Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

TO THE CHAIRMAN
OF THE SLAVONIC MEETING,
MARCH 21st 1881,
IN CELEBRATION OF THE ANNIVERSARY
OF THE PARIS COMMUNE

Citizen,

With great regret we have to inform you that we are not able to attend your meeting.

When the Commune of Paris succumbed to the atrocious massacre organised by the defenders of "Order", the victors little thought that ten years would not elapse before an event would happen in distant Petersburg which, maybe after long and violent struggle, must ultimately and certainly lead to the establishment of a Russian Commune;

that the King of Prussia who had prepared the Commune by besieging Paris and thus compelling the ruling bourgeoisie to arm the people—that that same King of Prussia, ten years after, besieged in his own capital by Socialists, would only be able to maintain his throne, by declaring the state of siege in his capital Berlin.

On the other hand, the Continental governments who after the fall of the Commune by their persecutions compelled the International Working Men’s Association to give up its formal, external organisation—these governments who believed they could crush the great International Labour Movement by decrees and special laws—little did they think that ten years later that same International Labour Movement, more powerful than ever, would embrace the working classes not only of Europe but of America also: that the common struggle for common interests against a common enemy would bind them together into a new
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and greater spontaneous International, outgrowing more and more all external forms of association.

Thus the Commune which the powers of the old world believed to be exterminated lives stronger than ever, and thus we may join you in the cry: Vive la Commune!

Written on March 21, 1881

First published, in Russian, in Pravda, No. 308, November 7, 1933

Reproduced from the manuscript
TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY NEWS

Sir,

The Daily News of to-day, in an article entitled: "Prosecution of the Freiheit Journal", states that the number of that paper, containing an article on the death of the Emperor of Russia, "also contained some allusion to the perpetrator of the Mansion House mystery". As this statement is open to an interpretation altogether at variance with the contents of the article in question; as that article is entirely unconnected with the one on the St. Petersburg affair and as Mr. Most the editor is at present not in a position to defend himself in the press, we beg to ask you to insert the following literal translation of all that is said, in the number of the Freiheit alluded to, with regard to the "Mansion House mystery".

Freiheit, 19th March, 1881:

"On Wednesday evening a parcel full of gunpowder, about 15 lb., was placed by an 'unknown' hand before the Mansion House in the City. It was burning at one end, but 'accidentally' a policeman at once observed this and was plucky enough to put it out. Now we do not see what purpose might possibly have been served by this powder explosion. Anyhow, the international police appear to have known how to make capital out of it. For on the following evening Government was to be asked in Parliament what measures they intended to take against the Socialist bands..."
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which had established themselves in London. However, the Home Secretary did not think proper to do anything besides shrugging his shoulders, and that was all the international police got for their pains."

We are, Sir, your obedient servants,

Karl Marx
Frederick Engels

London, March 31

Written on March 31, 1881

First published in The Daily News,
No. 10907, April 1, 1881

Reproduced from the manuscript, collated with the newspaper
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Frederick Engels

A FAIR DAY'S WAGES FOR A FAIR DAY'S WORK

This has now been the motto of the English working-class movement for the last fifty years. It did good service in the time of the rising Trades Unions after the repeal of the infamous Combination Laws in 1824; it did still better service in the time of the glorious Chartist movement, when the English workmen marched at the head of the European working class. But times are moving on, and a good many things which were desirable and necessary fifty, and even thirty years ago, are now antiquated and would be completely out of place. Does the old, time-honoured watchword too belong to them?

A fair day's wages for a fair day's work? But what is a fair day's wages, and what is a fair day's work? How are they determined by the laws under which modern society exists and develops itself? For an answer to this we must not apply to the science of morals or of law and equity, nor to any sentimental feeling of humanity, justice, or even charity. What is morally fair, what is even fair in law, may be far from being socially fair. Social fairness or unfairness is decided by one science alone—the science which deals with the material facts of production and exchange, the science of political economy.

Now what does political economy call a fair day's wages and a fair day's work? Simply the rate of wages and the length and intensity of a day's work which are determined by competition of employer and employed in the open market. And what are they, when thus determined?

A fair day's wages, under normal conditions, is the sum required to procure to the labourer the means of existence
necessary, according to the standard of life of his station and country, to keep himself in working order and to propagate his race. The actual rate of wages, with the fluctuations of trade, may be sometimes above, sometimes below this rate; but, under fair conditions, that rate ought to be the average of all oscillations.

A fair day’s work is that length of working day and that intensity of actual work which expends one day’s full working power of the workman without encroaching upon his capacity for the same amount of work for the next and following days.

The transaction, then, may be thus described—the workman gives to the Capitalist his full day’s working power; that is, so much of it as he can give without rendering impossible the continuous repetition of the transaction. In exchange he receives just as much, and no more, of the necessaries of life as is required to keep up the repetition of the same bargain every day. The workman gives as much, the Capitalist gives as little, as the nature of the bargain will admit. This is a very peculiar sort of fairness.

But let us look a little deeper into the matter. As, according to political economists, wages and working days are fixed by competition, fairness seems to require that both sides should have the same fair start on equal terms. But that is not the case. The Capitalist, if he cannot agree with the Labourer, can afford to wait, and live upon his capital. The workman cannot. He has but wages to live upon, and must therefore take work when, where, and at what terms he can get it. The workman has no fair start. He is fearfully handicapped by hunger. Yet, according to the political economy of the Capitalist class, that is the very pink of fairness.

But this is a mere trifle. The application of mechanical power and machinery to new trades, and the extension and improvements of machinery in trades already subjected to it, keep turning out of work more and more “hands”; and they do so at a far quicker rate than that at which these superseded “hands” can be absorbed by, and find employment in, the manufactures of the country. These superseded “hands” form a real industrial army of reserve for the use of Capital. If trade is bad they may starve, beg, steal, or go to the workhouse422; if trade is good they are ready at hand to expand production; and until the very last man, woman, or child of this army of reserve shall have found work—which happens in times of frantic over-production alone—until then will its competition keep down wages, and by its existence alone strengthen the power of Capital in its struggle with Labour. In the race with Capital, Labour is not only handicapped, it has to drag a
cannon-ball riveted to its foot. Yet that is fair according to Capitalist political economy.

But let us inquire out of what fund does Capital pay these very fair wages? Out of capital, of course. But capital produces no value. Labour is, besides the earth, the only source of wealth; capital itself is nothing but the stored-up produce of labour. So that the wages of Labour are paid out of labour, and the working man is paid out of his own produce. According to what we may call common fairness, the wages of the labourer ought to consist in the produce of his labour. But that would not be fair according to political economy. On the contrary, the produce of the workman’s labour goes to the Capitalist, and the workman gets out of it no more than the bare necessaries of life. And thus the end of this uncommonly ‘fair’ race of competition is that the produce of the labour of those who do work, gets unavoidably accumulated in the hands of those that do not work, and becomes in their hands the most powerful means to enslave the very men who produced it.

A fair day’s wages for a fair day’s work! A good deal might be said about the fair day’s work too, the fairness of which is perfectly on a par with that of the wages. But that we must leave for another occasion. From what has been stated it is pretty clear that the old watchword has lived its day, and will hardly hold water nowadays. The fairness of political economy, such as it truly lays down the laws which rule actual society, that fairness is all on one side—on that of Capital. Let, then, the old motto be buried for ever and replaced by another:

POSSSESSION OF THE MEANS OF WORK—
RAW MATERIAL, FACTORIES, MACHINERY—
BY THE WORKING PEOPLE THEMSELVES.

Written on May 1-2, 1881
Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Labour Standard* (London), No. 1, May 7, 1881, as a leading article
Frederick Engels

THE WAGES SYSTEM

In a previous article we examined the time-honoured motto, "A fair day's wages for a fair day's work", and came to the conclusion that the fairest day's wages under present social conditions is necessarily tantamount to the very unfairest division of the workman's produce, the greater portion of that produce going into the capitalist's pocket, and the workman having to put up with just as much as will enable him to keep himself in working order and to propagate his race.

