three years of age, the Prefect said he must be the son of M. Lafargue. Madame C—repeatedly declared he was mistaken—but in vain; at length, really anxious to prove her child's identity (she feared he might be carried off), she exclaimed: "Why, the boy only speaks the patois of the district." For a moment or two the Prefect looked as if even that argument had failed to convince him. Perhaps M. de Kératry, believing as he does, that the "International is a religion," was pondering on the miracle of the cloven tongues descending on the apostles.\(^\text{a}\)

One of the reasons why Madame C—was so much ill-used, was because she had never in her life heard of the International, and therefore could not give an account of the doings of that mysterious society at Luchon, which, by the by, would have been an impossible task for the best initiated member—at least previous to the period at which M. de Kératry commenced at Luchon his active propaganda for the International Association. Then Madame C—had been guilty of speaking of her tenant, M. Lafargue, in very high terms. But the head and front of her offending was in her inability to point out hidden bombs and pétroleum.

Yes, it is a fact, bombs and pétroleum were searched for in our house.

Taking up a small night lamp, used for warming the baby's milk, the assembled magistrates examined it; handling it with great caution, as if it were some diabolical machine, by means of which pétroleum might have been discharged into the streets of Paris. From Luchon to Paris. Even Münchhausen never indulged in such a stretch of imagination. The French government are capable de tout.\(^\text{b}\) They really believe in the truth of the wild pétroleum fables—the coinage of their own distempered brains. They do think the women of Paris are "neither brute nor human, neither man nor woman"\(^\text{c}\) but "pétroleuses"\(^\text{d}\)—a species of the Salamander, delighting in their native element—fire.

---

\(^{\text{a}}\) The Acts of the Apostles, 2:3.—Ed.

\(^{\text{b}}\) Capable of everything.—Ed.

\(^{\text{c}}\) E. A. Poe, The Bells, IV.—Ed.

\(^{\text{d}}\)
They almost come up to Henri de Pène of the *Paris-Journal*, their prophet and teacher, who, as I am told, now actually fancies that the famous letters, manufactured by himself in my father's name, have not been written by Henri de Pène but by Karl Marx.\(^a\)

One could afford to treat with silent contempt a government run mad, and to laugh at the farces in which the pottering pantaloons employed by that government play their muddling and meddling parts, did not these farces turn out to be tragedies for thousands of men, women and children. Think only of the "pétroleuses" before the court-martial of Versailles, and of the women who, for the last three months, are being slowly done to death on the pontoons.

*Jenny Marx*

London, Sept., 1871

First published in the weekly *Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly*, No. 23/75, October 21, 1871

---

\(^a\) See this volume, pp. 364-66.—*Ed.*
Concerning the International, he said that the great success which had hitherto crowned its efforts was due to circumstances over which the members themselves had no control. The foundation of the International itself was the result of these circumstances, and by no means due to the efforts of the men engaged in it. It was not the work of any set of clever politicians: all the politicians in the world could not have created the situation and circumstances requisite for the success of the International. The International had not put forth any particular creed. Its task was to organize the forces of labor and link the various working-men's movements and combine them. The circumstances which had given such a great development to the association were the conditions under which the work-people were more and more oppressed throughout the world, and this was the secret of the success. The events of the last few weeks had unmistakably shown that the working class must fight for its emancipation. The persecutions of the governments against the International were like the persecutions of ancient Rome against the primitive Christians. They, too, had been few in numbers at first, but the patricians of Rome had instinctively felt that if the Christians succeeded the Roman empire would be lost. The persecutions of Rome had not saved the empire, and the persecutions of the present day against the International would not save the existing state of things.

What was new in the International was that it was established by the working men themselves and for themselves. Before the foundation of the International all the different organizations had
been societies founded by some radicals among the ruling classes for the working classes, but the International was established by the working men for themselves. The Chartist movement in this country had been started with the consent and assistance of middle-class radicals, though if it had been successful it could only have been for the advantage of the working class. England was the only country where the working class was sufficiently developed and organized to turn universal suffrage to its own proper account. He then alluded to the revolution of February as a movement that had been favored by a portion of the bourgeoisie against the ruling party. The revolution of February had only given promises to the working classes and had replaced one set of men of the ruling class by another. The insurrection of June had been a revolt against the whole ruling class, including the most radical portion. The working men who had lifted the new men into power in 1848 had instinctively felt that they had only exchanged one set of oppressors for another and that they were betrayed.

The last movement was the Commune, the greatest that had yet been made, and there could not be two opinions about it—the Commune was the conquest of the political power of the working classes. There was much misunderstanding about the Commune. The Commune could not found a new form of class government. In destroying the existing conditions of oppression by transferring all the means of labor to the productive laborer, and thereby compelling every able-bodied individual to work for a living, the only base for class rule and oppression would be removed. But before such a change could be effected a proletarian dictatorship would become necessary, and the first condition of that was a proletarian army. The working classes would have to conquer the right to emancipate themselves on the battlefield. The task of the International was to organize and combine the forces of labor for the coming struggle.

First published in *The World*, October 15, 1871

Reproduced from the newspaper
NOTES
AND
INDEXES
The first Address (The General Council of the International Workingmen’s Association on the War) was written by Marx between July 19 and 23, 1870. On July 19, 1870, when the Franco-Prussian war broke out, the General Council instructed Marx to draft an address on the war, of which Marx informed Engels in his letter of July 20 (see present edition, Vol. 44). The Address was adopted by the Standing Committee of the General Council on July 23, and then unanimously approved at the Council meeting on July 26, 1870. It was first published in English, in the London Pall Mall Gazette, No. 1702, July 28, 1870, and a few days later it appeared as a leaflet in 1,000 copies. The Address was reprinted, in full or in part, by a number of British provincial newspapers.

As the first edition of the Address was quickly sold out, on August 2, 1870, the General Council resolved to have additional 1,000 copies printed. In September that year, the first Address was published in English again, together with the General Council’s second Address on the Franco-Prussian war. In this edition, Marx corrected the misprints that had occurred in the first edition of the First Address.

On August 9, the General Council appointed a commission to have the first Address translated into German and French and then distributed. The commission included Marx, Jung, Serraillier and Eccarius. The first German translation of the Address, made by Wilhelm Liebknecht, appeared in Der Volksstaat (Leipzig), No. 63, August 7, 1870. Marx edited it heavily and made a new translation of more than half the text. The new German translation of the Address was published in Der Vorbote (Geneva), No. 8, August 1870, and as a leaflet. Then it appeared in the Arbeiter Union (New York), August 12; Die Tagwacht (Zurich), No. 26, August 13; the Volkswille (Vienna), No. 26, August 13, and the Proletarier (Augsburg), No. 56, August 21. By the twentieth anniversary of the Paris Commune in 1891, Engels had the General Council’s first and second addresses published in the book K. Marx, Der Bürgerkrieg in Frankreich, 3rd German edition, Berlin, 1891, Vorwärts Publishing House. The translation of the two addresses for this edition was made by Louise Kautsky and edited by Engels.

The French translation of the Address appeared in L’Égalité (Geneva), No. 28, August 6, 1870; L’Internationale (Brussels), No. 82, August 7, 1870.
and *Le Mirabeau* (Verviers), No. 55, August 7, 1870. The Address was also published as a leaflet in the French translation made by the General Council's commission.

The first Russian translation of the first Address was published in *Narodnoye Dyelo* (People's Cause) (Geneva), No. 6-7, August-September 1870.

In this volume, the first Address is reproduced from the first edition of the English leaflet, checked against its second edition and the text of the German 1870 authorised edition and that of 1891. The most important textual differences are marked by footnotes.

2 In May 1870, Napoleon III's government held a plebiscite in an attempt to strengthen the tottering regime of the Second Empire. The issues put to the vote were formulated in such a way that disapproval of the policy pursued by the Second Empire could not be expressed without opposing democratic reforms at the same time. Despite this demagogic manoeuvre, the plebiscite showed the growing opposition: 1.5 million voted against the government, 1.9 million abstained. During the preparations for the plebiscite, the government organised a broad campaign of repression against the working class movement, scaring the middle-class sections with the threat of a revolution.

On April 24, 1870, the Paris Federation of the International and the Federal Chamber of Workers' Trades Associations in Paris issued a manifesto exposing the Bonapartist plebiscite manoeuvre and called on the workers to abstain from voting. On the eve of the plebiscite many members of the Paris Federation were arrested on a charge faked by the police of plotting to assassinate Napoleon III (see present edition, Vol. 43, Engels' letter to Marx of May 8, 1870). The government used this charge for organising a broad campaign of persecution and harassment of the International's members in various French towns. In this connection, the General Council, at its meeting on May 3, 1870, adopted the Address "Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections", written by Marx (see present edition, Vol. 21), which exposed the Bonapartist police's libellous charges. At the third trial of the Paris Federation members, held from June 22 to July 5, 1870, the false character of these charges was fully disclosed. Nevertheless, a number of members of the International in France were sentenced to imprisonment merely for affiliation to the International Working Men's Association.

Persecution of the International in France caused mass protests by the working class.

3 A reference to the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, which gave birth to the Second Empire.

4 A reference to the *Society of December 10* (called so after Louis Bonaparte, the Society's patron, who, on December 10, 1848, was elected President of the French Republic)—a secret Bonapartist Society, founded in 1848, mainly of declassed elements, political adventurists, militarists, etc. Though the Society was formally dissolved in November 1850, its members continued to conduct their Bonapartist propaganda and were instrumental in effecting the coup d'état of December 2, 1851 (see Note 3). A detailed description of this Society can be found in Marx's work *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 148-51).

A chauvinist demonstration in support of Louis Bonaparte's predatory plans took place on July 14, 1870.
5 A reference to Bismarck’s policy during the preparations for and the unleashing of the Austro-Prussian war of 1866. Bismarck used the contradictions between Austria and France to secure Napoleon III’s neutrality in this war. The war ended in a victory for Prussia and led to the formation of the North German Confederation (see Note 9), under the supremacy of militarist Prussia. This was a major step towards the unification of Germany under the auspices of the Prussian monarchy.

The decisive battle of the Austro-Prussian war was fought on July 3, 1866, not far from the village of Sadowa, at the town of Königgrätz (Hradec Králové). The Austrian troops suffered a major defeat.

On the course of the Austro-Prussian war, see Engels’ series of articles “Notes on the War in Germany” (present edition, Vol. 20).

6 This refers to the war waged by the German people against Napoleon I’s rule in 1813-14.

7 The workers’ meetings in Brunswick and Chemnitz on July 16 and 17, 1870 respectively, were organised by the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party in protest against the predatory policy of the ruling classes.

8 Notes on the War is one of Engels’ major works on the military question in which he analysed the events of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 from the position of historical materialism. These constitute a series of 59 closely connected articles, written in the form of military surveys. Forty of them are entitled Notes on the War and are numbered correspondingly; the rest have different titles.

The immediate incentive to write these articles was provided by the proposal to send military reviews to The Pall Mall Gazette, made to Marx by Thieblin (Taran), a contributor to the newspaper. In a letter of July 20, 1870 Marx passed on the proposal to Engels (see present edition, Vol. 44). Engels sent the first three articles to Marx, who read them and forwarded them to the editors. To speed up publication, Engels sent the subsequent articles directly to the newspaper’s editorial board.

Engels wrote the articles immediately after the events took place. As The Pall Mall Gazette appeared in the evening, his articles, written in the morning and posted from Manchester to London, were often published the same day. Engels made a thorough study of all the material available on the military operations: reports by English, German and French newspapers, the latest telegrams from France and Germany. Though these reports were incomplete and contradictory, he succeeded in presenting the real course of military operations, despite inaccuracies in certain details, which are inevitable in such circumstances. Marx’s and Engels’ letters from July to the end of September 1870, when Engels moved from Manchester to London and their regular correspondence stopped, contain information on Engels’ work on this series of articles, his appraisals and forecasts concerning individual operations, the character of the war in general. The ideas Engels expressed in his letters were developed in his articles.

When Engels began the Notes on the War, he intended writing two articles a week. After the first three articles aroused the readers’ keen interest and attracted the attention of the press, the Pall Mall Gazette editor Greenwood proposed that Engels send as many articles as he could; during periods of the most active military actions, Engels wrote three and even four articles a week.
Greenwood repeatedly made changes in Engels' text without his consent. As Engels pointed out, he arbitrarily changed various military terms in the Notes on the War.—III, which clearly showed Greenwood's incompetence in military terminology (see Engels' letter to Marx of August 3, 1870, present edition, Vol. 44), and, besides, he added a paragraph at the end of the Notes on the War.—XIII (see Note 45).

Notes on the War appeared in The Pall Mall Gazette from July 29, 1870 to February 18, 1871; with the exception of the first three articles, signed "Z", they were published unsigned, and Engels' authorship was known to only a few people. Marx valued the Notes highly. "Both your last articles [I and III] are splendid", "your articles ... are masterfully written" [XVI-XVII], he praised Engels in his letters of August 1 and September 10, 1870. The articles were a great success. Marx informed Engels on September 30, 1870 that The Spectator had declared his articles "the only significant ones in the English press". A number of newspapers reproduced them in their reviews. Among Engels' friends the nickname "General" stuck with him.

These articles on the Franco-Prussian war were not republished during Engels' lifetime. Victor Adler, one of the Austrian Social-Democratic leaders, kept cuttings from The Pall Mall Gazette with Engels' autograph. Only in 1923 were Engels' articles published in Vienna as a separate, lithographic, edition in English, under the general title Notes on the War.

In this volume, Notes on the War are reproduced from The Pall Mall Gazette, checked against the sources used by Engels. Minor misprints and inaccuracies of transcriptions have been silently corrected.

The North German Confederation (Norddeutscher Bund)—a federative state formed in 1867 after Prussia's victory in the Austro-Prussian war (see Note 5) to replace the disintegrated German Confederation (see Note 27). The North German Confederation included 19 states and three free cities, which were formally recognised as autonomous. The Constitution of the North German Confederation secured Prussia's dominance within it: the King of Prussia was declared President of the Confederation and Commander-in-Chief of the Confederate armed forces; he was also to direct its foreign policy. The legislative powers of the Reichstag, elected by so-called universal suffrage (women, soldiers and servants had no vote), were very limited: the laws it passed came into force only after being approved by the Bundesrat, which was reactionary in its composition, and confirmed by the President (Engels described the 1867 Constitution in his "The Role of Force in History", see present edition, Vol. 26). Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg and Hesse-Darmstadt, which initially remained outside the Confederation, joined it in 1870. The establishment of the North German Confederation was a major step towards the national unification of Germany. The Confederation ceased to exist in January 1871, when the German Empire was formed.

Engels is here referring to the duchies of Schleswig and Lauenburg, which came under Prussian rule as a result of the war between Prussia and Denmark in 1864 (see Note 64), and also the Kingdom of Hanover, the Electorate of Hesse-Cassel, the Grand Duchy of Nassau, the free city of Frankfurt am Main, the Duchy of Holstein and certain parts of Bavaria and Hesse-Darmstadt, annexed by Prussia after her victory over Austria in 1866 (see Note 5).

Landwehr—a second line army reserve formed in Prussia during the struggle against Napoleonic rule. In the 1870s, it consisted of men under forty years of
age who had seen active service and had been in the reserve of the first line. In peacetime, the Landwehr units were called up only for training for a certain period, while in wartime they served in the rear and in garrisons. During the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, the Landwehr was used in military actions on a par with the regular troops.

12 *Mitrailleuse*—a multi-barrelled, high-speed gun placed on a carriage. The mitrailleuse used in the French army in 1870-71 had 25 barrels that fired in a succession with the help of a special mechanism. It could shoot in a minute up to 175 shots with carbine cartridges. However, the experience of the Franco-Prussian war proved it unsuited to field conditions because of deficiencies in its construction.

13 The *Zouaves* (from the name of an Algerian tribe)—French light infantry first formed in 1830 as colonial troops. They were originally composed of Algerians and French colonists, but later of Frenchmen only, while Algerians were formed into special regiments of riflemen (see Turcos below). Three Zouave regiments of the MacMahon corps took part in the war of 1870-71.

*Turcos*—French light infantry formed in the early 1840s of native inhabitants of Algeria, except the officers and partly non-commissioned officers.

14 The *garde mobile* (mobile national guard)—special armed forces introduced in France in 1848. From 1868 onwards, it was made up of men who had reached a call-up age but were not enlisted for active service or in the reserve; it was assigned the defence of the frontiers, service in the rear and garrison service. In wartime, the *garde mobile* was made up of 20- to 40-year-olds. In 1870, it was called up for active service for the first time and formed the core of the French armed forces after the fall of the Empire. The *garde mobile* was abolished in 1872.

15 The French command intended to form a corps for landing on Germany’s Baltic coast. The course of the military operations frustrated this plan, however, and the landing troops were used for other operations (see this volume, pp. 35, 37, 67).

16 A reference to the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 (see Note 5).

17 This and many other forecasts made by Engels concerning the possible course of military operations proved completely true. At the beginning of August, the area here mentioned became the scene of the first major battles of the Franco-Prussian war (see this volume, pp. 27-31).

18 At the *Battle of Solferino* (Northern Italy), fought on June 24, 1859, during the war between the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) and France, on the one hand, and Austria, on the other, the French and Piedmontese forces defeated the Austrian troops and this decided the outcome of the war in their favour. Engels analysed the course of the battle in his articles “The Battle at Solferino”, “Historical Justice” and “The Battle of Solferino” (see present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 392-403).

19 Engels obtained this information through his friend Eduard Gumpert, a German physician, who lived in Manchester. His cousin was a company commander of the 77th regiment in the vanguard of the German 7th Army Corps (see Engels’ letter to Marx of July 31, 1870, present edition, Vol. 44).
20 At the Battle of Wissembourg, on August 4, 1870, three German corps of the Third Army under Frederick William, Crown Prince of Prussia, used the dispersal of the French troops to their advantage, attacking and defeating the French division under Douay, of MacMahon's 1st Corps, which was considerably inferior in strength. This victory opened the way for Frederick William's army to advance on Alsace. p. 25

21 The Chassepôt—a breech-loading rifle named after its inventor, was adopted by the French army in 1866. It had high combat efficiency for the time and was much superior to Dreyse's needle-gun used in the Prussian army. pp. 26, 120

22 The Battle of Woerth (Alsace) was one of the first major engagements of the Franco-Prussian war. It was fought on August 6, 1870 by Marshal MacMahon's troops and the German Third Army, which was over three times stronger than the French. The French troops were defeated and retreated to Châlons-sur-Marne. As a result the Germans were able to outflank Bazaine's army, near Metz, from the south. pp. 28, 103

23 At the Battle of Magenta (near Milan) on June 4, 1859, during the war between the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) and France, on the one hand, and Austria, on the other, the French troops defeated the Austrian army, captured Magenta and then entered Milan; as a result, the Austrians were forced to evacuate the greater part of Lombardy (see also Note 18). Engels described this battle in his articles "Military Events", "The Austrian Defeat" and "A Chapter of History" (see present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 364-79). p. 28

24 At the Battle of Forbach (Lorraine) on August 6, 1870, the German troops of the First Army under General Steinmetz defeated the French 2nd Corps under General Frossard. The capture of Forbach secured domination over the department of Moselle and opened up the way to Lorraine. MacMahon's army found itself cut off from that of Bazaine. In historical literature this battle is also called the battle of Spicheren. Later Engels uses this name too. pp. 29, 103

25 Engels is referring to one of the episodes in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 (see Note 5). After being defeated at Sadowa on July 3, the Austrian troops retreated to Olmütz (Czech: Olomouc) in order to divert the Prussian army from its advance on Vienna. This plan was a failure, because the Prussian troops left a covering force at Olmütz and advanced on the Austrian capital. p. 34

26 A reference to the anti-Bonapartist demonstrations by the Paris garde mobile battalions, consisting of workers and petty bourgeoisie, which took place in the camp of Châlons at the beginning of August 1870. p. 35

27 The German Confederation—a union of German states formed by decision of the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and originally consisting of 35 states and four free cities. It had neither a centralised army nor finances and retained all the main features of feudal fragmentation; its only central body—the Federal Diet—was presided over by a representative of Austria, had limited powers and served as a tool for the reactionary forces in the struggle against the revolutionary movement. The German Confederation fell apart during the 1848-49 revolution, was restored in 1850, and finally ceased to exist during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 (see Note 5) when the North German Confederation was established (see Note 9). p. 36

28 A reference to the battle of Forbach (Spicheren) (see Note 24). p. 38
The defeats of the French army at Forbach and Woerth, which revealed the rottenness of the Second Empire regime, led to spontaneous popular anti-government demonstrations in Paris, Lyons, Marseilles and other cities on August 7 to 9, 1870. A great manifestation took place in Paris on August 9. Numerous crowds, mainly of workers, surrounded the premises of the Corps Législatif and demanded a republic and arming of the people. The government made wide use of gendarmes and regular troops to disperse the demonstrations. To ward off the danger of a revolution, the Ollivier Cabinet was replaced by the Palikao government, which dubbed itself the "Ministry of National Defence" and consisted of rabid Bonapartists. The bourgeois republicans, "Left"-wing deputies to the Corps Législatif (Ferri, Gambetta and others), frightened by the prospect of a popular revolution, refused to support the masses and, in fact, helped preserve the Bonapartist regime. p. 41

Engels is referring to the reorganisation of the French army, carried out by the revolutionary government—the Committee of Public Safety (in which Carnot was responsible for the war and the army)—under the Jacobin dictatorship in 1793-94. An important part was played in this reorganisation by the Convention's commissars sent to the army. In keeping with the Convention's decree of August 23, 1793 calling for a general mobilisation, the strength of the revolutionary armies had increased greatly by the end of the year to exceed 600,000; volunteers' battalions merged with regular troops; old-time officers were replaced by men who enjoyed the soldiers' confidence. The Jacobin government organised the production of arms and ammunition on a large scale. All these measures enabled the French army to win several victories and clear French territory of the interventionists by the spring of 1794. p. 47

A reference to the armies of the first European counter-revolutionary coalition, which invaded France in 1793-94. The coalition included Austria, Prussia, the Kingdom of Sardinia, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Spain and the Kingdom of Naples. p. 47

Engels means the Battle of Colombey-Nouilly (also called the Battle of Borny), fought on August 14, 1870 east of Metz by the French Army of the Rhine under Marshal Bazaine and the troops of the German First Army under Steinmetz. A detailed description of this battle is to be found in Notes on the War.—XI (see this volume, pp. 61-62). p. 49

The Battle of Mars-la-Tour (below, on p. 136, called the Battle of Vionville) took place on August 16, 1870 between the French Army of the Rhine under Bazaine and the troops of the German First and Second armies. The losses on both sides were nearly equal, but strategically victory was on the German side. Having occupied the shortest route to Verdun, the Germans managed to prevent the French Army of the Rhine from continuing its retreat from Metz. The details of the battle are given in the Notes on the War.—XI (see this volume, pp. 64-65). p. 53

Francs-tireurs—guerrilla volunteers formed into small detachments to defend France against the invaders. Such detachments were first formed during the wars against the anti-French coalitions in the late 18th and early 19th century. In 1867, in connection with the growing threat of war with Germany, societies of francs-tireurs were again set up in the country. When the Franco-Prussian war broke out and Prussian troops invaded French territory, francs-tireurs were called to arms by special decree. After the French regular troops were defeated and blockaded in fortresses, the number of francs-tireurs' detachments increased
sharply. They mainly attacked enemy transports, weak detachments, trains, and food depots and caused considerable damage to the enemy. pp. 54, 582

35 At the **Battle of Jena** (Thuringia) on October 14, 1806, during the Russo-Prussian-French war of 1806-07, the French troops under Napoleon I defeated a part of the Prussian army. The same day, the troops of Marshal Davout routed the main Prussian forces at Auerstadt. The French continued to pursue the enemy and the overwhelming majority of Prussians were taken prisoner, which led to Prussia's capitulation to Napoleonic France. pp. 57, 103, 167

36 Engels is quoting King William's telegram about the German troops' victory over the French Army of the Rhine at Gravelotte on August 18, 1870 according to the report "Bivouac near Bezanville, Aug. 18, 9 p.m." in *The Times*, No. 26834, August 20. After the Battle of Gravelotte (also known in historical literature as the battle of Saint Privat) the Army of the Rhine was blockaded at Metz. Engels gives details of this battle in his *Notes on the War.— XI* (see this volume, p. 60). p. 58

37 A reference to the battles of Colombey-Nouilly-Borny (see Note 32), Vionville-Mars-la-Tour (see Note 33) and Gravelotte-Saint Privat (see Note 36). p. 61

38 Presumably Engels has in mind letters from a relative of his friend Eduard Gumpert (see Note 19). The 7th Army Corps, in which he served, participated in the Battle of Colombey-Nouilly. p. 61

39 In June 1796, during Bonaparte's Italian campaign (1796-97), a part of the French troops besieged Mantua (Northern Italy), which was defended by an Austrian garrison, while the main French forces acted against the Austrian troops that were trying to relieve the blockaded fortress. In September 1796, the Austrian army under Wurmser was defeated by Bonaparte and took cover in Mantua; in February 1797, after a long siege and blockade, the troops in Mantua were compelled to surrender owing to a lack of provisions.

In October 1805, during the war of Napoleonic France against the third European coalition, the Austrian army under Mack in the Ulm fortress was encircled, as a result of Napoleon I's skilful manoeuvring, and was compelled to surrender. p. 65

40 After winning a victory at Jena and Auerstadt in October 1806 (see Note 35), the vanguard of Napoleon I's troops forestalled the retreating Prussian troops and prevented their taking Stettin (Polish name Szczecin) and forcing the Oder; the remainder of the Prussian army routed in the campaign was compelled to capitulate. p. 69

41 As Engels foresaw, at Sedan, situated on the southern boundary of the area he specified, the Prussian troops on September 1 and 2, 1870 defeated the French army under MacMahon, cut off its way of retreat and forced it to capitulate. Engels thus not only forecast the possibility of the Sedan catastrophe, but also pointed quite accurately to the place where it was to happen. p. 69

42 This is a name used in France for generals and officers who made their military career in the colonial wars against Algerian tribes fighting for independence (see Note 59). MacMahon took an active part in these wars in which the French command practised barbaric raids on Algerian tribes and brutally exterminated the local population, thereby breaking treaties and refusing to recognise the enemy as a belligerent party. p. 69
In March 1814, during the war against the sixth European coalition, after Napoleon had lost the battles of Laon and Arcis-sur-Aube, and Blücher and Schwarzenberg had combined their armies against him, Napoleon resolved to attack the enemy from the rear and to halt their advance on Paris, cutting their communication lines with the Rhine with his main forces. The allies, however, who were far superior in strength and aware of the growing discontent in Paris with Napoleon's regime, kept advancing on the French capital and occupied it on March 31, 1814, thus accelerating the fall of the Empire.

As Engels predicted, the German troops of the Third and Fourth (Maas) armies moved north following MacMahon's Châlons army, which retreated to Sedan and was forced to surrender after being encircled (see Note 49).

At the end of this article, the Pall Mall Gazette editor, Greenwood, added a paragraph that is omitted in the present edition. It read: "There is every appearance that the siege of Strasbourg will soon be brought to an end by the reduction of the fortress. The Germans are clearly quite in earnest about it. The bombardment had yesterday morning been kept up from the side of Kehl day and night for three days. At the same time the Prussians had pushed their advanced posts to within 500 to 800 yards of the fortress. The arsenal has been fired, and some heavy guns just placed in position will be immediately brought to bear on the place."

In a letter to Marx on September 4, 1870 Engels wrote that, in order to fill up space, Greenwood had added to the article "a few quite absurd lines about the siege of Strasbourg. On the first suitable occasion I'll write an article on this and express a quite opposite view" (see present edition, Vol. 44). Engels fulfilled his intention in the Notes on the War.— XVII (see this volume, pp. 91-94).

At the Battle of Dembe Wielkie, a village near Warsaw, on March 18, 1831, during the Polish national liberation insurrection of 1830-31, the insurgent Poles won a victory over the Tsarist troops, who suffered considerable losses and were forced to retreat.

The Battle of Nouart was fought on Monday, August 29, 1870, by the vanguard of the 12th North German and 5th French Corps.

At the Battle of Beaumont on August 30, 1870, the troops of the 4th and 12th North German corps and the 1st Bavarian Corps defeated the French 5th Corps of General de Failly, which acted as part of MacMahon's Châlons Army.

Both battles were stages in the Prussian military operation against MacMahon's Army of Châlons, leading to the latter's capitulation at Sedan.

Engels is referring to the abortive attempt made on August 31-September 1, 1870 by the Army of the Rhine to break through from Metz along the right bank of the Moselle in a north-easterly direction. As a result of the battles, known as the engagements at Noiserville, both parties remained at their former positions.

On September 1, 1870, a final battle was fought between the Third and Fourth Prussian armies and MacMahon's Châlons Army, in which the French army was encircled by the Prussians and defeated. The French incurred heavy losses: 3,000 killed and 14,000 wounded. On September 2, the French command signed an act of capitulation according to which over 80,000 soldiers, officers and generals, headed by Napoleon III, surrendered.
The Sedan catastrophe speeded up the collapse of the Second Empire and the proclamation of the republic in France on September 4, 1870.

With the defeat of the French regular armies and the proclamation of the republic, when the predatory aspirations of the Prussian military, Junkers and the bourgeoisie became quite obvious, the war completely lost its defensive character on Prussia’s part. From that moment on, one of the major tasks of the international proletariat was to organise support for France in her defensive war against the Prussian invaders. The changed character of the war and the tasks facing the proletariat in view of this were considered by Marx in the General Council’s Second Address on the Franco-Prussian war (see this volume, pp. 263-70).

50 *Glacis*—an artificial slope running down from the top of a counterscarp so as to expose attackers to firing from ramparts (see this volume, p. 104). p. 87

51 *Dantzic (Gdańsk)* was besieged twice during Napoleon I’s wars against the anti-French coalitions of European states.

From March to May 1807, during Napoleon’s war against the fourth European coalition, the city garrison, consisting of Prussian troops and a Russian allied detachment, put up a stubborn resistance to the besieging French corps. The garrison was supported by another Russian detachment which attempted to break through the blockade. Dantzic surrendered because of lack of military stocks, on the condition that its garrison could freely evacuate the fortress.

In early 1813, the troops of Russia and Prussia, members of the sixth European coalition, surrounded Dantzic, which was occupied by Napoleonic troops and was staunchly defended. Dantzic resisted for about a year and withstood three regular sieges, but finally had to surrender. p. 88

52 The *Quadrilateral*—a strongly fortified position formed by the North Italian fortresses of Verona, Legnago, Mantua and Peschiera. The Quadrilateral played an important role as a stronghold in the nineteenth-century wars. During the 1848-49 bourgeois revolution in Italy, Verona, which occupied a favourable strategic position and covered the way to Austria, was the main operational base of Radetzky’s counter-revolutionary Austrian army in its actions against the Piedmontese troops (see present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 183-89 and 227-31). p. 88

53 The *siege of Sebastopol* (during the Crimean war, 1853-56) by the allied forces of France, Britain, Turkey and Sardinia lasted from September 25, 1854 to September 8, 1855. p. 88

54 *Demi-lune*—works to defend the entrance to a fort and inside the line of the main ditch.

*Curtain*—a wall or rampart extending between two neighbouring bastions (see also this volume, p. 101). p. 88

55 *Horn-work* and *Crown-work*—auxiliary outworks before the main rampart of a fortress. p. 88

56 At the *Battle of Waterloo* (Belgium) on June 18, 1815 Napoleon I’s army was routed by the Anglo-Dutch and Prussian armies under Wellington and Blücher, and this decided the final victory of the seventh anti-French coalition (Britain, Russia, Austria, Prussia, Sweden, Spain and other states). pp. 92, 103
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57 National Guard—an armed civilian militia, first formed in Paris at the beginning of the French Revolution, which existed, with intervals, till August 1871. In time of Napoleon I it was used as an auxiliary military force in his campaigns of 1809 and 1814-15; from 1868, to distinguish it from garde mobile (see Note 14), it was sometimes called the Sedentary National Guard. It consisted of men relieved from active service and older reservists. The National Guard defended Paris when it was besieged during the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71. After the revolution of March 18, 1871 a Central Committee of the Guard was elected to direct the major part of it; later this function was performed by the Commune Military Delegation. The National Guard was disbanded soon after the fall of the Paris Commune. p. 92

58 Engels has in mind the following events: Austria's victory over Piedmontese forces in the Austro-Italian war of 1848-49, during the Italian bourgeois revolution, and a number of defeats sustained by Austrian troops when suppressing the Hungarian bourgeois revolution of 1848-49; operations of the army sent by the Tsarist government of Russia to support the Austrian Habsburgs in Hungary in 1849; and Prussian intervention in Southern Germany to put down the Baden-Palatinate uprising in 1849. p. 95

59 The reference is to the war of the mountain-dwellers of the Northern Caucasus against Tsarist Russia which began at the end of the 1820s. It was caused by the Tsarist colonisation policy and the oppressive rule of local feudal lords who were supported by the Tsarist government. The war was very arduous and continued for decades. The last stronghold of the mountain-dwellers fell in 1859. The Algerian people put up a stubborn resistance to the French colonialists; it took more than two decades before the country was conquered. pp. 95, 193

60 The system of substitutes was, for a long time, widely employed in the French army; it was a privilege of the propertied classes, allowing them to buy themselves substitutes for military service. The system was prohibited during the French Revolution (1789-93), but was restored by Napoleon I. Certain changes were introduced into it in April 1855. According to the new legislation, the substitutes, if they were not close relatives of the men called up for military service, were appointed officially and the money for them donated to a special army fund. The 1868 legislation legitimatised the system of substitutes, used by approximately 20,000 people every year. The system was abolished in 1872. p. 96

61 Engels refers to the Austro-Italo-French war between the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) and France, on the one hand, and Austria, on the other (April 29 to July 8, 1859). It was launched by Napoleon III, who, under the banner of the "liberation of Italy", strove for aggrandizement and sought to strengthen the Bonapartist regime in France with the help of a successful military campaign. The Piedmontese ruling circles hoped that French support would enable them to unite Italy, without the participation of the masses, under the aegis of the Savoy dynasty ruling in Piedmont. The Austrian army was defeated at Magenta and Solferino (see Notes 18 and 23). However, Napoleon III, frightened by the scale of the national liberation movement in Italy and not willing to promote its unification, abruptly ceased hostilities. On July 11, the French and the Austrian emperor concluded a separate preliminary peace in
Villafranca. As a result of the war, France gained Savoy and Nice, Lombardy joined the Kingdom of Sardinia, and Austria was allowed to retain Venice (up to 1866).

62 The 1850 mobilisation of the Prussian army was a result of the intensification of the struggle between Austria and Prussia for domination in Germany. Prussia, however, was compelled to abandon the idea of military operations and capitulate (the Agreement of Olmütz or Olomouc of November 2, 1850) owing to the serious shortcomings in its military system, exposed during the mobilisation, and also its obsolete armaments, as well as vigorous opposition by Russia, which supported Austria in the conflict.

Engels ironically compares the failure of Prussian diplomacy with the defeat of the Roman legions at the Caudine Forks, near the ancient Roman town of Caudium, in 321 B.C., during the second Samnite war. The Samnites compelled the Romans to go under the yoke, which was the greatest disgrace for a defeated army. Hence the expression “to pass through the Caudine yoke”, meaning to undergo extreme humiliation.

63 In February 1860 the majority of the Second Chamber (the chamber of representatives) in the Prussian Landtag refused to approve the army reorganisation project submitted by War Minister von Roon. The government, however, soon succeeded in obtaining the Chamber's approval for large allocations to “maintain the army ready for action” and used them for the planned reorganisation of the army. When, in March 1862, the Chamber's liberal majority did not sanction military expenditures, the government dissolved the Landtag and called new elections. At the end of September 1862, Bismarck was appointed Prime Minister; the new government dissolved the Landtag in October and initiated a military reform without parliamentary approval of the necessary outlays.

64 The Danish war waged by Prussia and Austria against Denmark in 1864 brought Germany's unification under the Prussian auspices nearer. Bismarck's Junker government aimed to annex Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenburg, which belonged to Denmark but were inhabited mostly by Germans; to strengthen Prussian influence in Germany and to suppress the opposition of the liberal bourgeoisie. Austria, which likewise intended to seize the duchies, also took part in the war. The war ended with a defeat for Denmark. The duchies were proclaimed a condominium and were to be administrated jointly by Prussia (Schleswig and Lauenburg) and Austria (Holstein). After the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 (see Note 5) the three duchies were annexed to Prussia.

65 Large-scale re-planning and reconstruction of Paris, headed by Haussmann, prefect of the Seine department, took place in the 1850s-1860s. Apart from improving housing for the wealthy, the purpose of the works was to widen old streets and build new straight ones to make it easier for the troops to manoeuvre and the artillery to fire in the event of popular uprisings. Large sums from the allocations were misappropriated by Haussmann and his subordinates.

66 This saying, which Napoleon I was fond of, was also used before him by Marshal Turenne, Voltaire and Frederick of Prussia.

67 This and the following articles of the Notes on the War were written by Engels in London, having moved from Manchester on September 20, 1870.
Engels refers to the following events in the wars of the sixth and seventh coalitions of the European states against Napoleonic France: the capitulation of Paris on March 31, 1814 after the defeat of the French troops defending it against the Russian and Prussian armies, and also its surrender, without struggle, to English and Prussian forces on July 3, 1815.

On September 19, 1870, the 14th Corps of the French Army, under the command of General Ducrot, made a sally to prevent the German troops from seizing strategically important heights to the south of Paris. The battle of Châtillon resulted in a defeat for the French, who retreated in confusion. Paris was surrounded by Prussians. For details see Notes on the War.—XXI, p. 121 of this volume.

The negotiations between Bismarck and Jules Favre, spokesman of the Government of National Defence, took place in Ferrières on September 19-20, 1870. Bismarck laid down the following armistice terms: the surrender of Bitche, Toul and Strasbourg, while Paris was to remain surrounded or one of its forts was to surrender, and a continuation of the hostilities at Metz. Bismarck also demanded that Alsace and part of Lorraine be ceded to Germany. The negotiations came to a halt since Favre refused to accept the above terms.

During the Second Empire, in peacetime all the troops of a district were brought under the command of a single person (the commander of the army corps), who could use them to support the regime and to suppress revolutionary actions of the people. His powers on questions of the deployment, organisation and training of the troops were strictly limited. Permanent army corps and armies were to be formed only in case of war, the result being a poorly organised army and poor battle training.

The Minié rifle—a rifle firing the “Minié” bullet; it played an important role in the development of rifled firearms. The 1857 model was muzzle-loaded but, in 1867, it became breech-loaded.

Army of Lyons was the name given by the French press to the 24th Corps of the French army being formed in that town. Later the corps was incorporated in Bourbaki’s Eastern Army (First Army of the Loire).

“ A nation in arms ” was the name widely used in Prussian military literature and official documents of the time for the Prussian armed forces. The Prussian army was by no means an armed nation, as Engels repeatedly noted; on the contrary, it opposed the popular masses and was an instrument for the Prussian bourgeois-Junker state’s aggressive military policy. The Prussian military system was thoroughly investigated by Engels in his work The Prussian Military Question and the German Workers’ Party (see present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 37-79).

The Ersatz Reserve in the Prussian army was a part of the reserve composed of men of call-up age who, for various reasons, were exempted from active service in peacetime; they were placed in the Ersatz Reserve for 12 years and called up in time of war.

The reference is to the insurrection of 1808 in Spain against Napoleonic rule, which marked the beginning of the national liberation war by the Spanish people against French occupation (1808-14). The Spanish made extensive use of guerrilla warfare methods.
77 The reference is to the line of old city fortifications; in the 18th century they were demolished and boulevards set up in their place. p. 131

78 The Palais de Justice is the court building in Paris, occupying most of the western end of the Île de la Cité. p. 131

79 Sonderburg—a town in Schleswig which was a point of the so-called Lines of Düppel, a chain of Danish fortifications protecting the crossing to the island of Alsen during the war of Prussia and Austria against Denmark in 1864 (see Note 64). After a long siege, on April 18 Prussian troops seized the Lines of Düppel and forced the Danish army to retreat to Alsen. These battles demonstrated the increased role of artillery in siege operations. pp. 132, 218

80 The reference is to the Civil War in the United States of America (1861-65). p. 142

81 This refers to the military operations of the army of the North to capture two strategically important points in the South: Vicksburg (Mississippi) and Richmond, the capital of the South (Virginia). During 1862-63, the Northern Army several times tried to seize Vicksburg but succeeded in doing so only when it had organised close co-operation of the land forces and the river fleet: Vicksburg capitulated on July 4, 1863 after a 6-week siege. Numerous attempts to capture Richmond from 1861 to 1864 failed; only on April 3, 1865, was it occupied by General Grant’s troops after a stubborn blockade of nearly nine and a half months. p. 142

82 In the Battle of Tudela (Northern Spain) on November 23, 1808, during the Spanish national liberation war against Napoleonic rule, the French corps of Marshal Lann defeated the Spanish troops, taking advantage of their scattered positions. The remnants of the Spanish troops retreated to Saragossa. p. 143

83 This refers to the Austro-French war of 1809, which compelled Napoleon I to withdraw his guard and cavalry from Spain. Austria lost the war after being defeated at Wagram on July 5-6, 1809. Under the peace treaty of Schönbrunn, concluded in October 1809 between France and Austria, the latter lost a considerable part of its territory and was virtually deprived of political independence. p. 144

84 A “Commission of Barricades”, headed by H. Rochefort, was set up in mid-September 1870. It organised the construction of a third, interior line of defence—barricades and ditches—in Paris in case the enemy broke through the forts and rampart; during the siege of Paris they were not, however, used. pp. 145, 232

85 The reference is to the negotiations in September and October between Bazaine and Bismarck on an armistice, which were interrupted on October 24, 1870. At approximately the same time, preparations were made for talks between the Government of National Defence and Bismarck, with Britain participating as a negotiator. These talks between Thiers and Bismarck took place at Versailles between October 1 and 6, 1870 and were unsuccessful. p. 146

86 This refers to provinces that were incorporated into Prussia prior to the annexation of new territories in 1864-66: East and West Prussia, Brandenburg, Pomerania, Silesia, Posen, Saxony, Westphalia, and the Rhine Province. p. 146

87 This refers to the Delegation of the Government of National Defence, consisting of Glaîs-Bizoïn, Cremieux and Fourichon, sent to Tours in mid-
September 1870 to organise resistance to German invasion in the provinces and to establish foreign relations. From the beginning of October till the end of the war, the delegation was headed by Gambetta, War Minister and Minister of Home Affairs. The delegation formed and equipped new bodies of troops. At the beginning of December 1870, it moved to Bordeaux. pp. 147, 249

88 Water-polacks (Wasserpolacken) was a name (used from the 17th cent.) for Poles, native to Upper Silesia, who floated timber down the Oder. Subsequently, all the Poles of Upper Silesia, who had lived under Prussian rule for centuries, were called by this nickname.

Masures were Poles inhabiting North-eastern Poland and the Southern part of former East Prussia.

89 Baden Freischaaren were volunteer units which, as part of the revolutionary Baden-Palatinate army, fought against the Prussian invaders during the 1849 uprising in defence of the German Imperial Constitution in Southern and Western Germany. These units were poorly organised, disciplined and battle-trained. Engels fought in Willich's detachment, which was composed of workers and was conspicuous for its discipline and military efficiency. A detailed description of the Baden-Palatinate revolutionary army is given by Engels in his work *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* (present edition, Vol. 10).

The Bull Run, a river near Manassas (southwest of Washington), was the scene of the first major battle in the U.S. Civil War. During this battle, on July 21, 1861, the Confederate forces defeated the Northern volunteers, who were numerically superior but badly trained.

British volunteers—territorial militia organised in Great Britain from 1859 to 1861. According to the 1863 Volunteer Act, they were to have no less than 30 exercises a year and could be called up only in the event of foreign invasion. In his articles on volunteers (see present edition, Vol. 18), Engels criticised their bad organisation, the poor training of commissioned officers and inadequate drilling system.

90 The guides—special sub-units in a number of European armies used for guiding troops. In the French army, during the Napoleonic wars and the Second Empire, they guarded the headquarters and served as the Emperor's bodyguards.

91 In the battle of Leipzig on October 16-19, 1813, Napoleon's army was defeated by the armies of the sixth European coalition (Russia, Austria, Prussia, Britain, Sweden, Spain and other states). This led to Germany's liberation from Napoleon's rule.

92 After the fall of the Second Empire on September 4, 1870, Bazaine, having abandoned his plans to break the siege of Metz, started negotiations with Bismarck in September of the same year (see also Note 85) to put an end to the German blockade, with a view to using the French troops in Metz for the restoration of the empire. However, Bismarck no longer believed these plans would come true. The negotiations were interrupted on October 24, and on October 27 Bazaine signed a capitulation.

93 The *Mexican expedition* was an armed intervention by France (initially with Spain and Britain) in Mexico from 1862 to 1867, the aim being to suppress the revolution and turn the country into a colony of the European powers. In 1862, Bazaine was in command of the first division of the French army in Mexico; from October 1863, he was commander-in-chief. Although the
French troops captured the Mexican capital and an "empire" was proclaimed, with Napoleon III's henchman Archduke Maximilian of Austria as emperor, the French interventionists were defeated as a result of the liberation struggle of the Mexican people and, in 1867, were forced to withdraw. The Mexican expedition proved a heavy financial loss to France and was greatly detrimental to the Second Empire.

94 The Arcadians—an ironical nickname for naive, happy-go-lucky people; it originates from the name of a region in the ancient Peloponnese, Arcadia, whose people, according to Greek mythology, were simple and innocent in their manners.

95 Engels has in mind the position of the English during the American War of Independence (1775-83). In their struggle, the Americans successfully combined conventional warfare with a broad guerrilla movement.

96 On November 3, 1867, at Mentana, French troops and the Papal guards defeated Garibaldi, who had marched on Rome intending to liberate it from the Pope's rule and reunite it with the rest of Italy.

97 The Sepoy mutiny—the Indian national liberation uprising of 1857-59 against British rule. It started in the spring of 1857 among the Sepoy units (mercenary troops recruited from the Indian population) of the Bengal army and spread to vast regions of Northern and Central India. Peasants and poor artisans from the towns took an active part in the uprising, but the leaders were, as a rule, local feudal lords. The uprising was crushed because of India's lack of unity and its religious and caste differences, and the military and technical superiority of the British.

98 The Battle of Coulmiers took place on November 9, 1870 near Orleans. The newly formed 15th and 16th corps of the Army of the Loire, under the command of General D'Aurelle de Paladines, defeated the much weaker 1st Bavarian Corps of General von der Tann.

99 A reference to the Paris peace treaties of 1814 and 1815 signed by France and the main participants of the sixth and seventh anti-French coalitions (Russia, Britain, Austria and Prussia) that defeated Napoleon. Under the first treaty (Traité de paix signé entre la France et l'Autriche et ses alliés à Paris le 30 mai 1814), France lost all the territories won by her in the 1792-1814 wars, with the exception of several border fortresses and Western Savoy. Under the second Paris Treaty (Traité de paix de Paris du 20 nov. 1815, avec les conventions spéciales), the territory of France was limited by the 1790 borders and she was deprived of strategically important points on her Eastern frontier, including the fortress Landau.

100 On July 15, 1840, Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia, on the one hand, and Turkey, on the other, signed a convention to support the Sultan of Turkey against the Egyptian ruler Mehemet Ali, who was supported by France. This implied a threat of war between France and an anti-French coalition, but Louis Philippe decided against war and denied his support to Mehemet Ali.

101 During the Spanish national liberation war against Napoleonic rule from 1808 to 1814 (see Note 76) the British expeditionary corps under Sir John Moore, which landed on the Peninsula in 1808, operated in the country alongside guerrilla detachments, which were the main resistance force; the corps was forced to leave Spain in January 1809. Another corps under General
Arthur Wellesley (Duke of Wellington from 1814) landed on the Peninsula in April 1809 and fought the French until they were driven out of the country. p. 173

102 **Dismounting batteries**—siege batteries used for destroying embrasures and guns of a besieged fortress. p. 175

103 Engels is referring to the diplomatic crisis that arose in November 1870 because Russia denounced the articles of the Peace Treaty of Paris (signed on March 30, 1856 by the participants in the Crimean war: France, Britain, Sardinia, Turkey, and also by Austria and Prussia, on the one hand, and Russia, on the other), by which she had lost the right to keep her fleet in the Black Sea. The Russian policy was supported by Bismarck, who counted on the Tsar to back Prussia’s terms for a peace treaty with France. Britain and Austria-Hungary, although protesting against the revision of the Paris Treaty, failed to resist Russia’s demands. A convention annulling Arts. XI, XIII and XIV of the Paris Peace Treaty was signed on March 13 at the “Pontus” Conference, which was held in London from January to March 1871 with the participation of Russia, Britain, Austria-Hungary, Germany, France, Italy and Turkey. Thus, Russia and Turkey regained their right to have fleets and fortresses on the Black Sea. p. 175

104 Giuseppe Garibaldi with his sons Ricciotti and Menotti commanded detachments of the National Guard and foreign volunteers who, from the autumn of 1870, took part in the Franco-Prussian war on the side of the French Republic. Garibaldi’s troops were organised into the Vosges army and fought in Eastern France.

A detachment under Ricciotti Garibaldi defeated a Landwehr detachment in one of the battles at Châtillon, which were fought for two weeks from November 19, 1870. p. 180

105 In spite of official protests by Prussia, the USA and Britain exported a large quantity of rifles to France. However, the arms were often of poor quality since the suppliers wanted to get rid of obsolete models. p. 185

106 The engagements near Loigny and Patay took place from November 29 to December 1; they were of local importance and of variable success. On December 2, however, in battle at Loigny-Poupry some 40 km north-west of Orléans, the German troops under the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg defeated both the 16th and 17th corps of the Army of the Loire under generals Chanzy and Sónis, and the units of the 15th Corps under General Aurelle de Paladines which came to their help. p. 192

107 This refers to the persecution of the participants in the opposition movement of intellectuals in Germany following the wars with Napoleonic France. Many members of student gymnastic clubs, which developed during, and were active in, the liberation struggle against Napoleonic rule, came out against the reactionary system of German states and organised political demonstrations in support of the unification of Germany. The Karlsbad Conference of Ministers of the principal German states in August 1819 sanctioned measures against the participants in this movement who were called “demagogues”. p. 201

108 **“Papal Zouaves”**—a regiment of the Papal Guard organised and trained like the Zouaves (see Note 13) and consisting of young French aristocratic volunteers. When Rome was occupied by Italian troops and the Pope’s secular power abolished in September 1870, the Papal Zouaves were sent to France.
Notes

where they were reorganised into a "volunteer legion of the West". As part of the First and Second Loire armies, they participated in operations against the Germans. After the war, the legion helped suppress the Paris Commune and was later disbanded.

109 In the Battle of Villers-Bretonneux on November 27, 1870 in Normandy (also called the Battle of Amiens; under this name it was already mentioned by Engels in his Notes on the War.—XXIX, see this volume, p. 185) the French Army of the North was defeated by the First German Army under General Manteuffel. p. 223

110 Engels was proved completely right in this supposition. A decisive battle between General Bourbaki's Army of the East and German troops under General Werder took place on the river Lisaine in the vicinity of Belfort from January 15 to 17, 1871. The French, although numerically superior, could not gain victory. After the battle they were compelled to retreat and were finally routed. Engels gives a description of the battle (also called the Battle at Héricourt) and the subsequent retreat in his articles Notes on the War.—XXXVII and "Bourbaki's Disaster" (see this volume, pp. 236-39, 241-44, 255-58, 259-62). p. 226

111 In the Battle at Le Mans (Western France) on January 10-12, 1871, the German troops under Prince Frederick Charles defeated the re-formed Second Army of the Loire, commanded by General Chanzy, which was compelled to retreat after suffering heavy losses. p. 229

112 Engels has in mind the transfer of the English and French troops during the Crimean war from their initial position in Gallipoli (Turkey) to Varna, to help the Turkish army on the Danube fight the Russians who had started operations against Silistria in May 1854. The plan was not carried out because Russia, fearful of Austria, which was prepared to join the allies and had initiated military preparations, was compelled to lift the siege of Silistria and withdraw from the Danubian principalities. The allied troops, which by that time had been transferred to Varna, were subsequently used against Sebastopol. p. 235

113 In the Battle of St. Quentin (North-Eastern France) on January 19, 1871, the 1st German Army under General Goeben crushed the French Army of the North under General Faidherbe. The defeat had a demoralising effect on the French army and marked the end of its active operations in the region. p. 236

114 This refers to the Royalist insurrection during the French Revolution, which began in March 1793 in Vendée and spread to Brittany and Normandy. The bulk of the insurgents were local peasants, incited and organised by counter-revolutionary clergy and gentry. The insurrection in Vendée and Brittany was put down in 1795-96, although new attempts were made in 1799 and subsequent years. p. 238

115 The Battle of Mont Valérien (also known as the Battle of Montretout or Buzenval) was fought on January 19, 1871, four months after the beginning of the siege of Paris. It was the final sortie from besieged Paris, but it was not adequately prepared. There was no coordination between the actions of the attack troops, and the necessary reserves were lacking. Despite the courage displayed by the French soldiers, the sortie was beaten back at every point. pp. 240, 437

116 The Army of the East, as Engels had foreseen, found itself pushed to the Swiss
frontier having retreated after an unsuccessful battle at Héricourt on January 15-17, 1871 (see also Note 110). On February 1, it was compelled to cross the frontier and surrender (see also Note 121).

At the end of September 1870, Bourbaki was sent by Bazaine to Chislehurst in England, where the ex-Empress-Regent Eugénie lived in emigration. Bazaine, the Commander-in-Chief of the French army in Metz, had by that time begun negotiations with Bismarck with a view to restoring the Empire with the help of the troops besieged in Metz (see also notes 85 and 92). Bourbaki's trip was prompted by Regnier, a French adventurer who posed as Eugénie's representative and told Bismarck and Bazaine that she intended to hold talks. Bourbaki's mission ended in failure because Eugénie disavowed Regnier.

This refers to the Convention on the Armistice and Capitulation of Paris signed by Bismarck and Favre on January 28, 1871. The Government of National Defence refused to continue the struggle against the Prussian invaders and agreed to an ignominious capitulation. By this act it betrayed the national interests of France, which were sacrificed to the ruling classes' desire to suppress the revolutionary movement in the country by all possible means. By signing the Convention, Favre accepted humiliating demands put forward by the Prussians: payment of an indemnity of 200 million francs within a fortnight, the immediate surrender of most of the Paris forts, the handing over of the field guns and ammunition of the Paris army, and the disbanding of the francs-tireurs (armed civilians). Yet Bismarck and Favre did not dare to include a clause about the disarmament of the Paris National Guard, which mostly consisted of workers. The Convention provided for urgent elections to the National Assembly, which was to decide the question of a peace treaty.

Engels refers to the intention of the Prussian Junkers, bourgeoisie and military circles to annex French Alsace and Lorraine and their demand for a huge war indemnity.

The armistice concluded by Bismarck and Favre on January 28, 1871 (see also Note 118) expired on February 19. Though France's means of resistance had not been exhausted, operations against the Prussians were not resumed. After the National Assembly appointed Thiers Chief Executive, he immediately started peace talks, which concluded in a preliminary peace treaty signed at Versailles on February 26, France being compelled to accept all Bismarck's terms. On May 10, 1871 the final Peace Treaty was signed in Frankfurt am Main (see this volume, pp. 346-47 and also notes 179 and 324).

The Convention of Les Verrières (Switzerland) was concluded on February 1, 1871, between General Clinchant, who replaced Bourbaki as Commander-in-Chief of the Army of the East, and the Commander-in-Chief of the Swiss Army General Herzog. The Convention specified the terms for crossing the Swiss border (see also Note 116): the French Army was to lay down its arms, equipment and ammunition.

Engels is referring to the August 1870 campaign of the French Army of Châlons, which, owing to a lack of initiative on the part of its commander, Marshal MacMahon, was encircled at Sedan and had to capitulate (see notes 47 and 49).

The letter to the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party
was written by Marx in the capacity of Corresponding Secretary for Germany. On August 2, 1870, the General Council decided to defer the regular congress, due on September 5, 1870 in Mainz (on the programme of the congress see present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 143-44), owing to the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. The General Council decided to ask the sections of the International for approval of its decision. In its resolution, the Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party declared its support.

Marx's letter to the Committee is extant, as it was published, with abbreviations, in C. Koch, *Der Prozeß gegen den Ausschuß der social-demokratischen Arbeiterpartei...*, Braunschweig, 1871, S. 51 and in W. Bracke, *Der Braunschweiger Ausschuß der socialdemokratischen Arbeiter-Partei in Lützen und vor dem Gericht*, Braunschweig, 1872, S. 154; and also in *Leipziger Hochverrathsprüße. Ausführlicher Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Schwurgerichts zu Leipzig in dem Prozeß gegen Liebknecht, Bebel und Hepner wegen Vorbereitung zum Hochverrat vom 11-26 März 1872*, Leipzig, 1872, 1874, 1894.

Here Marx means the request of the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party, which was expressed in Bonhorst’s letter to Marx on October 25, 1869, to explain the Social-Democratic policy towards the German peasantry and give, in particular, instructions concerning the applicability of the Basle Congress (September 6-11, 1869) resolution on social landownership to Germany. Eager to help the leaders of the Social-Democratic Workers’ Party to come to the right decision, Marx planned to write a detailed answer, but the International’s current affairs prevented him from doing so. Engels provided an explanation of this question in February 1870 in his Preface to the second German edition of *The Peasant War in Germany* (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 397-482) and in the Addition to this Preface, which he wrote for the third German edition of the book in 1874 (see present edition, Vol. 23).

The letter to the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party was written in reply to a request from the members of the Brunswick Committee that Marx elucidate the attitude of the German working class to the Franco-Prussian war. Marx considered it necessary to express his opinion because the editorial board of the *Volksstaat* (Liebknecht and others), while, on the whole, taking an internationalist position, had, at the beginning, when the war, as far as Prussia was concerned, had a defensive character, shown a one-sided attitude to it and somewhat ignored the task of national unification. Some members of the Brunswick Committee, on the contrary, underestimated the expansionist tendencies of the Prussian ruling circles, which became obvious even in the initial stages of the war.

The correspondence between Marx and Engels deals with this matter in detail. Thus, in a letter of August 15, 1870, Engels drafted the tactics for German Social-Democracy; he stressed the need to come out against the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine, while participating in the movement for the unification of Germany; to distinguish between the German national and Prussian dynastic interests; always to put forward the common interests of the German and French workers (see present edition, Vol. 44). Marx considered the answer to the leaders of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party to be of exceptional importance, as the question concerned the “directives guiding the policy of the German workers” (see Marx’s letter to Engels of August 17, 1870, present edition, Vol. 44). The final variant of the reply was prepared by Marx
and Engels during Marx's stay in Manchester from August 22 to 30, 1870. The letter was signed by Marx and sent to Germany. He reported on it at the General Council meeting on September 6.

Part of the letter to the Committee was included in the text of the Manifesto on the war issued by the Committee as a leaflet on September 5, 1870 (Manifest des Ausschusses der social-demokratischen Arbeiterpartei, Braunschweig, 5. September 1870). The Manifesto proclaimed the German working class's loyalty to the cause of the international solidarity of the proletariat and called on German workers to organise mass meetings against the Prussian government's annexationist plans. The Manifesto noted that the text included in it had been written by "one of our oldest and most worthy comrades in London".

Only the part of the letter reproduced in the Manifesto has been preserved. The copy of the leaflet obtaining at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Moscow bears notes and corrections in Engels' hand, which testify that Marx and Engels worked together on it. The Manifesto was published by many newspapers in German, and also in English, French and Russian. It was also published in C. Koch, Der Prozeß gegen den Ausschuß der social-demokratischen Arbeiterpartei..., Braunschweig, 1871; W. Bracke, Der Braunschweiger Ausschuß der socialdemokratischen Arbeiter-Partei..., Braunschweig, 1872 as well as in Leipzig, Hochverratsprozeß..., Leipzig, 1872, 1874, and other publications.

It was first published in English in The Echo, October 15, 1870. p. 260

The treaties of Tilsit—peace treaties signed on July 7 and 9, 1807 by Napoleonic France, and Russia and Prussia, members of the fourth anti-French coalition. In an attempt to split the defeated powers, Napoleon made no territorial claims on Russia and even succeeded in transferring some of the Prussian monarchy's eastern lands to Russia. The treaty 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 its army reduced. However, Russia, like Prussia, had to break its alliance with Britain and, to its disadvantage, join Napoleon's Continental System. Napoleon formed the vassal Duchy of Warsaw on Polish territory seized by Prussia during the partitions of Poland at the end of the 18th century, and planned to use it as a springboard in the event of war with Russia.

Dictated by Napoleon, the Treaty of Tilsit caused dissatisfaction among the German population and paved the way for the liberation movement that broke out against Napoleonic rule in 1813. pp. 26, 266

National Liberals (Die Nationalliberale Partei) was the party of the German, mostly Prussian, bourgeoisie, which emerged in the autumn of 1866 as a result of the split in the Party of Progress. The policy of the National Liberals reflected the rejection by a considerable section of the liberal bourgeoisie of claims to broader political rights and its capitulation before Bismarck's Junker government after Prussia's victory in the Austro-Prussian war (see Note 5) and the establishment of her hegemony in Germany.

The German People's Party (Die Deutsche Volkspartei) was established in the second half of the 1860s, its members being democratically-minded bourgeois, mostly from South German states. In contrast to the National Liberals, it opposed Prussia's hegemony in Germany and supported the plan for a so-called "Great Germany", including both Prussia and Austria. While pursuing an anti-Prussian policy and advancing general democratic slogans, the German People's Party voiced the particularist aspirations of some German states. It
propagated the idea of a federal German state, but opposed Germany's unification in the form of a centralised bourgeois-democratic republic.

p. 261

Second Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian War was written by Marx between September 6 and 9, 1870.

On September 6, 1870, having examined the new situation that had taken shape after the collapse of the Second Empire and the start of a new stage of the war, the General Council of the International decided to issue a second address on the Franco-Prussian war and, for that purpose, appointed a commission including Marx, Jung, Milner and Serrailier.

In his work on the Address, Marx used the material he received from Engels, which exposed the efforts to justify, on military-strategic grounds, the urge on the part of the Prussian military clique, the Junkers and the bourgeoisie to annex French territory (see Engels' letter to Marx and Marx's reply of September 4 and 10, 1870 respectively, present edition, Vol. 44). The Address was unanimously adopted by a special meeting of the General Council on September 9, 1870, and was circulated to all the bourgeois London newspapers, which ignored it, with the exception of The Pall Mall Gazette which published an excerpt from the Address in its issue No. 1745 of September 16, 1870. On September 11-13, it was issued as a leaflet in English (1,000 copies); a new edition containing the First and Second addresses appeared in late September. The misprints of the first edition were corrected and some editorial changes made in it. The Address was published by the US labour press: The Working Man's Advocate, Chicago, No. 7, October 8, 1870; The National Standard, No. 1573, November 12, 1870.

The Second Address was translated into German by Marx, who added several sentences intended for the German workers and deleted some passages. This translation was published in the newspaper Der Volksstaat, No. 76, September 21, 1870; in the journal Der Vorbote, No. 10-11, October-November 1870; Volkswille, Wien, No. 37, October 8, 1870; Die Tagewacht, Zurich, No. 33, October 1, 1870; and also as a leaflet in Geneva. In 1891, Engels published the Second Address in a German edition of The Civil War in France; the translation for that edition was made by Louise Kautsky under Engels' supervision.

The French translation of the Second Address was published in the newspapers L'Internationale, Nos. 93 and 99, October 23 and December 4, 1870; in La Tribune de Bordeaux, September 21, 1870; and, in an abridged form, in L'Égalité, No. 35, October 4, 1870. It was also published in Antwerp in Flemish by De Werker, Nos. 51 and 52, October 16 and 24, 1870.

In the present edition, the Second Address is published according to the second edition of the English leaflet checked against the 1870 leaflet, which was translated into German by Marx. The major differences in reading are given in footnotes.

p. 263

In 1618, the Electorate of Brandenburg was united with the Duchy of Prussia (East Prussia), which had been formed from the possessions of the Teutonic Order in the early 16th century and was a fief of Poland. In his capacity as the Duke of Prussia, the Elector of Brandenburg continued to be a vassal of Poland until 1657, when, making use of Poland's embroilment in a war with Sweden, he secured recognition of his sovereign rights to Prussian possessions.

p. 264
130 The reference is to the Treaty of Basle concluded on April 5, 1795 separately by the French Republic and Prussia, the latter being a member of the first anti-French coalition. Its conclusion marked the beginning of the coalition's disintegration.  

p. 265

131 During their meeting in Biarritz in October 1865, Bismarck won Napoleon III's consent to an alliance between Prussia and Italy and to a war by Prussia against Austria; in agreeing to this, Napoleon III expected to be able to intervene in the conflict with benefit for himself, in the event of Prussia's defeat.

At the start of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, the Tsarist Foreign Minister Gorchakov declared, during his negotiations with Bismarck in Berlin, that in the war Russia would maintain a benevolent neutrality towards Prussia and would exert diplomatic pressure on Austria; for its part, the Prussian government undertook not to impede Tsarist Russia in her policy in the East.  

p. 267

132 The reference is to the strengthening of feudal reaction in Germany after the collapse of Napoleonic rule. The governments of the European feudal absolutist states, supported by the reactionary nobility, made use of the results of the liberation war against the domination of Napoleon I. The German Confederation (see Note 27) did not eliminate feudal division; the feudal-absolutist system was consolidated; all the nobility's privileges were preserved and semi-feudal exploitation of the peasants intensified.  

p. 268

133 The reference is to the June insurrection, the heroic insurrection of Paris workers on June 23-26, 1848. It was the first civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in history. Marx called it the first great battle between the two classes. He assessed its historical importance in the Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 67-70).  

pp. 269, 316, 445, 521

134 Marx is referring here to the movement of British workers for recognition of the French Republic, which was established on September 4, 1870, and giving it diplomatic support. From September 5, in London, Birmingham, Newcastle and other big cities meetings and demonstrations by large numbers of workers took place, with some trade unions taking an active part. Their participants expressed sympathy for the French people and demanded in their resolutions and petitions that the British government immediately recognise the French Republic.

The General Council of the International and Marx himself took an active part in organising the movement for recognition of the French Republic (see Marx's letters to Engels of September 10 and 14, 1870, present edition, Vol. 44).  

p. 269

135 The allusion is to Britain's active participation in forming the coalition of feudal-absolutist states, which unleashed a war against revolutionary France in 1792 (Britain entered the war in 1793); and also to the fact that the British ruling oligarchy was the first in Europe to recognise the Bonapartist regime in France, established as a result of Louis Bonaparte's coup d'état of December 2, 1851.  

p. 269

136 During the Civil War in the USA (1861-65), the British press, which expressed the views of the British ruling quarters, actively supported the Southern slave-owning states in an attempt to split and weaken the USA.  

p. 270
On September 9, 1870, Bracke, Bonhorst, Spier, Kühn and Galle, members of the Brunswick Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party, as well as Ehlers, a member of the Party, and Sievers, a printer, were arrested for publishing the Manifesto on war (see Note 125). By this measure, the ruling circles tried to undermine the workers' movement and to prevent any actions against the Prussian government's militarist plans. Having received news of the arrest of the Brunswick Committee from Wilhelm Liebknecht, Marx took immediate steps to give publicity to this act of tyranny on the part of the German authorities, the first in a series of open police persecutions of Social-Democrats there. The information was sent to The Pall Mall Gazette and The Echo, where it was published on September 15, and to a number of other newspapers. On September 20, 1870, at a meeting of the General Council, Marx made a report on the arrest of the members of the Brunswick Committee, stressing that there were absolutely no legal grounds for it. In October 1871, after many months of imprisonment, the members of the Brunswick Committee were brought to trial on the trumped-up charge of disturbing peace. One of the main charges was their membership of the international workers' organisation—the International, which was banned by Prussian laws. The court sentenced the members of the Brunswick Committee to various terms of imprisonment. Despite repressive police measures, the Social-Democratic Workers' Party, led by August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht, started propaganda work against Prussia's predatory plans and for an honourable peace with France.

Engels wrote this letter on the instructions of the General Council after a discussion of the question of the Belgian Sections at the Council's meeting on December 20, 1870. When the letter was published for the first time (L'Internationale, No. 103, January 1, 1871), the three last paragraphs in Engels' rough manuscript were omitted as being confidential in nature.

The 6th regular half-yearly Congress of the Belgian Federation of the International Working Men's Association took place on December 25 and 26, 1870 in Brussels. The delegates heard the financial report and reports on the Federation's press organ, L'Internationale, and on the position of the International Working Men's Association in Belgium.

The London Treaty on Neutrality of Luxembourg was signed on May 11, 1867 by Austria, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Prussia and Russia. It ended the so-called Luxembourg crisis that had been caused by Napoleon III's attempt to make Prussia agree to France's annexation of Luxembourg in payment for the latter's neutrality in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866. This treaty declared Luxembourg a permanently neutral state, its neutrality being guaranteed by the signatory states.

On December 9, 1870, Bismarck announced his intention not to abide by this treaty, considering that Luxembourg had taken too friendly a position towards France, but already on December 19 under pressure from Britain he abandoned his threat.

Engels wrote this letter in his capacity as the General Council's Corresponding Secretary pro tem for Spain in answer to a letter from the Spanish Federal Council of December 14, 1870. Having established links with the Spanish sections of the International, Engels helped them in their struggle against Bakuninism, which developed in Spain, too. There, within the limits of the International Bakuninists had set up an organisation of the Alliance of Socialist
Democracy and tried to take over leadership of the Spanish Federal Council. Despite the Bakuninists' splitting activities, the International's ideas penetrated among the workers and new sections of the International Working Men's Association were established in Spain. This letter was published in English for the first time in Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1955.

141 The *National Labour Union* was founded in the USA in August 1866 at a congress in Baltimore, with the active participation of William Sylvis, a prominent figure in the American labour movement. Marx thought highly of the Baltimore congress. In October 1866, the National Labour Union established contacts with the International Working Men's Association. However, Trevellick, elected delegate to the regular congress of the International at the Chicago congress of the Union in August 1867, could not come to Lausanne. At the last sessions of the Basle Congress of the International (September 1869) the National Labour Union was represented by A. Cameron. In August 1870, at a congress in Cincinnati, Cameron made a report on his participation in the congress of the International. The Union adopted a resolution on adherence to the principles of the IWMA and a desire to join it. This decision was not implemented, however, as the Union leaders were soon carried away by the utopian projects of currency reform. In 1870-71, many trades unions withdrew from the Labour Union and in 1872 it virtually ceased to exist.

pp. 280, 575

142 This article was occasioned by the floating on the London Stock Exchange in March 1871 of Russia's loan of £12 million. This article, first published in *The Pall Mall Gazette* on March 16, 1871, was included in a lithographic edition of Engels' series of articles *Notes on the War*, which came out in Vienna in 1923, and was subsequently reprinted with the *Notes on the War*.

p. 281

143 This refers to the London Conference of several states, which took place in January-March 1871 and discussed the question of Russia's denunciation of the articles of the Paris Treaty of 1856 forbidding her to have warships in the Black Sea and fortresses on its coasts (see Note 103).

p. 282

144 This letter was drafted by Engels on Marx's request in connection with a letter that was published in the French police newspaper *Paris-Journal* on March 19, 1871, which the editors declared to be Marx's letter to Serraillier. According to them it testified to the contradictions between the French and German members of the International. The forged letter was reprinted in the bourgeois newspapers of various countries, which joined in the campaign of slander against the International. At the meeting of the General Council of March 21, 1871, Marx exposed the communication in the *Paris-Journal* as a provocative forgery and said that he had already sent a refutation to the editor of *The Times*, which had reprinted the communication from the *Paris-Journal*.

The item on Marx's refutation was published in *The Times* on March 22, 1871, but the newspaper, joining the campaign of slander against the International, published an item by a correspondent of the Bonapartist newspaper *La Liberté* distorting Marx's letter of March 21. At the meeting of the General Council on March 28, 1871, Marx again exposed the slanderers. He inserted the text of this piece into his letter to Paul Lafargue of March 23, 1871 (see present edition, Vol. 44) in order to make it known to the Paris members of the International.

p. 285
This statement was made necessary by the false allegations about the expulsion of Germans from the International's sections in Paris, which were disseminated by the reactionary newspaper *Paris-Journal*. These allegations were refuted in a special letter from the Paris Federal Council in response to the General Council's request. The statement of the General Council to the editor of *The Times* and other papers was written by Marx and unanimously approved by the General Council at its meeting on March 21. The Statement was published in *The Times*, No. 27018, March 23; in *The Eastern Post*, No. 130, March 25; *The Standard*, No. 14555, March 27, 1871. The statement was included in Marx's letter to the editor of *Der Volksstaat* of March 23, 1871 (see this volume, p. 289), and in Marx's letter to Lafargue of the same date. p. 286

In the first half of March, the French bourgeois papers, particularly the *Paris-Journal* and the *Gaulois*, were actively supporting the idea of founding the so-called Anti-German League. The League was supposed to foster in the young people a spirit of revenge for the defeat in the war, to help the French depart from Alsace and Lorraine, which were occupied by the German army, and to sow discord between French and German workers. p. 286

The *Jockey Club*—an aristocratic club founded in Paris in 1833. p. 286

A meeting of Germans belonging to the propertied classes was held in Zurich in March 1871 to celebrate Germany's victory in the Franco-Prussian war. At the meeting, there was a clash between a group of French officers interned in Switzerland and the Germans. The reactionary press blew up a provocative campaign in order to undermine the international ties between the workers of different countries and accused the International of staging these events. The Swiss section of the International exposed the slander of the bourgeois press in a special statement. Several trades unions in Zurich likewise issued statements saying that members of the International had nothing to do with the clash. p. 286

Marx's letter to the editor of *Der Volksstaat* contained (with minor changes in the German translation) the statement by the General Council to the editor of *The Times* and other papers, written by him on March 21 (see this volume, pp. 286-87). The letter to the editor of *Der Volksstaat* was published in German in that paper, No. 26, March 29, 1871, in *Die Tagwacht*, No. 14, April 1, 1871 and in *Der Vorbote*, No. 4, April 23, 1871. It was published in French in *L'Égalité*, No. 6, March 31, 1871, with the first two paragraphs in abridged form. Besides the press organs of the International, the letter was published in *Die Zukunft*, No. 73, March 26, 1871. p. 288

*Haupt-Chef* (*The principal leader*)—the name given by Stieber, a Prussian police officer, at the Cologne Communist trial in 1852 to Cherval, an agent-provocateur, trying to ascribe to him, for provocative purposes, the leading role in the Communist League and make it appear that Cherval was closely connected with Marx and the defendants (see K. Marx's *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*, present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 407-19). p. 288

This letter to *De Werker* was written by Marx at the request of the editorial secretary Ph. Coenen to expose the forgeries published in the *Paris-Journal* and reprinted in the reactionary press of various countries in order to defame the International. The editor prefaced the letter, translated from the French into
Flemish with the following paragraph: "It has been known for a long time that our opponents stop at nothing to achieve their aims. Despite this we did not believe they were so impudent as to write forged letters on behalf of the members of the International. But this is what happened. Some time ago a letter by Karl Marx on the conduct of French workers could be read in all big newspapers. In connection with this, the Antwerp section asked Karl Marx for an explanation. Here is what the member of the General Council of the International replied."

p. 291

A similar letter was sent by Marx to The Daily News, which published it on April 6, 1871.

p. 292

Marx and Engels learned about the strike of the cigar-workers in Antwerp from the letter written by Ph. Coenen, an organiser of the International's sections in Belgium and the Netherlands, on March 29, 1871. They immediately took steps to organise international aid to the strikers. At the General Council meeting of April 4, 1871 Engels made a report on the strike, and the Council resolved, on Engels' proposal, to send letters and delegations to the British trades unions. On April 5, 1871 the General Council issued an address to the British trades unions to give assistance to the Antwerp cigar-workers; it was printed as a separate leaflet signed by Eccarius. That very day, Engels informed Ph. Coenen of this and sent a letter to Liebknecht asking him to provide assistance to the Antwerp cigar-workers, with the given item for Der Volksstaat enclosed (see Engels' letter to Coenen and Engels' letter to Liebknecht of April 5, 1871, present edition, Vol. 44).