This is a law of political economy, or, in other words, a law of the present economical organisation of society, which is more powerful than all the Common and Statute Law of England put together, the Court of Chancery included. While society is divided into two opposing classes—on the one hand, the capitalists, monopolisers of the whole of the means of production, land, raw materials, machinery; on the other hand, labourers, working people deprived of all property in the means of production, owners of nothing but their own working power; while this social organisation exists the law of wages will remain all-powerful, and will every day afresh rivet the chains by which the working man is made the slave of his own produce—monopolised by the capitalist.

The Trades Unions of this country have now for nearly sixty years fought against this law—with what result? Have they succeeded in freeing the working class from the bondage in which capital—the produce of its own hands—holds it? Have they enabled a single section of the working class to rise above the
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situation of wages-slaves, to become owners of their own means of production, of the raw materials, tools, machinery required in their trade, and thus to become the owners of the produce of their own labour? It is well known that not only they have not done so, but that they never tried.

Far be it from us to say that Trades Unions are of no use because they have not done that. On the contrary, Trades Unions in England, as well as in every other manufacturing country, are a necessity for the working classes in their struggle against capital. The average rate of wages is equal to the sum of necessaries sufficient to keep up the race of workmen in a certain country according to the standard of life habitual in that country. That standard of life may be very different for different classes of workmen. The great merit of Trades Unions, in their struggle to keep up the rate of wages and to reduce working hours, is that they tend to keep up and to raise the standard of life. There are many trades in the East-end of London whose labour is not more skilled and quite as hard as that of bricklayers and bricklayers' labourers, yet they hardly earn half the wages of these. Why? Simply because a powerful organisation enables the one set to maintain a comparatively high standard of life as the rule by which their wages are measured; while the other set, disorganised and powerless, have to submit not only to unavoidable but also to arbitrary encroachments of their employers: their standard of life is gradually reduced, they learn how to live on less and less wages, and their wages naturally fall to that level which they themselves have learnt to accept as sufficient.

The law of wages, then, is not one which draws a hard and fast line. It is not inexorable with certain limits. There is at every time (great depression excepted) for every trade a certain latitude within which the rate of wages may be modified by the results of the struggle between the two contending parties. Wages in every case are fixed by a bargain, and in a bargain he who resists longest and best has the greatest chance of getting more than his due. If the isolated workman tries to drive his bargain with the capitalist he is easily beaten and has to surrender at discretion; but if a whole trade of workmen form a powerful organisation, collect among themselves a fund to enable them to defy their employers if need be, and thus become enabled to treat with these employers as a power, then, and then only, have they a chance to get even that pittance which, according to the economical constitution of present society, may be called a fair day's wages for a fair day's work.
The law of wages is not upset by the struggles of Trades Unions. On the contrary, it is enforced by them. Without the means of resistance of the Trades Unions the labourer does not receive even what is his due according to the rules of the wages system. It is only with the fear of the Trades Union before his eyes that the capitalist can be made to part with the full market value of his labourer's working power. Do you want a proof? Look at the wages paid to the members of the large Trades Unions, and at the wages paid to the numberless small trades in that pool of stagnant misery, the East-end of London.

Thus the Trades Unions do not attack the wages system. But it is not the highness or lowness of wages which constitutes the economical degradation of the working class: this degradation is comprised in the fact that, instead of receiving for its labour the full produce of this labour, the working class has to be satisfied with a portion of its own produce called wages. The capitalist pockets the whole produce (paying the labourer out of it) because he is the owner of the means of labour. And, therefore, there is no real redemption for the working class until it becomes owner of all the means of work—land, raw material, machinery, etc.—and thereby also the owner of THE WHOLE OF THE PRODUCE OF ITS OWN LABOUR.

Written on May 15-16, 1881 Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in The Labour Standard (London), No. 3, May 21, 1881, as a leading article
In our last issue we considered the action of Trades Unions as far as they enforce the economical law of wages against employers. We return to this subject, as it is of the highest importance that the working classes generally should thoroughly understand it.

We suppose no English working man of the present day needs to be taught that it is the interest of the individual capitalist, as well as of the capitalist class generally, to reduce wages as much as possible. The produce of labour, after deducting all expenses, is divided, as David Ricardo has irrefutably proved, into two shares: the one forms the labourer’s wages, the other the capitalist’s profits. Now, this net produce of labour being, in every individual case, a given quantity, it is clear that the share called profits cannot increase without the share called wages decreasing. To deny that it is the interest of the capitalist to reduce wages, would be tantamount to say that it is not his interest to increase his profits.

We know very well that there are other means of temporarily increasing profits, but they do not alter the general law, and therefore need not trouble us here.

Now, how can the capitalists reduce wages when the rate of wages is governed by a distinct and well-defined law of social economy? The economical law of wages is there, and is irrefutable. But, as we have seen, it is elastic, and it is so in two ways. The rate
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of wages can be lowered, in a particular trade, either directly, by gradually accustoming the workpeople of that trade to a lower standard of life, or, indirectly, by increasing the number of working hours per day (or the intensity of work during the same working hours) without increasing the pay.

And the interest of every individual capitalist to increase his profits by reducing the wages of his workpeople receives a fresh stimulus from the competition of capitalists of the same trade amongst each other. Each one of them tries to undersell his competitors, and unless he is to sacrifice his profits he must try and reduce wages. Thus, the pressure upon the rate of wages brought about by the interest of every individual capitalist is increased tenfold by the competition amongst them. What was before a matter of more or less profit, now becomes a matter of necessity.

Against this constant, unceasing pressure unorganised labour has no effective means of resistance. Therefore, in trades without organisation of the workpeople, wages tend constantly to fall and the working hours tend constantly to increase. Slowly, but surely, this process goes on. Times of prosperity may now and then interrupt it, but times of bad trade hasten it on all the more afterwards. The workpeople gradually get accustomed to a lower and lower standard of life. While the length of working day more and more approaches the possible maximum, the wages come nearer and nearer to their absolute minimum—the sum below which it becomes absolutely impossible for the workman to live and to reproduce his race.

There was a temporary exception to this about the beginning of this century. The rapid extension of steam and machinery was not sufficient for the still faster increasing demand for their produce. Wages in these trades, except those of children sold from the workhouse to the manufacturer, were as a rule high; those of such skilled manual labour as could not be done without were very high; what a dyer, a mechanic, a velvet-cutter, a hand-mule spinner, used to receive now sounds fabulous. At the same time the trades superseded by machinery were slowly starved to death. But newly-invented machinery by-and-by superseded these well-paid workmen; machinery was invented which made machinery, and that at such a rate that the supply of machine-made goods not only equalled, but exceeded, the demand. When the general peace, in 1815, re-established regularity of trade, the decennial fluctuations between prosperity, over-production, and commercial panic began. Whatever advantages the workpeople had preserved
from old prosperous times, and perhaps even increased during the period of frantic over-production, were now taken from them during the period of bad trade and panic; and soon the manufacturing population of England submitted to the general law that the wages of unorganised labour constantly tend towards the absolute minimum.

But in the meantime the Trades Unions, legalised in 1824, had also stepped in, and high time it was. Capitalists are always organised. They need in most cases no formal union, no rules, officers, etc. Their small number, as compared with that of the workmen, the fact of their forming a separate class, their constant social and commercial intercourse stand them in lieu of that; it is only later on, when a branch of manufactures has taken possession of a district, such as the cotton trade has of Lancashire, that a formal capitalists’ Trades Union becomes necessary. On the other hand, the workpeople from the very beginning cannot do without a strong organisation, well-defined by rules and delegating its authority to officers and committees. The Act of 1824 rendered these organisations legal. From that day Labour became a power in England. The formerly helpless mass, divided against itself, was no longer so. To the strength given by union and common action soon was added the force of a well-filled exchequer——“resistance money”, as our French brethren expressively call it. The entire position of things now changed. For the capitalist it became a risky thing to indulge in a reduction of wages or an increase of working hours.