In response to the General Council's appeal, material assistance to the Antwerp cigar-workers was provided by a number of British trades unions and the workers of Brussels, where the cigar-workers also went on strike. The aid provided by the General Council to the Antwerp cigar-workers, who came out in defence of their trades union, enabled them to hold out till September 1871, when the manufacturers had to accept their terms.

p. 294

This Outline of an Appeal was prepared by Engels on the request of the Madrid Federal Council to provide assistance to the weavers and spinners of Barcelona who were on strike. Engels made a report on the subject at the meeting of the General Council on April 18, 1871. On April 19 he sent the Outline to Eccarius, who was to appeal to the weavers' and spinners' trades unions of Manchester for donations for the strikers. The outline was preceded by an address to Eccarius: "Dear Eccarius, the following on the strike of the Barcelona. To save effort, I am giving it to you direct in English."

The Outline ended with the words: "The form of contribution—donation or loan—should be left to the men's discretion. The Council could take care of the remittances, or they can send in the money direct, the address is available. Best regards, yours F. E." At the General Council meeting on April 25, 1871, Engels again touched upon the situation in the Spanish textile industry.

p. 295

The resolution of the Federal Council of the Paris sections of the International expelling Tolain from the IWMA as a deserter of the working-class cause was published in the newspaper of one of the Paris sections, La Révolution politique et sociale, No. 3, April 16, 1871. The next day, this news appeared in The Times (No. 27039), The Standard (No. 14573) and other newspapers. Tolain, who was elected deputy to the National Assembly on February 8, 1871 from the Paris workers, after the proclamation of the Paris Commune remained in the
Versailles Assembly the activity of which was aimed at suppressing the revolution in Paris, and refused to fulfil the Commune's demand that the workers' deputies break with that reactionary body. Even before this, the General Council, acting on the strength of reports in the London press, had a preliminary discussion on Tolain's treacherous behaviour at its meeting on April 18 and decided that it should be publicly condemned. After receiving the resolution on April 25, the General Council resumed its examination of Tolain's case and resolved to expel him from the International.

In the manuscript of the General Council's resolution on Tolain's expulsion, written by Engels, some corrections are made by Marx. The resolution was published in English in The Eastern Post, No. 135, April 29; in French (translated by Engels)—in L'Internationale, No. 122, May 14; in German—in Der Volksstaat, No. 42, May 24 and Der Vorbote, No. 7, July 1871. The last paragraph of the manuscript is published only in L'Internationale, which printed the resolution over Engels' signature, as a corresponding secretary pro tem for Belgium.

Engels' article "Once Again 'Herr Vogt'" is connected with Marx's Herr Vogt, published in 1860 (see present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 21-329), in which Marx exposed the petty-bourgeois democrat Karl Vogt as a paid Bonapartist agent and a disseminator of slanderous inventions about proletarian revolutionaries.

The direct reason for writing the article was the appearance, in the autumn of 1870, after the collapse of the Second Empire, of Vogt's new pamphlet Karl Vogt's Politische Briefe an Friedrich Kolb, in which the author tried to camouflage his past ties with the Bonapartists. In his article, Engels also used newly-published data, confirming Marx's conclusion, made in 1860, that Vogt was a paid agent of Bonaparte. Marx wrote about this in his letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht on April 10, 1871 (see present edition, Vol. 44), that is, before Engels' article appeared. Der Volksstaat (No. 31, April 15) published the following short message, which, in the main, reproduced the text of Marx's letter to Liebknecht: "In the official Papiers et correspondance de la famille impériale, published in the report of the French government, we find, on the alphabetic list of recipients of Bonapartist money, under the letter V, literally the following: 'Vogt; il lui est remis en août 1859, 40,000 Fr. (Vogt received 40,000 francs in August of 1859).''"

The editor of Der Volksstaat provided this information, published on Marx's behalf, with the following comment: "The Party comrades who reproached us for ignoring Vogt's writings against the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine and were not content with our referring them to the well-known pamphlet by Marx, will surely be satisfied now. But we request our Paris friends to send us the complete register. We are certain to find many an old acquaintance on it who once dealt in Bonapartism as 'fellow-rogués' of Vogt's and now, for the same motives and with equal enthusiasm, peddle Bismarck's patriotism."

Engels' article was included in his collection Internationales aus dem "Volksstaat" (1871-75), Berlin, 1894 and reprinted in Der New Yorker Volkszeitung, Sonntagsbl., No. 19, May 12, 1895.

The Augsburg Campaign is the ironical name Marx uses in his pamphlet Herr Vogt for Vogt's action brought against the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung in 1859 for reprinting the leaflet "Zur Warnung", which exposed Vogt as a Bonapartist agent (see present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 111-32). When his complaint was dismissed, he published a booklet Mein Prozess gegen die
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Allgemeine Zeitung, in which he libelled proletarian revolutionäres. Marx's pamphlet Herr Vogt was written in response. p. 298

The Brimstone Gang (Schwefelbande)—the name of a students' association at Jena University in the 1770s, whose members were notorious for their brawls; later the expression became widespread. In his pamphlet Mein Prozess gegen die Allgemeine Zeitung, Vogt applied it to Marx's supporters (see present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 28-47). p. 298

Napoléon le Petit (Napoleon the Little)—the nickname given to Louis Bonaparte by Victor Hugo in a speech he made in the French Legislative Assembly in 1851. It gained wide currency after the publication in 1852 of Hugo's Napoléon le Petit. p. 299

Engels ironically calls the Schweizer Handels-Courier, which was the mouthpiece of the Bonapartists in the 1850s-1860s, Vogt's Moniteur, by analogy with the French official organ of the same name. Vogt had close ties with this newspaper. p. 299


Marx is apparently referring here to Jean Baptiste Troppmann, a murderer sentenced to death in Paris in December 1869. p. 301

The Civil War in France, one of Marx's most important works, was written as an address by the General Council of the International to all Association members in Europe and the United States.

From the earliest days of the Paris Commune Marx made a point of collecting and studying all available information about its activities. He made clippings from all available French, English and German newspapers of the time. Newspapers from Paris reached London with great difficulty. Marx had at his disposal only individual issues of Paris newspapers that supported the Commune. He had to use English and French bourgeois newspapers published in London, including ones of Bonapartist leanings, but succeeded in giving an objective picture of the developments in Paris. The notebook with newspaper excerpts from March 18 to May 1, 1871 is extant (it was published for the first time in the original languages in: Marx/Engels, Archives, Vol. III (VIII), Moscow, 1934).

Marx also drew valuable information from the letters of active participants and prominent figures of the Paris Commune, such as Leo Frankel, Eugène Varlin, Auguste Serraillier, Yelisaveta Tomanovskaya, as well as from the letters of Paul Lafargue, Pyotr Lavrov and others.

Originally he intended to write an address to the workers of Paris, as he declared at the meeting of the General Council on March 28, 1871. His motion was unanimously approved. The further developments in Paris led him, however, to the conclusion that an appeal should be addressed to proletarians of the world. At the General Council meeting on April 18, Marx suggested to issue "an address to the International generally about the general tendency of the struggle".

Marx was entrusted with drafting the address. He started his work after April 18 and continued throughout May. Originally he wrote the First and Second drafts of The Civil War in France as preparatory variants for the work (see this volume, pp. 433-51 and Note 285), and then set about making up the final text of the address.
He did most of the work on the First and Second drafts and the final version roughly between May 6 and 30. On May 30, 1871, two days after the last barricade had fallen in Paris, the General Council unanimously approved the text of *The Civil War in France*, which Marx had read out.

*The Civil War in France* was first published in London on about June 13, 1871 in English, as a pamphlet of 35 pages in 1,000 copies. Since the first edition quickly sold out, the second English edition of 2,000 copies was published at a lower price, for sale to workers. In this edition, Marx corrected some of the misprints occurring in the first edition, and the section “Notes” was supplemented with another document. Changes were made in the list of General Council members who signed the Address: the names of Lucraft and Odger were deleted, as they had expressed disagreement with the Address in the bourgeois press and had withdrawn from the General Council, and the names of the new members of the General Council were added. In August 1871, the third English edition of *The Civil War in France* came out, in which Marx eliminated the inaccuracies of the previous editions.

In 1871-72, *The Civil War in France* was translated into French, German, Russian, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, Flemish, Serbo-Croat, Danish and Polish, and published in the periodical press and as separate pamphlets in various European countries and the USA. It was repeatedly published in subsequent years.

The German translation was made by Engels and published in *Der Volksstaat* in June-July 1871 (Nos. 52-61, June 28 and July 1, 5, 8, 12, 16, 19, 22, 26 and 29), and, in abridged form, in *Der Vorbote* (Nos. 8-10) in August-October 1871, and it also came out as a separate pamphlet in Leipzig. Engels made several insignificant alterations in the text. By the fifth anniversary of the Paris Commune, in 1876, a new German edition was put out, with minor corrections introduced in the text.

In 1891, when preparing a jubilee German edition of *The Civil War in France* to mark the 20th anniversary of the Paris Commune, Engels once again edited the text of his translation. He also wrote an introduction to this edition, emphasising the historical significance of the experience of the Paris Commune, and its theoretical generalisation by Marx in *The Civil War in France*, and also giving additional information on the activities of the Communards from among the Blanquists and Proudhonists. Engels included in this edition the First and Second addresses of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian war, which were published in subsequent editions in different languages also together with *The Civil War in France*.

*The Civil War in France* was published in French for the first time in *L'Internationale* in Brussels in July-September 1871. A separate French edition appeared in Brussels in 1872; it was edited by Marx, who made numerous changes in the proofs and retranslated many passages.

The first Russian edition of *The Civil War in France*, which served as the basis for a number of subsequent printed and hectographed publications, appeared in Zurich in 1871. In 1905, *The Civil War in France* came out in Russian in a translation from the German edition of 1891 (Burevestnik Publishers, Odessa). The second edition was brought out under the editorship of Lenin by the same publishing house, also in 1905 during the first Russian revolution. When editing the translation of *The Civil War in France*, at the request of the publishers, Lenin introduced precise economic and political terminology into the text, eliminated numerous mistakes and inaccuracies of
the previous edition of 1905 and restored those parts of the text deleted by Tsarist censorship.

In this volume, *The Civil War in France* is published according to the 3rd English edition of 1871, collated with the German translations of 1871 and 1891. The most essential textual differences are given in the footnotes. To establish Marx's sources, his notebook with excerpts from various newspapers was used. References to the sources quoted or mentioned in the text are given according to these excerpts. In a number of cases concerning decrees and other documents of the Paris Commune, a reference is also given to the publications of the official organs of the Commune.


Capitulards—a scornful nickname for those who advocated the capitulation of Paris during the siege of 1870-71. It subsequently came to denote capitulators in general.

Jean Jules Pic and Jean Taillefer stole large sums of money from the insurance society by forgery and used them to finance the Bonapartist newspaper *L'Étendard*. In 1869 they were sentenced to hard labour.

The *Société générale du Crédit Mobilier*—a large French joint-stock bank founded by the Péreire brothers in 1852. It was closely associated with Napoleon III's government and under the latter's protection engaged in large-scale speculation. It went bankrupt in 1867 and was liquidated in 1871. Marx gave an all-out characteristic of the Crédit Mobilier in a number of articles published in the *New-York Daily Tribune* in 1856-58 (see present edition, Vol. 15).

A reference to the anti-Legitimist and anti-clerical riots in Paris on February 14 and 15, 1831, which were echoed in the provinces. In protest against the Legitimist demonstration during the requiem mass for the Duke du Berry, the mob plundered the church of Saint Germain l'Auxerrois and the palace of Archbishop Quélen, who was known for his Legitimist sympathies. The Orleanist government, which was striving to weaken the hostile Legitimist party, did nothing to stop the crowd. Thiers, who was present when the church and palace were attacked, urged the National Guards not to interfere.

In 1832, by order of Thiers, then Minister of the Interior, the Duchess de Berry, mother of the Comte de Chambord, the Legitimist pretender to the French throne, was arrested and subjected to a humiliating medical examination to expose her secret marriage with a Neapolitan nobleman and pregnancy, and in this way politically compromise her and her son.

An allusion to the unseemly role played by Thiers in suppressing the popular insurrection in Paris on April 13-14, 1834, directed by the secret Republican Society of the Rights of Man (Société des Droits de l'Homme). Thiers, then Minister of the Interior, organised the brutal persecution of the participants in the insurrection and was, in particular, responsible for the death of the inhabitants of a house in Rue Trasnnonain.

*September Laws* (1835) were issued by the French government, which took advantage of an attempt on the life of Louis Philippe on July 28 to restrict trial by jury and introduce harsh measures against the press, including higher
securities for periodicals, and prison terms and large fines for statements against property and the existing political system.

pp. 315, 446, 454, 520, 596

170 In January 1841, Thiers came forward in the Chamber of Deputies with a project, prepared by Minister of War Soult, for building fortifications around Paris—a wall and several forts. Revolutionary and democratic circles took it as a preparatory step towards suppressing any popular movement, though the project was presented as a measure to strengthen the city's defences. It was noted that Thiers' project provided for the construction of especially strong and numerous forts near the working-class quarters to the east and north-east of Paris.

pp. 315, 454, 520

171 In January 1848, the Neapolitan troops of King Ferdinand II, subsequently nicknamed King Bomba for his savage bombardment of Messina in the autumn of that year, shelled Palermo in an effort to suppress a popular uprising, which sparked off the bourgeois revolution in the Italian states in 1848-49.

pp. 315, 455, 520

172 In April 1849, the French bourgeois government, in alliance with Austria and Naples, intervened against the Roman Republic for the purpose of suppressing it and restoring the Pope's secular power. As a result of the armed intervention and the siege of Rome, which was subjected to fierce bombardment by French troops, the Roman Republic, despite heroic resistance, was overthrown and Rome was occupied by French troops.

pp. 315, 455, 510, 521, 572

173 The Party of Order—a party of the big reactionary bourgeoisie, which was formed in 1848 as a coalition of monarchist groups: the Legitimists (supporters of the Bourbon dynasty), the Orleanists (supporters of the Orleans dynasty) and the Bonapartists. From 1849 until the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, it held sway in the Legislative Assembly of the Second Republic.

pp. 316, 497, 503, 521

174 On January 11, 1864, Thiers spoke in the Corps législatif about the government's duty to return the "necessary liberties" to the country, including freedom of the individual, the press, association, and elections to parliament (Le Moniteur universel, No. 12, January 12, 1864).

pp. 316, 443, 453

175 Thiers asked Bismarck for permission to increase the number of troops, which was not to exceed 40,000 according to Art. 3 of the preliminary treaty signed by Thiers and Jules Favre, on the one hand, and Bismarck and representatives of the South German states, on the other, in Versailles on February 26, 1871. Thiers' government assured Bismarck that the troops would be used exclusively for suppressing the insurrection in Paris, and on March 28, 1871, according to the Rouen Convention, Thiers received permission to increase the size of the Versailles army to 80,000 and, somewhat later, to 100,000 men. Accordingly, the German Command repatriated French prisoners of war, most of whom had been serving in the armies that surrendered in Sedan and Metz. The Versailles government quartered these units in secret camps, where they were trained for action against the Paris Commune.

pp. 317, 452, 458, 483, 541

176 Legitimists—the party of supporters of the Bourbon dynasty, which was overthrown in France in 1792, representing the interests of the big landed aristocracy and top clergy; it took shape as a party and assumed this name in
1830, after the dynasty was overthrown for the second time. During the Second Republic, the Legitimists, together with the other monarchist parties, formed the Party of Order (see Note 173). Under the Second Empire, failing to win any support from the people, they confined themselves to marking time and issuing critical pamphlets, and were galvanised into action only in 1871, when they joined the general counter-revolutionary onslaught against the Paris Commune.

**Notes**

177 *Chambre introuvable*—the name given by King Louis XVIII to the Chamber of Deputies in France which in 1815-16 consisted of extreme reactionaries.

178 The Assembly of “Rurals”—a scornful nickname for the National Assembly, which met on February 12, 1871 in Bordeaux and consisted mostly of reactionary monarchists, such as provincial landowners, civil servants, rentiers and merchants elected from rural constituencies.

179 According to the terms of the preliminary peace treaty, signed on February 26, 1871 at Versailles, France ceded Alsace and East Lorraine to Germany and paid it 5 billion francs indemnity; until the indemnity was paid, a part of the French territory continued to be occupied by the German troops. The final peace treaty was signed in Frankfurt am Main on May 10, 1871 (see this volume, pp. 346-47).

180 On March 10, 1871, the National Assembly adopted a law on overdue bills. Accordingly, a seven-month moratorium was set for payments on security made from August 13 to November 12, 1870; no moratorium was allowed for payments on securities contracted after November 12. This meant that the law gave virtually no deferment to those in debt, the working class and the imppectious sections of the population. It also caused the bankruptcy of many small industrialists and merchants.

During the siege of Paris, the time for rent payment was transferred from one quarter of a year to another. At the end of March 1871 another payment came due. The project advanced by Thiers and Dufaure gave house-owners the right, if the rent had not been paid for two years, to evict the tenants and appropriate their furniture and personal belongings. The National Assembly refused to consider the project.

181 *Decembriseur*—participant in the Society of December 10 (see Note 4). Vinoy was directly involved in the coup d’état of December 2, 1851, having used troops to put down attempts to start a republican uprising in one of the departments of France.

182 According to newspaper reports, out of the internal loan that the government of the Third Republic had decided to float, its head Thiers and other ministers were to receive more than 300 million francs by way of “commission”. Thiers subsequently admitted that the men representing the financial circles with whom the loan was being negotiated were demanding swift suppression of the revolution in Paris. The loan bill was passed on June 20, 1870, after the Paris Commune had been crushed.

183 *Cayenne*—town in French Guiana (South America), a penal colony and place of exile for political prisoners and criminals.

184 On October 31, 1870, following the reports of the capitulation at Metz, the defeat at Le-Bourget, and the negotiations with the Prussians started by Thiers
on behalf of the Government of National Defence, Paris workers and the revolutionary section of the National Guard started an uprising and took the Town Hall, setting up an organ of revolutionary power—the Committee of Public Safety, headed by Auguste Blanqui. Under pressure from the workers, the Government of National Defence was forced to promise to resign and set elections to the Commune for November 1. But, taking advantage of the loose organisation of the revolutionary forces in Paris and the differences between the Blanquists and the petty-bourgeois Jacobin Democrats, who led the uprising, the government went back on its promise to resign, threw the loyal battalions of the National Guard against the Town Hall and restored its power.

pp. 323, 447, 527

185 *Bretons*—the Breton Mobile Guard, which Trochu used as a gendarmerie to suppress the revolutionary movement in Paris. The Bretons replaced the *Corsicans* who, under the Second Empire, constituted a large section of the gendarmerie corps.

pp. 323, 446, 481, 513, 527, 532, 539

186 On January 22, 1871, the Blanquists initiated a new revolutionary action by the Paris proletariat and the National Guard, who demanded the overthrow of the government and the establishment of a commune. On orders of the Government of National Defence, the Breton Mobile Guard, who were guarding the Town Hall, fired on them. Many of the participants in the demonstration were arrested, all the clubs in Paris were closed down, public gatherings were prohibited and a number of newspapers banned. Once the revolutionary movement was suppressed by means of terrorism, the government proceeded to prepare for the surrender of Paris.

p. 324

187 *Sommation* (a demand to disperse)—a form of warning given while breaking up demonstrations, meetings, etc. According to the 1831 law, the demand was repeated three times, accompanied by drumming or trumpets (faire les trois sommations), following which the authorities were entitled to resort to force.

The *Riot Act* (an act for preventing tumults and riotous assemblies, and for the more speedy and effectual punishing of rioters) was introduced in the British Parliament in 1714 and passed in 1715. The Act obliged the authorities to read part of it to those unlawfully assembled and to open fire if the latter refused to disperse within an hour.

pp. 325, 511, 529

188 This refers to the repressive laws initiated or actively supported by J. Dufaure and passed in 1839 and 1849. On May 14, 1839, after the armed action, the secret Republican Society of the Seasons was banned. After the demonstration of June 13, 1849 had been dispersed, a number of repressive laws were adopted: on June 19, the law on associations, on June 27—the law on the press (loi sur la presse), on August 9—the law on the state of siege (loi sur l'état de siège). After Dufaure became Minister of Justice in February 1871, he adopted a whole series of repressive laws. The law on the state of siege of April 28, 1871 restored certain laws meant to suppress freedom of the press, including the law of 1849.

pp. 325, 444, 512

189 During the October 31 events (see Note 184), when the members of the Government of National Defence were detained at the Town Hall, Flourens prevented their being shot, as one of the insurgents was demanding.

p. 326

190 By the terms of the European Convention signed at Geneva in 1864, subject to certain regulations, the wounded and the official staff of ambulances and their equipment were declared neutral.

pp. 327, 478, 530
Notes 671

191 The decree of the Commune of April 5, 1871 on reprisals and hostages (Marx gives the date according to the report in The Daily News, No. 7781, April 7, 1871) was published in the Journal officiel (Paris), No. 96, April 6, 1871. Under this decree, all persons charged with and proved to be maintaining contacts with Versailles were declared to be hostages. By this measure, the Paris Commune tried to prevent the Versailles men from shooting Communards.

p. 327

192 

Girondins—during the French Revolution the party of the big commercial and industrial bourgeoisie and the landowning bourgeoisie which emerged in the years of the revolution; named after the department of Gironde, which was represented in the Legislative Assembly and the Convention by many leaders of this party. The Girondins stood for turning France into a federation of republics and opposed the Jacobin dictatorship.

p. 333

193 On December 21, 1870, Professor Thomas Huxley suggested to the School Board for London that the Board Secretary's salary should be £1,000. The School Board decided on a salary of £800.

pp. 336, 488

194 On April 12, 1871, the Commune suspended all kinds of prosecution for delay of payments (Décret sur la suspension des poursuites pour échéances) until the law on payment terms was published. The Paris Commune law of April 16, 1871 (Loi sur les échéances) provided for payment of all debts in instalments over three years and the abolition of interest on them. The law greatly alleviated the financial position of the petty bourgeoisie and was disadvantageous to the big capitalist creditors.

pp. 336, 474

195 Marx is referring to the Constituent Assembly’s rejection, on August 22, 1848, of the bill on “amicable agreements” (“concordats à l’amiable”), providing for a moratorium for debtors able to prove that they had gone bankrupt as a result of the depression caused by the revolution. This had ruined a considerable section of the petty bourgeoisie and left it in the clutches of big bourgeois creditors.

pp. 336, 496

196 Frères ignorantins or ignorantines—the name of the religious order Frères des écoles chrétiennes (Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools), which was founded in Rheims in 1680 and whose members pledged themselves to educate the children of the poor. Marx uses the term to hint at the low level and clerical nature of primary education in France.

p. 336

197 This refers to the Alliance républicaine des départements, a political association of petty-bourgeois residents in Paris who came from various regions of France. It was founded in April 1871 and soon sided with the Paris Commune. The Alliance came out against the Versailles Government, organised solidarity meetings in the provinces, and worked out a project for democratic reforms to strengthen the Republican system.

pp. 337, 495

198 This apparently refers to the Paris Commune appeal “To the Working People of the Villages” (“Aux travailleurs des campagnes”), published in April-early May 1871 in the Commune newspapers and issued as a separate leaflet.

p. 337

199 Marx is referring to the law passed by the government of Charles X on April 27, 1825, authorising the payment of compensation to former émigrés for the landed estates confiscated from them during the French Revolution. Most of
this compensation, which came to 1 billion francs and was paid as a three per cent state rent, went to top courtiers and big landowners. pp. 337, 492

200 An additional tax of forty-five centimes on the franc of the direct tax was established by the Provisional Government of the Second Republic on March 16, 1848. The tax, the whole brunt of which fell on the shoulders of the peasants, aroused intense resentment among them, and this mood was utilised by the big landowners and Catholic priests for agitation against the democrats and workers of Paris in order to turn the peasantry into a reserve of the counter-revolution. pp. 337, 492

201 A reference to the ordinance dividing France into military districts and granting almost unlimited powers to their commanders; the bill giving the President of the Republic the right to remove or appoint mayors; the law on village teachers, who were put under the supervision of the prefects, and the education law which increased the influence of the clergy on education. Marx gives a description of these laws in his work The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 10, p. 123). pp. 338, 493

202 The Vendôme Column—a war memorial erected in Paris between 1806 and 1810 as a tribute to the military victories of Napoleon I. It was made of bronze from captured enemy guns. On May 16, 1871, by order of the Paris Commune the Vendôme Column was destroyed as a symbol of militarism. pp. 339, 475, 501

203 In the 1850s and 1860s, G.E. Haussmann, prefect of the Seine Department, carried out considerable work on rebuilding Paris. The old streets were widened and new straight ones were laid to facilitate the use of artillery by troops in suppressing popular uprisings. Big sums of money allocated by the state for these works were misappropriated by Haussmann and his subordinates. pp. 339, 351

204 In May 1871, facts exposing crimes committed in monasteries became known. In the Picpus nunnery, in the St. Antoine suburb of Paris, cases were established of nuns being incarcerated in cells for many years and instruments of torture found; in the Church of Saint Laurent, a secret cemetery was discovered attesting to the murders that had been committed there. See “Les squelettes découverts...” in Le Mat d’Ordre, No. 71, May 5, 1871; H. Rochefort, “Les mystères du Couvent Picpus”, Le Mat d’Ordre, No. 72, May 6, 1871, and also the pamphlet Les crimes des congrégations religieuses. Mystères de l’Eglise Saint Laurent, Paris, [1871]. p. 340

205 Wilhelmshöhe (near Kassel)—the castle of the Prussian kings, where the ex-Emperor Napoleon III, captured by the Prussians, was retained from September 5, 1870 to March 19, 1871. p. 340

206 This refers to Stanislas Pourille, elected to the Commune under the false name of Blanchet. On May 5, 1871 he was expelled from the Commune and then arrested. p. 340

207 Absentees—landlords who owned estates in Ireland but lived permanently in England. Their estates were managed by agents who robbed the Irish peasants, or were leased to speculator-middlemen, who subleased small plots to the peasants. p. 341
208 *Francs-fileurs* (literally: "free absconders")—the name given to the Paris bourgeois who fled from the city during the siege. It sounded all the more ironical being a pun on *francs-tireurs* (see Note 34). pp. 342, 350, 457, 543

209 This refers to the Théâtre de la Porte-Saint-Martin in Paris. p. 343

210 Coblenz—a city in Western Germany, the centre of counter-revolutionary emigration during the French Revolution. It was the seat of the émigré government headed by de Calonne, former minister of Louis XVI. pp. 343, 457, 543

211 *Chouans*—participants in the counter-revolutionary insurrection in North-West France during the French Revolution. During the Paris Commune, this name was given by the Communards to the detachment of monarchist-minded Versailles soldiers recruited in Brittany and used against the Commune. pp. 343, 452

212 Under the impact of the proletarian revolution of March 18, 1871, which led to the establishment of the Paris Commune, revolutionary mass actions were mounted in Lyons, Marseilles and a number of other cities of France. On March 22, the Town Hall in Lyons was seized by the National Guard and the city's working people, and a Commune was proclaimed. However, the provisional commission set up to prepare elections to the Commune abdicated its powers because it commanded only a small military force and had no strong links with the people and the National Guard. Fresh actions by the working people of Lyons on April 30 were fiercely suppressed by the army and the police.

In Marseilles, the insurgent population took the Town Hall and arrested the prefect. A commission of the Department was set up in the city and elections to the Commune were scheduled for April 5. However, the revolutionary movement in Marseilles was put down on April 4 by government troops, who shelled the city.

213 This refers to Dufaure's activities, aimed at strengthening the regime of the July monarchy, during the armed action of the secret conspiratorial Republican Society of the Seasons (Société des Saisons) in May 1839, and to Dufaure's role in the struggle against the oppositional petty-bourgeois Party of the Mountain during the Second Republic in June 1849.

The revolutionary action of the Society of the Seasons on May 12, 1839, headed by Blanqui and Barbès, was suppressed by government troops and the National Guard. To fight the revolutionary danger a new ministry was formed, of which Dufaure became a member.

In June 1849, in a situation of mounting political crisis that resulted from the oppositional moves of the Party of the Mountain against Louis Bonaparte, President of the Republic, Dufaure, who became Minister of the Interior, initiated a number of repressive laws aimed against the revolutionary section of the National Guard, democrats and socialists. p. 345

214 This refers to the law on the press, adopted by the National Assembly on June 6, 1871, which reintroduced provisions from the previous reactionary laws on the press of 1819 and 1849: it provided for harsh penalties, including the closure of periodicals, for statements against the authorities. Besides, a law was adopted on the reinstatement of officials of the Second Empire who had been dismissed and a special law on the procedures for the return of property
confiscated by the Commune and on the introduction of penalties for its confiscation, as a criminal offence. pp. 345, 467, 479

215 The bill on shortening the trial by courts-martial (Projet de loi relatif à l'abréviation des procédures devant les Conseils de guerre), motioned by Dufaure and adopted by the National Assembly on April 6, 1871, extended the powers of the army commander and the Minister of War. In particular, they were empowered to institute criminal proceedings without preliminary investigation and pass sentences within 48 hours. p. 345

216 A reference to the commercial treaty between Britain and France, signed on January 23, 1860, under which France was conceded the right to export most of its goods to England duty-free. France abandoned her prohibitive tariff policy and replaced it with duties of no more than 30 per cent of the value of the goods. The result was a sharp intensification of competition on the French domestic market, which was flooded with goods from Britain, and this caused discontent among French industrialists. Marx describes this treaty in his articles published in volume 17 of the present edition. pp. 346, 442

217 A reference to the reign of terror and bloody reprisals in Ancient Rome in the period of intensified social and political struggle in the 1st century B.C.

The dictatorship of Sulla (82-79 B.C.), who was made dictator by the slave-owning nobility, was characterised by mass scale annihilation of members of the oppositional slave-owners' faction.

The First and Second Triumvirates—periods of dictatorship by the most influential Roman generals, who divided power between themselves.

The First Triumvirate (60-53 B.C.)—the period of the dictatorship of Pompey, Caesar and Crassus; the Second Triumvirate (43-36, formally until 31 B.C.)—of Octavianus, Antonius and Lepidus. p. 349

218 In August 1814, during the war between Britain and the United States (1812-14), the British troops took Washington and burned the Capitol (the Congressional building), the White House and other public buildings.

In October 1860, during the colonial war (1856-60) waged by Britain and France against China, the Anglo-French troops plundered and burned down the Summer Palace, a treasure-house of Chinese architecture and art near Peking. p. 350

219 In 1812, Moscow became the centre of the all-Russian resistance to the aggression of Napoleon's France. On September 7, a battle took place at the village of Borodino near Moscow, and this largely predetermined the collapse of Napoleon's aggressive plans. At the beginning of the occupation of Moscow by the French army, a great fire began in the city and lasted about a week. p. 351

220 Praetorians—privileged troops in the Roman Empire; originally—the bodyguard of the military commanders. Their name has come to symbolise mercenary troops supporting a tyranny. pp. 352, 514

221 Marx gives the name “Chambre introuvable” (see Note 177) to the Prussian Assembly elected in January-February 1849, on the basis of the Constitution granted by the Prussian King on December 5, 1848, the day of the counter-revolutionary coup d'état in Prussia. In accordance with the Constitution, the Assembly consisted of two chambers: the privileged, aristocratic “chamber of the gentry”, and the second chamber, dominated by
the Junkers and the bourgeoisie. Bismarck, elected to the second chamber, was the leader of its extreme Right-wing Junker group. p. 353

222 The statement issued by the General Council of the International over Jules Favre’s circular of June 6, 1871, written by Marx and Engels, was included in the second and third English editions of *The Civil War in France* and its German editions of 1871, 1876 and 1891. It was also published separately in a number of newspapers (see this volume pp. 361-63). p. 357

223 In 1841, *Le National*, the newspaper of moderate bourgeois Republicans, approved Thiès’ plan for building fortifications round Paris, aimed against the workers’ and democratic movement (on the plan see Note 170). E. Cabet strongly condemned the position of *Le National*. On April 10, 1841, the newspaper published an article containing attacks of a personal nature against Cabet and presenting a distorted picture of his position during the July 1830 revolution. *Le National* refused to publish Cabet’s refutation. Cabet prosecuted the newspaper for libel, and in May 1841 the court compelled it to publish the letter. After new attacks by *Le National* in August 1841, Cabet obtained a court order obliging the newspaper to publish his new letter. During the summer of 1841, he published a number of pamphlets in which he exposed the slanderous character of the newspaper’s publications. p. 357


The statement was included in some editions of *The Civil War in France* (see this volume, p. 357 and note 222). p. 361

225 This statement, written by Marx and edited by Engels, was occasioned by the leading article of *The Times* on June 19, which libelled the Paris Commune and the International; it extolled Louis Bonaparte’s “merits” in suppressing the revolutionary working-class movement. The editor of *The Times* refused to publish the statement. Engels made some changes in the draft statement written by Marx.

The statement was published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 419-20. p. 364

226 On September 24, 1867, the General Council resolved, on Marx’s initiative, to abolish the permanent office of Chairman and elect a Chairman for each meeting. p. 365

227 The last paragraph of Marx’s draft statement was edited by Engels. *The Standard* never published the letter.


228 This statement by the General Council was drawn up by Engels in connection
with the letter by George Holyoake, a leading figure in the co-operative movement, published in *The Daily News* on June 20, 1871, which contained attacks on the General Council's Address *The Civil War in France*. George Holyoake asserted that the Address aided the reactionary forces; that its authors were not thoroughly acquainted with the English working-class movement; that the English members of the General Council Odger and Lucraft neither saw nor signed the statement. He thus encouraged them to oppose it.

At the General Council meeting of June 20, 1871, which was to approve this statement, Odger and Lucraft expressed their disapproval of it and demanded that their names should not be appended. In compliance with Marx's wishes, the General Council announced in this statement that the Address *The Civil War in France* had been drawn up by Marx.

229 Engels wrote this letter at Marx's suggestion because *The Spectator* and *The Examiner* reprinted the reports of the reactionary French press on the so-called manifestoes of the International, which were actually forged by the French police (see this volume, pp. 364-66). Marx's proposal to send a refutation to these papers was approved by the General Council at its meeting on June 20, 1871. The editors of the newspapers did not, however, publish the letter.

This letter was first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871, Minutes*, Moscow, 1967, p. 423. p. 369

230 Marx's letter to the editor of *The Daily News* was occasioned by this newspaper's publication on June 26, 1871 of letters by British clergyman John Llewellyn Davies, Benjamin Lucraft, and George Holyoake. George Holyoake again slanderously attacked the Address even after the General Council had made its statement on June 21 (see this volume, pp. 367-68). Lucraft expressed his disagreement with the propositions of the Address and declared his resignation from the General Council. Davies called upon the French Government to start legal proceedings against the General Council for the accusations contained in the Address against Thiers, Favre and others. Marx sent the letter to the editors of *The Daily News* and *The Pall Mall Gazette*. The latter published an excerpt from the letter on June 27, 1871. As the editors of *The Daily News* refused to publish the second part of Marx's letter, in which he exposed the British bourgeois press, the letter was also sent to *The Eastern Post*, which published it in full on July 1, 1871.

p. 370

231 This refers to articles and documents exposing Palmerston's foreign policy. They were published in the 1830s and 1840s by the British conservative journalist and politician David Urquhart in *The Portfolio*, a collection of diplomatic documents put out by him, and in various periodicals. Marx, who persistently exposed the diplomacy of the ruling classes, in addition to other sources, made use of the documents published by Urquhart in his series of articles "Lord Palmerston" written in 1853 (see present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 341-406). At the same time, Marx criticised Urquhart's reactionary views.

p. 371

232 This statement, drawn up by Engels in connection with the letters of Holyoake and Lucraft published in *The Daily News* on June 26, 1871, was approved at the meeting of the General Council on June 27, 1871. The meeting unanimously censured Lucraft and Odger, who refused to support the Address of the General Council *The Civil War in France* and accepted their resignation from the Council.

p. 372
This refers to articles and documents forged by the Paris reactionary press to slander the Paris Commune and the International; they resembled the forgeries used in the struggle against the revolutionary movement by the Prussian police under Stieber, one of the chief organisers of the provocative Communist trial in Cologne (1852).