Hence the violent outbursts of the capitalist class of those times against Trades Unions. That class had always considered its long-established practice of grinding down the working class as a vested right and lawful privilege. That was now to be put a stop to. No wonder they cried out lustily and held themselves at least as much injured in their rights and property as Irish landlords do nowadays.425

Sixty years’ experience of struggle have brought them round to some extent. Trades Unions have now become acknowledged institutions, and their action as one of the regulators of wages is recognised quite as much as the action of the Factories and Workshops Acts as regulators of the hours of work. Nay, the cotton masters in Lancashire have lately even taken a leaf out of the workpeople’s book, and now know how to organise a strike, when it suits them, as well or better than any Trades Union.

4 "An Act to repeal the Laws relative to the Combination of Workmen; and for other Purposes therein mentioned [21st June, 1824]." — Ed.
Thus it is through the action of Trades Unions that the law of wages is enforced as against the employers, and that the workpeople of any well-organised trade are enabled to obtain, at least approximately, the full value of the working power which they hire to their employer; and that, with the help of State laws, the hours of labour are made at least not to exceed too much that maximum length beyond which the working power is prematurely exhausted. This, however, is the utmost Trades Unions, as at present organised, can hope to obtain, and that by constant struggle only, by an immense waste of strength and money; and then the fluctuations of trade, once every ten years at least, break down for the moment what has been conquered, and the fight has to be fought over again. It is a vicious circle from which there is no issue. The working class remains what it was, and what our Chartist forefathers were not afraid to call it, a class of wages slaves. Is this to be the final result of all this labour, self-sacrifice, and suffering? Is this to remain for ever the highest aim of British workmen? Or is the working class of this country at last to attempt breaking through this vicious circle, and to find an issue out of it in a movement for the ABOLITION OF THE WAGES SYSTEM ALTOGETHER?

Next week we shall examine the part played by Trades Unions as organisers of the working class.

II

So far we have considered the functions of Trades Unions as far only as they contribute to the regulation of the rate of wages and ensure to the labourer, in his struggle against capital, at least some means of resistance. But that aspect does not exhaust our subject.

The struggle of the labourer against capital, we said. That struggle does exist, whatever the apologists of capital may say to the contrary. It will exist so long as a reduction of wages remains the safest and readiest means of raising profits; nay, so long as the wages system itself shall exist. The very existence of Trades Unions is proof sufficient of the fact; if they are not made to fight against the encroachments of capital what are they made for? There is no use in mincing matters. No milksop words can hide the ugly fact that present society is mainly divided into two great antagonistic classes—into capitalists, the owners of all the means for the employment of labour, on one side; and working men, the owners of nothing but their own working power, on the other.
The produce of the labour of the latter class has to be divided between both classes, and it is this division about which the struggle is constantly going on. Each class tries to get as large a share as possible; and it is the most curious aspect of this struggle that the working class, while fighting to obtain a share only of its own produce, is often enough accused of actually robbing the capitalist!

But a struggle between two great classes of society necessarily becomes a political struggle. So did the long battle between the middle or capitalist class and the landed aristocracy; so also does the fight between the working class and these same capitalists. In every struggle of class against class, the next end fought for is political power; the ruling class defends its political supremacy, that is to say its safe majority in the Legislature; the inferior class fights for, first a share, then the whole of that power, in order to become enabled to change existing laws in conformity with their own interests and requirements. Thus the working class of Great Britain for years fought ardent and even violently for the People's Charter, which was to give it that political power; it was defeated, but the struggle had made such an impression upon the victorious middle class that this class, since then, was only too glad to buy a prolonged armistice at the price of ever-repeated concessions to the working people.

Now, in a political struggle of class against class, organisation is the most important weapon. And in the same measure as the merely political or Chartist Organisation fell to pieces, in the same measure the Trades Unions Organisation grew stronger and stronger, until at present it has reached a degree of strength unequalled by any working-class organisation abroad. A few large Trades Unions, comprising between one and two millions of working men, and backed by the smaller or local Unions, represent a power which has to be taken into account by any Government of the ruling class, be it Whig or Tory.

According to the traditions of their origin and development in this country, these powerful organisations have hitherto limited themselves almost strictly to their function of sharing in the regulation of wages and working hours, and of enforcing the repeal of laws openly hostile to the workmen. As stated before, they have done so with quite as much effect as they had a right to expect. But they have attained more than that—the ruling class, which knows their strength better than they themselves do, has volunteered to them concessions beyond that. Disraeli's Household Suffrage gave the vote to at least the greater portion of the
organised working class. Would he have proposed it unless he supposed that these new voters would show a will of their own—would cease to be led by middle-class Liberal politicians? Would he have been able to carry it if the working people, in the management of their colossal Trade Societies, had not proved themselves fit for administrative and political work?

That very measure opened out a new prospect to the working class. It gave them the majority in London and in all manufacturing towns, and thus enabled them to enter into the struggle against capital with new weapons, by sending men of their own class to Parliament. And here, we are sorry to say, the Trades Unions forgot their duty as the advanced guard of the working class. The new weapon has been in their hands for more than ten years, but they scarcely ever unsheathed it. They ought not to forget that they cannot continue to hold the position they now occupy unless they really march in the van of the working class. It is not in the nature of things that the working class of England should possess the power of sending forty or fifty working men to Parliament and yet be satisfied for ever to be represented by capitalists or their clerks, such as lawyers, editors, etc.

More than this, there are plenty of symptoms that the working class of this country is awakening to the consciousness that it has for some time been moving in the wrong groove 429; that the present movements for higher wages and shorter hours exclusively, keep it in a vicious circle out of which there is no issue; that it is not the lowness of wages which forms the fundamental evil, but the wages system itself. This knowledge once generally spread amongst the working class, the position of Trades Unions must change considerably. They will no longer enjoy the privilege of being the only organisations of the working class. At the side of, or above, the Unions of special trades there must spring up a general Union, a political organisation of the working class as a whole.

Thus there are two points which the organised Trades would do well to consider, firstly, that the time is rapidly approaching when the working class of this country will claim, with a voice not to be mistaken, its full share of representation in Parliament. Secondly, that the time also is rapidly approaching when the working class will have understood that the struggle for high wages and short hours, and the whole action of Trades Unions as now carried on, is not an end in itself, but a means, a very necessary and effective means, but only one of several means towards a higher end: the abolition of the wages system altogether.
For the full representation of labour in Parliament, as well as for the preparation of the abolition of the wages system, organisations will become necessary, not of separate Trades, but of the working class as a body. And the sooner this is done the better. There is no power in the world which could for a day resist the British working class organised as a body.

Written on about May 20, 1881

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in The Labour Standard (London), Nos. 4 and 5, May 28 and June 4, 1881, as a leading article
On Thursday, June 9, in the House of Commons, Mr. Monk (Gloucester) proposed a resolution to the effect that "no commercial treaty with France will be satisfactory which does not tend to the development of the commercial relations of the two countries by a further reduction of duties".  

A debate of some length ensued. Sir C. Dilke, on behalf of the Government, offered the mild resistance required by diplomatic etiquette. Mr. A. J. Balfour (Tamworth) would compel foreign nations, by retaliatory duties, to adopt lower tariffs. Mr. Slagg (Manchester) would leave the French to find out the value of our trade to them and of theirs to us, even without any treaty. Mr. Illingworth (Bradford) despaired of reaching free-trade through commercial treaties. Mr. Mac Iver (Birkenhead) declared the present system of free-trade to be only an imposture, inasmuch as it was made up of free imports and restricted exports. The resolution was carried by 77 to 49, a defeat which will hurt neither Mr. Gladstone's feelings nor his position.

This debate is a fair specimen of a long series of ever-recurring complaints about the stubbornness with which the stupid foreigner, and even the quite as stupid colonial subject, refuse to recognise the universal blessings of free-trade and its capability of remedying all economic evils. Never has a prophecy broken down so completely as that of the Manchester School—free-trade, once established in England, would shower such blessings over the country that all other nations must follow the example and throw
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their ports open to English manufactures. The coaxing voice of
the free-trade apostles remained the voice of one crying in the
wilderness. Not only did the Continent and America, on the
whole, increase their protective duties433; even the British Col-
onies, as soon as they had become endowed with self-
government,434 followed suit; and no sooner had India been
placed under the Crown than a 5 per cent duty on cotton goods
was introduced even there,435 acting as an incentive to native
manufactures.

Why this should be so is an utter mystery to the Manchester
School. Yet it is plain enough.

About the middle of last century England was the principal seat
of the cotton manufacture, and therefore the natural place where,
with a rapidly rising demand for cotton goods, the machinery was
invented which, with the help of the steam engine, revolutionised
first the cotton trade, and successively the other textile manufac-
tures. The large and easily accessible coalfields of Great Britain,
thanks to steam, became now the basis of the country's prosperity.
The extensive deposits of iron ore in close proximity to the coal
facilitated the development of the iron trade, which had received a
new stimulus by the demand for engines and machinery. Then, in
the midst of this revolution of the whole manufacturing system,
came the anti-Jacobin and Napoleonic wars,436 which for some
twenty-five years drove the ships of almost all competing nations
from the sea, and thus gave to English manufactured goods the
practical monopoly of all Transatlantic and some European
markets. When in 1815 peace was restored, England stood there
with her steam manufactures ready to supply the world, while
steam engines were as yet scarcely known in other countries. In
manufacturing industry, England was an immense distance in
advance of them.

But the restoration of peace soon induced other nations to
follow in the track of England. Sheltered by the Chinese Wall of
her prohibitive tariff,437 France introduced production by steam.
So also did Germany, although her tariff was at that time far more
liberal438 than any other, that of England not excepted. So did
other countries. At the same time the British landed aristocracy, to
raise their rents, introduced the Corn Laws,439 thereby raising the
price of bread and with it the money rate of wages. Nevertheless
the progress of English manufactures went on at a stupendous
rate. By 1830 she had laid herself out to become "the workshop of
the world". To make her the workshop of the world in reality was
the task undertaken by the Anti-Corn Law League.440
There was no secret made, in those times, of what was aimed at by the repeal of the Corn Laws. To reduce the price of bread, and thereby the money rate of wages, would enable British manufacturers to defy all and every competition with which wicked or ignorant foreigners threatened them. What was more natural than that England, with her great advance in machinery, with her immense merchant navy, her coal and iron, should supply all the world with manufactured articles, and that in return the outer world should supply her with agricultural produce, corn, wine, flax, cotton, coffee, tea, etc.? It was a decree of Providence that it should be so, it was sheer rebellion against God's ordinance to set your face against it. At most France might be allowed to supply England and the rest of the world with such articles of taste and fashion as could not be made by machinery, and were altogether beneath the notice of an enlightened millowner. Then, and then alone, would there be peace on earth and goodwill towards men; then all nations would be bound together by the endearing ties of commerce and mutual profit; then the reign of peace and plenty would be for ever established, and to the working class, to their "hands", they said: "There's a good time coming, boys—wait a little longer." Of course the "hands" are waiting still.

But while the "hands" waited the wicked and ignorant foreigners did not. They did not see the beauty of a system by which the momentary industrial advantages possessed by England should be turned into means to secure to her the monopoly of manufactures all the world over and for ever, and to reduce all other nations to mere agricultural dependencies of England—in other words, to the very enviable condition of Ireland. They knew that no nation can keep up with others in civilisation if deprived of manufactures, and thereby brought down to be a mere agglomeration of clodhoppers. And therefore, subordinating private commercial profit to national exigency, they protected their nascent manufactures by high tariffs, which seemed to them the only means to protect themselves from being brought down to the economical condition enjoyed by Ireland.

We do not mean to say that this was the right thing to do in every case. On the contrary, France would reap immense advantages from a considerable approach towards Free Trade. German manufactures, such as they are, have become what they are under Free Trade, and Bismarck's new Protection tariff...41

will do harm to nobody but the German manufacturers themselves. But there is one country where a short period of Protection is not only justifiable but a matter of absolute necessity—America.

America is at that point of her development where the introduction of manufactures has become a national necessity. This is best proved by the fact that in the invention of labour-saving machinery it is no longer England which leads, but America. American inventions every day supersede English patents and English machinery. American machines are brought over to England; and this in almost all branches of manufactures. Then America possesses a population the most energetic in the world, coalfields against which those of England appear almost as a vanishing quantity, iron and all other metals in plenty. And is it to be supposed that such a country will expose its young and rising manufactures to a long, protracted, competitive struggle with the old-established industry of England, when, by a short term of some twenty years of protection, she can place them at once on a level with any competitor? But, says the Manchester School, America is but robbing herself by her protective system. So is a man robbing himself who pays extra for the express train instead of taking the old Parliamentary train—fifty miles an hour instead of twelve.

There is no mistake about it, the present generation will see American cotton goods compete with English ones in India and China, and gradually gain ground in those two leading markets; American machinery and hardware compete with the English makes in all parts of the world, England included; and the same implacable necessity which removed Flemish manufactures to Holland, Dutch ones to England, will ere long remove the centre of the world's industry from this country to the United States. And in the restricted field which will then remain to England she will find formidable competitors in several Continental nations.

The fact cannot be longer shirked that England's industrial monopoly is fast on the wane. If the "enlightened" middle class think it their interest to hush it up, let the working class boldly look it in the face, for it interests them more than even their "betters". These may for a long time yet remain the bankers and money-lenders of the world, as the Venetians and the Dutch in their decay have done before them. But what is to become of the "hands" when England's immense export trade begins to shrink down every year instead of expanding? If the removal of the iron shipbuilding trade from the Thames to the Clyde was sufficient to reduce the whole East-end of London to chronic pauperism, what
will the virtual removal of all the staple trades of England across the Atlantic do for England?

It will do one great thing: it will break the last link which still binds the English working class to the English middle class. This link was their common working of a national monopoly. That monopoly once destroyed, the British working class will be compelled to take in hand its own interests, its own salvation, and to make an end of the wages system. Let us hope it will not wait until then.

Written in mid-June 1881

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Labour Standard* (London), No. 7, June 18, 1881, as a leading article
Frederick Engels

TWO MODEL TOWN COUNCILS

We have promised our readers to keep them informed of the working men's movements abroad as well as at home. We have now and then been enabled to give some news from America, and today we are in a position to communicate some facts from France—facts of such importance that they well deserve being discussed in our leading columns.

In France they do not know the numerous systems of public voting which are still in use in this country. Instead of having one kind of suffrage and mode of voting for Parliamentary elections, another for municipal, a third for vestry elections and so forth, plain Universal Suffrage and vote by ballot are the rule everywhere. When the Socialist Working Men's Party was formed in France, it was resolved to nominate working men's candidates not only for Parliament, but also for all municipal elections; and, indeed, at the last renewal of Town Councils for France, which took place on January 9 last, the young party was victorious in a great number of manufacturing towns and rural, especially mining, communes. They not only carried individual candidates, they managed in some places to obtain the majority in the councils, and one council, at least, as we shall see, was composed of none but working men.

Shortly before the establishment of the Labour Standard, there was a strike of factory operatives in the town of Roubaix, close on the Belgian frontier. The Government at once sent troops to occupy the town, and thereby, under the pretext of maintaining order (which was never menaced), tried to provoke the people on strike to such acts as might serve as a pretext for the interference of the troops. But the people remained quiet, and one of the principal causes which made them resist all provocations was the action of the Town Council. This was composed, in its majority, of working men. The subject of the strike was brought before it, and
amply discussed. The result was that the Council not only declared the men on strike to be in the right, but also actually voted the sum of 50,000 francs, or £2,000, in support of the strikers. That subsidy could not be paid, as according to French law the prefect of the department has the right to annul any resolutions of Town Councils which he may consider as exceeding their powers. But nevertheless the strong moral support thus given to the strike by the official representation of the township was of the greatest value to the workmen.