This letter was written by Marx in reply to the declaration of *The Pall Mall Gazette* that the accusations levelled by Marx against the Versailles Government in the General Council's Address *The Civil War in France* were libellous (see this volume, pp. 307-59). On July 3, *The Pall Mall Gazette* printed Marx's letter in an editorial entitled “The Regenerator Rampant”, but at the same time made new attacks on him, arbitrarily quoting from Section One of the Address. On July 4, Marx informed the General Council about his letter and its publication in *The Pall Mall Gazette*.

This Address of the General Council, drawn up by Marx, exposes the demagogical and provocative part played by bourgeois diplomacy in relation to the Paris Commune, citing as an example the activities of Mr. Washburne, American Ambassador in Paris. Marx showed that, from the start, the American diplomats joined international reaction in its struggle against the Commune. Washburne, while expressing his sympathy for the Communards, in actual fact used his position in Paris to act against the Commune. Though he stayed in Paris, he maintained constant contacts with the Versailles Government and often went to Versailles to convey information about the situation in the city. During the days of the Commune, he corresponded with Bismarck and the latter's representatives in Versailles, inciting them to armed actions. At the same time, in order to disrupt the defence of Paris, American diplomats tried to make the Communards entertain hopes that Prussia would remain neutral and act as mediator. That was the primary aim pursued by Washburne in suggesting that contacts be established with the Prussian command.

When writing this Address, Marx used the letter by Mr. Reid, the Paris correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph* (Section I) and the communication of Serraillier, a Communist and member of the General Council (Section II). On returning to England Reid delivered lectures in support of the Paris Commune, contacted Marx and met him on July 1, 1871 (see this volume pp. 552-53). On July 4, the General Council unanimously passed a resolution to cooperate with Reid in disseminating truthful information about the Paris Commune and the General Council's Address *The Civil War in France*. On July 7, the Sub-Committee of the General Council, having discussed Washburne's subversive activities against the Commune, adopted a draft Address written by Marx. On July 11, the Address was unanimously approved by the General Council and published in London as a pamphlet. On August 1, the New York Central Committee for the United States Sections of the International had it published in the bourgeois New York newspaper *The Sun*. Sorge and other members of the New York Committee supplied the Address with a preface explaining the significance of the Commune. Concerning Washburne, it stated that “he belongs to that large family of State parasites, feeding upon the public crib...”; the New York Committee called on the workers to give no credence to the information about the Commune received “through the channel of its deadly adversaries—a subsidised press” and to remember that the Commune “was a workingmen's government, and as such was hated, dreaded and calumniated by all the privileged classes and their ubiquitous mouthpieces and subordinates...”.

The Address “Mr. Washburne, the American Ambassador in Paris” was

Thiers' government banned the publication of the Address in France.

p. 379

236 The Archbishop of Paris, Georges Darboy, was arrested and, among others, kept hostage by the Commune in an attempt to stop the Versaillse shooting Communards. The Commune repeatedly offered the Versailles Government to exchange all the hostages for Blanqui alone, who was arrested on March 17, 1871 (see this volume, pp. 352, 400-02, 446-49). Washburne recommended Thiers to consent, hoping that, if Blanqui were released, the position of the Blanquists in the Commune would become stronger and the contradictions that intensified in late April and early May within the Commune would be aggravated further. Thiers did not agree. After the Archbishop had been executed, Washburne in his articles and at lectures slandered the Commune on the strength of this measure, which it had been forced to take. p. 381

237 This article by Engels was occasioned by the slander campaign against the International and the Paris Commune being joined by Mazzini before the 12th Congress of the Italian workers' societies, which took place on November 1-6, 1871. Mazzini planned to prevent the spread of the International's influence on the Italian workers' movement and the strengthening of their class organisation in Italy.

Carlo Cafiero, a leader of the Neapolitan Section of the International, sent Mazzini's Address "To the Italian Workers" to Engels. The Address, published in *La Roma del Popolo*, No. 20, July 13, 1871, distorted the history of the foundation of the International, its programme and principles. Engels made a speech concerning Mazzini's attitude towards the International at the meeting of the General Council on July 25 (see this volume, pp. 607-08). He developed the principal theses of his speech in this article, which he enclosed in a letter to Cafiero of July 28, 1871. In his letter Engels stressed that the facts about Mazzini's activities should be made known to the workers and the true meaning of his propaganda exposed. Cafiero sent Engels' article to several newspapers and used it and an extract Engels sent him from the minutes of the General Council's meeting in writing his own article against Mazzini, but he was arrested before he could finish it; the rough draft of the article was confiscated by the police.

p. 385

238 At a meeting of the Sub-Committee of the General Council on October 8, 1864, Luigi Wolff proposed that the Rules of the Italian Working Men's Association, written by Mazzini and translated into English by Wolff, should be adopted as the Rules of the International. Mazzini's Rules gave the organisation a sectarian and conspiratorial character.

The *Sub-Committee*, or the Standing Committee, of the General Council of the International developed from a committee set up in the early period of the International Working Men's Association in 1864 to draw up its programme and Rules. The Sub-Committee consisted of corresponding secretaries for various countries, the General Secretary of the General Council, and a treasurer. The Sub-Committee, which was not envisaged by the Rules of the International, was an executive body; under Marx's direction, it fulfilled a wide range of duties in the day-to-day guidance of the International and drafting its
documents, which were subsequently submitted to the General Council for approval.  

239 This refers to the withdrawal of the Italian Mazzinists from the General Council in April 1865 following the discussion of the conflict in the Paris section of the International between journalist Henri Lefort, on the one hand, and the Proudhonists Fribourg and Tolain, on the other; the bourgeois elements tried to use this conflict to their own ends. The discussion ended with the adoption of resolutions written by Marx (see present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 82-83).  

240 This refers to Jung’s letter to the editor of the bourgeois-democratic newspaper L’Écho de Verviers, in reply to the libellous attacks made on the International’s leaders by the petty-bourgeois republican Vésinier in the columns of the paper (H. Jung, “L’Association Internationale des Travailleurs”, L’Écho de Verviers, No. 43, February 20, 1866). Jung’s letter was edited by Marx and dated February 15, 1866 (see present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 392-400).  

241 This covering letter to the editor of The Times of August 7, 1871 attached to Engels’ letter printed below, was written by Marx in connection with an article published in the newspaper on July 29, 1871. Along with the appeals to prosecute the leaders of the Paris Commune, the newspaper admitted that a great many citizens suspected of participating in it were being kept under terrible conditions in the Versailles prisons without trial for two months and brutally treated. The Times article and an attempt by Thiers’ Journal officiel to refute it aroused protests in the press of various countries against the brutal treatment of the arrested Communards. However, Marx’s and Engels’ attempt to make use of the polemic between the two papers in order to defend the victims of the Versailles terror in the columns of the widely read British newspaper failed. The editor of The Times did not publish Engels’ letter.  

This letter was first published in English in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, On the Paris Commune, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1971, pp. 260-61.  

242 See Note 241.  


243 This and other refutations (see this volume, pp. 393, 405) were written by Marx in reply to the libellous article about the International Working Men’s Association published in the Berlin National-Zeitung on July 30, 1871. Excerpts from it were reprinted in several bourgeois London newspapers, including L’International, which also made new attacks on Marx.  

The refutation was published in full in Der Volksstaat in an item about the National-Zeitung libel on the International. The rough draft in French contains some additions in Engels’ hand.  

244 This private letter and an open letter to the editor of Public Opinion (this volume, pp. 393-94) were dispatched by Marx to Engels with his letter of August 19, 1871 (see present edition, Vol. 44), in which he asked Engels to make copies of the letters and send them to the newspaper, because his own handwriting might cause misprints.  

This letter was first published in English in Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe (MEGA). Erste Abteilung, Bd. 22, Berlin, 1978, S. 1090.
This open letter was sent to the editor of Public Opinion together with a private letter (this volume, p. 392). The editor supplied Marx's letter with the following statement: "In our last number we published, under the title 'A German View of the International', an article from the Berlin National-Zeitung, criticising the proceedings of the International Society. M. Karl Marx complains of a paragraph in that article as conveying an imputation of personal corruption or impropriety against himself and his colleagues in the Society. We gladly publish his letter. We at once disclaim the intention of making any such imputations as that which he has understood to be conveyed by the paragraph in question; and we are sorry that anything has appeared in our columns capable of such a meaning."

A copy was sent by Marx to The Evening Standard, but it was not published there (see this volume, p. 405).

This letter was written by Marx in connection with the reprint by Le Gaulois of extracts from the report of a conversation Marx had with a New York Herald correspondent on July 20, 1871, since the report, published in The New York Herald on August 3, deliberately falsified the conversation (see also Marx's letter to Friedrich Bolte of August 25, 1871, present edition, Vol. 44). The New York Herald did not publish Marx's statement.

This is Marx's reply to a letter from Charles Dana, a former editor of the New-York Daily Tribune whom Marx had known since the time he had contributed to the paper in 1851-62. In his capacity as editor of The Sun, Dana asked Marx on July 6, 1871, to write several articles on the International. Marx decided to use this opportunity primarily to expose the Thiers government and the regime of police terror in France. He wanted, in particular, to make public the facts revealing the persecution of his daughters and Paul Lafargue in France and Spain. Later, to the same end, Marx also dispatched to the American press a letter written by his daughter Jenny (see this volume, pp. 622-32). In replying to Dana, Marx expected Dana to publish, in one form or another, the material contained in the letter on the persecution of the members of his family by the French authorities. Marx's letter reached New York at the same time as rumours of his death, circulated by a Bonapartist newspaper. This prompted Dana to publish in The Sun the whole letter, with a short obituary, on September 9, 1871. Subsequently Marx refuted the rumours spread in the American press about his death and pointed to their source (see this volume, p. 432).

At a meeting of the General Council of the International on August 22, 1871, Engels proposed that an appeal be made by the General Council to the workmen of America on behalf of the refugees. The General Council instructed Marx to write an appeal and dispatch it to the American section of the International. Marx forwarded it to Friedrich Sorge on September 5, 1871. The text of the appeal has not survived.

The letter was one of the numerous contributions by Marx in defence of the Paris Commune (see this volume, pp. 360, 364-74, 378, 388-99, 403-05). Marx presumably addressed it to the editor of The Examiner because, as Engels put it, it was "the only paper to behave really decently" (see this volume, p. 376) in the slander campaign initiated by the British bourgeois press after The Civil War in France had been published.

The title "The Commune and Archbishop Darboy" was probably supplied by the editors of the newspaper.

Marx spoke at the meeting of the General Council on July 11, 1871 about the fabrications presented as documents of the International. The report on the meeting and the account of Marx's speech were published in *The Eastern Post*, No. 146, July 15, 1871. p. 403

These propositions were submitted by Marx to the General Council at its meeting on September 5, 1871 and approved by it. The available manuscript, written by Engels, has a correction in Marx's hand. The words "Financial account" at the beginning of the manuscript related to the proposal that the General Council should prepare the accounts for the Conference. They were published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*, Moscow, 1967. p. 406

Preliminary draft resolutions were submitted by Marx to the Sub-Committee of the General Council (see Note 238) and approved by it on September 9, 1871. Later, the drafts were supplemented; in particular, clauses were added on the formation of working women's sections and on the general statistics of the working class. On September 12, after Engels' report, the resolutions were discussed and approved by the General Council. At the London Conference, Marx moved these resolutions on behalf of the General Council. Some of them were edited and subsequently included in the official publication of the Conference resolutions (see resolutions of the London Conference II, III, IV and X, in this volume, pp. 423, 424, 427).

Engels' manuscript contains additions made by Marx. They were published in English for the first time in: *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*, Moscow, 1967. pp. 407, 565

The reference to the resolutions of the Congress of Basle is inaccurate. The Congress of Basle (1869) adopted a number of resolutions enhancing the leading role of the General Council, but it did not adopt a resolution on the designation of local branches of the International. Such a resolution was adopted at the London Conference (1871) and, after its approval by the General Council, included in the Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association (see present edition, Vol. 23) without any reference to the Congress of Basle. pp. 408, 565

The *London Conference* (September 17-23, 1871) marked an important stage in the struggle waged by Marx and Engels for establishing a proletarian party.

In conformity with a resolution of the Congress of Basle (1869), the next congress of the International Working Men's Association was to be held in Paris. However, the persecution of the International's sections by the police in France by orders of the Bonapartist government compelled the General Council to shift the next congress to Mayence (Germany) (see present edition, Vol. 21, p. 132). The outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war made the congress impossible; nor was it possible to hold it in the atmosphere of severe reprisals against the members of the International during the civil war in France, especially after the suppression of the Paris Commune. Under these conditions,
the majority of national federations suggested that the congress be postponed and the General Council be empowered to convene it at its own discretion. At the same time, the need to take account of the experience of the Paris Commune and adopt collective decisions so as to strengthen the ideological unity and organisation of the International, the urgent tasks of the struggle against the Bakuninists and other sectarian elements, who had stepped up their splitting activities, as well as other tasks, demanded the convocation of a conference of representatives of the International from all countries. At its meeting on July 25, 1871, the General Council, at Engels' suggestion, resolved to convene a closed conference of the International Working Men's Association in London on September 17. The majority of the federations agreed with this proposal. Marx and Engels carried out tremendous preparatory work. At the meetings of the General Council on August 15 and September 5, 12 and 16, the questions concerning the organisation and the agenda were discussed and the draft resolutions were adopted.

Twenty-two delegates with votes and ten delegates with voice but no votes took part in the work of the Conference. The countries unable to send delegates were represented by the corresponding secretaries. Marx represented Germany, Engels, Italy. In all, there were nine closed sessions.

The minutes of the Conference and the other related material were first published, in Russian, in the book *The London Conference of the First International, 17-23 September, 1871*, Moscow, 1936.

In this volume, the Conference resolutions, along with the accounts of the statements by Marx and Engels, which have reached us as written down by Engels, are published in the main text. Marx's speeches, recorded by Rochat and Martin, are published in Appendices (see pp. 613-21).

This speech was made by Marx on September 18, 1871 at the sitting of the commission elected by the London Conference to consider the question of the Bakuninists' splitting activities in the International's sections of Romance Switzerland. Bakunin's followers used several Swiss newspapers to attack the General Council and propagate Bakunin's ideas. At the Congress in La Chaux-de-Fonds, held in April 1870, the Bakunists won an insignificant majority. The representatives of the Geneva sections refused to comply with the decisions of the Congress. The General Council repudiated the attempts by the Bakunist Council to take over the powers of a central, leading body of the International in Switzerland. As a result of the sharp criticism of the Bakunists' activities by Marx and Engels, who were supported by a majority of the International's sections, the leaders of the Alliance did not venture to come out against the General Council openly and, some weeks before the London Conference, they declared the Alliance dissolved, but wanted to keep it secretly.

Marx and Engels considered the unmasking of the Bakuninists' activities and ideas, which introduced disorganisation into the working-class movement, to be an important task of the London Conference. The Conference commission expressed its agreement with Marx's conclusions and exposed the attempts on the part of the Bakunist Robin to justify the Alliance's activities in Switzerland. The question of the Alliance was subsequently discussed at the Conference which, on September 21, approved the report made by Marx on behalf of the commission and unanimously passed the resolutions moved by him (see this volume, pp. 419-22, 429-31).
Notes 683

Congress of the Romance Federation of the International in La Chaux-de-Fonds on April 4-6, 1870 (see Note 256). Locle, mentioned in the manuscript, was a centre of Bakuninists' activity. p. 412

This document contains the preliminary text of the resolutions on organisational and tactical questions moved by Marx on behalf of the General Council and adopted at its meeting on September 12, 1871. The Conference unanimously adopted these resolutions on September 18 and 19, 1871. The text was discussed at the General Council's meeting on October 16, 1871 and finally edited by Marx. The text that is published in this volume was written by Engels in French, and does not fully coincide with the official edition of the Resolutions of the Conference of Delegates of the International Working Men's Association Assembled at London from 17th to 23rd September 1871 (see this volume, pp. 423-31). p. 413

The question of the political action of the working class, which was the main issue on the agenda of the London Conference and was comprehensively analysed in the speeches by Marx and Engels, was discussed at the sixth and seventh sessions of the Conference on September 20 and 21. The Bakuninists Bastelica and Robin, as well as Lorenzo, the representative of the Spanish sections, tried to have this question taken off the agenda declaring that the Conference was incompetent to discuss it. By a majority vote, the Conference instructed the General Council to prepare the final text of the resolution taking all motions into account (see this volume, pp. 426-27). In addition to this plan of Engels' speech on the political action of the working class, written in German, there is his record of this speech in French, which was appended to the minutes of the Conference on September 21 (pp. 417-18). This speech has also survived as a brief record in the minutes. p. 415

See Note 259.

Published in English for the first time in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Works, Moscow, 1968, p. 314. p. 417

This full text of the resolution in French was moved by Marx at the Conference session on September 21, 1871 and finally edited not later than September 26. In the official edition of the Resolutions of the London Conference, Clause 1 is abridged. The text of the resolution published in L'Egalité was signed: "Pour copie conforme: Le secrétaire-correspondant pour la Suisse H. Jung."

Marx also spoke on the conflicts in the Romance Federation and the splitting activities of the Bakuninists in the Conference commission on September 18, 1871 (see this volume, pp. 411-12). p. 419

This refers to the General Council Resolution on the Federal Committee of Romance Switzerland, written by Marx, which, despite the Bakuninists' claims, helped to preserve the committee's name and status as the guiding body of the International's sections in Romance Switzerland (see present edition, Vol. 21) pp. 420, 430

The resolutions of the London Conference were mainly drafted and moved at its sessions by Marx and Engels. Several resolutions were based on preliminary drafts prepared by them (see this volume, pp. 407-08), Marx's speeches at the Sub-Committee meeting on September 9, 1871 (ibid., pp. 565-66) and also the speeches by Marx and Engels at the Conference. Marx's and Engels' positions were also reflected in resolutions moved by other delegates at the Conference. In
his capacity as Conference Secretary for editing and translating resolutions, Engels took a major part in drafting and editing them.

Marx and Engels deemed it necessary to inform the members of the International and the international working-class movement in general about the major decisions of the Conference as quickly as possible. On their initiative, the Conference commissioned the delegates to make reports in the sections of the International about the adopted resolutions. The General Council charged a special commission headed by Marx with the official publication of the resolutions of the London Conference in English, French and German. Marx and Engels carried out the final editing of the Conference resolutions, which they received in rough form. The translation of the resolutions into French and German was done under their direct supervision.

In view of the fact that the decisions of the 1871 London Conference, which was of a consultative nature, were not, according to the Rules, obligatory, in contrast to the decisions of regular congresses, its resolutions approved by the General Council and published as a circular letter of the General Council, were addressed to all the federations and sections of the International.

The resolutions were published in pamphlet form in English and French at the beginning of November 1871.

The resolutions were published in German in Der Volksstaat, No. 92, November 15, 1871 and as a separate edition early in February 1872. In November-December 1871, on the basis of these three editions approved by the General Council, many newspapers reprinted these resolutions in full or in an abridged form. They were translated into Italian, Spanish, Polish, Serbo-Croatian and Flemish and widely circulated.

The resolutions were published in the principal organs of the International in 1871: L'Égalité, No. 22, November 19, L'Internationale, No. 150, November 26, Die Tagwacht, Nos. 48, 49 and 50, November 25, December 2 and 9, Der Vorbote, No. 12, December, La Emancipation, No. 24, November 27, La Federacion, No. 119, November 26, L'Eguagianza, No. 21, December 3, and others.

The decisions were supported by most of the sections and federations of the International.

Resolution I—"Composition of General Council"—was moved by Laurent Verrycken and César De Paepe, and was adopted at the eighth session of the London Conference on September 22, after a discussion in which Marx and Engels took part; of the four resolutions on the composition of the General Council passed by the Conference, only the first (Resolution I) and the fourth (see Point 1 of the section XIII "Special Votes of the Conference") were published. The second and third resolutions envisaged an extension of the probation period for candidate members of the Council to three weeks, and the right of sections of different countries to nominate candidates for the respective corresponding secretariats. These resolutions have survived in the minutes of the London Conference and in the Minute Book of the General Council (meeting of October 16, 1871, at which Marx read the four resolutions).

Resolution II—"Designations of National Councils, etc."—was moved by Marx on behalf of the General Council, and passed at the second session of the London Conference on September 18, 1871. Point 1 of this resolution had already been formulated by Marx and Engels in the preliminary draft resolutions, which were submitted to and approved by the Sub-Committee of
the General Council on September 9, 1871 (see this volume, pp. 407-08). This point, with some amendments, was included in the Administrative Regulations as Point 1 of Section II, points 2-4 became points 2-4 of Section V (see present edition, Vol. 23). The resolution was directed against the attempts of the petty-bourgeois elements (Right-wing Proudhonists, Bakuninists, Positivists, etc.) to impose their sectarian views on the local organisations of the International in opposition to the principles of the General Rules, which was reflected in the designations of local sections.

266 Resolution III—“Delegates of the General Council” was moved by Marx on behalf of the General Council and passed at the fourth session of the London Conference on September 19, 1871; its first version is found in the preliminary draft resolutions written by Marx and Engels (see this volume, p. 408); it was included in the Administrative Regulations as point 8 of Section II (see present edition, Vol. 23).

267 Resolution IV—“Contribution of Id. per Member to the General Council”—was moved by Frankel, who made a report on behalf of the commission that was to work out measures for a more regular inflow of individual contributions, and passed by the London Conference at its sixth session on September 20. During the preparations for the Conference, Marx raised the question of the contributions at the meeting of the Sub-Committee of the General Council on September 9, 1871 (see this volume, p. 565). The resolution, with slight amendments, was included in the Administrative Regulations as Section III (see present edition, Vol. 23).

268 Resolution V—“Formation of Working Women’s Branches”—was moved by Marx on behalf of the General Council and passed by the London Conference at its third session on September 19, 1871. During the preparations for the Conference, the question was raised at the meeting of the Sub-Committee of the General Council on September 11, 1871 (see this volume, p. 567). Moving his motion, Marx stressed the need to establish women’s branches in countries with a high rate of female employment in industry. The resolution was included in the Administrative Regulations as point 6 of Section V (see present edition, Vol. 23).

269 Resolution VI—“General Statistics of the Working Class”—was moved by Marx on behalf of the General Council at the third session of the London Conference on September 19, 1871 and adopted with addenda proposed by Utin and Frankel. Moving the resolution, Marx stressed that general statistics were especially important in organising aid for strikers from the workers of other countries and for other joint actions as an expression of international proletarian solidarity. The resolution was included in the Administrative Regulations as points 1-4 of Section VI (see present edition, Vol. 23). p. 425

270 This refers to the Rules of the International Working Men’s Association published by the General Council in London in 1867. This edition reflected the changes introduced in the Rules at the Geneva (1866) and Lausanne (1867) congresses. In the Provisional Rules, published in 1864, this article, except the last sentence added later, was numbered 6 (see present edition, Vol. 20).

The resolution passed by the Geneva Congress (its text is included in section VI of the Administrative Regulations, see present edition, Vol. 23), was based on Section 2 (c) of Marx’s “Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional Central Council” (see present edition, Vol. 20).
Resolution VII—"International Relations of Trades' Unions"—was moved by Frankel, Bastelica, Utin, Serraillier, Lorenzo and De Paepe at the fifth session of the London Conference on September 20, 1871 in connection with the discussion of Delahaye's proposal to organise international federations of trade unions according to trades, to direct the working-class movement and to achieve "administrative decentralisation" and "to create a real commune of the future". Delahaye's proposal contained anarcho-syndicalist ideas that specifically denied the significance of the proletarian party. It was criticised by Marx and other delegates (see Note 406). The resolution was adopted as edited by Marx and Engels.

Resolution VIII—"Agricultural Producers"—was moved by Marx and adopted at the eighth session of the London Conference on September 22, 1871. In his speeches, Marx stressed the need to carry on propaganda in the countryside and proposed that the question of securing the alliance of the working class and the peasants be discussed.

At the sixth session of the London Conference on September 20, 1871, Vaillant moved a draft resolution stressing that political and social questions were inseparable, and that the political activities of the working class were of prime importance. During the discussion of Vaillant's resolution and Serraillier's and Frankel's additions to it, Marx and Engels made speeches on the political action of the working class (see this volume, pp. 409-10, 413-14 and Note 259). Their speeches formed the basis of Resolution (IX) "Political Action of the Working Class" which the General Council was charged with drafting by the Conference. On October 7, 1871 a commission was set up; Engels was elected to the commission and Marx also took part in its work. Marx and Engels drafted an essentially new resolution formulating a clear proposition on the political party of the working class as indispensable for the victory of a social revolution and the achievement of its final goal—the building of a classless society.

The 9th resolution of the London Conference was approved by the Hague Congress in September 1872 and its main part was included in Article 7 of the General Rules.

At the end of 1864-beginning of 1865, the Paris section of the International, headed by Proudhonists, published the French translation of the Provisional Rules (Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Congrès ouvrier. Règlement provisoire. [Paris, s.a.]) and, at the end of 1865, issued a new edition almost without changes. There were, however, a number of inaccuracies and distortions of principle (see K. Marx, "The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland", present edition, Vol. 21).

"General Resolution as to the Countries where the Regular Organisation of the International is Interfered with by the Governments" (X) was moved by Marx on behalf of the General Council at the ninth session of the London Conference on September 22, 1871. Its contents were set forth in preliminary draft resolutions worked out by Marx and Engels (see this volume, p. 407) and also in Marx's speech at the meeting of the Sub-Committee of the General Council on September 9, 1871 (see this volume, p. 565).

"Resolutions Relating to France" (XI) were introduced by Utin at the eighth session of the London Conference on September 22, 1871 during the discussion of the state of the International's organisation in France. The resolutions were based on propositions expounded at this session by Marx. Of
the resolutions on this issue adopted by the Conference only the first two were published, which are given in this volume. The third resolution made the Belgian and Spanish federal councils and the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland ensure contacts between the French sections and the General Council and admit sections formed by French refugees to the respective federations. The fourth resolution proposed that the General Council publish an appeal to the French workers, calling on them to wage an open struggle against the counter-revolutionary government and, despite persecutions, to set up organisations of the International. At its meeting on October 24, however, the General Council resolved to abstain from publishing this appeal since it might do harm to the imprisoned Communards.

Note 277 “Resolution Relating to England” (XII)—was moved by Marx at the eighth session of the London Conference on September 22, 1871. Moving his motion, Marx noted that the General Council had previously opposed the formation of the Federal Committee or Council for England, because the English workers were represented on the General Council, which promoted their education in a spirit of proletarian internationalism and socialism and prevented the bourgeoisie from taking over the leadership of the English working-class movement. The tremendous amount of work carried out by the General Council after the establishment of the Paris Commune made, however, the formation of a Federal Council in England imperative. On October 21, 1871, a provisional London Federal Council, which included representatives of the London Section of the International and some trades unions, was set up.

Note 278 “Special Votes of the Conference” (XIII). The first resolution was moved by De Paepe and adopted at the eighth session of the London Conference on September 22. The second, adopted at the ninth session on September 22, was based on Marx’s speech on the position of the International in Germany and England, in which he noted the solidarity of the German workers with the Paris Commune, and also on a proposal introduced by Utin. The third one was adopted at the fifth session on September 20, in connection with the memorandum of the Spanish Federation on the organisation of the International in Spain. The fourth was moved by De Paepe at the ninth session, on September 22, in connection with Utin’s report on Nechayev’s case. Marx, who spoke on the issue, noted that the bourgeois press used the Nechayev conspiracy to slander the International (see Note 279).

The reference is to the activities of Nechayev, who had established contacts with Bakunin and started setting up a secret organisation called Narodnaya Rasprava (People’s Justice) in various cities in Russia. Having received from Bakunin the credentials of the non-existent European Revolutionary Union, Nechayev passed himself off as a representative of the International and thus misled the members of the organisation he had created.

When members of Nechayev’s organisation were arrested and put on trial in St. Petersburg in the summer of 1871, his adventurist methods to achieve his own ends were made public: blackmail, intimidation, deception, etc. The bourgeois press used Nechayev’s case to discredit the International. See “Declaration on Nechayev’s Misuse of the Name of the International” (present edition, Vol. 23).

Note 280 Resolution XIV—“Instruction to Citizen Outine”—was moved by Edouard Vaillant and adopted at the ninth session of the London Conference on
September 22, 1871, in connection with Utin's communication about the Nechayev trial. Marx moved that the report on the Nechayev trial should be submitted to the General Council. Using the material of the St. Petersburg trial, Utin wrote a detailed report in French; its main points he used in his speech at the Hague Congress in 1872. Marx and Engels used Utin's report while working on the assignment of the Hague Congress on The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association, in Chapter VIII "The Alliance in Russia" (see present edition, Vol. 23). p. 429

281 Resolution XV—"Convocation of Next Congress"—was moved, in a slightly different wording, by De Paepe and Eugène Steens at the ninth session of the London Conference on September 22, 1871. p. 429

282 Resolution XVI—"Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste"—was moved by Marx at the seventh session of the London Conference on September 21, 1871. After the question had been discussed in the commission (see this volume, pp. 411-12 and Note 256), this session heard Marx's report on the Alliance and Bakuninists' splitting activities in Switzerland and then passed Resolutions XVI and XVII. p. 429

283 Resolution XVII—"Split in the French-Speaking Part of Switzerland"—was moved by Marx at the seventh session of the London Conference on September 21, 1871. An abridged text of this resolution was published in a separate edition of the London Conference resolutions. The resolution was published in full in L'Égalité, No. 20, October 21, 1871 (see this volume, pp. 419-22). p. 430

284 This is Marx's covering letter to that of his daughter Jenny (see this volume, pp. 622-32). It was presumably written in reply to a request by the editors of Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly for an explanation of the rumours about Marx's death circulated by the bourgeois press. p. 432

285 Marx wrote the drafts of The Civil War in France, which are preparatory versions of this work, between mid-April and May 23, 1871; after this, he started work on the final version of The Civil War in France as an Address of the International Working Men's Association. Newspaper clippings and excerpts in Marx's notebook relating to the last week of the Paris Commune were used not in the second draft, but in the final text of the Address itself.

The manuscript of the first, more sizable draft, which seems to have survived in full, fills eleven sheets, 22 pages altogether. Judging by Marx's pagination (it is not on all sheets), the Second Draft consisted of 13 sheets, of which only 11 have survived. The missing sheets apparently contained item 4, which preceded extant item 5: "Opening of the civil war. 18 March Revolution. Clement Thomas. Lecomte. The Affaire Vendôme". The last three unnumbered pages (see this volume, pp. 545-51) contain, in the main, a new version of separate passages of the Second Draft. Marx marked a large part of the text of the First and Second Drafts with vertical and oblique lines, by which he usually indicated the passages included in the final version of a text. Words and sentences crossed out by Marx by horizontal lines are not reproduced in this edition (in some cases, the crossed out passages that are of importance are reproduced in the footnotes). Both manuscripts have numerous marks in the margins, parentheses, square brackets, etc., that Marx made for himself. They are not reproduced in the present edition.

When Marx quotes or mentions the decrees and proclamations of the
Commune, he often gives the dates according to their publication or reports of them in London newspapers.

The drafts were not published in Marx's and Engels' lifetime and for a long time after their death. Some excerpts from the First Draft were published first, in Russian, in the USSR in Pravda, Nos. 72 and 76, March 14 and 18, 1933; both drafts were first published in full in the USSR in 1934 in the language of the original (English), and in a Russian translation in Marx/Engels Archives, Vol. III (VIII), by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU.

286 On October 5, 1870, a demonstration of the workers' battalions of the National Guard took place in front of the Town Hall in Paris. The workers, led by Gustave Flourens, demanded that the Government of National Defence hold elections to the Commune, and take measures to strengthen the Republic and to fight resolutely against the invaders. The government rejected these demands and banned National Guard assemblies and armed demonstrations.

On the October 31, 1870 uprising see Note 184.

287 This refers to the new electoral qualifications introduced under the law of May 31, 1850, which was passed by the Legislative Assembly of the French Republic on the initiative of Thiers' Party of Order, frightened by the successes of the Democrats and Socialists at the by-elections to the Assembly in March and April 1850. The new electoral law, directed against the workers, agricultural labourers and poor peasants, introduced personal tax and three-year residential qualification. As a result, the number of voters fell by almost three million.

Shortly after the adoption of the 1850 electoral law, the salary of the President of the Republic, Louis Bonaparte, paid from the treasury, was raised by the Assembly from 600,000 to three million francs.

288 The attempts by the Normand millowners to reduce the wages of textile workers in order to compete more effectively with British manufacturers caused a big strike at Sotteville-lès-Rouen in late 1868 and early 1869. Meeting the strikers' request for support, the General Council of the International organised collection of funds for the strikers through the London and French trades unions. As Marx noted in the Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association (see present edition, Vol. 21), the strike, despite its defeat, promoted the organisation and unity of the workers in the Normand textile industry and led to the establishment of trades unions in Rouen, Elbeuf, Darnétal and other towns. It also consolidated an alliance between the English and French workers.

289 The reference is to the actions of the Blanquist Société des Saisons on May 12, 1839 (see Note 213).

290 This refers to the Comité de la réunion de la rue de Poitiers, the guiding body of the Party of Order (see Note 173). The Comité was dominated by the Orleanists, headed by Thiers.

291 When speaking of the Union libérale of 1847, Marx has in mind a group of so-called progressive conservatives that took shape in the French Chamber of Deputies after the elections of 1846. Its leaders were the Orleanists Girardin, Tocqueville, Dufaure and others.

The Union libérale was a coalition of bourgeois Republicans, Orleanists and a section of the Legitimists, formed during the elections to the Corps Législatif in
1863, on the common platform of opposition to the Empire. An attempt to
revive the Union libérale during the election campaign of 1869 failed owing to
differences between the parties that formed the 1863 coalition. p. 445

292 This refers to the Bonapartist coup d'état of December 2, 1851. p. 447

293 The Commission of Fifteen (Commission des Quinze) was appointed by
the National Assembly on March 20, 1871 to help Thiers' government fight
revolutionary Paris. It consisted mainly of monarchists and bourgeois republicans supporting Thiers; after the defeat of the Commune the Commission ceased to exist.
pp. 447, 541

294 Marx presumably intended to give examples of monarchist intrigues in the
Versailles National Assembly. The excerpts made by Marx from the newspa-
ers of the time contain information about the intrigues of the Duc d'Aumale
and his brother Prince Joinville, rumours about a merger of the Bourbons and
the Orleans and plans to put the Duc d'Aumale on the French throne.

295 The municipals or the Municipal Guard (from 1871—the Republican Guard)—
militarised foot and mounted police in Paris, formed by the government of the
July monarchy in 1830 to fight the revolutionary movement. In 1871, it became
the shock force of the counter-revolutionary Versailles army.

296 The London Convention, signed by Russia, Britain, Austria, Prussia and Turkey
in 1840, provided for aid to the Turkish Sultan against the Egyptian ruler
Mehemet Ali (see Note 100). As France supported Mehemet Ali, it faced
political isolation and the threat of a new anti-French coalition of the European
powers. By denying support to Mehemet Ali, which signified a major defeat of
French foreign policy in the Middle East, the French government secured its
participation in the signing of the London Convention on July 13, 1841. Russia,
Britain, France, Austria and Prussia, on the one hand, and Turkey, on the
other, agreed to close the Black Sea Straits for foreign men of war in
peacetime.

In the third English edition of The Civil War in France, Marx cites the
London Convention of 1840 as an example of the defeat of French diplomacy.

297 The Vienna Treaties were concluded at the Congress of Vienna (1814-15) in May
and June 1815 by the states that had participated in the Napoleonic wars. Under
these treaties, the map of Europe was redrawn with a view to restoring legitimate
monarchies, contrary to the interests of the unity and independence of nations.

The Paris Treaty—a preliminary peace treaty signed by France and
Germany on February 26, 1871 (see Note 179). p. 458

298 Marx has in mind the half-hearted bourgeois reforms carried out in feudal
Prussia from 1807 to 1811, after its defeat in the war against Napoleonic
France in 1806. The personal bondage of serfs was abolished, but they still had
to perform all the feudal services; their redemption was allowed only with the
consent of the landowner; limited local self-government was introduced and the
army and central government institutions reorganised.

299 At the Paris Congress (February-March 1856) the Russian diplomats took
advantage of the contradictions between Britain, Austria and France to secure
much milder peace terms for Russia which had lost the Crimean war: the
territorial concessions to Turkey were considerably reduced, Russia retained
her possessions in the Caucasus and the right to have her fleet and fortresses on
the Azov Sea. The Congress adopted a decision to put an end to the occupation
of Moldavia and Wallachia by Austria, which made Austria's expansion in the
Balkans much more difficult.

Speaking about the reforms in Russia after the Crimean war, Marx has in
mind the 1861 Reform which abolished serfdom, the local government
reforms (the introduction of Zemstvos in 1864) and the 1870 reform of
municipal administration, the introduction of new judicial regulations in 1864
and the financial reform. These reforms were a step towards the transforma-
tion of Russia into a bourgeois monarchy.