On June 8 the Mining Company of Commentry, in the centre of France (Department Allier), discharged 152 men who refused to submit to new and more unfavourable terms. This being part of a system employed for some time for the gradual introduction of worse terms of work, the whole of the miners, about 1,600, struck. The Government at once sent the usual troops to overawe or provoke the strikers. But the Town Council here, too, at once took up the cause of the men. In their meeting of June 12 (a Sunday to boot) they passed resolutions to the following effect:

1. Whereas it is the duty of society to ensure the existence of those who, by their work, permit the existence of all; and whereas if the State refuses to fulfil this duty the communes are bound to fulfil it, this Council resolves to take up a loan of 25,000 francs (£1,000) with the consent of the highest rated inhabitants, which sum is to be devoted for the benefit of the miners whom the unjustifiable discharge of 152 of their body has compelled to strike work.

Carried unanimously, against the veto of the Mayor alone.

2. Whereas the State, in selling the valuable national property of the mines of Commentry to a joint-stock company, has thereby handed over the workmen there employed to the tender mercies of the said company; and whereas, consequently, the State is bound to see that the oppression exercised by the company upon the miners is not carried to a degree threatening their very existence; whereas, however, the State, by placing troops at the disposal of the company during the present strike, has not even preserved its neutrality, but taken sides with the company,

This Council, in the name of the working-class interests which it is its duty to protect, calls upon the sub-prefect of the district.

1. To recall at once the troops whose presence, entirely uncalled for, is a mere provocation; and

2. To intervene with the manager of the company and induce him to revoke the measure which has caused the strike.

Carried unanimously.

In a third resolution, also carried unanimously, the Council, fearing that the poverty of the commune will frustrate the loan voted above, opens a public subscription in aid of the strikers, and appeals to all the other municipal councils of France to send subsidies for the same object.

Here, then, we have a striking proof of the presence of working
men, not only in Parliament, but also in municipal and all other local bodies. How differently would many a strike in England terminate if the men had the Town Council of the locality to back them! The English Town Councils and Local Boards, elected to a great extent by working men, consist at present almost exclusively of employers, their direct and indirect agents (lawyers, etc.), and at the best, of shopkeepers. No sooner does a strike or lock-out occur than all the moral and material power of the local authorities is employed in favour of the masters and against the men; even the police, paid out of the pockets of the men, are employed exactly as in France the troops are used, to provoke them into illegal acts and hunt them down. The Poor Law authorities in most cases refuse relief to men who, in their opinion, might work if they liked. And naturally so. In the eyes of this class of men, whom the working people suffer to form the local authorities, a strike is an open rebellion against social order, an outrage against the sacred rights of property. And therefore, in every strike or lock-out all the enormous moral and physical weight of the local authorities is placed in the masters' scale so long as the working class consent to elect masters and masters' representatives to local elective bodies.

We hope that the action of the two French Town Councils will open the eyes of many. Shall it be for ever said, and of the English working men too, that “they manage these things better in France”? The English working class, with its old and powerful organisation, its immemorial political liberties, its long experience of political action, has immense advantages over those of any continental country. Yet the Germans could carry twelve working-class representatives for Parliament,441 and they as well as the French have the majority in numerous Town Councils. True, the suffrage in England is restricted; but even now the working class has a majority in all large towns and manufacturing districts. They have only to will it, and that potential majority becomes at once an effective one, a power in the State, a power in all localities where working people are concentrated. And if you once have working men in Parliament, in the Town Councils and Local Boards of Guardians,445 etc., how long will it be ere you will have also working men magistrates, capable of putting a spoke in the wheels of those Dogberries who now so often ride roughshod over the people?

Written in the latter half of June 1881 Reproduced from the newspaper
First published in The Labour Standard
(London), No. 8, June 25, 1881, as a leading article
Frederick Engels

AMERICAN FOOD AND THE LAND QUESTION

Since autumn 1837 we have been quite accustomed to see money panics and commercial crises imported from New York into England. At least one out of every two of the decennial revulsions of industry broke out in America. But that America should also upset the time-honoured relations of British agriculture, revolutionise the immemorial feudal relations between landlord and tenant at will, smash up English rents, and lay waste English farms, was a sight reserved for the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

And yet so it is. The virgin soil of the Western prairie—which is now coming into cultivation, not by piecemeal but in thousands of square miles—is now beginning to rule the price of wheat, and, consequently, the rent of wheat land. And no old soil can compete with it. It is a wonderful land, level, or slightly undulating, undisturbed by violent upheavals, in exactly the same condition in which it was slowly deposited at the bottom of a Tertiary ocean; free from stones, rocks, trees; fit for immediate cultivation without any preparatory labour. No clearing or draining is required; you pass the plough over it and it is fit to receive the seed, and will bear twenty to thirty crops of wheat in succession and without manuring. It is a soil fit for agriculture on the grandest scale, and on the grandest scale it is worked. The British agriculturist used to pride himself of his large farms as opposed to the small farms of Continental peasant proprietors; but what are the largest farms in the United Kingdom compared to the farms of the American prairie, farms of 40,000 acres and more, worked by regular armies of men, horses, and implements, drilled, commanded, and organised like soldiers?
This American revolution in farming, together with the revolutionised means of transport as invented by the Americans, sends over to Europe wheat at such low prices that no European farmer can compete with it—at least not while he is expected to pay rent. Look at the year 1879, when this was first felt. The crop was bad in all Western Europe; it was a failure in England. Yet, thanks to American corn, prices remained almost stationary. For the first time the British farmer had a bad crop and low prices of wheat at the same time. Then the farmers began to stir, the landlords felt alarmed. Next year, with a better crop, prices went lower still. The price of corn is now determined by the cost of production in America, plus the cost of transport. And this will be the case more and more every year, in proportion as new prairie-land is put under the plough. The agricultural armies required for that operation—we find them ourselves in Europe by sending over emigrants.

Now, formerly there was this consolation for the farmer and the landlord, that if corn did not pay meat would. The plough-land was turned into grass-land, and everything was pleasant again. But now that resource is cut off too. American meat and American cattle are sent over in ever-increasing quantities. And not only that. There are at least two great cattle-producing countries which are on the alert for methods permitting them to send over to Europe, and especially to England, their immense excess of meat, now wasted. With the present state of science and the rapid progress made in its application, we may be sure that in a very few years—at the very latest—Australian and South American beef and mutton will be brought over in a perfect state of preservation and in enormous quantities. What is then to become of the prosperity of the British farmer, of the long rent-roll of the British landlord? It is all very well to grow gooseberries, strawberries, and so forth—that market is well enough supplied as it is. No doubt the British workman could consume a deal more of these delicacies—but then first raise his wages.

It is scarcely needful to say that the effect of this new American agricultural competition is felt on the Continent too. The small peasant proprietor mostly mortgaged over head and ears and paying interest and law expenses where the English and Irish farmer pays rent, he feels it quite as much. It is a peculiar effect of this American competition that it renders not only large landed property, but also small landed property useless, by rendering both unprofitable.

It may be said that this system of land exhaustion, as now
practised in the Far West, cannot go on for ever, and things must come right again. Of course, it cannot last for ever; but there is plenty of unexhausted land yet to carry on the process for another century. Moreover, there are other countries offering similar advantages. There is the whole South Russian steppe, where, indeed, commercial men have bought land and done the same thing. There are the vast pampas of the Argentine Republic, there are others still; all lands equally fit for this modern system of giant farming and cheap production. So that before this thing is exhausted it will have lived long enough to kill all the landlords of Europe, great and small, at least twice over.

Well, and the upshot of all this? The upshot will and must be that it will force upon us the nationalisation of the land and its cultivation by co-operative societies under national control. Then, and then alone, it will again pay both the cultivators and the nation to work it, whatever the price of American or any other corn and meat may be. And if the landlords in the meantime, as they seem to be half inclined to do, actually do go to America, we wish them a pleasant journey.