300 Marx gave a detailed description of the bourgeois republican faction rallied
round Le National and represented primarily by A. Marrast, A. T. Maire,
J. Bastide and L. E. Cavaignac, in his The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis

301 The (Great) Unpaid—an ironic name for magistrates in Britain, who were not
paid for their services. p. 461

302 The Ligue d'Union Républicaine pour les droits de Paris—a bourgeois organisation
set up in Paris in early April 1871. It tried to stop the Civil War, expecting that
an agreement between Versailles and Paris based on recognition of the
Republic and municipal liberties of Paris would lead to a peaceful elimination
of the Commune.

The manifestation of the freemasons was held on April 29, 1871: the fre-
emasons marched to the city fortifications to make the Versailles troops stop
military operations. On April 26 and 29, the Commune organised meetings
with the freemasons in the Town Hall striving to win over the republican petty
and middle bourgeoisie, whose views the freemasons expressed. At these
meetings, the freemasons, whose armistice proposals were rejected by Thiers,
declared their support for the Commune. The meeting on April 29 was
followed by the manifestation already mentioned, the delegates of the
Commune taking part in it. pp. 466, 543

303 Marx has in mind the “law of suspects” (Loi des suspects) passed by the Corps
Législatif on February 19, 1858; it gave the government and the emperor
unlimited powers to deport to various parts of France and Algeria or to exile
from France all persons suspected of a hostile attitude to the Second Empire.
p. 467

304 An Address from the Lyons municipal council, submitted to the National
Assembly by deputy Greppo, contained a demand to put an end to the Civil
War and for a reconciliation between Versailles and Paris. It also proposed
that functions be clearly divided between the National Assembly and the Pa-
ris Commune, and that the Commune's activities be limited to municipal matters.
p. 468

305 This refers to the municipal councils elected in 1865, with the Imperial
authorities exerting strong pressure. p. 468

306 Ligue des villes (League of the Cities) (full name: Ligue patriotique des villes
républicaines)—an organisation which bourgeois republicans, fearing the
restoration of the monarchy after the suppression of the Paris Commune, tried
to set up in April-May 1871. The provisional committee of the League, with the
active support of the Ligue d'Union Républicaine pour les droits de Paris (see Note
intended to convene a congress of municipal council representatives in Bordeaux on May 9, 1871, with the aim of bringing closer an end of the Civil War, consolidating the Republic and formalising the League. The Versailles Government banned the Congress and the provisional committee soon ceased to exist.

*Le Rappel* in its issue No. 692, May 6, 1871 carried the programme of the proposed congress of the *Ligue des villes.*

The news of the Sedan disaster and the revolution in Paris, which brought about the fall of the Empire on September 4, 1870, caused revolutionary actions of the workers in many towns of France. In Lyons, Marseilles and Toulouse organs of popular power—communes—were set up. Though they were short-lived, provincial communes, especially in Lyons, implemented a number of important revolutionary measures. The Government of National Defence brutally crushed the provincial communes.

On November 3, 1870, the Government of National Defence held a plebiscite in Paris on the question of support for the government, trying in this way to consolidate its unstable position, which had been demonstrated during the revolutionary events of October 31, 1870 (see Note 184). Although a considerable section of Parisians voted against the government’s policy, it succeeded, at the time of the actual state of siege, in winning a majority vote by exerting pressure on the population, carrying on demagogical propaganda, etc.

*Ryots*—hereditary tenants of state-owned lands in India. Here—Indian peasants.

On June 20, 1789, in response to Louis XVI’s attempt to frustrate a regular sitting of the States-General, which had proclaimed itself the National Assembly, the deputies of third estate who gathered in the Salle des Paumes (Tennis Court) at Versailles took an oath to stay there till the Constitution was adopted. The Tennis Court oath was one of the events that marked the prologue to the French Revolution.

A reference to the Paris *Société des prolétaires positivistes,* whose programme was based on Auguste Comte’s ideas. At the beginning of 1870, the General Council, taking into account the working-class composition of the society, admitted it to the International as a section; at the same time, the society’s programme was sharply criticised (see Marx’s letter to Engels of March 19, 1870, present edition, Vol. 49).

*Billingsgate* was one of the early gates into London; the fish-market situated nearby is named after it. Used figuratively, it can mean the abusive language of the market.

*Phalanstère*—palaces in which, according to the French utopian socialist, Charles Fourier, members of producer and consumer associations were to live and work in an ideal socialist society.

*Icarie*—an utopian communist country in Étienne Cabet’s *Voyage en Icarie* (1840), subsequently the name of communist colonies in America.

*National estates (Biens nationaux)*—real estate and movable property of the clergy, émigrés and enemies of the revolution confiscated by the government during the French Revolution. A considerable part of national property passed
Notes

to the bourgeoisie and rich peasants. During the Restoration period, the unsold lands from the national estates were returned to their former owners; owners whose lands had been sold received monetary compensation. p. 501

315 L'Association générale des Défenseurs de la République (the General Association of the Defenders of the Republic)—a bourgeois-democratic organisation founded in Paris in February 1871; its aim was to struggle for the Republic. It supported the Commune and condemned the policy of the Versailles Government. The quoted decision was published in the Journal officiel (Paris), No. 129, May 9, 1871. p. 507

316 The Constitution of 1793 was the Constitution of the First French Republic adopted by the Convention during the Jacobins' revolutionary dictatorship. p. 510

317 This refers to the participants in the Bonapartist coup d'état of December 2, 1851. p. 516

318 This refers to the convention on capitulation (see Note 118), which came into force for Paris on January 28 and for departments on January 31, 1871. pp. 523, 525

319 Oeil de Boeuf (Bull's eye)—named from its oval window, was the anteroom in the Palace of Versailles, where the courtiers waited for Louis XIV to wake up and appear. p. 524

320 The reference is to the invasion of France in 1814 and 1815 by the troops of the sixth and seventh anti-French coalitions headed by Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia, to overthrow Napoleon I's rule and restore the legitimate Bourbon monarchy. p. 524

321 A reference to the influence on the international trade of the discovery of gold in California and Australia in the mid-19th century. p. 536

322 Marx ironically hints at the dictum “L'état c'est moi” (“I am the state”) ascribed to the French King Louis XIV, which became the motto of absolutism. p. 538

323 This refers to the secession of the Southern slave states from the North American Union in late 1860 and early 1861. The armed rebellion of the secessionist states in April 1861 marked the beginning of the US Civil War (1861-65). p. 542

324 The Frankfort Peace Treaty, concluded on May 10, 1871, defined the final terms of the peace between France and Germany, confirming the concession of Alsace and Eastern Lorraine to Germany as was envisaged by the preliminary peace treaty of February 26, 1871 (see Note 179). Under the Frankfort treaty, France was to pay indemnities on more onerous terms and the occupation of French territory by the German troops was prolonged in exchange for help rendered by Bismarck to the Versailles Government in suppressing the Commune. The Frankfort Peace Treaty made a future military clash between France and Germany inevitable. p. 544

325 This presumably refers to the law on municipal organisation of 1831, which drastically curtailed the rights of municipal councils, and also the law on municipal organisation of 1855, which banned interrelations between councils. On the plan for convening a congress of municipal delegates at Bordeaux see Note 306. pp. 545, 593
Engels recorded in English and German the talk he and Marx had had with the 
British democratic journalist Robert Reid. On June 30, Reid offered Marx, for the 
defence of the Commune, the use of the material he had collected while in 
Paris during the Commune as correspondent for the London liberal newspaper 
The Daily Telegraph. Marx and Engels reported their talk to the General Council 
on July 4, 1871. Engels noted that Reid “had made some interesting statements 
which proved the villainous part acted by the press of this country towards the 
Commune”.

It was first published in the languages of the original (English and German) in 
Marx/Engels, Gesamtausgabe (MEGA), Vol. 1/22, pp. 244-45. p. 552

On April 12, 1871, the Federal Council of the Paris sections of the 
International passed a resolution expelling Tolain from the International as a 
deserter of the working class cause (see Note 155). On April 25, the General 
Council endorsed this by a special resolution which was published only by the 
working-class press (see this volume, p. 590). p. 553

As the English newspapers declared, the lecture was due on July 1, 1871 (see 
The Daily Telegraph, No. 5006, June 30, 1871; The Morning Advertiser, 
No. 24987, July 1, 1871). p. 553

The excerpts made by Marx and partly by Engels from the Minute Books of 
the General Council for 1869-71, which have survived, end on September 5, 
1871. They were made during the preparations for the London Conference of 
the International and were to serve as material for the General Council’s report 
to the Conference on the work of the International from 1869 to 1871. Related 
to them are excerpts from the minutes for June 1870-April 1872, made by 
Marx a year later, at the end of August 1872, on the eve of the Hague 
Congress of the International (see present edition, Vol. 23). Markings in the 
manuscripts testify that Marx and Engels used them in the course of their work 
on the International’s documents. The square brackets are Marx’s. The 
abbreviated words are written in full, without mentioning it.

Published in English for the first time in The Hague Congress of the First 
International, September 2-7, 1872. Minutes and Documents, Progress Publishers, 
Moscow, 1976, pp. 643-54.

The minutes are published in full in The General Council of the First 
International. 1868-1870, Moscow, 1966 and The General Council of the First 
International. 1871-1872, Moscow, 1968. p. 554

In his letter of September 3, 1869 Gustave Gluseret expressed his regret that 
he could not attend the Basle Congress and asked the delegates to work out a 
specific programme of action for the workers of all countries and to adopt an 
address to the American workers calling for solidarity with the International. 
p. 554

This refers to Eugène Varlin’s letter to Jung of September 29, 1869. As he 
intended to publish the Rules and Administrative Regulations of the 
International Working Men’s Association, Varlin asked Jung to send him all the 
resolutions of the Basle Congress concerning the relations of the General 
Council with federal councils, the procedure for expelling sections, etc. The 
French translation of the Rules, with some Proudhonist distortions, was published 
on September 19, 1869 in La Commerce,—a small newspaper of the commercial 
employees’ trade union. p. 554

On December 11, 1869, a specimen issue of Die Tagwacht, the organ of the 
German sections of the International in Switzerland, was published in Zurich. It
carried a programmatic article containing the following demands: separation of the church from the State and of the school from the church, free tuition in institutions of higher education, free medical aid, nationalisation of railways, prohibition of child labour in factories, a reduction of working hours, and government supervision over factories. A Bakuninist criticism of the programme appeared in *Le Progrès*, No. 28, December 25, 1869 and *L'Égalité*, No. 1, January 1, 1870.

This refers to the letter sent by the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland to Jung on January 4, 1870. The Council declared its disagreement with *L'Égalité*’s attacks on the General Council and stated that the Alliance of Socialist Democracy had not been admitted to the Romance Federation, nor had its aims anything to do with those of the International. The private letter written on the same date by the secretary of the Federal Council, Henri Perret, informed Jung about the Bakuninists' withdrawal from the editorial board of the paper. The letters were posted from Geneva prior to the receipt of the circular letter “The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland” (see present edition, Vol. 21).

This refers to the conflict between the old Lyons section (Schettel and others), which sided with the French Left Republicans, and the group under the Bakuninist Richard. See Marx's letter to Engels of February 19, 1870 (present edition, Vol. 43).

The reference is to Guillaume’s letter to Jung of April 21, 1870 in connection with the split at the Congress in La Chaux-de-Fonds (see Note 256).

At the meeting of the General Council on June 28, 1870, Weston said that, if the Alliance of Socialist Democracy “advised abstention from politics and acted upon that”, the General Council “would disqualify them from acting as administrators. The Alliance was only tolerated on condition of conforming to the Rules”.

This refers to the third trial (June 22-July 5, 1870) of the International members arrested in France for alleged participation in the conspiracy against Napoleon III. The charge fell through and the accused were tried for being members of the International (see Note 2).

This refers to the so-called French Section in London, founded in the autumn of 1865 by a group of French petty-bourgeois refugees in London, followers of Félix Pyat. Having lost contact with the International, they continued to call themselves the French section in London and to issue documents in the name of the International Working Men's Association. When a third trial against members of the International was being prepared in France, the incriminating material included documents of the so-called French section in London. The meeting of the General Council on May 10, 1870 adopted a resolution that the French section had nothing in common with the International (see present edition, Vol. 21).

At the General Council meeting on July 12, 1870 Lemaître “regretted very much that there should exist a difference between the Council and the French branch... He considered the differences only personal”.

On September 9, 1870 five members of the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party, a member of the Party and a printer, were arrested in Germany for publishing the manifesto on war (see this volume, p. 271). *Manifest des Ausschusses der socialdemokratischen Arbeiterpartei. An alle
deutschen Arbeiter! appeared as a leaflet on September 5, 1870 and was also published in Der Volksstaat, No. 73, September 11, 1870.

Four Social-Democrats who took part in the demonstration prohibited by the police were expelled from Mayence as not being natives or citizens of the town.

The deputation of English workers and democratic organisations was received by the Prime Minister Gladstone on September 27, 1870. It included several trade union leaders (Applegarth, Coulson, Dodson and others) and prominent bourgeois-democratic leaders (Beesly, Congreve). They asked for Britain to recognise the French Republic and to promote peace. Gladstone got away with indefinite promises to facilitate the termination of the war.

The news of the defeat at Sedan caused an uprising in Lyons on September 4, 1870. On his arrival in Lyons on September 15, Bakunin tried to head the movement and implement his anarchist programme. On September 28, the anarchists attempted a coup d’état, which was a complete failure. The Minute Book of the General Council mistakenly has “September 27”.

Marx is referring to the meetings of October 11 and 18, 1870, organised by Freundschaft (Friendship), a German nationalistic society in London. These meetings put forward, allegedly in the name of the German workers in London, the demand that Alsace and Lorraine be annexed. In reply, the German Workers’ Educational Society in London and the Teutonia Society issued a joint address to the German workers in London, exposing the groundless arguments of those who advocated the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. The address was published in Der Vorbote, Nos. 11 and 12, 1870 and as a leaflet in Geneva Erklärung des Londoner Arbeiter-Bildungs-Vereins und der Teutonia (1870).

The joint meeting of the German and French sections of New York was held on October 16, 1870. The address to the workers of Europe, adopted by these sections, was the first joint document of the New York sections of the International. It was published in a number of newspapers, and also issued in leaflet form in French and in English.

The Anglo-French Intervention Committee was founded in October 1870 by the petty-bourgeois leaders of the International Democratic Association (see Note 354) and trade union members of the Land and Labour League (see Note 350), with the leaders of the British Positivists playing a prominent role. Its programme demanded immediate recognition of the French Republic by Britain, condemnation of Prussia’s aggressive policy and the conclusion of a defensive treaty with France.

Taking advantage of the discontent with the British government’s pro-Prussian policy among part of the workers, the Committee’s leaders tried to head the movement in support of the French Republic and organised several meetings in London in October-November 1870.

From Sorge’s letter, dated October 30, 1870, Marx learned about the preparations for the mass anti-war meeting that was held in New York on November 19, 1870. It was organised by the International’s sections, trades unions, the Free Thinkers’ Society and other associations. Attended by nearly 2,000 people, the meeting adopted an address condemning the continued war against the French Republic and the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine, and
called on the US Government to exert its influence to render assistance to the French Republic.

The Central Committee of the International Working Men’s Association for the United States was formed on December 1, 1870 by delegates from several sections of the International: German Section No. 1, French Section No. 2 and Czech Section No. 3.

The German workers’ educational societies in Switzerland, whose press organ was the Swiss Felleisen, joined the International at their congress in Neuchâtel in August 1868. The growing nationalist tendencies in these societies after Germany’s victory in the Franco-Prussian war led to their withdrawal from the International (see Marx’s letter to Jung of January 18, 1871, present edition, Vol. 44).

On January 6 and 10, 1871, meetings for the recognition of the French Republic by Britain were held in St. James’s Hall. At these meetings Odger moved a resolution extolling the Government of National Defence and its Foreign Minister Jules Favre.

The Land Tenure Reform Association was founded in July 1869 under the auspices of John Stuart Mill. Its aim was to revive the class of small farmers by leasing small plots of waste land to the unemployed.

The Land and Labour League was set up in London in October 1869 with the participation of the General Council. The League’s programme was drawn up by Eccarius with Marx’s help (see Address of the Land and Labour League to the Working Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland, present edition, Vol. 21).

Marx held that the League could play a certain role in revolutionising the working class and regarded it as a means for establishing an independent proletarian party in England.

This refers to the Déclaration réglant divers points de droit maritime, a codicil to the Paris Treaty of 1856 which concluded the Crimean war of 1853-56. The Declaration set up rules for warfare at sea, envisaged the abolition of privateering, immunity of neutral goods in enemy vessels and of enemy goods in neutral vessels (with the exception of war contraband), and the recognition of a blockade only if actually effective.

In their speeches at the General Council meetings of January 31 and March 7, 1871, Marx and Engels put forward the demand that, because of the international situation, Britain should renounce the Paris Declaration, and argued that this step would serve as a means of preventing Tsarist Russia entering the Franco-Prussian war as Prussia’s ally.

In the autumn of 1870, the English republican movement gained strength as a result of the campaign for the recognition of the French Republic by Britain. In the spring of 1871, under the influence of the Paris Commune, a Left wing began to take shape which put social content into the republican slogans and actively supported the Commune. The General Council of the International took advantage of the numerous republican meetings to organise a campaign in support of the Commune.

One of the meetings was held at Wellington Music Hall on March 22, 1871. This meeting, chaired by Odger, resolved to form a Central Republican
Association and elected an Executive Committee, which included Odger, Eccarius and others. p. 562

353 Marx is referring to the letter from John Wallis, Secretary of the Canterbury Working Men's Mutual Protection Society, dated February 16, 1871. John Wallis asked that the English workers who wanted to emigrate to New Zealand be warned that there was unemployment there and that the authorities and police compelled immigrants to work for scanty wages. The letter was included in the report on the General Council meeting published in The Eastern Post, No. 137, May 13, 1871. p. 562

354 The International Democratic Association consisted of petty-bourgeois French and German immigrants in London and also included English Republicans.

In April 1871, members of the Association founded the Universal Republican League. Its leaders attempted to involve the General Council of the International in it, but their proposition was rejected unanimously at the General Council meeting on April 25, 1871 (see Engels' letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht of April 20, 1871, present edition, Vol. 44.) pp. 562, 597

355 In his letter of June 12, 1871, Cafiero wrote about his contacts with workers' societies in Italy. p. 563

356 The Refugees' Society, formed in London in July 1871, tried to take over the right to distribute money collected by the General Council for the refugees and to establish direct ties with the International's sections in other countries in order, bypassing the General Council, to obtain money collected by them for the refugees or information about the sums being sent to the General Council. Early in 1872, this society was reorganised into a mutual aid society. p. 564


359 In a letter to Marx of August 9, 1871, Truelove informed him that 200 copies of the first edition of The Civil War in France had not been sold out, of the second—600 copies, and all the copies of the third edition remained with him. In a letter of September 4, Truelove again requested payment of the bill. p. 567

360 Marx's speech on the Government of National Defence at the General Council meeting on January 17, 1871 was directed against Odger's praising of the government and its Foreign Minister Jules Favre, who was expected in London, at the meeting in St. James's Hall in London on January 10. Odger moved a resolution that extolled the Government of National Defence and contradicted the class approach taken towards it by the General Council in its Second Address on the Franco-Prussian war (see this volume, pp. 267-75). In connection with Marx's criticism of Odger's speech, the General Council discussed the question of the need for the members of the International to adhere to its principles at meetings.

This speech, like other speeches by Marx and Engels at the General Council meetings, has survived as a record in the Minute Book. The records for the period covered by this volume were made by Eccarius (up to May 1871) and later by Hales, they are brief and fragmentary, and often contain serious inaccuracies. The same applies to the newspaper reports of the General Council.
meetings made by Eccarius on their basis and published in *The Eastern Post*. In some cases, when the newspaper reports are fuller than the minutes, Marx's and Engels' speeches are given according to the newspaper reports. The minutes, as was the rule in the General Council, were approved at each subsequent meeting; on Marx's and Engels' demand, notes were often made concerning mistakes in the records.

This record was first published in *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 106-07. p. 571

361 The Paris demonstration on May 15, 1848 was organised by revolutionary clubs; nearly 150,000 people, mainly workers, took part in it. The participants marched to the Constituent Assembly, which was to discuss the Polish question that day, entered the conference hall and demanded military assistance to Poland in her struggle for independence, as well as decisive measures to combat unemployment and poverty. Since their demands were rejected, they declared the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly and the formation of a revolutionary government. The demonstration was dispersed by troops and bourgeois detachments of the National Guard. p. 571

362 The reference is to the *Executive Committee* (Commission exécutif)—the Government of the French Republic, set up by the Constituent Assembly on May 10, 1848, in place of the Provisional Government, which had resigned. It existed until June 24, 1848, when Cavaignac's dictatorship was established. p. 572

363 The reference is to the reactionary press laws passed by the Constituent Assembly on August 9 and 11, 1848. According to these laws, the periodicals had to make large deposits of money, which meant that progressive and workers' newspapers and journals had to close down; the laws also envisaged serious punishment (fines and imprisonment) for the printing of articles against the government, the existing order and private property. They were based on similar laws enacted during the Restoration and the July monarchy. p. 572

364 The minutes of the General Council meetings, extracts from which are given below, were first published in English in *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 108-57. The reports of the meetings were published in *The Eastern Post*, in January-March 1871. p. 573

365 This mass meeting was held in Trafalgar Square on January 23, 1871. It put forward a demand, in the name of the workers, that the British Government bring pressure to bear on Prussia in order to make the latter end the war against the French Republic. p. 573

366 This refers to excesses committed by trade unionists against strike-breakers in Sheffield in the autumn of 1866. The matter was investigated by a special government commission over several months in 1867 and was widely used by the bourgeois papers to discredit the trade unions and the working-class movement in general.

Speaking at a meeting in London on July 4, 1867, Beesly exposed the hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie who condemned the trade unionist excesses, but applauded General Eyre, who had savagely put down the Jamaica revolt of 1865. Beesly was ruthlessly persecuted by the bourgeois press for his speech. The London trade unions expressed their gratitude to Beesly in public. In July 1867, Marx wrote a letter of sympathy to Beesly in view of the campaign against him. p. 574
A reference to the remonstrance to Gladstone, published in *The Times* on December 30, 1870; it was signed by Beesly and other Positivists and also by some members of the General Council—Eccarius, Odger and Applegarth. Its last point called on the British Government to declare war on Prussia. p. 574

Analysing the military position of the French Republic, Engels compares the situation in October-November 1870—when the defence of Paris engaged considerable Prussian forces, and the Army of the Loire under the command of General Aurelle de Paladines carried out a successful operation against the Prussian army—with that in January 1871, after the battle at Le Mans in Western France, where the German troops defeated the newly formed Army of the Loire under the command of General Chanzy, which suffered serious losses and had to retreat (see this volume, pp. 236-39). p. 575

The *Peninsular War* was the name given to the joint military operations by the British, Spanish and Portuguese armies against Napoleon's troops on the Peninsula from 1808 to 1814 (see also notes 76 and 101).

The *Crimean war* (1853-56) was waged by Russia against a coalition of Britain, France and Turkey for supremacy in the Middle East. The course of military operations and the results of the war were analysed by Marx and Engels in the articles included in Vols. 13, 14 and 15 of the present edition. p. 575

The meeting on January 5, 1871 in the hotel in Cannon Street, chaired by the lawyer J. Merriman, called on the British Government to make efforts to end the Franco-Prussian war and to recognise the French Republic. p. 577

This refers to the mass demonstrations in London in June and July 1855 as a consequence of Parliament's decision to limit the working hours of taverns and places of entertainment and to prohibit retail trade on Sundays. Marx participated in one of the demonstrations (see present edition, Vol. 14, pp. 302-07, 323-27). p. 578

A reference is evidently to the following speeches: by Lowe, Chancellor of the Exchequer, on September 16, 1870 in Elgin; by Bruce, Home Secretary, on September 26 in Glasgow; and by Cardwell, M.P., on October 14, in Oxford. All the speakers demanded that Britain observe strict neutrality. p. 579

What is meant here is the exchange of Notes between Bernstorff, Prussian Ambassador to London, and Lord Granville, British Foreign Secretary, that took place in August to October 1870 in connection with British supplies of arms and other equipment to France. p. 579

This refers to the British ship *International*, detained by customs officials in the mouth of the Thames on December 21, 1870; it carried submarine cable for the line to be laid between Dunkirk and Bordeaux. On January 17, 1871, a British court found the actions of the customs officials illegal. p. 579

The *Holy Alliance*—an association of European monarchs, founded in 1815, to suppress revolutionary movements and preserve feudal monarchies in European countries. Later, the phrase was often used to denote a coalition of counter-revolutionary powers. p. 582

This refers to the international conference of representatives from Russia, Britain, Austria-Hungary, Germany, France, Italy and Turkey, held in London.
from January to March 1871, to discuss the revision of the Paris Treaty of 1856.  

This speech of Engels begins a series of reports by Marx and Engels on the proletarian revolution in Paris on March 18, 1871, which they made regularly at the General Council meetings. Basing his report on letters received from Paris, Engels refutes the bourgeois press stories that gave a distorted picture of the events of March 18. The minutes of this meeting, with the record of Engels' speech, were mistakenly dated March 14; Marx, when looking through them, corrected the date to March 21.


Engels has in mind the National Assembly, extremely reactionary in its composition, elected on February 8 and opened on February 12, 1871 in Bordeaux (see Note 178).

In their speeches on the republican movement in England, Marx and Engels summed up the discussion of this issue at the General Council meeting on March 28, 1871 in connection with the report of the General Council deputation to the republican meetings. The deputation included Hales, Weston, Jung and Serraillier; its report said that Serraillier's speech at the meeting in the Wellington Music Hall on March 22 (see Note 352) was well received and that a resolution expressing support for the Paris workers was passed unanimously. It was also noted that the meeting adopted a very moderate, bourgeois republican resolution moved by Odger.

During the discussion, the General Council members criticised the position taken by Odger and other trade union leaders, confining the programme of the republican movement to the slogan of a bourgeois republic in France.


The elections to the Commune took place on March 26, 1871. After the victorious uprising of the Paris people, on March 18-28, 1871, power was held by the Central Committee of the National Guard, which then handed it over to the Commune.

This laconic remark by Engels refers to Favre's speech in the National Assembly on April 10, 1871. Favre tried to justify the Versailles Government, which had actually concluded an alliance with Bismarck in order to suppress the Paris Commune, and hypocritically stated that the government had rejected the help offered by Bismarck. In a number of articles and speeches, particularly in Marx's *The Civil War in France* (see this volume, pp. 346-55), Marx and Engels exposed the treacherous agreement between the French counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and the country's enemies for the purpose of suppressing the working-class movement.

For a long time, Marx's speech at the General Council meeting of April 25, 1871 was not published in full because page 216 was missing from the Minute Book. The text of this page found later was first published in English in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung* (Berlin), 1978, No. 3, p. 402.
384 The reference is to the report of the Central Committee of the North-American Sections, dated April 2, 1871 and signed by Sorge. p. 589

385 Serraillier was elected to the Commune at the additional elections on April 16, 1871, from the Paris 2nd arrondissement. Eugène Dupont, a member of the General Council, was also nominated, but he did not stand, because he was unable to leave England for Paris. J. M. A. Dupont was elected from the 17th arrondissement. p. 590

386 In his letter to Leo Frankel of April 26, 1871, written on the instructions of the General Council, Marx refuted the slanderous attacks on Serraillier made by petty-bourgeois democrat Félix Pyat (see present edition, Vol. 44). p. 591

387 Paul Lafargue stayed in Paris from April 6 to 12, 1871. p. 591

388 Published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 189-90, 192. p. 593

389 Engels seconded Jung's proposal to send a delegation from the General Council to the celebrations of the centenary of Robert Owen's birth, which were to take place on May 16, 1871, in Freemason's Hall, London. p. 593

390 Mottershead objected to participation in the celebrations on the grounds that Owen "had not been quite so original as Engels seemed to think. His socialism he had had from older French writers, his religious ideas from Locke". Besides, Mottershead ascribed to Engels the allegation that Owenite socialists were Chartists (see *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 191-92). p. 594

391 Marx's speech at the General Council meeting on May 23, 1871, started the debate on the need to expose the Versailles Government and voice a protest against the brutal reprisals against the Communards being prepared by Thiers. In his speech on this issue (only a short record of it was made in the Minute Book) Engels stressed the treacherous behaviour of Thiers, who had promised to be lenient to the Communards. The General Council also decided to form a commission to find out what measures could be taken in England to put a stop to the brutalities of the Versailles Government. p. 595

392 *Fenian Brotherhood*, or Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood—a secret organisation founded in the late 1850s among Irish immigrants in America and later in Ireland. Its members fought for the establishment of an independent Irish Republic through an armed uprising. Objectively, the Fenians voiced the interests of the Irish peasants, although they mainly belonged to the urban petty bourgeoisie and democratic intellectuals. Marx and Engels more than once pointed to the shortcomings of the Fenian movement and criticised the Fenians for their conspiratorial tactics and their sectarian and bourgeois-nationalistic views. At the same time they highly appreciated its revolutionary character.

*Carbonari* were members of a secret society active in Italy in the first three decades of the nineteenth century, and in France in the 1820s.

*Marianne* was the name of a secret republican society founded in France in 1850; during the Second Empire it opposed Napoleon III. p. 597

393 Marx's speech is recorded in the Minutes of the General Council meeting on June 20, 1871 as follows: "Citizen Marx then proposed that a letter should be sent to the *Examiner* and *Spectator* denouncing the pretended manifestoes of the Paris section of the International; they were all forgeries of the Versailles
police” (The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes, Moscow, 1967, p. 220). The letter written by Engels on behalf of the General Council did not appear in the aforementioned newspapers and only a rough draft of it has survived (see this volume, p. 379). p. 599

Hans Breitmann’s Ballads by the American humorous author Ch. G. Leland were written in a peculiar Anglo-German dialect. p. 600

The correspondent’s record is inaccurate. It was the textile workers who went on strike in Barcelona in the spring of 1871, while the cigar-makers’ strike occurred at the same time in Antwerp (see this volume, pp. 294-96). p. 602

In an attempt to strengthen its weakened positions, the government of Napoleon III scheduled a plebiscite for the spring of 1871. The questions were formulated in such a way that it was impossible to express disapproval of the Second Empire’s policy without simultaneously opposing all democratic reforms. Along with this demagogic address to the popular (mostly peasant) masses, repressions were taken against the proletarian and left-wing republican movements (see present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 127-28). p. 603

The public meeting to celebrate the anniversary of the June 1848 insurrection of the Paris workers was held on June 29, 1868 at Cleveland Hall in London. The French petty-bourgeois democrat Félix Pyat delivered a speech and moved a provocative resolution urging terroristic acts against Napoleon III (the resolution was published in The Bee-Hive, No. 351, July 4, 1868). The Brussels L’Éspiègle, No. 25 on July 5, 1868 published a report on the meeting describing it as a meeting of International members, with Pyat as one of its leaders. This statement was repeated in other newspapers. The General Council held that this might discredit the International in the eyes of the workers and serve the Bonapartist government as a pretext for persecuting its members in France and Belgium. Consequently, at its meeting on July 7 the Council resolved, on Marx’s proposal, to disavow Pyat’s behaviour in a resolution to this effect (see present edition, Vol. 21).

Pyat’s group lost its ties with the International, but continued to act in its name and repeatedly supported antiproletarian groups opposing Marx’s line in the General Council. On May 10, 1870, the General Council officially dissociated itself from this group (see present edition, Vol. 21). p. 605

The interview ended as follows: “I have here given you as well as I can remember them the heads of my conversation with this remarkable man. I shall leave you to form your own conclusions. Whatever may be said for or against the probability of its complicity with the movement of the Commune we may be assured that in the International Association the civilized world has a new power in its midst with which it must come to a reckoning for good or ill.” p. 606

Before Engels took the floor at the General Council meeting, Marx made a report on Pope Pius IX’s speech against the International. p. 607

Engels has in mind the so-called “principle of nationalities” advanced by the ruling circles of the Second Empire and used extensively by them as an ideological screen for their aggressive plans and adventurist foreign policy. Posing as a “defender of nations”, Napoleon III made use of national interests
of the oppressed peoples to strengthen France's hegemony and extend her frontiers. The "principle of nationalities" was designed to stir up national hatred and to turn the national movement, especially that of small nations, into a weapon of counter-revolutionary policy of the rival powers. This principle was exposed by Marx in his pamphlet *Herr Vogt* (present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 133-83) and by Engels in his work "What Have the Working Classes to Do with Poland?" (present edition, Vol. 20). p. 608

Having adopted Engels' proposal on the convocation of the London conference, the General Council at its meeting on July 25, 1871, instructed the Sub-Committee (see Note 238) to work out its programme. It also resolved that the conference should discuss the splitting activities of the Bakuninist Alliance of Socialist Democracy in Romance Switzerland (see Note 256).

Published in English for the first time in *The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*, Moscow, 1967, pp. 244-45. p. 609

Marx spoke against Odger, in connection with his shift to the position of bourgeois republicanism, open renunciation of the International's principles and slanderous attacks on the General Council and the Paris Commune. p. 610

The resolution abolishing the office of President of the General Council, adopted at the General Council meeting of September 24, 1867, was confirmed by the Basle Congress of the International (September 1869). p. 611

Marx's speech at the opening of the London Conference has reached us in two versions.

Like the speeches of other delegates, it was recorded in French in the minutes of the Conference sessions by the two secretaries, Martin and Rochat. The English minutes are not extant.

Another version of Marx's speech was given by Eccarius in his article on the London Conference, published anonymously in *The Scotsman*, No. 87, October 2, 1871.

Marx said that the conference was "a meeting of delegates from different countries, rendered necessary by extraordinary circumstances, to consult with the General Council about urgent matters arising out of these extraordinary circumstances; but that this conference could not appoint a new General Council, or transfer the seat of the General Council, or alter the fundamental Rules of the Association. Its province was to decide upon tactics, policy, and organisation within the limits of the existing Rules, and to devise measures for carrying out these rules more effectually". p. 613

Marx has in mind the trial of the members of Nechayev's organisation (see Note 279), which took place in St. Petersburg from July 1, 1871.

On September 22, 1871, the London Conference instructed the General Council to inform the public that the International Working Men's Association had nothing in common with Nechayev's activities. On October 16, the General Council adopted a relevant resolution drafted by Marx (see present edition, Vol. 23). p. 613

Marx spoke about the trades unions during the discussion on the draft resolution submitted by Delahaye at the fifth session of the London Conference on September 20, 1871 (see Note 271). p. 614

The reference is to the Basle Congress resolution on the trades unions, one of whose clauses instructed the General Council to promote international
Notes 705


p. 614

During the discussion on the international contacts of trade unions, Steens, a delegate from Belgium, expressed an apprehension that in case of international federation of trade unions the national trades unions might be absorbed by the English ones.

p. 614

The reference is to Chartism, the workers' political movement in Great Britain from the 1830s to the early 1850s under the slogan of the People's Charter, which included the demand for universal suffrage and certain conditions to ensure this right to the workers.

pp. 615, 634

This refers to the Executive Committee of the Reform League, set up on the initiative and with the participation of the Central (General) Council of the International in London in the spring of 1865 as the political centre of the mass movement for the electoral reform. The League's leading bodies—the Council and the Executive Committee—included the General Council members, mainly trade union leaders and representatives of bourgeois radicals. Unlike the bourgeois parties, which confined their demands to suffrage for householders and tenants, the League demanded suffrage for the entire adult male population. This revived Chartist slogan secured it the support of the trades unions, hitherto indifferent to politics. The vacillations of the radicals in its leadership and the conciliatory behaviour of the trade union leaders prevented the League, however, from following the line charted by the General Council of the International. The British bourgeoisie succeeded in splitting the movement and a moderate reform was carried out in 1867, granting franchise only to the petty bourgeoisie and the upper strata of the working class.

p. 616

On the discussion at the London Conference of the political action by the working class, see notes 253 and 273.

p. 616

The original text of the Rules of the International Working Men's Association was written by Marx in English in October 1864 and approved by the Central Council on November 1 of that year as the Provisional Rules (see present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 14-16). At the Geneva Congress in 1866, the Rules were confirmed, with some additions and amendments, together with the Administrative Regulations appended to them. In the autumn of 1866, the Rules and Administrative Regulations were translated by Marx and Lafargue into French and, late in November, published in London as a pamphlet that included the basic changes introduced at the Geneva Congress (see present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 441-46). In 1867, the English text of the Rules and Administrative Regulations was printed in London; it took account of the changes introduced by the Geneva and Lausanne congresses since the adoption of the Provisional Rules in 1864. At the next congresses—in Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869)—a number of resolutions were adopted that constituted addenda to the Rules. However, the texts of the Rules without these addenda and amendments were current at the time. The English editions published after the Geneva and Lausanne congresses also contained some substantial inaccuracies. Besides, there was no official edition of the Rules in different languages, which led to poor translations of them circulating in a number of countries. The French translation of 1866, prepared by Tolain, a Right-wing Proudhonist, distorted
the most important proposition of the role of political struggle for the emancipation of the working class. Considering all these circumstances, the London Conference adopted a resolution, drafted by Marx, on the publication of a new, authentic edition of the Rules and Administrative Regulations in English, German and French. It also resolved that all translations into other languages should be approved by the General Council.

At the end of September-October 1871, Marx and Engels prepared a new edition of the Rules and Administrative Regulations, taking into account the resolutions of all the congresses of the International and of the London Conference. They rewrote the Appendix that substantiated all the amendments and addenda in detail. Marx and Engels directly supervised the translation of the Rules and Regulations into German and French. The official English edition—General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association—appeared as a pamphlet in London early in November, in French—in December 1871; in German the Rules and Regulations were published in pamphlet form in Leipzig and also in the newspaper Der Volksstaat, No. 12, February 10, 1872. For lack of money, the General Council failed to publish the official edition of the Rules and Regulations, prepared with Engels' participation, in Italian. They were issued in Italian in abridged form by La Plebe and L'Eguaglianza publishers.

Marx has in mind certain dubious elements and traitors who made their way into the Central Committee of the National Guard in Paris, which was of a mixed character (Blanquists, neo-Jacobins, Proudhonists, etc.). Such people on the Central Committee functioning as the revolutionary government from March 18 to 28, 1871 (when the Commune was proclaimed), as well as absence of political unity among them, were the main reasons for the serious mistakes it committed (see this volume, pp. 509-10).

This refers to the congress of the American National Labour Union, which took place from August 7 to 10, 1871 (see Note 141).

The reference is to Utin's motion to instruct the General Council to draw up the final text of the resolution "Political Action of the Working Class", taking into account Vaillant's proposal and Serrailier's and Frankel's amendments made during the discussion of this question at the Conference. The London Conference adopted Utin's motion.

This is Marx's brief report as Corresponding Secretary of the General Council for Germany; other corresponding secretaries and delegates also made reports. The part of his speech dealing with England is an addition to his speeches on trades unions (this volume, pp. 614-15).

The congress of the Union of German Workers' Associations (Verband Deutscher Arbeitervereine) in Nuremberg on September 5-7, 1868, resolved to join the International. In 1869 in Eisenach, the Union was reorganised into the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei). Its Dresden Congress (August 12-15, 1871) decided to campaign for a shorter working day, a genuine universal suffrage, etc., and reaffirmed the decision to join the International by stating in its resolution on the party organ, Der Volksstaat, that it maintained the ideological ties between German Social-Democracy and the International Working Men's Association.

Marx sent his daughter Jenny's letter to the editors of Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly; it was published in the journal together with Marx's covering letter (see this volume, p. 432).
419 *Pétroleuses* was the nickname given by the reactionary press to the Paris women workers falsely accused by the Versailles courts of setting fire to houses during street fighting in Paris in May 1871. 

420 Marx made this speech at the ceremonial meeting on the occasion of the 7th anniversary of the International, held in London on September 24, 1871. The meeting was chaired by Marx and attended by the delegates to the London Conference, members of the General Council and refugee Communards. The report on this meeting, mistakenly dated September 25, was published in *The World*; it gave a brief rendering of Marx's speech, which is reproduced in this volume.

421 This refers to the February 1848 revolution in France.
NAME INDEX

A

Affre, Denis Auguste (1793-1848)—Archbishop of Paris (1840-48); shot by the soldiers of the government troops during the June 1848 uprising in Paris when he tried to persuade the insurgent workers to lay down their arms.—352, 446, 528

Albert (1828-1902)—Saxon Crown Prince, King of Saxony from 1873; German general, field marshal-general from 1871; commanded the 12th (Saxon) Corps and subsequently the Fourth (Meuse) Army during the Franco-Prussian war.—74, 147, 155

Albrecht, Friedrich Heinrich (1809-1872)—Prussian prince, German general; commanded the Fourth Cavalry Division during the Franco-Prussian war.—169

Albrecht, Friedrich Wilhelm Nikolaus (1837-1906)—Prussian prince, son of the above; German general, subsequently field marshal-general; commanded a cavalry brigade during the Franco-Prussian war.—223

Alexander (1845-1894)—Russian Grand Duke, son of Alexander II; heir to the Russian throne from 1865; Emperor Alexander III from 1881.—282

Alexander I (1777-1825)—Emperor of Russia (1801-25).—7

Alexander II (1818-1881)—Emperor of Russia (1855-81).—267, 276, 281, 282

Alexander of Macedon (Alexander the Great) (356-323 B.C.)—general and statesman of antiquity; King of Macedon (336-323 B.C.).—12

Alexandra (Alexandra Caroline Maria Charlotte Louisa Julia) (1844-1925)—daughter of Christian IX, King of Denmark; in 1863 married Prince of Wales, who from 1901 reigned as Edward VII, King of Great Britain and Ireland.—324, 528

Alvensleben, Konstantin von (1809-1892)—German general; commanded the Third Corps during the Franco-Prussian war.—42

Applegarth, Robert (1833-1925)—a leader of the British trade unions, cabinet-maker; 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.—7, 270, 431, 562, 564
Arnold, Georges Léon (1837-1912) — French architect; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune and of its Military Commission; was deported to New Caledonia in 1872; after the amnesty of 1880 returned to Paris. — 381

Assi, Adolphe Alphonse (1841-1886) — French mechanic; organised strike movement in Creusot (1870); one of the accused at the third Paris trial against the International in 1870; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; headed the capture of Hôtel de Ville on March 18, 1871; was sentenced to exile to New Caledonia in 1871 — 292, 365, 400, 403, 563

Aster, Ernst Ludwig von (1778-1855) — Prussian general and military engineer, fortifications expert. — 88

Aubry, Hector Emile (1829-1900) — French worker, lithographer; Proudhonist, member of the International; Corresponding Secretary of the Rouen section and Federation of the International; delegate to the Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International; took part in the Paris Commune; in 1873 emigrated to Belgium. — 560

Augusta, Marie Louise Katharina (1811-1890) — wife of William I, King of Prussia. — 80, 189

Aulnois — French prosecutor. — 558

Aumale, Henri Eugène Philippe Louis d'Orléans, Duc d' (1822-1897) — son of Louis Philippe, King of France; emigrated to England after the February 1848 revolution; deputy to the National Assembly (1871). — 450

Aurelle de Paladines, Louis Jean Baptiste d' (1804-1877) — French general; commanded the Army of the Loire during the Franco-Prussian war; Commander of the Paris National Guard (March 1871); deputy to the National Assembly (1871). — 168, 169, 176-78, 181, 203-05, 210, 320, 322, 441, 508-10, 546, 575, 585

B

Bakunin, Mikhail Alexandrovich (1814-1876) — Russian revolutionary and journalist; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; subsequently an ideologist of Narodism and anarchism; opposed Marxism in the First International; was expelled from the International at the Hague Congress (1872) for his splitting activities. — 376, 411

Balan, Hermann Ludwig von (1812-1874) — German diplomat, envoy to Brussels (1865-74). — 275

Barnekow, Albert Christoph Gottlieb, Baron von (1809-1895) — German general; commanded the 16th Division during the Franco-Prussian war. — 32

Barrai, Eugène (1808-1890) — French general; during the Franco-Prussian war inspector-general of the army training camps. — 203

Barthélémy Saint Hilaire, Jules (St. Hilaire) (1805-1895) — French philosopher and politician; member of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; deputy to the National Assembly (1871); member of the Versailles Commission of the Fifteen and manager of Thiers' office (1871-73). — 390

Bastelica, André Augustin (1845-1884) — took part in the French and Spanish working-class movement, printer; member of the International; Bakuninist; participant in the revolutionary uprising in Marseilles in October-November 1870; member of the General Council of the International (1871), delegate to the London Conference (1871). — 616, 618

Bataille, Henri Jules (1816-1882) — French general; commanded a divi-
sion of the Second Corps at the beginning of the Franco-Prussian war.—22

Bazaine, François Achille (1811-1888)—French marshal; monarchist; headed the French armed intervention in Mexico (1863-67); commanded the Third Corps and then the Army of the Rhine during the Franco-Prussian war; capitulated at Metz in October 1870.—32, 34, 38, 41, 42, 51, 53, 54, 57-59, 62, 65-73, 75, 76, 82, 87, 127, 129, 136, 150, 152, 154-56, 159-61, 166, 182

Behel, Ferdinand August (1840-1913)—a major figure in the international and German working-class movement; turner; President of the League of German Workers’ Unions from 1867; member of the First International from 1866; one of the founders and leaders of the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party; deputy to the Reichstag of the North German Confederation in 1867-70; took a proletarian, internationalist stand during the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71; came out in support of the Paris Commune; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—272, 274, 278, 617, 619

Beesly, Edward Spencer (1831-1915)—English historian and politician, Professor at London University; radical, positivist philosopher; a leader of the campaign for the recognition of the French Republic by the British government; supported the Paris Commune in the English press.—364

Benedek, Ludwig von (1804-1881)—Austrian general; Commander-in-Chief of the Austrian Army fighting against the Prussians during the Austro-Prussian war of 1866.—35

Bergeret, Jules Henri Marius (1830-1905)—member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; general of the National Guard; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England, and later to the USA.—325, 510, 511, 529

Berry, Marie Caroline Ferdinande Louise de Bourbon, duchesse de (1798-1870)—mother of Count Chambord, Legitimist pretender to the French throne; in 1832 attempted to start an uprising in Vendée with the aim of overthrowing Louis Philippe.—315, 454, 503, 520

Berruyer, Pierre Antoine (1790-1868)—French lawyer and politician; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Legitimist.—524

Beslay, Charles Victor (1795-1878)—French entrepreneur and politician; member of the International; Proudhonist; member of the Paris Commune and its Finance Commission; its delegate at the Bank of France; pursued a policy of non-interference in the latter’s internal affairs and abstention from its nationalisation; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to Switzerland.—317, 453

Bigot, Léon (1826-1872)—French lawyer and journalist, Left republican; after the suppression of the Commune became the Communards’ defence counsel before the Versailles court.—400

Bismarck-Schönhausen, Otto, Prince von (1815-1898)—statesman of Prussia and Germany, diplomat; Prussian representative in the Federal Diet in Frankfurt am Main (1851-59); ambassador to St. Petersburg (1859-62) and Paris (1862); Prime Minister of Prussia (1862-71) and Chancellor of the German Empire (1871-90); carried through the unification of Germany by counter-revolutionary means.—5, 112-14, 125, 134, 248, 249, 267, 274, 275, 303, 313, 314, 317, 318, 320, 321, 340, 343, 346, 347, 353, 358, 359, 362, 393, 438, 444, 450-53, 459, 467, 482, 483, 501, 505, 517, 523,
Blanc, Jean Joseph Louis (1811-1882) —
French petty-bourgeois socialist, historian; member of the Provisional Government and President of the Luxembourg Commission (1848); pursued a policy of conciliation with the bourgeoisie; emigrated to England (August 1848) and became a leader of the petty-bourgeois refugees in London; deputy to the National Assembly (1871); came out against the Paris Commune.—386, 497, 503, 571, 598, 611

Blanqui, Louis Auguste (1805-1881) —
French revolutionary, utopian communist; organised several secret societies and plots; active participant in the revolution of 1830; adhered to the extreme Left of the democratic and proletarian movement during the 1848 revolution; a leader of the uprising of October 31, 1870 in Paris; was elected member of the Commune in his absence while in prison.—292, 319, 323, 352, 399, 471, 478, 480, 527

Blücher, Gebhard Leberecht von, Prince of Wahlstatt (1742-1819) — Prussian field marshal-general; took part in wars against the French Republic and Napoleonic France.—72, 196

Bonaparte — dynasty of French emperors (1804-14, 1815 and 1852-70).—156, 451

Bonaparte — see Napoleon I

Bonaparte, Joseph (1768-1844) — eldest brother of Napoleon I, King of Naples (1806-08) and Spain (1808-13).—160

Bonaparte, Louis — see Napoleon III

Bonaparte, Prince Napoléon Joseph Charles Paul (1822-1891) — cousin of Napoleon III, nicknamed Plon-Plon and the Red Prince.—301

Bonjean, Louis Bernard (1804-1871) —
French lawyer, Right Republican; commanded the Légion d'honneur; remained in Paris during the Paris Commune; was shot in La Roquette in April 1871.—401

Boon, Martin James — participant in the British working-class movement; mechanic; supported the social-reformist views of the Chartist James O'Brien; member of the General Council of the International (1869-72); Secretary of the Land and Labour League; member of the British Federal Council (1872).—7, 270, 355, 382, 431

Bora, Giovanni — member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for Italy in 1870.—8, 270

Bouis, Casimir Dominique (c. 1843-1916) — French journalist; Blanquist; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; after the suppression of the Commune was deported to New Caledonia.—478

Bourbaki, Charles Denis Sauter (1816-1897) — French general, Greek by birth; commanded the Guard and later the 18th Corps and the Army of the East during the Franco-Prussian war.—138, 187, 203, 207, 209, 210, 222, 226-30, 236-37, 241-49, 251, 252, 255-58

Bourbons — royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15 and 1815-30).—459, 460, 540

Bower, Elyott — Paris correspondent of The Morning Advertiser (1871).—552

Bradnick, Frederick — member of the General Council of the International (1870-72); delegate to the London Conference of 1871; following the Hague Congress (1872), together with the reformist wing of the British Federal Council opposed its decisions; expelled from the International by decision of the General Council in May 1873.—7, 270, 355, 382, 431
Brass, August (1818-1876)—German journalist; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; emigrated to Switzerland after its defeat; follower of Bismarck from the 1860s; editor-in-chief of the Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung.—300

Bressolles, Antoine Aubin (1828-1891)—French general, commanded the 24th Corps of the Army of the Loire during the Franco-Prussian war.—241

Broadhead, William (1815-1879)—British trade-unionist; secretary of the Union of Knife-Makers (1848-67).—574

Bruce, Henry Austin, 1st Baron Aberdare (1815-1895)—British statesman, Liberal, Home Secretary (1868-73).—563, 579

Brunel, Paul Antoine Magloire (b. 1830)—French officer, Blanquist; took part in the uprising of October 31, 1870; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; was gravely wounded by the Versaillists in May 1871; emigrated to England after the suppression of the Commune; in his absence was sentenced to death in Paris in 1871, which was commuted to five years' imprisonment in 1872.—357

Butler, Benjamin Franklin (1818-1893)—American politician and general, Democrat; during the US Civil War commanded the expeditionary Northern Army which occupied New Orleans; military Governor of New Orleans.—582

Buttery, G. H.—member of the General Council of the International (1871-72).—355, 382, 431

C

Cabet, Étienne (1788-1856)—French lawyer and writer, utopian communist, author of Voyage en Icarie (1840); one of the organisers of communist communes in North America in 1848-56.—357, 362

Cadiot (Cadrot)—participant in the Paris Commune.—562

Cafiero, Carlo (1846-1892)—Italian lawyer, member of the First International; pursued the policy of the General Council in Italy in 1871; from 1872, one of the founders of the Italian anarchist organisations; abandoned anarchism at the end of the 1870s; in 1879 published a brief summary of Volume I of Capital in the Italian language.—563

Caihill, Edward—member of the General Council of the International (1870-71).—270, 355, 382

Calonne, Charles Alexandre de (1734-1802)—French statesman; controller of finances (1783-87); a leader of the counter-revolutionary émigrés during the French Revolution.—343, 457, 543

Canrobert, François Certain (1809-1895)—French general, Marshal of France from 1856; Senator, Bonapartist; an active participant in the coup d'état of December 2, 1851.—33, 38, 40, 41, 45, 54, 58, 62, 66, 78, 154, 158-59

Caporusso, Stefano—Italian worker, tailor; follower of Bakunin; one of the founders of the Naples section of the International; expelled from the section in 1870.—559

Cardinal von Widdern, Georg (1841-1920)—Prussian officer and military writer, author of works on strategy, tactics, military geography and history; participant in the Franco-Prussian war.—17, 18

Cardon, Émile.—398

Cardwell, Edward Cardwell, Viscount (1813-1886)—British statesman, a Peelite leader, later Liberal; President of the Board of Trade (1852-55), Secretary for Ireland (1859-61), Sec-
retary for the Colonies (1864-66) and Secretary for War (1868-74).—579

Carnot, Lazare Nicolas Marguerite (1753-1823)—French mathematician; political and military leader of the French Revolution, Jacobin; member of the Directory (1795-97); War Minister during the Consulate.—47

Carrel, Armand (1800-1836)—French journalist; moderate republican; a founder and editor of Le National.—454, 456

Castagny, Armand Alexandre de (1807-1900)—French general; commanded the Second Division of the Third Corps of the Army of the Rhine during the Franco-Prussian war; was taken prisoner at Metz.—42

Castiau, Adelson Joseph Adolphe (1804-1879)—Belgian lawyer and politician; democrat; member of the Chamber of Representatives (1843-48).—617

Cathelineau (Cathélineau), Henri de (1813-1891)—French general, Royalist; during the Franco-Prussian war and the suppression of the Paris Commune commanded a legion of volunteers from the West.—452, 539, 541

Catherine II (1729-1796)—Empress of Russia (1762-96).—576

Cavaignac, Louis Eugène (1802-1857)—French general and politician, moderate republican; took part in the conquest of Algeria; after the February 1848 revolution, Governor of Algeria; from May 1848 War Minister of France; directed the suppression of the June uprising; head of the executive (June-December 1848).—352, 444, 446, 461, 510, 521-22, 528

Chambord, Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné d’Artois, duc de Bordeaux, comte de (1820-1883)—last representative of the elder line of the Bourbons, grandson of Charles X, pretender to the French throne under the name of Henri V.—301, 540

Changarnier, Nicolas Anne Théodule (1793-1877)—French general and politician, monarchist; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (1848-51); commander of the Paris garrison and the National Guard after June 1848; commanded the troops that dispersed the demonstration of June 13, 1849 in Paris; was expelled from France after the coup d’état of December 2, 1851 and returned to France in 1859; a staff officer of the Army of the Rhine during the Franco-Prussian war; was taken prisoner at Metz; deputy to the National Assembly (1871).—325, 455, 512, 529

Chanzy, Antoine Alfred Eugène (1823-1883)—French general; commanded the 16th Corps and then the Second Army of the Loire during the Franco-Prussian war; deputy to the National Assembly (1871).—203, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 221, 222, 226, 228-30, 236-38, 249, 251, 253, 450, 478

Charette de la Contrie, Athanase, baron de (1832-1911)—French general; commanded the Pontifical Zouaves and then a legion of volunteers from the West during the Franco-Prussian war.—452, 513, 539, 549

Charmont, Jeanne (1812-1870)—wife of Vernier, mistress of Jules Favre.—313, 439, 517

Chassepot, Antoine Alphonse (1833-1905)—French military inventor.—26, 120

Clarendon, George William Frederick Villyers, 4th Earl of, 4th Baron Hyde (1800-1870) — British statesman, Whig, later Liberal; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1847-52), Foreign Secretary (1853-58, 1865-66, 1868-70).—576, 582

Clausewitz, Karl (1780-1831)—Prussian general and military theorician.—166
Cluseret, Gustave Paul (1823-1900)—French officer; member of the First International; was close to the Bakuninists; took part in the revolutionary uprisings in Lyons and Marseilles (1870); member of the Paris Commune and its military delegate (April 1871); a refugee after the suppression of the Paris Commune.—399, 470, 554, 557

Cobbett, William (1762-1835)—British politician and radical writer.—370, 375

Coenen, Philip (Philippe) (1842-1892)—took part in the Belgian working-class movement, shoe-maker; founded the Antwerp section of the International in 1868; founder and editor-in-chief of De Werker; delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868) and the London Conference (1871) of the International; at the Hague Congress (1872) supported the Bakuninists; subsequently one of the organisers of the Belgian Socialist Party.—294

Coëtlogon, Louis Charles Emmanuel, comte de (1814-1886)—French official, Bonapartist; one of the organisers of the counter-revolutionary demonstration in Paris on March 22, 1871.—327, 511, 529

Cohn (Cohen), James—active in the British working-class movement; President of the London Association of Cigar-Makers; member of the General Council of the International (1867-71), Corresponding Secretary for Denmark (1870-71), delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868) and the London Conference (1871) of the International.—8, 270, 355, 382, 578, 581

Comte, Isidore Auguste François Marie (1798-1857)—French philosopher and sociologist, founder of Positivism.—498, 504, 574

Conseil-Dumesnil, Gustave Antoine Marie (1813-1877)—French general; commanded a division of the Seventh Corps of the Army of the Rhine during the Franco-Prussian war; was taken prisoner at Sedan.—40

Corbon, Claude Anthime (1808-1891)—French politician, republican; Vice-President of the Constituent Assembly (1848-49); after the fall of the Second Empire, Mayor of the 15th arrondissement of Paris; deputy to the National Assembly of 1871; belonged to its Left minority.—312, 516

Cormontaigne, Louis de (c. 1695-1752)—French general, military engineer; author of works on fortification.—135

Courbet, Désiré Jean Gustave (1819-1877)—painter, founder of the realistic trend in French painting; republican; Socialist, member of the Paris Commune; worked in the Journal officiel de la République française; in 1873 emigrated to Switzerland.—552, 553

Cousin-Montauban, Charles Guillaume Marie Apollinaire Antoine, comte de Palikao (1796-1878)—French general, Bonapartist; War Minister and Prime Minister (August-September 1870).—13, 44, 50, 120, 161, 320, 441

Cowley, Henry Richard Charles Wellesley, 1st Earl of (1804-1884)—British diplomat, ambassador to Paris (1852-67).—380

Crémer, Camille (1840-1876)—French general; commanded a division of the Army of the East during the Franco-Prussian war.—224, 255, 258

Crouzat, Joseph Constant (1811-1879)—French general; commanded the 20th Corps during the Franco-Prussian war.—203

Dallas—Paris correspondent of The Times (1871).—552, 553

Dana, Charles Anderson (1819-1897)—American journalist, follower of
Fourier, abolitionist; an editor (1848) and then managing editor (1849-62) of the New-York Tribune; an editor of the New American Cyclopaedia (1857-63); editor-in-chief of the New-York Sun (1868-97).—396

Darboy, Georges (1813-1871)—French theologian, Archbishop of Paris from 1863; shot by the Commune as a hostage in May 1871.—342, 352, 381, 400, 401, 446, 448, 476, 477, 528

Davies, John Llewellyn (1826-1916)—English clergyman and theologian, liberal.—370, 376

Decaen, Claude Théodore (1811-1870)—French general; commanded a division of the Third Corps, and then the Third Corps during the Franco-Prussian war; was mortally wounded at the battle of Borny in August 1870.—62, 154

Dechamps, Victor Auguste (1810-1883)—Belgian cardinal; Archbishop of Malines from 1867, primat de Belgique.—563

Deguerry, Gaspard (1797-1871)—French clergyman; Curé of the Madeleine Church in Paris; was shot by the Commune as a hostage in May 1871.—448, 476

Dejean, Pierre Charles, vicomte (1807-1872)—French general, Deputy War Minister in the Ollivier cabinet in August 1870.—45, 46

Delahaye, Victor Alfred (1838-1897)—French mechanic, member of the First International; member of the Paris Commune; emigrated to London; member of the General Council of the International and the British Federal Council (1871-72); Secretary of the London Conference (1871).—355, 431

Delescluze, Louis Charles (1809-1871)—French revolutionary, journalist; participant in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848; founder, editor and publisher of Le Réveil (1868-71); member of the Paris Commune, and its military delegate; was killed on the barricades during the street fighting in Paris on May 25, 1871.—381, 398

Delescluze, Louise Azémia (b. 1808)—sister of Charles Delescluze.—398

Delpech—French lawyer, reactionary; general prosecutor in Toulouse (1871).—397, 398, 624-25, 630

De Paepe, César Aimé Désiré (1841-1890)—prominent in the Belgian working-class and socialist movement; comissar, subsequently physician; a founder of the Belgian section of the International; member of the Belgian Federal Council; delegate to the London Conference (1865), the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses and to the London Conference (1871) of the International; following the Hague Congress of 1872 supported the Bakuninists for some time; one of the founders of the Belgian Workers’ Party.—557

De Potter, Louis (1786-1859)—Belgian publicist and politician, bourgeois democrat; member of the Provisional Government during the 1830 revolution in Belgium.—617

Derby, Edward Geoffrey Smith Stanley, Earl of (1799-1869)—British statesman, Tory leader; Prime Minister (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68).—579, 582

Desagarre, baron—French lawyer, public prosecutor at a local lawcourt of Haute-Garonne (1871).—621, 623, 625, 630

Desmaret—French captain of the gendarmerie troopers at Versailles; killed Gustave Flourens.—326, 447, 464, 530

Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield (1804-1881)—British statesman and author, a Tory leader; one of the
founders and ideologists of the Conservative Party; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852, 1858-59, 1866-68), Prime Minister (1868, 1874-80).— 576

Dombrowski, Jaroslaw (1836-1871)— Polish revolutionary democrat; took part in the national liberation movement in Poland (1860s); general of the Paris Commune; commander-in-chief of all its armed forces from early May 1871; killed on the barricades.— 339

Douay, Charles Abel (1809-1870)— French general; commanded a division of the Second Corps during the Franco-Prussian war; killed in the battle of Wissembourg.— 37

Douay, Félix Charles (1816-1879)— French general; commanded the Seventh Corps of the Army of the Rhine during the Franco-Prussian war; was taken prisoner at Sedan; one of the organisers of reprisals against the Paris Commune; commanded the Fourth Corps of the Versailles Army.— 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 51, 54, 58, 66, 67, 78, 109, 159, 348

Ducrot, Auguste Alexandre (1817-1882)— French general, Orleanist; commanded a division of the First Corps, then the First Corps and the Second Paris Army during the Franco-Prussian war; took part in the building up of the Versailles Army for the suppression of the Paris Commune; deputy to the National Assembly (1871).— 108, 121, 169, 177, 189-91, 193, 232, 506

Dufauire, Jules Armand Stanislas (1798-1881)— French lawyer and politician, Orleanist; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848); Minister of the Interior (October-December 1848, June-October 1849); Minister of Justice (February 1871-May 1873); inspired the suppression of the Paris Commune.— 319, 325, 344, 345, 441, 443-45, 467-69, 497, 519, 544

Dumas, Alexandre (son) (1824-1895)— French dramatist and novelist.— 464, 478

Dupanloup, Félix Antoine Philibert (1802-1878)— French theologian and politician; one of the leaders of the Catholic Party; Bishop of Orléans from 1849; deputy to the National Assembly (1871).— 198, 200, 585

Dupont, Eugène (c. 1831-1881)— participant in the French and international working-class movement; musical-instrument maker; took part in the June 1848 uprising in Paris; from 1862 lived in London, then in Manchester; member of the General Council of the International (November 1864-72), Corresponding Secretary for France (1865-71); participant in all the conferences and congresses of the International (except the Basle Congress); contributed to Le Courrier français; formed the French branch of the International in Manchester (1870); in 1872 became a member of the British Federal Council of the International; in 1874 moved to the USA; associate of Marx and Engels.— 8, 270, 355, 382, 431, 556, 558, 560, 590-91

Duval, Émile Victoire (1840-1871)— French ironfounder, Blanquist; member of the International; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; general of the Commune’s National Guard; member of the Executive and Military commissions; was shot by the Versailles troops on April 4, 1871.— 326, 401, 447, 471, 530, 557, 591

E

Eccarius, Johann Georg (1818-1889)— prominent figure in the international and German working-class movement; tailor; member of the League of the Just and later of the Communist League; member of the General
Council of the First International (1864-72) and then its General Secretary (1867-71); Corresponding Secretary for America (1870-72), delegate to all the International's congresses and conferences; until 1872 follower of Marx; after the Hague Congress joined the reformist wing of the British Federal Council.—8, 270, 286, 287, 355, 382, 431, 562, 565-67, 577, 590

Elliott, Thomas—British trade-unionist; from 1871 member of the British Federal Council of the International.—563

Elpidin, Mikhail Konstantinovich (c. 1835-1908)—was active in the Russian revolutionary movement in the early 1860s; in 1865 emigrated to Switzerland; member of the First International and of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; later was exposed as an agent-provocateur of the tsarist secret police.—377

Engels, Frederick (1820-1895)—138, 156, 158, 161, 170, 185, 186, 192, 208, 247, 249, 250, 256, 273, 277-80, 284, 355, 370, 382, 389, 561, 564, 566, 567, 573, 577, 582, 587, 588, 593, 594, 607, 609

Espartero, Joaquin Baldomero Fernández, duque de la Vittoria y de Morello, conde de Luchana (1793-1879)—Spanish general and politician; leader of the Progresista Party; Regent of Spain (1841-43), head of government (1854-56).—315, 455, 521

Eugénie—see Montijo, Eugénie

F

Faidherbe, Louis Leon César (1818-1889)—French general; commanded the Army of the North during the Franco-Prussian war.—203, 222-24, 230, 236, 251, 253, 389

Failly, Pierre Louis Charles Achille de (1810-1892)—French general, Senator; commander of a division in the Crimea (1855); commanded the Fifth Corps during the Franco-Prussian war; was taken prisoner at Sedan.—33, 37, 38, 40, 51, 57, 66, 67, 78, 109, 154, 158, 161

Falloux, Frédéric Alfred Pierre, comte de (1811-1886)—French politician and writer; Legitimist and clerical; in 1848 initiated the closure of the national workshops and inspired the suppression of the June uprising of the Paris workers; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Minister of Education (1848-49).—524

Favre, Claude Gabriel Jules (1809-1880)—French lawyer and politician; from the late 1850s, a leader of the bourgeois-republican opposition; Foreign Minister in the Government of National Defence and in Thiers' government (1870-71); negotiated the capitulation of Paris and peace treaty with Germany; together with Thiers directed the struggle against the First International.—4, 112, 114, 241, 248, 249, 304, 312, 313, 317, 320, 323, 340, 346, 357-62, 370, 376, 416, 417, 437-40, 442, 450, 454, 456, 466, 469, 475, 481, 482, 506, 509, 511, 513-18, 527, 528, 571, 572, 588, 595, 608, 610, 611, 616

Ferdinand II (1810-1859)—King of the Two Sicilies (1830-59), nicknamed King Bomba for the bombardment of Messina (1848).—315, 455, 520

Ferry, Jules François Camille (1832-1893)—French lawyer and politician; one of the leaders of moderate bourgeois republicans; member of the Government of National Defence; Mayor of Paris (1870-71); deputy to the National Assembly (1871); Prime Minister (1880-81, 1883-85).—314, 438, 439, 440, 443, 480, 509, 515, 517-18

Flocon, Ferdinand (1800-1866)—French politician and journalist; democrat; an editor of La Réforme; member of
the Provisional Government in 1848.—571

Flourens, Gustave Paul (1838-1871)—French naturalist and revolutionary, follower of Blanqui; contributed to La Marseillaise; emigrated to London in March 1870 and returned in September 1870; one of the leaders of the Paris uprisings on October 31, 1870 and January 22, 1871; member of the Paris Commune and its Military Commission; on April 3, 1871 was killed by the Versaillists.—320, 323, 326, 447, 471, 480, 527, 530, 591

Fondeville, Eugène (Fondewille)—member of the French section of the First International in Bordeaux; member of the Paris Commune; a refugee in London after its defeat; took part in the London Conference of the International in 1871; in 1875 emigrated to the USA.—400-02

Forcade de la Roquette, Jean Louis Victor Adolphe de (1820-1874)—French statesman, liberal; Minister of the Interior in the Ollivier cabinet (1869).—45

François—French National Guardsman, Communard; killed during the counter-revolutionary demonstration in Paris on March 22, 1871.—511, 529

Frankel, Léo (1844-1896)—active in the Hungarian and international working-class movement; jeweller; in the 1860s emigrated to France; in 1870 was one of the founders of the German section in Paris; Secretary and member of the Paris Federal Council; was prosecuted at the third trial of the International in Paris; member of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; in 1872 was sentenced to death in his absence; in 1871-72 member of the General Council of the International, Corresponding Secretary for Austria-Hungary; delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872); in 1876 returned to Hungary; associate of Marx and Engels.—339, 431, 476, 501, 617

Fransecky, Eduard Friedrich von (1807-1890)—German general; commanded the Second Corps during the Franco-Prussian war.—241

Frederick II (the Great) (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86).—165, 359

Frederick Charles (1828-1885)—Prussian prince, German general, from October 1870 field marshal-general; during the Franco-Prussian war commanded the Second Army.—20, 23, 29, 33, 34, 39, 41, 62, 69, 86, 104, 147, 152, 170, 171, 175-77, 179, 183, 185, 186, 188, 195, 196, 204-06, 209-12, 221, 222, 226, 228-30, 238, 245, 248-49, 252

Frederick Francis II (1823-1883)—Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin (1842-83); German general; during the Franco-Prussian war first commanded the troops on the coast of Germany and then a formation fighting south of Paris.—147, 169, 176, 177, 179, 180, 182, 183, 186, 195, 196, 204-06, 208, 209, 221, 222, 243

Frederick William (1831-1888)—Crown Prince of Prussia and the German Empire; general; son of William I; King of Prussia and Emperor of Germany under the name of Frederick III (1888); commanded the Third Army during the Franco-Prussian war.—20, 23, 25, 28-29, 33, 37, 57, 67-69, 71, 72, 75, 78, 81, 147, 177, 195, 281

Frederick William III (1770-1840)—King of Prussia (1797-1840).—98, 195-97

Friedländer, Max (1829-1872)—German democratic journalist, editor of the Neue Oder-Zeitung and Die Presse, to which Karl Marx contributed in the 1850s-1860s; founder and editor of the Neue Freie Presse (1864-72).—374

Frossard, Charles Auguste (1807-1875)—French general; commanded the Sec-
ond Corps during the Franco-Prussian war; was taken prisoner at Metz.—22, 29, 30, 32-34, 37, 38, 42, 57, 61, 62, 67, 154

G

Gallien, Louis Auguste (b. 1831)—officer of the National Guard of the Commune.—470, 477

Galliffet, Florence Georgina—wife of marquis de Galliffet.—326, 356, 447, 530

Galliffet, Gaston Alexandre Auguste, marquis de (1830-1909)—French general; commanded a cavalry regiment during the Franco-Prussian war; was taken prisoner at Sedan but was released to fight the Commune; commanded a cavalry brigade in the Versailles army.—326-27, 356, 447, 477, 513, 530, 532

Gambetta, Léon (1838-1882)—French statesman, bourgeois republican; member of the Government of National Defence (1870-71); head of the delegation sent by this government to Tours; Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1881-82).—129, 168, 186, 191, 221, 229, 238, 242, 253, 275, 312, 437, 480, 516, 532, 618

Ganesco, Grégory (c. 1830-1877)—French journalist, Romanian by birth; Bonapartist during the Second Empire, and then supported the Thiers government.—338

Garau—governor of the prison in Mazas.—401

Garibaldi, Giuseppe (1807-1882)—Italian revolutionary, democrat, leader of the Italian national liberation movement and the struggle for the unification of Italy in the 1850s-1860s; participant in the Franco-Prussian war on the side of the French Republic; commanded the Vosges Army, consisting of units of the National Guard, French and foreign volunteers.—199, 224, 242, 244, 245, 248, 252

Garibaldi, Ricciotti (1847-1924)—son of Giuseppe Garibaldi; took part in the national liberation movement in Italy; participant in the Franco-Prussian war on the side of France as the commander of a brigade of the Vosges Army.—180

Garnier-Pagès, Louis Antoine (1803-1878)—French politician, moderate republican; member of the Provisional Government and Mayor of Paris in 1848; member of the Government of National Defence (1870-71).—469

Giovacchini, P.—member of the General Council of the International, Corresponding Secretary for Italy (1871).—355, 382

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory and then Peelite; in the latter half of the nineteenth century, leader of the Liberal Party; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55 and 1859-66) and Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886, and 1892-94).—281, 560, 578-80

Gneisenau, August Wilhelm Anton, Count Neithardt von (1760-1831)—Prussian field marshal; one of the organisers of the liberation struggle against Napoleon's rule; took part in drawing up and carrying out Prussian army reforms.—166, 200-02

Goeben, August Karl Friedrich Christian von (1816-1880)—German general; commanded the Eighth Corps and from January 1871 the First Army during the Franco-Prussian war.—223, 228, 230, 248, 252

Goltz, Eduard Kuno, Baron von der (1817-1897)—German general; commanded a Prussian detachment of the 14th Corps during the Franco-Prussian war.—228

Gorchakov, Alexander Mikhailovich, Prince (1798-1883)—Russian statesman and diplomat, envoy in Vienna (1854-56),
Foreign Minister (1856-82).—267, 575

Gramont, Antoine Alfred Agénor, duc de Gramont et de Guiche, prince de Bidache (1819-1880)—French diplomat; Minister of Foreign Affairs (1870); pursued the policy of unleashing a war between France and Prussia.—12

Grand Duke of Mecklenburg—see Frederick Francis II

Grant, Ulysses Simpson (1822-1885)—American general and statesman; fought in the Civil War on the side of the Union, Commander-in-Chief of the Northern Army from March 1864; War Secretary (1867-68), US President (1869-77).—142

Granville, George Leveson Gower, 2nd Earl (1815-1891)—British statesman, Whig and later Liberal; Foreign Secretary (1851-52, 1870-74, 1880-85); President of the Council (1852-54, 1855-58 and 1859-65), Secretary of State for the Colonies (1868-70, 1886).—579

Greenwood, Frederick (1830-1909)—British journalist, first editor of The Pall Mall Gazette (1865-80); held bourgeois-liberal and then conservative views.—281, 359, 378

Greppo, Jean Louis (1810-1888)—French socialist, took part in the Lyons uprisings of 1831 and 1834; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Mayor of an arrondissement in Paris (1870-71); deputy to the National Assembly (1871).—468

Grimal—French officer; commissary of one of the military courts set up at Versailles for trying the Communards.—389