Written in late June 1881

First published in The Labour Standard (London), No. 9, July 2, 1881, as a leading article

Reproduced from the newspaper
Frederick Engels

THE WAGES THEORY
OF THE ANTI-CORN LAW LEAGUE

In another column we publish a letter from Mr. J. Noble finding fault with some of our remarks in a leading article of the Labour Standard of June 18. Although we cannot, of course, make our leading columns the vehicle of polemics on the subject of historical facts or economic theories, we will yet, for once, reply to a man who, though in an official party position, is evidently sincere.

To our assertion that what was aimed at by the repeal of the Corn Laws was to "reduce the price of bread and thereby the money rate of wages", Mr. Noble replies that this was a "Protectionist fallacy" persistently combated by the League, and gives some quotations from Richard Cobden's speeches and an address of the Council of the League to prove it.446

The writer of the article in question was living at the time in Manchester—a manufacturer amongst manufacturers.447 He is, of course, perfectly well aware of what the official doctrine of the League was. To reduce it to its shortest and most generally-recognised expression (for there are many varieties) it ran thus:—The repeal of the duty on corn will increase our trade with foreign countries, will directly increase our imports, in exchange for which foreign customers will buy our manufactures, thus increasing the demand for our manufactured goods; thus the demand for the labour of our industrial working population will increase, and therefore wages must rise. And by dint of repeating

446 J. Noble, "The Anti-Corn Law League and Wages", The Labour Standard, No. 10, July 9, 1881.—Ed.
447 See this volume, pp. 389-93.—Ed.
this theory day after day and year after year the official representatives of the League, shallow economists as they were, could at last come out with the astounding assertion that wages rose and fell in inverse ratio, not with profits, but with the price of food; that dear bread meant low wages and cheap bread high wages. Thus, the decennial revulsions of trade which have existed before and after the repeal of the Corn duties were, by the mouthpieces of the League, declared to be the simple effects of the Corn Laws, bound to disappear as soon as those hateful laws were removed; that the Corn Laws were the only great obstacle standing between the British manufacturer and the poor foreigners longing for that manufacturer's produce, unclad and shivering for want of British cloth. And thus Cobden could actually advance, in the passage quoted by Mr. Noble, that the depression of trade and the fall in wages from 1839 to 1842 was the consequence of the very high price of corn during these years, when it was nothing else but one of the regular phases of depression of trade, recurring with the greatest regularity, up to now, every ten years; a phase certainly prolonged and aggravated by bad crops and the stupid interference of greedy landlord legislation.

Well, this was the official theory of Cobden, who with all his cleverness as an agitator was a poor business man and a shallow economist; he no doubt believed it as faithfully as Mr. Noble believes it to this day. But the bulk of the League was formed of practical men of business, more attentive to business and generally more successful in it than Cobden. And with these matters were quite different. Of course, before strangers and in public meetings, especially before their "hands", the official theory was generally considered "the thing". But business men, when intent upon business, do not generally speak their mind to their customers, and if Mr. Noble should be of a different opinion, he had better keep off the Manchester Exchange. A very little pressing as to what was meant by the way in which wages must rise in consequence of free trade in corn, was sufficient to bring it out that this rise was supposed to affect wages as expressed in commodities, and that it might be quite possible that the money rate of wages would not rise—but was not that substantially a rise of wages? And when you pressed the subject further it usually came out that the money rate of wages might even fall while the comforts supplied for this reduced sum of money to the working man would still be superior to what he enjoyed at the time. And if you asked a few more close questions as to the way, how the
expected immense extension of trade was to be brought about, you would very soon hear that it was this last contingency upon which they mainly relied: a reduction in the money rate of wages combined with a fall in the price of bread, etc., more than compensating for this fall. Moreover, there were plenty to be met who did not even try to disguise their opinion that cheap bread was wanted simply to bring down the money rate of wages, and thus knock foreign competition on the head. And that this, in reality, was the end and aim of the bulk of the manufacturers and merchants forming the great body of the League, it was not so very difficult to make out for any one in the habit of dealing with commercial men, and therefore in the habit of not always taking their word for gospel. This is what we said and we repeat it. Of the official doctrine of the League we did not say a word. It was economically a "fallacy", and practically a mere cloak for interested purposes, though some of the leaders may have repeated it often enough to believe it finally themselves.

Very amusing is Mr. Noble's quotation of Cobden's words about the working classes "rubbing their hands with satisfaction" at the prospect of corn at 25s. a quarter. The working classes at that time did not disdain cheap bread; but they were so full of "satisfaction" at the proceedings of Cobden and Co. that for several years past they had made it impossible for the League in the whole of the North to hold a single really public meeting. The writer had the "satisfaction" of being present, in 1849, at the last attempt of the League to hold such a meeting in Salford Town Hall, and of seeing it very nearly broken up by the mere putting of an amendment in favour of the People's Charter. 448 Since then the rule at all League meetings was "admission by ticket", which was far from being accessible to everyone. From that moment "Chartist obstruction" ceased. The working masses had attained their end—to prove that the League did not, as it pretended, represent them.

In conclusion, a few words about the wages theory of the League. The average price of a commodity is equal to its cost of production; the action of supply and demand consists in bringing it back to that standard around which it oscillates. If this be true of all commodities, it is true also of the commodity Labour (or more strictly speaking, Labour-force). Then the rate of wages is determined by the price of those commodities which enter into the habitual and necessary consumption of the labourer. In other words, all other things remaining unchanged, wages rise and fall with the price of the necessaries of life. This is a law of political
economy against which all the Perronet Thompsons, Cobdens, and Brights will ever be impotent. But all other things do not always remain unchanged, and therefore the action of this law in practice becomes modified by the concurrent action of other economical laws; it appears darkened, and sometimes to such a degree that you must take some trouble to trace it. This served as a pretext to the vulgarising and vulgar economists dating from the Anti-Corn Law League to pretend, first, that Labour, and then all other commodities, had no real determinable value, but only a fluctuating price, regulated by supply and demand more or less without regard to cost of production, and that to raise prices, and therefore wages, you had nothing to do but increase the demand. And thus you got rid of the unpleasant connection of the rate of wages with the price of food, and could boldly proclaim that in this crude, ridiculous doctrine that dear bread meant low wages and cheap bread high wages.

Perhaps Mr. Noble will ask whether wages are not generally as high, or even higher, with to-day’s cheap bread than with the dear taxed bread before 1847? That would take a long inquiry to answer. But so much is certain: where a branch of industry has prospered and at the same time the workmen have been strongly organised for defence, their wages have generally not fallen, and sometimes perhaps risen. This merely proves that the people were underpaid before. Where a branch of industry has decayed, or where the workpeople have not been strongly organised in Trades Unions, these wages have invariably fallen, and often to starvation level. Go to the East-end of London and see for yourselves!

Written at the beginning of July 1881

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in The Labour Standard (London), No. 10, July 9, 1881, as a leading article
How often have we not been warned by friends and sympathisers, "Keep aloof from party politics!" And they were perfectly right, as far as present English party politics are concerned. A labour organ must be neither Whig nor Tory, neither Conservative nor Liberal, or even Radical, in the actual party sense of that word. Conservatives, Liberals, Radicals, all of them represent but the interests of the ruling classes, and various shades of opinion predominating amongst landlords, capitalists, and retail tradesmen. If they do represent the working class, they most decidedly misrepresent it. The working class has interests of its own, political as well as social. How it has stood up for what it considers its social interests, the history of the Trades Unions and the Short Time movement shows. But its political interests it leaves almost entirely in the hands of Tories, Whigs, and Radicals, men of the upper class, and for nearly a quarter of a century the working class of England has contented itself with forming, as it were, the tail of the "Great Liberal Party".