Grousset, Paschal Jean François (1844-1909)—French journalist and politician, Blanquist; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; Chairman of the Commission for Foreign Relations; after the suppression of the Commune deported to New Caledonia, from which he escaped in 1874; up to 1881 lived in England and then returned to France.—476

Guillaume, James (1844-1916)—Swiss teacher, anarchist, Bakuninist; member of the International; participant of the Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867), Basle (1869) and the Hague (1872) congresses of the First International; one of the organisers of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; editor of the newspapers Le Progrès, La Solidarité and Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne; at the Hague Congress (1872) was expelled from the International for his splitting activities.—412, 557, 559

Guiod, Alphonse Simon (b. 1805)—French general; Commander-in-Chief of the artillery during the siege of Paris in the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71).—313, 438, 517

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874)—French historian and statesman; virtually directed the home and foreign policy of France from 1840 to the February 1848 revolution; expressed the interests of the big financial bourgeoisie.—315, 316, 445, 455, 521

Gyulay, Ferenc, Count (1798-1868)—Austrian general, Hungarian by birth; took part in suppressing the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; War Minister (1849-50); during the Italian war of 1859 commanded an Austrian army until the defeat at Magenta.—34

Hales, John (b. 1839)—British trade-union leader, weaver; member of the General Council of the International (1866-72) and its Secretary (1871-72); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League and of the
Land and Labour League; delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; in 1872 headed the reformist wing of the British Federal Council.—7, 270, 355, 358, 362, 367, 368, 370, 373, 382, 403, 431, 554, 555, 558, 562, 564, 567

Hales, William—member of the International; member of the General Council of the International (1867, 1869-72).—7, 270, 355, 382, 431, 562

Harris, George—active in the British working-class movement; Chartist, supported the social views of James O’Brien; member of the National Reform League; member of the General Council of the International (1869-72); Financial Secretary of the Council (1870-71).—7, 270, 355, 431

Haussmann, Georges Eugène, Baron (1809-1891) — French politician, Bonapartist; took part in the coup d’état of December 2, 1851; prefect of the Seine Department (1853-70); directed work on the reconstruction of Paris.—98, 339, 351

Heeckeren, Georges Charles d’Anthès, Baron (1812-1895) — French politician, Royalist; Russian army officer (1834-37); killed the Russian poet Alexander Pushkin in a duel; Bonapartist from 1848; Senator of the Second Empire; one of the organisers of the counter-revolutionary demonstration in Paris on March 22, 1871.—325, 505, 529

Heinemann—Prussian agent provocateur in England; editor-in-chief of the German-language weekly Hermann, published in London.—560

Henderson, Edmund Newman Wolcott (1821-1896) — British officer, chief of the London police (1869-86).—597

Henry II (1519-1559) — King of France (1547-59).—117

Henry V—see Chambord, Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie Dieudonné d’Artois, duc de Bordeaux, comte de

Heppner, Adolf (1846-1923) — German journalist; one of the founders of the Social-Democratic Workers’ Party (1869); editor of Der Volksstaat (1869-73); delegate to the Hague Congress of the International (1872); emigrated to the USA (1882); in 1908 returned to Germany.—275

Herbert, Auberon Edward William Molyneux (1838-1906) — English philosopher and publicist, Liberal; member of the House of Commons (1870-74).—580

Herman, Alfred—active in the Belgian working-class movement, sculptor; founder and member of the International section in Liege (1868-71); member of the General Council and Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (1871-72); delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868), the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; at the Hague Congress joined the anarchist minority.—355, 431, 563

Hervé, Aimé Marie Édouard (1835-1899) — French journalist; one of the founders and editor-in-chief of Le Journal de Paris; bourgeois liberal; Orleanist after the fall of the Second Empire.—349

Herzen, Alexander Ivanovich (1812-1870) — Russian revolutionary democrat, materialist philosopher, journalist and writer; emigrated to France in 1847; from 1852 lived in London, where he established the Free Russian Press and published the periodical Polyarnaya Zvezda (Polar Star) and the newspaper Kolokol (The Bell).—374

Hill, F.H.—editor-in-chief of The Daily News (1868-86).—274-76

Hohenzollerns—dynasty of Brandenburg electors (1415-1701), Prussian kings (1701-1918) and German emperors (1871-1918).—5, 125, 275, 301, 339
Holyoake, George Jacob (1817-1906)—
British journalist; reformist; Owenite and Chartist in the 1830s and 1840s; prominent figure in the co-operative movement.—367, 368, 370, 372, 563

Hossart.—378, 380, 382

Hugo, Victor Marie (1802-1885)—
French writer; deputy to the Constituent and the Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; opposed Louis Bonaparte.—133

Hume, Robert William—American journalist; one of the leaders of the National Labour Union; member of the International and Correspondent of its General Council.—555, 558

Hurliman (Hurlimann)—Swiss by birth; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72).—431

Huxley, Thomas Henry (1825-1895)—
British naturalist, the closest associate of Charles Darwin; inconsistent materialist in philosophy.—336, 488

J

Jaclard, Charles Victor (1840-1903)—
French mathematician, physician and publicist, Blanquist; member of the International; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard; during the Paris Commune commander of a legion of the National Guard; following the suppression of the Paris Commune emigrated to Switzerland and then to Russia; after the 1880 amnesty returned to France.—510

Jacquemet, Alexandre—French clergyman; in 1848, Vicar General of the Archbishops of Paris.—352, 446, 528

Jaubert, Hippolyte François, comte (1798-1874)—French politician, monarchist; Minister of Public Works in the Thiers government (1840); deputy to the National Assembly (1871).—354, 538, 596

Jaurès, Constant Louis Jean Benjamin (1823-1889)—French naval officer, admiral from 1871; as a general commanded the 21st Corps during the Franco-Prussian war; deputy to the National Assembly (1871).—203

Jeannerod, Georges (1832-1890) —
French officer and journalist; war correspondent of Le Temps at the beginning of the Franco-Prussian war.—23, 38, 39, 43, 62, 66

Johannard, Jules Paul (1843-1892)—
active in the French working-class movement; flowerist; Blanquist; member of the General Council of the International (1868-69, 1871-72) and Corresponding Secretary for Italy (1868-69); member of the Paris Commune; following the defeat of the Commune emigrated to London; delegate to the Hague Congress (1872).—431

Joukovsky (Zhukovsky), Nikolai Ivanovich (1833-1895)—Russian anarchist; a refugee in Switzerland from 1862; Secretary of the Geneva section of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; in 1872 withdrew from the International in protest against Bakunin's expulsion.—429

Jourde, François (1843-1893)—French banking employee; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; representative of the Finance Commission; adhered to the Proudhonist minority; sentenced to exile to New Caledonia after the suppression of the Commune; escaped in 1874.—553

Jung, Hermann (1830-1901)—prominent in the Swiss and international working-class movement; watchmaker; an émigré in London; member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland (November 1864-72); Treasurer of the General Council (1871-72); Vice-Chairman of the London Conference (1865), Chairman of the Geneva (1866), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses
and of the London Conference (1871) of the International; member of the British Federal Council; supported Marx before the Hague Congress of 1872 but later sided with the reformist wing of the British trade unions.—8, 270, 355, 382, 420, 431, 554-59, 562, 564-67

K

Kameke, Georg Arnold Karl von (1817-1893)—German general; during the Franco-Prussian war commanded the 14th Division, then conducted the siege operations near Paris; War Minister (1873-83).—32, 224

Keller—German general; commanded a brigade during the Franco-Prussian war.—257

Kératry, Émile, comte de (1832-1905)—French politician, Orleanist, Prefect of the Paris police (September-October 1870); later supervised the formation of territorial armed forces in Brittany; Prefect of the Haute-Garonne Department (1871); in April 1871 suppressed the Commune in Toulouse.—176, 186, 203, 397, 398, 624-27, 629-30

Kinglake, Alexander William (1809-1891)—English historian and politician, Liberal M.P. (1857-68).—235

Kolb, Georg Friedrich (1808-1884)—German politician, publicist and statistician; bourgeois democrat.—299

Kolb, Karl—member of the General Council of the International (1870-71).—355, 382

Küchenmeister, Gottlieb Friedrich Heinrich (1821-1890) — German physician, parasitologist; author of scientific works.—298

Kummer, Ferdinand von (1816-1900)—Prussian general; commanded the Third Reserve Division and then the 15th Division during the Franco-Prussian war.—127, 147

L

Lacretelle, Charles Nicolas (1822-1891)—French general; during the Franco-Prussian war commanded a division of the 12th Corps; was taken prisoner at Sedan; later commanded a division of the Second Corps of the Versailles Army.—470

Ladmirault, Louis René Paul de (1808-1898)—French general; took part in conquering Algeria in the 1830s and 1840s; commanded the Fourth Corps during the Franco-Prussian war; was taken prisoner at Metz; later commanded the Second Corps of the Versailles Army; Governor of Paris (1871-78).—32, 34, 37, 38, 62, 154

Lafargue (February 1871-July 1871)—second son of Laura and Paul Lafargue.—622, 623

Lafargue, Charles Étienne (1869-1872)—first son of Laura and Paul Lafargue.—622, 623, 625, 630, 631

Lafargue, François (died 1870 or 1871)—father of Paul Lafargue.—396

Lafargue, Laura (1845-1911)—second daughter of Karl Marx; was active in the French working-class movement; wife of Paul Lafargue from 1868.—396-98, 432, 622, 623, 625, 627-30

Lafargue Paul (1842-1911)—prominent figure in the French and international 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); one of the founders of the Workers' Party of France (1879); disciple and associate of Marx and Engels; from 1868 husband of Marx's daughter Laura.—396-98, 612, 622, 623, 625-31
Laffitte, Jacques (1767-1844)—French banker and liberal politician; headed the government in the early period of the July monarchy (1830-31).— 314, 454

Lafont—French official; inspector-general of prisons (1871).— 478

Lagarde—French abbot.— 401

Lambord—member of the International.— 554

Lamennais, Félicité Robert de (1782-1854)—French abbot, writer, one of the ideologists of Christian socialism.— 507

Landeck, Bernard (b. 1832)—French jeweller, Polish by birth; participant in the Paris uprisings on October 31, 1870 and January 22, 1871; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune; emigrated to England; one of the founders of the French section of the International in London in 1871; in his absence was sentenced to death in Marseilles (1872) and Versailles (1873).— 565

Landor, R.—American journalist; London correspondent of the New York newspaper The World (1871).— 600-06

La Rochejaquelein (Larochejaquelein), Henri Auguste Georges du Vergier, marquis de (1805-1867)—French politician, one of the leaders of the Legitimists; deputy to the Constituent Assembly during the Second Republic; Senator during the Second Empire.— 524

La Roncière Le Noury, Camille Adalbert Marie, baron Clement de (1813-1881)—French admiral; during the siege of Paris (1870-71) commanded a division of the Third Paris Army and then a corps.— 189

Latham, Robert Masden—British trade-unionist; President of the Labour Representation League; member of the International.— 554

Lavallée, Théophile Sébastien (1804-1866)—French historian and military geographer.— 117

Lebrun, Barthélemy Louis Joseph (1809-1889)—French general; during the Franco-Prussian war commanded the 12th Corps; was taken prisoner at Sedan.— 78

Lecomte, Claude Martin (1817-1871)—French general; commanded a brigade during the Franco-Prussian war; on March 18, 1871 was shot by the insurgent soldiers after the failure of the Thiers government to seize the artillery of the National Guard.— 323, 324, 328, 345, 347, 443, 445, 508, 524, 526, 528, 532

Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre Auguste (1807-1874)—French journalist and politician, a leader of the petty-bourgeois democrats; editor of La Réforme; Minister of the Interior in the Provisional Government (1848); deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies (leader of the Montagnards); after the demonstration of June 13, 1849 emigrated to England, where he lived up to early 1870; deputy to the National Assembly in 1871, resigned in protest against the conclusion of peace with Germany.— 571

Le Flô, Adolphe Emmanuel Charles (1804-1887)—French general, politician and diplomat; representative of the Party of Order; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic, Minister of War in the Government of National Defence and the Thiers government (1870-71); deputy to the National Assembly (1871), Ambassador to St. Petersburg (1848-49 and 1871-79).— 324, 327, 449, 527

Legreulier—member of the General Council of the International in 1870.— 8

Leland, Charles Godfrey (1824-1903)—
American lawyer, writer and journalist.—600

Lemaître, Antoine Louis Prosper (pseudonym Frédéric Lemaître) (1800-1876)—French actor and playwright, representative of romanticism and founder of critical realism in the French theatre.—442

Lemaître, Frédéric—French refugee, owner of a small printshop in London; member of the Paris section of the International; participant in the Paris Commune; after its suppression again emigrated to England; member of the French branch of the International in London.—558

Le Moussu, Benjamin Constant (b. 1846)—active in the French working-class movement, engraver; member of the Paris Commune; after its suppression emigrated to London; in 1872 was sentenced to death in his absence; member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for the French sections in America (1871-72); delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); supported Marx and Engels in their struggle against the Bakuninists.—431

Leroux, Pierre (1797-1871)—French writer, utopian socialist; representative of Christian socialism; émigré in England in 1851-52.—598

Lessner, Friedrich (Frederick) (1825-1910)—active in the German and international working-class movement, tailor; member of the Communist League; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; at the Cologne Communist trial was sentenced to three years' imprisonment; from 1856, an émigré in London, member of the London German Workers' Educational Society and of the General Council of the International (November 1864 to 1872); delegate to the London Conferences (1865 and 1871), the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868), Basle (1869) and the Hague (1872) congresses of the International; member of the British Federal Council; a founder of the British Independent Labour Party in 1893; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—8, 270, 355, 382, 431

Leuckart, Friedrich Rudolf (1823-1898)—German parasitologist and zoologist.—298

Lewis, Sir George Cornewall (1806-1863)—British statesman, Whig; Secretary to the Treasury (1850-52), Chancellor of the Exchequer (1855-58); Home Secretary (1859-61), and Secretary of State for War (1861-63).—582

Liebknecht, Wilhelm Philipp Martin Christian Ludwig (1826-1900)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; member of the Communist League and the First International, delegate to the Basle Congress (1869); editor of Der Volksstaat (1869-76); a founder and leader of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party; in 1867-70 member of North German Reichstag; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—272, 274, 278, 617, 619, 620

Lincoln, Abraham (1809-1865) — American statesman, a leader of the Republican Party, President of the USA (1861-65); under the influence of the masses, carried out important bourgeois-democratic reforms during the Civil War, thus making possible the adoption of revolutionary methods of warfare; was assassinated by an agent of slave-owners in April 1865.—458, 464, 542

Lintern, W. — British trade-unionist, member of the General Council of the International (1870).—8

Littré, Maximilien Paul Émile (1801-
1881)—French philosopher, philologist and politician.—510

Lochner, Georg (born c. 1824)—active in the German and international working-class movement, carpenter; member of the Communist League and of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, member of the General Council of the International (November 1864-1867 and 1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1865); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—355, 386, 431

Locke, John (1632-1704)—English dualist philosopher and economist.—594

Longuet, Charles Félix César (1839-1903)—prominent in the French working-class movement, journalist, Proudhonist; member of the General Council of the International (1866-67, 1871-72); Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (1866); delegate to the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868), the Hague (1872) congresses and the London Conference (1871); took part in the defence of Paris (1870-71); member of the Paris Commune; editor-in-chief of the Paris Commune's organ Journal officiel de la République française; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England; later joined the Possibilists; husband of Marx's daughter Jenny.—431

Lopatin, German Alexandrovich (1845-1918)—Russian revolutionary, follower of Chernyshevsky, Narodnik; member of the General Council of the International (1870); translated into Russian a sizable part of Volume I of Capital; Marx's friend.—270

Lorenz (Lorentz), Josef (1814-1879)—Austrian army officer and military inventor.—96

Lorenzo, Anselmo (1841-1915)—Spanish printer, member of the International (from 1869); a founder of the International's sections in Spain (1869); delegate to the London Conference (1871); Secretary of the Spanish Federal Council (1872).—415, 616

Louis XIV (1638-1715) — King of France (1643-1715).—165, 440, 538

Louis XVI (1754-1793)—King of France (1774-92); guillotined during the French Revolution.—476

Louis XVIII (1755-1824)—King of France (1814-15 and 1815-24).—503

Louis Napoleon—see Napoleon III


Louis Philippe Albert, duc d'Orléans, count of Paris (1838-1894)—grandson of Louis Philippe; pretender to the French throne.—540

Lowe, Robert, 1st Viscount Sherbrooke (1811-1892)—British statesman and journalist, contributor to The Times, Whig and later Liberal; M.P., Chancellor of the Exchequer (1868-73); Home Secretary (1873-74).—579

Löwenfeld—German general, inspector of reserve units during the Franco-Prussian war.—148

Lucraft, Benjamin (1809-1897)—a leader of the British trade unions, cabinet-maker; 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, later member of London School Board; in 1871 refused to sign the General Council's Address The Civil War in France and withdrew from the International.—8, 270, 372, 376, 386

Lumley.—563
Lyons, Richard Bickerton Pemell, 2nd Baron and 1st Earl Lyons (1817-1887)—British diplomat, envoy in Washington (1858-65), ambassador to Constantinople (1865-67) and Paris (1867-87); in September 1870 mediator in the negotiations between Favre and Bismarck.—379, 380

M

Maccabees—the name of a Jewish family of priests dominant in Jerusalem; in the mid-2nd century B.C. headed the revolt against foreign dominion; ruling dynasty in Judaea from 142 to 40 B.C.—200

McDonnell (Mac Donnell), Joseph Patrick (1847-1906)—active in the Irish working-class movement; member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for Ireland (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; in 1872 emigrated to the USA where he participated in the American working-class movement.—355, 382, 386, 431

Mack, Charles (1752-1828)—Austrian general; in 1805 commanded troops in the war against Napoleonic France; was defeated by Napoleon I and capitulated at Ulm.—34, 65

McKeen, J. A.—secretary of the American ambassador Washburne in Paris in 1871.—381

Mac-Mahon (MacMachon), Marie Edme Patrice Maurice, comte de, duc de Magenta (1808-1893)—French general and politician, marshal, Bonapartist; during the Franco-Prussian war commanded the First Corps and later the Army of Châlons; was taken prisoner at Sedan; Commander-in-Chief of the Versailles Army; President of the Third Republic (1873-79).—26-30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 40, 42, 44, 51, 54, 57, 58, 65-85, 86, 91, 109, 120, 155, 158-59, 161, 174, 348, 352-53, 465, 542

Magne, Alfred—French official, collector-general of taxes in the Loire Department; Pierre Magne's son.—443

Magne, Pierre (1806-1879)—French statesman, Bonapartist; Minister of Finance (1855-60, 1867-69, 1870, 1873-74).—443

Malet, Sir Edward Baldwin, Baronet (1837-1908)—British diplomat, secretary of the embassy in Paris (1867-71).—380

Maljournal, Louis Charles (1841-1894)—French bookbinder; member and secretary of the National Guard's Central Committee; member of the First International; participant in the Paris Commune; was wounded and taken prisoner; in 1872 was sentenced to deportation and amnestied in 1879.—325, 511

Malon, Benoît (1841-1893)—French socialist; member of the International; was accused at the second and third trials in Paris against the International; delegate to the Geneva Congress (1866); deputy to the National Assembly (1871); member of the National Guard's Central Committee and of the Paris Commune; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to Italy and then to Switzerland; later one of the leaders and ideologists of the Possibilists.—421

Manteuffel, Edwin Hans Karl, Baron von (1809-1885)—German general, from 1873 field marshal-general; in 1865-66 governor and commander of Prussian troops in Schleswig; during the Franco-Prussian war commanded the First Corps, then the First (from October 1870) and South (from January 1871) armies; Commander-in-Chief of the German occupational troops in France (1871-73).—185,
Manuel, Jacques, Antoine (1775-1827)—French lawyer, democrat; in 1818-23 member of the Chamber of Deputies; was expelled from the Chamber by the reactionary majority.—617

Markowski—agent of the Tsarist government in France; was in the service of Thiers in 1871.—338

Martin, Constant (Saint-Martin) (1839-1906)—French employee, Blanquist; member of the Paris Federal Council of the First International; member of the Paris Commune; after its defeat emigrated to London; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72); Secretary of the London Conference (1871); after the amnesty in 1880 returned to France.—431

Martinet des Pallières, Charles Gabriel Félicité (1823-1876)—French general; commanded a brigade of the Second Corps and then the 15th Corps during the Franco-Prussian war.—203

Marx, Eleanor (1855-1898)—Karl Marx's youngest daughter, prominent figure in the British and international working-class movement; married Eduard Aveling in 1884.—397, 398, 432, 622-31

Marx, Jenny (née von Westphalen) (1814-1881)—Karl Marx's wife.—397, 625

Marx, Jenny (1844-1883)—Karl Marx's eldest daughter, journalist; was active in the international working-class movement; married Charles Longuet in 1872.—397, 398, 432, 622-32


Mayo, Henry—active in the British working-class movement; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72) and from 1872 of the British Federal Council, belonged to its reformist wing.—431

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); during the foundation of the International in 1864 tried to bring it under his influence; in 1871 opposed the Paris Commune and the General Council of the International.—385-87, 598, 605, 607-08

Michel, Alexandre Ernest—French general; commanded a cavalry division of the Army of the Loire during the Franco-Prussian war.—203

Mill, John Stuart (1806-1873)—English economist and positivist philosopher.—561, 582, 605

Miller, Joseph or Josias (commonly called Joe Miller) (1684-1738)—English comic actor.—314, 440, 518

Millière, Jean Baptiste Édouard (1817-1871)—French lawyer, journalist, Left Proudhonist; participated in the uprising of October 31, 1870; criticised the Thiers government, blamed Jules Favre and supported the Paris Commune; was shot by Versaillists on May 26, 1871.—313, 358, 362, 365, 439, 512, 597

Mills, Charles—English engineer, member of the General Council of the International in 1871.—355, 386

Milner, George—Irish tailor; was active in the British working-class movement; supported the social views of the Chartist James O'Brien; member of the National Reform League and the Land and Labour League;
member of the General Council of the International (1868-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871); from the autumn of 1872 member of the British Federal Council.—7, 270, 355, 382, 431, 578

**Milton, John** (1608-1674)—English poet and writer; prominent in the English revolution.—490

**Minté, Claude Etienne** (1804-1879)—French army officer, inventor of a new type of rifle.—120

**Mirabeau, Honoré Gabriel Victor Riqueti, comte de** (1749-1791)—prominent figure in the French Revolution, constitutional monarchist.—316

**Molière** (real name Jean Baptiste Poquelin) (1622-1673)—French dramatist.—319, 524

**Molinet, vicomte de** (d. 1871)—French aristocrat; killed during the counter-revolutionary demonstration on March 22, 1871 in Paris.—512

**Moltke, Helmuth Karl Bernhard, Count von** (1800-1871)—military writer and strategist, ideologist of Prussian militarism: field marshal-general from 1871; Chief of Prussian (1857-71) and Imperial (1871-88) General Staff; virtually commander-in-chief during the Franco-Prussian war.—21, 27, 52, 71, 133, 152-53, 170, 177, 178, 181, 186, 195, 243, 245, 248, 574, 577

**Montalembert, Marc René, marquis de** (1714-1800)—French general, military engineer; elaborated a new fortification system largely used in the nineteenth century.—87

**Montaudon, Jean Baptiste Alexandre**—French general; commanded a division of the Third Corps during the Franco-Prussian war.—42

**Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondat, baron de la Brède et de** (1689-1755)—French philosopher, economist and writer of the Enlightenment.—333, 507, 510

**Montijo, Eugénie (Eugenia Maria de Montijo de Guzman, condesa de Teba)** (1826-1920)—French Empress, wife of Napoleon III.—30, 160, 161, 162, 300, 301

**Moore, Sir John** (1761-1809)—British general; commanded the British troops in Portugal in 1808-09.—173

**Mottershead, Thomas G.** (c. 1826-1884)—English weaver, a Chartist; member of the General Council (1869-72), Corresponding Secretary for Denmark (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872); member of the British Federal Council; opposed Marx's line in the General Council and the British Federal Council; expelled from the First International by decision of the General Council in May 1872.—7, 270, 355, 382, 431, 555, 562, 565, 591, 594

**Murray, Charles**—active in the British working-class movement, shoemaker, a Chartist, follower of the social views of James O'Brien, member of the National Reform League and the Land and Labour League, member of the General Council of the International (1870-72) and of the British Federal Council (1872-73).—7, 270, 355, 382, 431

**N**


**Napoleon III (Charles Louis Napoléon Bonaparte)** (1808-1873)—nephew of Napoleon I, President of the Second Republic (1848-51), Emperor of the French (1852-70).—3-5, 11, 12, 14, 22, 24-26, 29-30, 33-38, 44, 48-51,
O:

Obernitz, Hugo Moritz Anton Heinrich von (1819-1901)—German general, commanded the Württemberg division during the Franco-Prussian war.—190, 191

Odger, George (1820-1877)—a leader of the British trade unions, shoemaker; took part in founding the London Trades Council and was its Secretary from 1862 to 1872; member of the British National League for the Independence of Poland, the Land and Labour League and the Labour Representation League; member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League; member of the General Council of the International (1864-71) and its President (1864-67); took part in the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866); opposed revolutionary tactics; in 1871 refused to sign the General Council's Address The Civil War in France and left the Council.—7, 270, 364, 373, 376, 386, 554, 562, 563, 571, 610, 611

Ollivier, Émile (1825-1913)—French politician, moderate republican; member of the Corps Législatif from 1857; became Bonapartist in the late 1860s; head of the government (January-August 1870).—4, 160, 448, 532

Orléans—royal dynasty in France (1830-48).—301, 340

Oudinot, Nicolas Charles Victor (1791-1863)—French general, Orleanist; in 1849 commanded the troops sent against the Roman Republic.—521

Oultine—see Utin

Owen, Robert (1771-1858)—British utopian socialist.—594

P:

Palikao—see Cousin-Montauban

Pallières—see Martin des Pallières

Palmerston, Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount (1784-1865)—British statesman; at the beginning of his career a Tory, from 1830 Whig; Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41, 1846-51); Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58, 1859-65).—371, 579, 582

Parnell, James—English worker, member of the General Council of the International (1869-70).—7, 270

Pène, Henri de (1830-1888)—French journalist, monarchist; an organiser of the counter-revolutionary demonstration in Paris on March 22, 1871.—325, 511, 529, 631

Perret, Henri—Swiss engraver; one of the leaders of the International in Switzerland; member and secretary of the Romance Federal Committee
(1868-73); member of the editorial board of L'Égalité, delegate to all congresses and the London Conference (1871) of the International.—557

Pertz, Georg Heinrich (1795-1876)—German historian, author of works on the history of Germany.—201

Petit—secretary of Archbishop Darboy.—401

Pfänder (Pfander), Carl (1818-1876)—participant in the German and international working-class movement, miniaturist; from 1845, a refugee in London; a leader of the League of the Just; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, of the Central Committee of the Communist League and of the General Council of the First International (1864-67 and 1870-72); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—7, 270, 355, 382, 431

Pic, Jules—French journalist, Bonapartist; editor of L'Étendard.—313, 475, 518

Picard, Eugène Arthur (b. 1825)—French politician and broker; moderate republican; editor-in-chief of L'Électeur libre; brother of Joseph Ernest Picard.—314, 439, 440, 518

Picard, Louis Joseph Ernest (1821-1877)—French lawyer and politician; moderate republican; Minister of Finance in the Government of National Defence (1870-71); Minister of the Interior in the Thiers government (1871).—314, 320, 326, 354, 439, 440, 442, 443, 445, 454, 466, 467, 471, 508, 515, 517, 518, 616

Piétri, Joseph Marie (1820-1902)—French politician, Bonapartist; Prefect of the Paris police (1866-70).—5, 343, 440, 447, 452, 459, 477, 518, 541

Pis IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti) (1792-1878)—Pope (1846-78).—166, 563, 601, 607

Plon-Plon—see Bonaparte, Prince Napoléon Joseph Charles Paul

Pourille, Jean Baptiste Stanislas Xavier (pseudonym Blanchet) (b. 1833)—former Capuchin; French journalist; sold second-hand things and silk, interpreter in the Lyons' prison (1864-67), secretary of the police commissariat; member of the National Guard's Central Committee and of the Paris Commune; member of the Justice Commission; expelled from the Commune as a police officer.—340

Pouyer-Quertier, Augustin Thomas (1820-1891)—French manufacturer and politician; Protectionist; Minister of Finance (1871-72); took part in peace negotiations with Germany in Frankfurt (1871).—319, 346, 441-43, 446, 519

Protot, Eugène (1839-1921)—French lawyer, physician and journalist; Blanquist; member of the First International; member of the Paris Commune; delegate of the Justice Commission, after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to Italy, Switzerland, England and the USA; after the amnesty returned to France and withdrew from politics.—475, 591

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865)—French journalist, economist and sociologist; ideologist of the petty bourgeoisie; a founder of anarchism.—607

Pyat, Félix (1810-1889)—French journalist, playwright and politician; democrat; took part in the 1848 revolution; emigrated in 1849 to Switzerland and later to Belgium and England; was against independent working-class movement; conducted a slander campaign against Marx and the First International; member of the Paris Commune, after its suppression emigrated to England.—416, 417, 586, 591, 605
Radetzky Joseph, Count of Radetz (1766-1858)—Austrian field marshal; commanded the Austrian troops in Northern Italy from 1831; suppressed the national liberation movement in Italy (1848-49); Governor-General of the Kingdom of Lombardy and Venice (1850-56).—88

Raglan, Lord Fitzroy James Henry Somerset, Baron (1788-1855)—British field marshal; Commander-in-Chief of the British forces in the Crimea (1854-55).—235

Reid, Robert—British journalist, democrat; Paris correspondent of English and American newspapers before and during the Paris Commune.—379-82, 552, 553, 563

Reitlinger—Jules Favre's friend and private secretary.—358, 362

Renault (Renaut), Léon Charles (b. 1839)—French lawyer; defended Paris Communards before the Versailles court (1871).—403

Renault, Pierre Hippolyte Publius (1807-1870)—French general; commanded the Second Corps of the Second Paris Army during the Franco-Prussian war.—190

Reuter, Paul Julius, Baron von (1816-1899)—founder of the Reuter telegraph agency in London (1851); German by birth.—48

Richard, Albert (1846-1925)—French journalist, a leader of the Lyons section of the International; member of the secret Alliance of Socialist Democracy; took part in the Lyons uprising of 1870; after the suppression of the Paris Commune, a Bonapartist; in the 1880s adhered to the Allemansists, an opportunist trend in the French socialist movement.—556, 563

Roach, John—member of the General Council of the International (1871-72); delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); Corresponding Secretary for the British Federal Council, where he sided with the reformist wing (1872).—355, 382, 386

Robin, Paul Charles Louis Jean (1837-1912)—French teacher, Bakuninist; a founder of the Belgian section of the First International; one of the leaders of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy (from 1869); member of the General Council (1870-71); delegate to the Basle Congress (1869) and the London Conference (1871); in October 1871 expelled from the International.—419-21, 561-63, 609

Robinet, Jean François Eugène (1825-1899)—French physician and historian; Positivist, republican; took part in the 1848 revolution; Mayor of an arrondissement in Paris during the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71); member of Ligue de L'Union républicaine pour les Droits de Paris, came out for a reconciliation between the Versailles government and the Commune.—354, 364

Rochat, Charles Michel (b. 1844)—member of the Paris Federal Council and of the General Council of the International; took part in the Paris Commune; Corresponding Secretary for Holland (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871); in 1872 emigrated to Belgium.—355, 431, 563

Rochefort, Victor Henri, marquis de Rochefort Luçay (1830-1913)—French journalist, writer and politician; Left-wing republican; publisher of La Lanterne (1868-69); founder and publisher of La Marseillaise (1869-70) and editor of Le Mot d'Ordre (1871); member of the Government of National Defence (September-October 1870); condemned the counter-revolutionary policy of the Versailles government but at the same time opposed the Commune's revolution-
ary activities; after the suppression of the Commune was exiled to New Caledonia; returned to France after the amnesty (1880).—145, 232

Roche-Lambert—French official; was appointed collector-general of taxes in the Loire Department (1871).—442

Roon, Albrecht Theodor Emil, Count von (1803-1879)—Prussian statesman and military leader; field marshal-general from 1873, War Minister (1859-73) and Naval Minister (1861-71); reorganised the Prussian army.—106

Rouher, Eugène (1814-1884)—French statesman, Bonapartist; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; Minister of Justice (1849-52, with intervals), Minister of Agriculture, Commerce and Public Works (1855-63), Prime Minister (1863-69), President of the Senate (1869-70); after the fall of the Empire emigrated to England; a leader of the Bonapartists in France in the 1870s.—23

Rühl, J.—German worker, member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the General Council of the International (1870-72).—7, 270, 355, 382, 431

Russell, Odo William Leopold, 1st Baron Amphil (1829-1884)—British diplomat, ambassador at Berlin (1871-84).—580

Rutson, E.—private secretary of Henry Austin Bruce, British Home Secretary, in 1871.—563

S

Sadler, Michael Thomas—British member of the General Council of the International (1871-72).—355, 382, 431

Sagasta, Práxedes Mateo (1827-1903)—Spanish politician, leader of the Liberal party; Home Minister (1868-70, 1871-72); Prime Minister and Foreign Minister (1874), Prime Minister (1881-1902, with intervals).—398

Saguljajew (Zagulyaev), Mikhail Andreyevich (1834-1900)—Russian officer and journalist; editor of the political section of the newspaper Golos (Voice) (1862-83).—276

Saint-Arnaud, Armand Jacques Achille Leroy de (1801-1854)—Marshal of France, Bonapartist; an organiser of the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; War Minister (1851-54); Commander-in-Chief of the French army in the Crimea (1854).—235

Saisset, Jean Marie Joseph Théodore (1810-1879)—French admiral and politician, monarchist; commanded the troops defending the Eastern forts during the siege of Paris (1870-71); Commander of the Paris National Guard (March 20-25, 1871); tried to unite reactionary forces in Paris to suppress the proletarian revolution of March 18; deputy to the National Assembly (1871).—326, 450, 457, 497, 512, 529, 539, 543

Scharnhorst, Gerhard Johann David von (1755-1813)—Prussian general and politician; after the defeat of the Prussian army by Napoleon I in 1806, head of the commission for a reform of the army; War Minister (1807-10) and Chief of Staff (1810-13); took an active part in the liberation war of the German people against Napoleonic rule.—166

Scheffer—French National Guardsman; took part in the Paris Commune.—327, 465, 478, 532

Schill, Ferdinand von (1776-1809)—Prussian officer; commanded a guerrilla detachment fighting against Napoleon's forces, killed in 1809 during an attempt to raise a national liberation uprising.—199, 200

Schmeling—German general; commanded the Fourth Reserve Army
during the Franco-Prussian war.—148, 243

**Schmutz**—Swiss worker, member of the General Council of the International (1870-71).—8, 270

**Schoelcher, Victor** (1804-1893)—French politician and journalist, Left Republican; deputy to the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic; commanded the artillery legion of the Paris National Guard during the Franco-Prussian war and the Paris Commune; deputy to the National Assembly (1871); tried to persuade the Communards to capitulate to the Thiers government.—497, 509

**Schwarzenberg, Karl Philipp, Prince von** (1771-1820)—Austrian field marshal; fought against Napoleon I; Commander-in-Chief of the Allied armies of the European coalition (1813-14).—72

**Schweitzer, Johann Baptist von** (1833-1875)—editor of Der Social-Demokrat (1864-67); President of the General Association of German Workers (1867-71); supported Bismarck's policy of unification of Germany under Prussia's supremacy; hindered German workers from joining the International, fought against the Social-Democratic Workers' Party; was expelled from the Association for his contacts with the Prussian authorities (1872).—616

**Serebrennikoff, Vladimir Ivanovich** (born c. 1850)—Russian revolutionary; took part in the students movement in St. Petersburg in 1868-69; refugee in England and Switzerland; follower of Nechaev.—377

**Serraillier, Auguste** (b. 1840)—active in the French and international working-class movement, shoemaker; lived in England; member of the General Council of the International (1869-72) and of the British Federal Council (1873-74); associate of Marx and Engels; Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (1870) and France (1871-72); was sent to Paris as representative of the General Council in September 1870 and in March 1871; officer of the National Guard; member of the Paris Commune; delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International.—8, 270, 273, 277, 288, 289, 355, 381, 431, 556, 557, 559, 561, 562, 566, 567, 585, 590-91

**Shakespeare, William** (1564-1616)—English poet and dramatist.—319, 356, 470, 496, 540, 626, 628

**Shepherd, Joseph**—member of the General Council of the International (1869-70).—8, 270

**Sheridan, Philip Henry** (1831-1888)—American general; took part in the US Civil War (1861-65) on the side of the Northerners; observer in the German headquarters during the Franco-Prussian war.—512.