This is a political position unworthy of the best organised working class of Europe. In other countries the working men have been far more active. Germany has had for more than ten years a Working Men's party (the Social-Democrats), which owns ten seats in Parliament, and whose growth has frightened Bismarck into those infamous measures of repression of which we give an account in another column. Yet in spite of Bismarck, the Working Men's party progresses steadily; only last week it carried sixteen elections for the Mannheim Town Council and one for the Saxon

---
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Parliament. In Belgium, Holland, and Italy the example of the Germans has been imitated; in every one of these countries a Working Men's party exists, though the voter's qualification there is too high to give them a chance of sending members to the Legislature at present. In France the Working Men's party is just now in full process of organisation; it has obtained the majority in several Municipal Councils at the last elections, and will undoubtedly carry several seats at the general election for the Chamber next October. Even in America where the passage of the working class to that of farmer, trader, or capitalist, is still comparatively easy, the working men find it necessary to organise themselves as an independent party. Everywhere the labourer struggles for political power, for direct representation of his class in the Legislature—everywhere but in Great Britain.

And yet there never was a more widespread feeling in England than now, that the old parties are doomed, that the old shibboleths have become meaningless, that the old watchwords are exploded, that the old panaceas will not act any longer. Thinking men of all classes begin to see that a new line must be struck out, and that this line can only be in the direction of democracy. But in England, where the industrial and agricultural working class forms the immense majority of the people, democracy means the dominion of the working class, neither more nor less. Let, then, that working class prepare itself for the task in store for it—the ruling of this great empire; let them understand the responsibilities which inevitably will fall to their share. And the best way to do this is to use the power already in their hands, the actual majority they possess in every large town in the kingdom, to send to Parliament men of their own order. With the present household suffrage, forty or fifty working men might easily be sent to St. Stephen's, where such an infusion of entirely new blood is very much wanted indeed. With only that number of working men in Parliament, it would be impossible to let the Irish Land Bill become, as is the case at present, more and more an Irish Land Bull, namely, an Irish Landlords' Compensation Act; it would be impossible to resist the demand for a redistribution of seats, for making bribery really punishable, for throwing election expenses, as is the case everywhere but in England, on the public purse, etc.

Moreover, in England a real democratic party is impossible unless it be a working men's party. Enlightened men of other classes (where they are not so plentiful as people would make us

---
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believe) might join that party and even represent it in Parliament after having given pledges of their sincerity. Such is the case everywhere. In Germany, for instance, the working-men representatives are not in every case actual working men. But no democratic party in England, as well as elsewhere, will be effectively successful unless it has a distinct working-class character. Abandon that, and you have nothing but sects and shams.

And this is even truer in England than abroad. Of Radical shams there has been unfortunately enough since the break-up of the first working men's party which the world ever produced—the Chartist party. Yes, but the Chartists were broken up and attained nothing. Did they, indeed? Of the six points of the People's Charter,\(^4\) two, vote by ballot and no property qualification, are now the law of the land. A third, universal suffrage, is at least approximately carried in the shape of household suffrage; a fourth, equal electoral districts, is distinctly in sight, a promised reform of the present Government. So that the break-down of the Chartist movement has resulted in the realisation of fully one-half of the Chartist programme. And if the mere recollection of a past political organisation of the working class could effect these political reforms, and a series of social reforms besides, what will the actual presence of a working men's political party do, backed by forty or fifty representatives in Parliament? We live in a world where everybody is bound to take care of himself. Yet the English working class allows the landlord, capitalist, and retail trading classes, with their tail of lawyers, newspaper writers, etc., to take care of its interests. No wonder reforms in the interest of the workman come so slow and in such miserable dribbles. The workpeople of England have but to will, and they are the masters to carry every reform, social and political, which their situation requires. Then why not make that effort?

Written in mid-July 1881

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Labour Standard* (London), No. 12, July 23, 1881, as a leading article
Frederick Engels

BISMARCK AND
THE GERMAN WORKING MEN'S PARTY

The English middle-class Press has lately been very silent about the atrocities committed by Bismarck and his understrappers against the members of the Social-Democratic Working Men's Party in Germany. The only exception, to some extent, has been the Daily News. Formerly, when despotical Governments abroad indulged in such vagaries at the expense of their subjects, the outcry was great indeed in the English dailies and weeklies. But here the oppressed parties are working men, and proud of the name, and the Press representatives of "Society", of the "Upper Ten", suppress the facts and almost seem, by the obstinacy of their silence, to approve of them. What business, indeed, have working men with politics? Leave that to their "betters"! And then there is this other reason for the silence of the English Press: It is very hard to attack Bismarck's Coercion Act and the way he carries it out, and in the same breath to defend Mr. Forster's coercion proceedings in Ireland. This is a very sore point, and must not be touched. The middle-class Press can scarcely be expected to point out itself how much the moral position of England in Europe and America has been lowered by the present Government's action in Ireland.

At every general election the German Working Men's party turned up with rapidly-increasing numbers; at the last but one above 500,000; at the last one more than 600,000 votes fell to

---
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their candidates. Berlin elected two, Elberfeld-Barmen, one; Breslau, Dresden, one each; ten seats were conquered in the face of the coalition of the Government with the whole of the Liberal, Conservative, and Catholic parties, in the face of the outcry created by the two attempts at shooting the Emperor, which all other parties agreed to make the Working Men's party responsible for. Then Bismarck succeeded in passing an Act by which Social-Democracy was outlawed. The Working Men's newspapers, more than fifty, were suppressed, their societies and clubs broken up, their funds seized, their meetings dissolved by the police, and, to crown all, it was enacted that whole towns and districts might be "proclaimed", just as in Ireland. But what even English Coercion Bills have never ventured upon in Ireland Bismarck did in Germany. In every "proclaimed" district the police received the right to expel any man whom it might "reasonably suspect" of Socialistic propaganda. Berlin was, of course, at once proclaimed, and hundreds (with their families, thousands) of people were expelled. For the Prussian police always expel men with families; the young unmarried men are generally let alone; to them expulsion would be no great punishment, but to the heads of families it means, in most cases, a long career of misery if not absolute ruin. Then Hamburg elected a working man member of Parliament, and was immediately proclaimed. The first batch of men expelled from Hamburg was about a hundred, with families amounting, besides, to more than three hundred. The Working Men's party, within two days, found the means to provide for their travelling expenses and other immediate wants. Now Leipzig has also been proclaimed, and without any other pretext but that otherwise the Government cannot break up the organisation of the party. The expulsions of the very first day number thirty-three, mostly married men with families. Three members of the German Parliament head the list; perhaps Mr. Dillon will send them a letter of congratulation, considering that they are not yet quite so badly off as himself.

But this is not all. The Working Men's party once being outlawed in due form, and deprived of all those political rights which other Germans are supposed to enjoy, the police can do with the individual members of that party just as they like. Under the pretext of searching for forbidden publications, their wives and daughters are subjected to the most indecent and brutal treatment. They themselves are arrested whenever it pleases the

---

\[a\] Wilhelm Liebknecht, August Bebel and Wilhelm Hasenclever.— Ed.
police, are remanded from week to week, and discharged only after having passed some months in prison. New offences, unknown to the criminal code, are invented by the police, and that code stretched beyond all possibility. And often enough the police finds magistrates and judges corrupt or fanatical enough to aid and abet them; promotion is at this price! What this all comes to the following astounding figures will show. In the year from October, 1879, to October, 1880, there were in Prussia alone imprisoned for high treason, treason felony, insulting the Emperor, etc., not less than 1,108 persons; and for political libels, insulting Bismarck, or defiling the Government, etc., not less than 10,094 persons. Eleven thousand two hundred and two political prisoners, that beats even Mr. Forster's Irish exploits!