**Shipton, George** (1839-1911)—trade-union leader, Reformist; founder and secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Housepainters and Decorators, member of the Land and Labour League; secretary of the London Trades Council (1872-96).—600

**Simon, Jules François Simon Suisse** (1814-1896)—French statesman; moderate republican; deputy to the Constituent Assembly (1848-49); Minister of Public Instruction in the government of National Defence and the Thiers government (1870-73); deputy to the National Assembly (1871); President of the Council of Ministers (1876-77).—320, 442, 469

**Smith (Smith-Headingley), Adolphe (Adolphus)** (1846-1924)—British journalist; was born in Paris; member of the Social Democratic Federation in the 1880s; adhered to the French Possibilists.—553
Sonis, Louis Gaston de (1825-1887)—French general; commanded the 17th Corps during the Franco-Prussian war.—203

Sorge, Friedrich Adolph (1828-1906)—prominent figure in the international and American working-class and socialist movement, German teacher; took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; in 1852 emigrated to the USA; founder of the American sections of the First International; Secretary of the Federal Council; delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); member of the General Council in New York and its General Secretary (1872-74); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—589

Steens, Eugène (1825-1898)—Belgian journalist, member of the International; editor of La Tribune du Peuple and L'Internationale; delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868) and the London Conference (1871) of the International.—614

Steinmetz, Karl Friedrich, von (1796-1877)—German general, field marshal from 1871; commanded the First Army during the Franco-Prussian war (up to September 1870).—20, 23, 33, 34, 42, 69, 86
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See also France, Second Empire

Borders (frontiers), state—117-18, 264-66

Bourgeoisie
— its economic domination—278, 354, 493-94, 501
— its different factions, struggle between them—461, 548
— and state power—278, 328-31, 353, 354, 426, 460, 485, 486, 534-35, 547-49; see also Dictatorship of the bourgeoisie; Republic, bourgeois
— and peasantry—330, 337-38, 550

Bourgeoisie, English—580, 584

Bourgeoisie, French—286, 314, 453, 460, 501, 519

— in the first half of the 19th cent.—333, 460, 485, 522
— during the Second Empire—330, 337, 486, 496, 603, 629
— during the Third Republic—576, 578, 581

Bourgeoisie, German—264, 268, 579, 582, 605

Bourgeoisie, Swiss—299

Bureaucracy, officials—278, 328, 483-85, 488-89, 494-97, 533-35, 547, 549

C

Capital—329, 330, 335, 535, 536, 548, 549

Capitalist mode of production—335

Capitalists—335, 536, 549

Carbonari—597

Cavalry—12, 98

Censorship—275

Centralisation of capital—339-40, 535-36

Centralisation (political)—328, 485-86, 504, 533-35, 547-49
— bourgeois—328, 332-33, 485-86, 502, 504, 533-35, 549
— its use in the interests of the exploiting classes—116, 502, 504, 533-35, 547-49
— under the dictatorship of the proletariat—331, 333, 485-86, 504, 533-34, 547-48

Chartism—615, 634

Chauvinism—104, 260-61, 500-01

Civil society—483-88, 490-92, 550

Civil war—134, 606
See also Paris Commune of 1871—civil war as a form of class struggle

Civil War in the USA, 1861-65—142, 151, 270, 458, 464, 542, 606

Classes
— ruling classes in bourgeois society—3, 4, 263, 290, 316, 329-31, 333, 335, 352, 354, 426-27, 460, 484-90, 495-500, 519, 521, 525-26, 531, 533-37, 547-51, 603-04
— middle strata in bourgeois society—336, 344, 385, 492, 496, 591
— class contradictions, antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—329, 335, 535, 536, 548, 602
— class prejudices—318, 332, 493, 494, 496, 519, 537
— exploiting, propertied—251, 278, 329, 330, 335, 356, 426, 427, 457, 459, 460, 577
— privileged, upper—282, 322, 385, 426, 427, 526, 535, 549, 595, 597
— appropriating—325, 335, 353, 534-36, 548
— parasitic—455, 541
— lower, exploited, propertyless—278, 494
— productive—329, 330, 335, 459, 531, 534-36, 549
— proletariat as the ruling class—336, 416, 417, 426, 486-92, 500, 536, 634; see also Dictatorship of the proletariat

Class struggle—335, 350, 353, 491, 499, 531, 535, 536, 603, 604
— struggle of the workers with the bourgeoisie in the period of developed capitalism—330, 348, 353, 354, 427, 491, 498, 534, 535, 541, 602, 619
— workers' economic struggle against the bourgeoisie—427, 498
— political struggle as a form of class struggle—536
— struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and middle strata—337, 496
— and national question—311-12, 353, 501, 515-16
— and revolution—329, 335, 353, 416, 417, 491, 525, 526, 548-49
— classes and class struggle in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat—493-94, 500
— international character of the class struggle of the proletariat—602, 605

Clergy
— as a champion of the interests of the exploiting classes—502, 504, 533, 534, 548
— its place in social hierarchy, its functions—328, 485
— and national liberation movements—198, 200-01

Communism, Icarian (Cabet's communism)—499

Communism, scientific
— demand of socialisation of the means of production—494, 634

Communism (social formation)
— as a necessary result of the historical development of human society—336, 491-92, 504
— as the aim of the revolutionary workers' movement, of the proletarian revolution—334, 416, 417, 426-27, 491, 497-500, 548-49, 601-02
— criticism of the utopian ideas of the future society—336, 499-500
— material preconditions of the communist transformation of society—336, 491, 492, 494, 499
— international character of the communist transformation of society—7, 338, 459, 486, 490-92, 501, 540
— period of transition from capitalism to communism (socialism)—331-41, 485-95, 496, 498-501, 533, 536-38, 547-49
— abolition of private property, social property in the means of production—335, 494-95, 505, 608, 634
— social character of production—335-36, 491-92, 494
— labour—7, 335, 491-92, 494, 496, 498, 608
— communism as a new society, new organisation of society—7, 341, 349, 353, 354, 537-38, 540
— abolition of class antagonisms and differences, society without classes—331, 335, 416, 417, 427, 486, 491, 494-95, 499-500, 525, 526, 548-49, 634
— communist transformation of society and the state—328-42, 483-93, 496, 498-501, 533, 536-37, 547-49
— communist transformation of society and the army—7, 322-23, 328, 331, 332, 334, 487-90, 527, 531, 536-38, 547-48
— communist transformation of society and the law—328, 331-32,
337-38, 340-41, 490, 493, 533, 536-38, 547-48, 634
— communist transformation of society and man—332, 335, 336, 486, 490, 491, 492, 493, 505, 537
Communism (positivism) and working-class movement—556, 558, 574, 605
Co-operation, co-operative movement—335-36, 339, 472, 488
Corruption—77, 333-34, 463, 486, 505
Counter-revolution—354, 441, 481, 532
— bourgeois—319, 323, 440, 524-26, 529, 546
— its international character—352-54, 498, 509, 520
Crimean war of 1853-56—88, 96, 97, 100, 110, 135, 141, 142, 158, 193, 216-17, 459, 575, 576, 579-80, 583

D

Danish war of 1864—98, 132, 218, 219
Democracy, bourgeois—385, 605
Despotism—4, 5, 260, 275, 487, 502
Dictatorship, counter-revolutionary—497, 533-34, 539
Dictatorship of the bourgeoisie—278, 533-35
— as a means of suppression of the liberation struggle of workers—348, 349, 351, 352, 485-86, 531, 548
— its anti-popular character—485
Dictatorship of the proletariat
— its historical necessity—335, 416, 417, 426, 427, 500
— demand of the dictatorship of the proletariat in programme documents of the working-class movement—427
— as a state of the transitional period from capitalism to communism (socialism)—634
— its historical tasks—334, 416, 417, 490, 548-49, 601-02, 634
— destruction of the bourgeois state machine—328, 331-34, 483, 486-90, 493, 497, 498, 533, 536-37, 548
— its constructive functions—601-02; see also Paris Commune of 1871
— and the peasantry—333, 337-38, 488, 492-95
— and the urban middle strata—336, 472-74, 486, 492, 496, 591
— its truly democratic nature—331, 333, 334, 338, 464, 487-90, 495, 498
— its international character—339, 460, 475, 486, 490, 501
— separation of the church from the state—331, 337, 475, 490, 493, 533, 537
— classes and class struggle—491-92, 500
— role of the proletarian party in winning the dictatorship of the proletariat and in the implementation of its functions—416, 417, 426-27
— political rule of the proletariat as a means of building a classless society—416, 417, 491-92
— and experience of the Paris Commune—328-43, 483-93, 536-38, 634; see also Paris Commune of 1871
— using of the term “dictatorship of the proletariat”—634
Distribution—491

E

“Eastern question” at the beginning of the 1870s—175, 282
Economics and politics—327, 332-35, 426-27, 491-92, 549, 601, 602
Electoral rights
— in bourgeois society—488, 496, 539
— and the working class—278, 331, 333, 474, 489, 490, 537, 617, 634
Emigration (counter-revolutionary)—342-43, 457-58, 538-39, 543-44

England (Great Britain)
— constitutional monarchy—587
— oligarchic character of government—339
— bodies of local self-government—333, 464
— judiciary—333, 464
— Radicals—634
— electoral system—617
— bourgeois-republican movement—587
— trade unions—279, 498, 554, 560, 561, 589, 614, 615
— possibility of carrying out a proletarian revolution in a peaceful way—602, 606
— State Church (Anglican) and religion—587
— foreign policy and popular masses—269, 573, 574, 582
— foreign policy and the Civil War in the USA—270
— and France during the Second Empire—269, 580
See also Army, British; Bourgeoisie, English; International Working Men’s Association in England; Working class in England; Working-class movement in England

Exploitation—334-35, 484-85, 493-94
Expropriation—334-37, 493-95, 535-36

F

Federalism (reactionary)—502
Fenians—597
Feudalism—329-31, 483-86, 533, 534, 548
Feudal society—504, 531
Foreign policy—3, 276, 282
See also—foreign policy (in different countries)


Fourierism, Fourierists—499

France (prior to 1830)
— general characteristics—116, 333, 502
— territory, state frontiers—116, 117, 251
— French nation, its formation—77, 482
— Frenchmen, their national character—96, 106-07, 129, 156, 232
— social and political system—116, 328-31, 483-84, 502, 533, 547-49
— classes, class struggle—329, 534-36, 548-49
— state apparatus—328-34, 484-87, 502, 533-37, 550-51
— religion, the church—198, 314, 315, 484-85
— during the Consulate and the First Empire—328, 484-85, 534, 547-48
— social and political situation during the Restoration—458-59, 491-92, 521-23, 534-35
See also French Revolution, the

France. Foreign policy and diplomacy
— foreign policy during the July monarchy—316, 452-53, 519-20
— during the Second Empire—266-67
— and Austria—452-53, 519-20
— and England—316, 346, 442, 452-53, 519-20
— and Germany—37, 106, 117, 266-67, 316, 452-53
— and Italy—316, 317, 462
— and Poland—338-39
— and Prussia—5, 106, 266-67, 316, 452-53, 519-20
— and Russia—316, 338-39, 452-53, 519-20
— and Turkey—316, 452-53, 514-20
— colonial aggression against Algeria—95
— colonialist policy in Egypt—316, 452-53, 519-20

See also Army, French; Bourgeoisie, French; Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71; International Working Men’s Association in France; June 1848 uprising of the Paris proletariat; Napoleonic wars; Paris Commune of 1871; Revolution of 1848 in France; Wars of the First French Republic; Working class in France

France. Revolution of September 4, 1870, proclamation of the Third Republic
— workers' uprising on September 4, 1870 in Lyons, proclamation of the Commune—480, 532-33
— proclamation of the Commune by the workmen of Marseilles and Toulouse—480, 532-33
— rise of the Paris workmen on October 5, 1870—437-39, 480
— National Guard—330-31, 437, 445, 446, 449-50, 481, 482, 521, 527

France. Second Empire
— coup d'état of December 2, 1851—3-5, 95-96, 269, 330, 455-57, 460-63, 468-69, 586
— industry—330, 522-23, 535-36, 594
— agriculture—338, 493-94
— trade—330

— finances—5, 319, 330, 337, 484-85, 496-97, 535-36
— home policy, domestic situation—5
— character of political power—3-5, 330-31, 484-87, 497-98, 532-37, 550-51, 603-04
— administrative apparatus, bureaucracy—76-77, 484-85
— army as the bulwark and dominating force of the Bonapartist regime—95-96, 98, 330, 452-53, 484-85, 550
— public works—98-99, 339-40, 350-52
— suffrage—330, 442, 468-69, 484-85, 496, 539
— Corps Législatif—160, 321-22, 442, 484-85, 533
— monarchist groups—522-23
— clergy—198, 484-85, 492-93, 502
— bourgeoisie—330, 336, 484-85, 500, 601-02, 626-27
— people, the—195
— republican movement—443
— plebiscite of May 8, 1870—3-4, 557
— Bonapartist regime and wars—3-6, 36
— causes of the collapse of the Second Empire—5, 263, 459-60, 552
See also Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71

France. Third Republic (after the defeat of the Paris Commune)
— peasantry—629-30
— petty bourgeoisie—481
— home policy—357-58, 361, 608
— the bourgeois press—319-20, 369

Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71
— general characteristics—3-7, 31, 150, 193-94, 253-54, 260-70, 272, 276, 353-54, 473, 517, 527, 621
— its causes, diplomatic preparation—36, 59-60, 608
— change in its character during the course of military operations—104, 126, 253-54, 263-64, 267-68, 272, 503, 517, 527, 528, 549-51
— major battles after the capitulation at Sedan (the second period of war)—168, 169, 176, 194, 204, 228-30, 236-38, 241, 245, 251, 256, 257
— prospects of the continuation of the war by France—175-76, 180, 183, 184, 187-88, 193-97, 207, 242, 249, 251-54, 276
— cruelty of German invaders—92, 93, 130, 163-67, 182, 194-95, 198-200, 233-34, 350-53
— Frankfort Peace Treaty of May 10, 1871—346, 347, 543-44


— and the French working class—3-7, 120, 251, 261, 268-70, 279, 286, 289, 311, 516, 532, 558, 560, 562

— and revolutionary and democratic movements in France—35, 41-42, 134, 480-82

— and internal situation in Germany—12, 36, 105-06, 124, 197, 207, 214-15, 242, 261, 272, 274-75, 281, 617


— and attitude of the South-German states—11, 301

— and the German bourgeoisie—107, 215, 260-262, 264-67

— and the German working class—6, 7, 261-62, 268-69, 272, 275, 428, 577-78, 619

— and German Social-Democracy, its internationalism—271-75, 278, 279, 281, 299, 303, 558-59, 617, 619-20

— and England—59, 66, 175, 181-82, 244, 269-70, 281, 286, 289, 559, 573-81, 583-84

— and the English working class and the democratic movement—7, 269-70, 272, 358-59, 361, 557-60, 569, 571, 572, 575, 578-80

— and Russia—6, 7, 175, 260-61, 266-67, 275-76, 281-84, 575, 576, 579-80, 582-84

— and other European countries—173-75, 275, 560, 575-77, 579-81, 584

— and European bourgeois democracy—299-304

— and the International Association and the international working-class movement—3-7, 263-74, 277-79, 286-87, 289, 358, 362, 412, 515, 558-62, 573-84, 609, 619-20

— post-war alignment of forces in Europe, threat of a new military conflict—260-61, 266-68, 282, 302, 576, 580-82, 583-84

Freedom—264, 335, 426-27

— political freedoms in bourgeois society as a privilege of property classes—274-76, 617

— freedom of assembly, association and coalition—415, 417-18, 621

— workers’ use of political freedoms in bourgeois society—269, 278, 415, 417-18, 617, 634

— conditions for the actual emancipation of people—335-36, 426-27, 497, 501, 531

— true freedom under communism—395-36, 490, 491

See also Communism (social formation)—communist transformation of society and man

French Revolution, the—328, 533-34, 549


— Girondins—333

— national assemblies, their policy—497, 538-39

— National Convention, its policy—47

— counter-revolutionary rebellions, Vendée—238-39, 342-43, 457-58, 543-44

— revolutionary wars, army—47; see also Wars of the First French Republic

— and England—269-70

— and Europe—485, 534-35

— and Germany—266-67

G

General German Workingmen’s Society—589, 616

German Confederation (1815-1866)—36

German People’s Party, 1865—261

German Social-Democracy

— Social-Democratic Workers’ Party (Eisenachers)—278, 619
I

India—166, 494

Infantry—12, 97, 125

International Democratic Association—562

International solidarity of workers—3, 294, 501, 602, 603

International Working Men's Association
— general characteristics, its historical importance—354, 386, 545, 601-02, 633-34
— first programme documents (Inaugural Address and Provisional Rules)—364, 426, 600, 616, 618
— struggle for proletarian class character of the Association—277-78, 386, 600, 601, 633-34
— struggle for unity of actions of the proletarians of all countries—430, 602, 603, 633-34
— emancipation of the workers as the aim of the Association—426, 601, 602
— programme demand that the working class should win political power and build a classless society—416, 417, 427, 601, 602, 634
— and political struggle of the working class—278, 412, 415, 416, 417, 418, 427-28, 602, 616-18
— demand for forming a proletarian party in some countries—415-18, 427, 616-18
— question of the connection of the economic and political struggle of the proletariat—415, 427-28, 601-02
— and trade union organisations—279, 294, 423-25, 428, 554, 558, 560, 561, 590, 614-15
— and statistical surveying of the condition of the working class—425, 566
— and the agrarian question, peasantry and agricultural proletariat—426, 554, 561
— and the Irish question—555, 561, 620
— struggle against Bonapartism—3-5, 608
— and Franco-Prussian war—see Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71—
and the International Association and the international working-class movement; see also Paris Commune of 1871—and the International Association
— and religion—563, 608
— and secret societies—407, 428, 597, 621
— organisational principles of the International Association—365, 407, 408, 413-14, 422, 423, 430, 556, 557, 564, 565, 567, 601, 611, 616, 621
— Rules and Regulations—259, 408, 413, 428, 429, 557, 565, 566, 600, 602
— funds—273, 397, 398, 407-08, 424
— local sections, federations, federal councils, national organisations—407-08, 414, 422, 423, 426-30, 555, 559, 565, 601-02
— Marx as Corresponding Secretary for Germany—8, 259, 270, 288-90, 357, 367, 382, 398, 431
— Marx as Corresponding Secretary for the Netherlands—357, 382
— Marx as Corresponding Secretary for Russia—270, 431, 556
— Engels as Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (December 1870-July 1871)—272-73, 357, 382
— Engels as Corresponding Secretary for Spain—277-80, 357, 382, 431, 561
— Engels as Corresponding Secretary for Italy—431
— press organs of the International Association—555, 556, 570, 603

International Working Men’s Association.
Congress and conferences
— functions and tasks of general congresses—430, 616
— competence, character and tasks of conferences—420-22
— Geneva Congress (1866)—413, 425, 614
— Lausanne Congress (1867)—426
— Basle Congress (1869)—407-08, 413, 419, 423, 430, 552, 557, 566, 614
— Mainz (Mayence) Congress (1870)—agenda, reasons for cancelling it—259, 557, 558, 562
See also London Conference (1871)

International Working Men’s Association in Belgium—272-73, 556, 559, 564, 603, 609

— and the Land and Labour League—484-85, 610

— Paris Federation—3, 4, 286, 297, 546, 585

International Working Men’s Association in Germany—6, 619
— Social-Democratic Workers’ Party as a branch of the International Working Men's Association—259, 271, 555, 557-59, 619-20
— during the Franco-Prussian war and the Paris Commune—271-74, 279, 428, 558, 559
— police persecutions—271-74, 279, 405, 559, 562, 609, 619-20

International Working Men’s Association in Ireland—620

International Working Men’s Association in Italy—556, 559, 608
International Working Men's Association in the Netherlands—294, 603
International Working Men's Association in Portugal—279
International Working Men's Association and Russia—377, 429, 556, 613
International Working Men's Association in Spain—277-79, 295, 428, 603, 612
International Working Men's Association in Switzerland—279, 411, 430, 555, 556, 557, 558, 561, 563, 603, 609, 613
— Romance sections, Romance Federation, Federal Council of Romance Switzerland—412, 419-21, 430, 559, 561; see also Alliance of Socialist Democracy; Bakuninism, Bakuninists
— press—411, 421-22, 430
— resolution of the London Conference on the Alliance of Socialist Democracy—see London Conference (1871)
International Working Men's Association in the USA—279-80, 555, 557, 559-61, 563, 589, 590
Internationalism, proletarian—3, 268, 278, 339, 421, 430, 603, 614
See also Working-class movement
Italy—266

J
Joint-stock companies—496, 536
Journalism, journalists—264, 324, 336, 456, 457, 530
July Revolution of 1830 and July monarchy—see France. July Revolution of 1830 and July monarchy
June 1848 uprising of the Paris proletariat—588, 634
— causes of the uprising—324, 571-72
— establishment of Cavaignac's military dictatorship, suppression of the uprising by the bourgeoisie—269, 325, 329-30, 348, 351-62, 445, 446, 455-56, 461, 521, 527, 571-72, 610-11

L
Land and Labour League (England, 1869)—555, 561, 603
Landed property—491, 493-95, 523, 549
Landed proprietor (landlord)—335, 492, 523, 548, 549
Large-scale industry—329, 491, 548
Lassalleanism, Lassalleans—616
Law, international—353, 461
Legislation (bourgeois)—339, 444, 445
Liberalism—300, 340
London Conference (1871)
— its preparation and convening—406-08, 413-14, 561, 563-66
— its tasks, character and composition—407, 432, 563-67, 609, 613, 616
— resolution on the political struggle of the working class and formation of an independent proletarian party—415-18, 426-27, 616
— on the winning of political power by the working class—416, 417, 427
— on the international solidarity of the workers—428, 619-20
— struggle against anarchist sectarianism, resolution on the Alliance of Socialist Democracy—411-12, 429-30
— resolutions on the organisational questions—413, 423-24, 427-28
— and trade unions—614-15
— various resolutions—419-22, 424-31
— publication of the International Association's documents by decision of the Conference—413, 423-32, 566, 613
Lorraine—33, 117, 260, 261, 264-65
See also Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71—annexation of Alsace and Lorraine by Germany
Luxembourg—275, 575, 579

M
Mazzinism, Mazzinists—380-85, 562, 563, 598, 605, 607-08
Means of labour—490, 494, 500, 634
Means of production—335, 494, 524
Mexican expedition, 1861-67—129, 156, 166, 182, 397
Military science, history, literature—88, 220, 463
Military training—98, 104, 106, 125, 151-52, 256, 311, 516

N
— and Russia—7
Nation—332-33, 484, 490
— national pride, consciousness, feeling—12, 128-29, 330, 336-37, 496-97, 550
National debt—319, 329, 484, 488, 536
Nationalism—3, 518-19, 608, 620
National Labour Union (USA, 1866)—280, 615
National Liberals (Germany, from 1866)—261
National question—265-67, 290, 353-54, 500-01, 608
— and bourgeoisie—311-12, 338-39, 353-54, 500-01, 515-16
— and peasantry—268-70
— and working-class, and working-class and socialist movement—267-70, 500-01
Natural science—298-99, 303-05
Navy
— British—572, 576, 584
— French—77, 304
Neutrality—173, 175

P
Pan-Germanism—261
Pan-Slavism—282
Paris Commune of 1871
— as people’s revolution—456-57, 463-64, 476-77, 482, 483, 485-86, 488, 498, 505, 590-91, 603-04
— completion of bourgeois-democratic reforms—524
— as a political form of the emancipation of labour—394-35, 490-92
— as a form of the proletarian statehood on a national scale—331-34, 481, 490, 491, 504, 536-38
— its international character—339, 353, 459-60, 475, 487, 490, 501
— leadership of the working class—335-37, 487, 490, 493-99, 526, 536-38, 588, 591, 601
— role of the National Guard and arming of the people in the preparation of the revolution of March 18—331, 482, 483, 536-37, 545-48
— rising of March 18—292, 313, 319-26, 328, 343, 441-42, 445, 446, 449-50, 478, 482, 483, 507-09, 517, 524-25, 528, 530, 532-33, 536-37, 547-48, 585, 586, 616
— Central Committee of the National Guard as the first workers’ government—322-26, 328, 354-55, 445, 449-50, 483, 491-92, 500, 508-13, 525, 530, 533, 545-46, 586, 588, 616
— election of the Commune on March 26, 1871—326, 330-31, 481-82, 508-09, 512-13, 586, 588
— its democratic character—332-34, 338-39, 350-51, 483, 485-86, 488-90, 538
— electivity, revocability and responsibility of all functionaries of the Commune—330-33, 335-38, 340, 474-75, 488-90, 537, 592
— replacement of the standing army by the National Guard—330-31, 334, 474-75, 488-90, 537-38
— destruction of the old judicial system—330-32, 474-75, 493, 533, 537-38
— transformation of the police into a body responsible to the people—330, 332, 337-38, 489, 490, 493, 536-37
— and universal suffrage—330-33, 474-75, 489, 490, 537
— social measures in the interests of the working class and the non-proletarian working people—339-40, 472-75, 499, 590-91
— socialist trend in its activity—335-36, 338-40, 472, 486-87, 490-492, 496, 499-500
— financial measures—337-40, 478-79, 491-92, 537-38, 592
— cutting down of the expenditures on administration (“cheap government”)—330-31, 333-38, 490-91, 493, 592
— foreign policy of the Commune—353-54, 475-76, 586
— women’s participation in the revolution—341-42, 350-51, 505, 631-32
— and the Versailles army—317, 325-26, 341-44, 448-49, 452-53,
459-60, 465-69, 488-89, 506-07, 513-14, 539-44, 591
— and the ruling classes of Europe and the USA—335-36, 355, 379-82, 386-87, 457-60, 524-26, 532-33
— and European bourgeois democracy—367, 380, 386, 499-500
— and international proletariat, its movement of solidarity with the Commune—338-39, 353-55, 415-17, 426-28, 486-87, 490-92, 545-46, 553-54, 562, 563, 595, 599, 610-12, 615, 620
— Marx’s advice to the Commune—388, 389, 396, 589-91
— Marx and Engels on the General Council’s Address The Civil War in France—367-68, 370, 372-73, 375-77, 386-87, 400, 562, 563, 592
— defeat of the Commune, its causes—324-26, 399, 508, 512-14, 528-31, 547-48, 588, 615
— emigration of Paris Communards—396, 428-29, 562-64

— use of bourgeois parliament by representatives of the working class—273, 274, 278, 617

Party, political—277, 483-84
Party, proletarian

— its nature, tasks, leading role—278, 415-18, 427-28, 634
— in the period of the International Association—47, 278
— organisational principles—419
— its tactics, propaganda, agitation—278, 415-18, 617
— resolution of the London Conference on founding independent proletarian parties in some countries—415-18, 426-428, 520-21

Patriotic war of 1812 in Russia—200, 351-52

Patriotism—166-67, 199, 267-68, 480

Peace
— struggle for peace, against militarism, wars of conquest and annexations—3, 6, 7, 261-62, 267-70, 272, 573, 574, 577-82, 617, 620, 634


People, the—290, 332-33, 460-61, 463-64, 468-70, 488-89, 499, 535
— in the proletarian revolution—335-37, 463-64, 482-84, 487-88, 498-99, 504-05, 536-37

Poland—79, 148-49, 264, 283, 339

Police, the—328, 331, 337-38, 354, 370-71, 490, 493, 497, 502, 504, 533, 534, 537, 548

Press, the—274-76, 291, 414, 416, 418, 586
— anti-democratic character of the official press in the exploiting society—269-70, 336-37, 371, 438, 446, 498-99, 597

Prevision, prediction (Marx’s and Engels’ predictions of social, political and historical phenomena and events)—5, 260-61, 263, 267-68, 270

Private property—315, 334-35, 439, 494-95, 504, 505, 523-25, 608, 634

Proudhonism, Proudhonists—297, 423, 429-30, 553, 562, 590

Prussia—481
— population—97-98, 105, 149, 199
— feudalism and its survivals—459
— reforms of 1807-14—166, 199-202, 459
— in 1850s-1870s—5-6
— political system—5, 104-06, 166, 334, 459, 487
— religion and the church—340
— foreign policy and diplomacy—124-25, 272
— and Austria—97
— and France—5, 106, 267
— and Germany—5, 11, 31, 59-60, 261, 299, 302-03, 316
— and Poland, its oppression—149, 264
— and Russia—281-82, 353
See also Army, Prussian

Public opinion—65, 199, 266-67, 272, 274, 285

R

Radicalism, radicals—633-34
Reformism—372, 373, 376, 386, 610-11
Reform League (England, 1869)—615
Religion—496, 537, 620
Republican, proletarian—331, 497, 499, 540, 548-50, 577, 580
See also Dictatorship of the proletariat

Revolution—329, 341, 416, 417, 481-88, 540
— and the state—328, 329, 460, 483-88, 534-38, 547-50
— revolutionary initiative—336-37, 498, 501, 526

Revolution, bourgeois and bourgeois-democratic—322, 333, 460-61, 469, 484-86, 516, 526, 535, 547-50

Revolution, continuous
— proletarian revolution as its final stage—335-36

Revolution of 1848 in France. Second Republic
— February 1848 revolution—315-16, 323, 329, 330, 456, 459-61, 505, 571-72, 634
— counter-revolutionary dictatorship of Cavaignac—495-98, 521
— Second Republic, general characteristics—329-30, 445, 460-61, 484, 487, 493, 497, 522, 523, 533, 534, 536, 549
— retaining and improvement of the old state machine—329-30, 345, 484-86, 548-49
— National Assembly, its policy—325, 330, 336, 461, 533, 571-72
— election of Louis Bonaparte President, enhancing of his personal power—444, 493
— Legislative Assembly (from May 28, 1849), its politics—442, 469
— events of June 13, 1849, defeat of petty-bourgeois democracy—325, 444, 456, 496, 512
— universal suffrage, its abolition on May 31, 1850—330, 440, 469, 539
— and the National Guard—496
— and the bourgeoisie—329, 336, 460-62, 492, 493, 505, 522, 549
— and the working class—330-31, 461, 522, 548-49, 571
— and the peasantry—337, 493
— various monarchist groups—319, 461, 522, 523, 549
— and bourgeois republicans (the National Party)—329, 461
— Rome expedition—315, 316, 325, 455, 462-63, 510-12, 521, 572, 610-11

Revolution of 1848-49 in Germany (uprising in the south-western Germany in May-June 1849)—95, 151, 165-66, 352

Revolution of 1848-49 in Hungary—95, 165, 225, 266

Revolution of 1848-49 in Italian states—165, 315, 316, 325-26, 455, 462, 510-12, 520, 572, 611
Revolution, people’s—484, 487, 498, 505, 535, 548

Revolution, proletarian, socialist—416, 417, 427, 486, 491, 498, 525, 526; see also Dictatorship of the proletariat
— its historical necessity—504, 540, 603
— its prerequisites—335, 491, 499
— its radical difference from the bourgeois revolution—486, 487, 498, 533
— its international character—339, 460, 486, 490, 502, 540
— peaceful and violent ways of carrying it out—576-77, 602, 603, 606, 618
— necessity of winning the army over to the side of the revolution—488
— and national question—501

Revolution, social—277, 427, 452, 481, 486-87, 491, 496, 516, 524, 526, 540, 602

Russia—7, 261, 266-67, 281-84, 301, 351, 575, 576, 577, 579, 583

S

Science—140, 298, 331-32, 335-36, 488-90, 494-98, 522-23, 537

Second Empire—see France, Second Empire

Sectarianism—335-36, 423, 429, 497-99, 618
See also London Conference (1871)—struggle against anarchist sectarianism, resolution on the Alliance of Socialist Democracy

Sepoy mutiny—166, 352

Silesia—149

Slave-owning society—504, 505

Slavery—491, 504

Socialism (theories and trends)
— doctrinal—335-36
— petty-bourgeois socialism of Louis Blanc—497, 598
— utopian—499, 618
— in France—278
— in Germany—278

Société des Saisons—444

Society of December 10—5

Spain—129, 143-44, 165, 173, 182, 254

State
— and society—328-31, 333-34, 483-92, 498, 504, 533-38, 540, 547-51, 598
— its genesis—328, 333, 483, 484, 533, 534
— formation of national states—328, 331, 333, 483-85
— state machine—328, 332, 461, 483-84, 486-87, 490, 493, 496, 498, 502, 504, 533-37, 547-48
— and religion—332, 474, 490, 537, 547-48
— and classes, class struggle—278, 329-30, 490, 496, 498, 533-36, 548, 550
— its withering away in communist society—333, 490, 537

State, bourgeois—278, 329-31, 483-90, 498, 533-38, 548-51
— its parasitical character—333-34, 459, 484-85, 491, 493, 533-34, 538
— as an instrument of exploitation of working people—278, 329-33, 459, 484-88, 490, 502, 548-50
— decay of the bourgeois state apparatus—77, 330-31, 459, 486, 536, 550
— its various forms—330-31, 333-34, 460, 486-87, 533-36, 550, 551

See also Monarchy; Republic, bourgeois

State power, its class character—487, 534-35
— its origin—328, 333, 483, 484, 533, 534
— as an instrument of the class domination of the bourgeoisie—329-34, 484-88, 533-38, 548-51, 618

State, proletarian—see Communism (social formation); Dictatorship of the proletariat; Paris Commune of 1871; Republic, proletarian

Strikes—294-96, 442, 498, 602-03

Swindling—330, 336, 536

T

Taxes, taxation—329, 487-88, 537-38

Terror—325, 329, 344, 348, 350-51
461, 481, 497, 503, 511, 529, 531, 549
See also June 1848 uprising of the Paris proletariat—establishment of Cavaignac’s military dictatorship, suppression of the uprising by the bourgeoisie; Paris Commune of 1871—counter-revolutionary terror
Third Republic (France)—see France. Third Republic (after the defeat of the Paris Commune)
Trade unions, trade-union movement—279, 295, 428, 558, 603, 614, 615
See also England (Great Britain)—trade unions

U

United States of America, the—379-82, 536, 587, 618
See also Civil War in the USA, 1861-65; War of Independence in North America, 1775-83
Uprising, armed
— national, popular—201, 341, 469, 485
— proletarian—339, 386, 588
See also June 1848 uprising of the Paris proletariat; Paris Commune of 1871; Revolution, proletarian, socialist

V

Voltaireanism—336, 460

W

War(s)
— general characteristics—165, 193, 574, 583
— economic causes of their origin—337-38, 492-93
— under feudalism—330
— under capitalism—319, 343, 492
— and politics—3, 265-66, 495, 576, 577
— consequences of wars, their influence on economic and social development—496-97, 574
— and revolution and revolutionary movement—261
—and foreign policy of the working class—see Working class—struggle for peace, against militarism, wars of conquest and annexations
— revolutionary—350
— national liberation—97, 129, 353
— guerrilla warfare—137, 164, 165, 173, 182, 188, 195, 199-201, 254
— defensive—6, 126, 214, 264
— of conquest—3, 6, 106, 126, 195, 214-15, 266
— local, localised—267
— laws (rules) of warfare—132-33, 164, 199
— threat of war in the last third of the 19th cent.—261, 267, 577, 583
— elimination of wars in communist society—7
See also Anglo-Franco-Chinese war of 1856-60; Austro-Italo-French war of 1859; Austro-Prussian war of 1866; Civil War in the USA, 1861-65; Crimean war of 1853-56; Danish war of 1864; Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71; Napoleonic wars; Patriotic war of 1812 in Russia; War of Independence in North America, 1775-83; Wars of the First French Republic
War of Independence in North America, 1775-83—165-66
Wars of the First French Republic (end of the 18th-beginning of the 19th cent.)—35, 47, 65, 265, 266, 269
Women’s question and women’s movement—341, 350, 424, 567
Working class
— its world historic mission—335, 486, 499, 590, 601-03
— historical necessity of turning it into the ruling class—335, 416, 417, 426-27, 494, 601-02
— development of its class consciousness—335, 499, 505
— as a leading class, expressing the interests of all people—335-36, 486, 495, 496, 591
— and the peasantry—337-38, 426, 488, 493-95
— and the petty urban bourgeoisie—336, 486, 496, 591
— struggle for peace, against militarism, wars of conquest and annexations—3, 6, 7, 261-62, 268-70, 272, 573-84, 619-20

Working class in England—573, 574, 578-81, 602, 617, 620, 634

Working class in France
— during the revolution of 1848 and the Second Republic—330-31, 461, 522, 548-49, 571, 634
— during the Second Empire—4, 5, 330, 331, 486, 536, 550, 556, 601; see also Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71—and the French working class
— during the Third Republic—269-70, 311, 321, 437-38, 451, 481, 515-16, 526-27, 532, 547

Working class in Germany—267, 268, 577, 578, 582, 602, 619, 620; see also Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71—and the German working class

Working class in Ireland—620

Working-class movement
— its immediate and ultimate aims—278, 416, 417, 426-27, 491, 494, 498-500, 601-03
— struggle for the emancipation of the working class—3, 275, 278, 426, 460, 461, 500, 534, 595, 602, 633-34
— significance of its unity—278, 427, 602-03
— its origin and conditions of development—494, 499
— stages of its development—277-78, 498
— necessity to unite the economic and political struggle of the working class—426-27, 601-02
— and the revolutionary theory—277, 499-500, 605

— internationalism as its essential feature—3, 268, 278, 421, 430, 501, 602, 603, 614
— struggle for democratic demands—278, 415, 417-18, 587, 617
— struggle for the elimination of national oppression—267-68
— combination of legal and illegal forms of political struggle—278, 600-02

See also Class struggle; International Working Men's Association; Party, proletarian

Working-class movement in England—269, 573-74, 577
See also International Working Men's Association in England

Working-class movement in Germany—261-62; see also Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71
— and the Paris Commune—599, 620
See also International Working Men's Association in Germany

Working-class movement in the USA—554, 560, 587, 589, 590, 606, 614-15
See also International Working Men's Association in the USA

Working-class and socialist movement in France—443, 497, 554, 558
— between the revolution of September 4, 1870 and the Paris Commune—324, 437-38, 445, 481, 527, 590
— during the Paris Commune—see Paris Commune of 1871
See also International Working Men's Association in France

Working-class and socialist movement in Italy—621
See also International Working Men's Association in Italy