And what has Bismarck attained with all his coercion? Just as much as Mr. Forster in Ireland. The Social-Democratic party is in as blooming a condition, and possesses as firm an organisation, as the Irish Land League. 468 A few days ago there were elections for the Town Council of Mannheim. The working-class party nominated sixteen candidates, and carried them all by a majority of nearly three to one. Again, Bebel, member of the German Parliament for Dresden, stood for the representation of the Leipzig district in the Saxon Parliament. Bebel is himself a working man (a turner), and one of the best, if not the best speaker in Germany. To frustrate his being elected, the Government expelled all his committee. What was the result? That even with a limited suffrage, Bebel was carried by a strong majority. Thus, Bismarck's coercion avails him nothing; on the contrary, it exasperates the people. Those to whom all legal means of asserting themselves are cut off, will one fine morning take to illegal ones, and no one can blame them. How often have Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Forster proclaimed that doctrine? And how do they act now in Ireland?

Written in mid-July 1881

First published in *The Labour Standard* (London), No. 12, July 23, 1881, as a leading article
Frederick Engels

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE FREIHEIT] 464

[London,] July 22, 1881

To the Editor of the "Freiheit"

Mr. Norris A. Clowes, the New York Star's correspondent in Ireland, who has been recommended to me from America, 465 has written as follows:

* "If Herr Most would like to make any statement to the New York Star public, I should be glad to give him the opportunity." *

To which I replied:

* "If you wish to enter into communication with Mr. Most, you had better write to the Editor a of the Freiheit, 252 Tottenham Court Road, W. London, who will be able to tell you whether such communication will be possible under present circumstances." * 466

I hasten to bring this to your attention.

Yours faithfully,

F. E.


Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English in full for the first time

---

a Karl Schmidt.— Ed.
Frederick Engels

COTTON AND IRON

Cotton and iron are the two most important raw materials of our time. Whichever nation is the leading one in the manufacture of cotton and iron articles, that nation heads the list of manufacturing nations generally. And because and as long as this is the case with England, therefore and so long will England be the first manufacturing nation of the world.

It might, then, be expected that the workers in cotton and iron should be remarkably well off in England; that, as England commands in the market, trade in these articles should be always good, and that at least in these two branches of industry the millennium of plenty, promised at the time of the Free Trade agitation,\(^{467}\) should be realised. Alas! we all know that this is far from being the case, and that here, as in other trades, if the condition of the workpeople has not become worse, and in some instances even better, it is due exclusively to their own efforts—to strong organisation and hard-fought strikes. We know that after a few short years of prosperity about and after 1874 there was a complete collapse of the cotton and iron trades\(^{468}\); factories were closed, furnaces blown out, and where production was continued short time was the rule. Such periods of collapse had been known before; they recur, on an average, once in every ten years; they last their time, to be relieved by a new period of prosperity, and so on.

But what distinguishes the present period of depression especially in cotton and iron is this, that it has now for some years outlasted its usual duration. There have been several attempts at a revival, several spurs; but in vain. If the epoch of actual collapse
has been overcome, trade remains in a languid state, and the markets continue incapable to absorb the whole production.

The cause of this is that with our present system of using machinery to produce not only manufactured goods, but machines themselves, production can be increased with incredible rapidity. There would be no difficulty, if manufacturers were so minded, during the single period of prosperity to increase the plant for spinning and weaving, bleaching and printing cotton, so as to be able to produce fifty per cent more goods, and to double the whole production of pig-iron and iron articles of every description. The actual increase has not come up to that. But still it has been out of all proportion to what it was in former periods of expansion, and the consequence is—chronic over-production, chronic depression of trade. The masters can afford to look on, at least for a considerable time, but the workpeople have to suffer, for to them it means chronic misery and a constant prospect of the workhouse.469

This, then, is the outcome of the glorious system of unlimited competition, this the realisation of the millennium promised by the Cobdens, Brights, and Co.! This is what the workpeople have to go through if, as they have done for the last twenty-five years, they leave the management of the economical policy of the empire to their "natural leaders", to those "captains of industry" who, according to Thomas Carlyle, were called upon to command the industrial army of the country.4 Captains of industry indeed! Louis Napoleon's generals in 1870 were geniuses compared to them. Everyone of these pretended captains of industry fights against every other, acts entirely on his own account, increases his plant irrespective of what his neighbours do, and then at the end they all find, to their great surprise, that overtrading has been the result. They cannot unite to regulate production; they can unite for one purpose only: to keep down the wages of their workpeople. And thus, by recklessly expanding the productive power of the country far beyond the power of absorption of the markets, they rob their workpeople of the comparative ease which a period of moderate prosperity would give them, and which they are entitled to after the long period of collapse, in order to bring up their incomes to the average standard. Will it not yet be understood that the manufacturers, as a class, have become incapable any longer to direct the great economical interests of the country, nay, even the

process of production itself? And is it not an absurdity—that the greatest enemy to the working people of England is the ever-increasing productivity of their own hands?

But there is another fact to be taken into consideration. It is not the English manufacturers alone who increase their productive powers. The same takes place in other countries. Statistics will not allow us to compare separately the cotton and iron industries of the various leading countries. But, taking the whole of the textile, mining, and metal-working industries, we can draw up a comparative table with the materials furnished by the chief of the Prussian Statistical Bureau, Dr. Engel, in his book, "Das Zeitalter des Dampfs" (The Age of Steam, Berlin, 1881). According to his computation, there are employed in the above industries in the countries stated below steam-engines of the following total horse-power (one horse-power equal to a force lifting 75 kilogrammes to the height of one metre in one second), viz:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textile Industries</th>
<th>Mining and Metal Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England, 1871</td>
<td>515,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany, 1875</td>
<td>128,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>about 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>about 93,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus we see that the total steam power employed by the three nations who are England’s chief competitors amounts to three-fifths of the English steam power in the textile manufactures, and nearly equals it in mines and metal works. And as their manufactures progress at a far more rapid rate than those of this country, there can be scarcely a doubt that the combined produce of the former will soon surpass that of the latter.

Look, again, at this table, giving the steam horse-power employed in production, exclusive of locomotives and ships’ engines:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horsepower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* The tables given below were compiled by Frederick Engels on the basis of the statistical data on pp. 178, 180 and 182-84 of Ernst Engel's book.—*Ed.*
This still more clearly shows how little there is left of the monopoly of England in steam manufactures, and how little Free Trade has succeeded in securing England's industrial superiority. And let it not be said that this progress of foreign industry is artificial, is due to protection. The whole of the immense expansion of the German manufactures has been accomplished under a most liberal Free Trade régime, and if America, owing to an absurd system of internal excise more than anything else, is compelled to have recourse to a protection more apparent than real, the repeal of these excise laws would be sufficient to allow her to compete in the open market.

This, then, is the position in which twenty-five years of an almost absolute reign of Manchester School doctrines have left the country. We think these results are such as to call for a speedy abdication of the Manchester and Birmingham gentlemen, so as to give the working classes a turn for the next twenty-five years. Surely they could not manage worse.

Written at the end of July 1881

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Labour Standard* (London), No. 13, July 30, 1881, as a leading article
Frederick Engels

SOCIAL CLASSES—NECESSARY AND SUPERFLUOUS

The question has often been asked, in what degree are the different classes of society useful or even necessary? And the answer was naturally a different one for every different epoch of history considered. There was undoubtedly a time when a territorial aristocracy was an unavoidable and necessary element of society. That, however, is very, very long ago. Then there was a time when a capitalist middle class, a bourgeoisie as the French call it, arose with equally unavoidable necessity, struggled against the territorial aristocracy, broke its political power, and in its turn became economically and politically predominant. But, since classes arose, there never was a time when society could do without a working class. The name, the social status of that class has changed; the serf took the place of the slave, to be in his turn relieved by the free working man—free from servitude but also free from any earthly possessions save his own labour force. But it is plain: whatever changes took place in the upper, non-producing ranks of society, society could not live without a class of producers. This class, then, is necessary under all circumstances—though the time must come, when it will no longer be a class, when it will comprise all society.

Now, what necessity is there at present for the existence of each of these three classes?

The landed aristocracy is, to say the least, economically useless in England, while in Ireland and Scotland it has become a positive nuisance by its depopulating tendencies. To send the people across the ocean or into starvation, and to replace them by sheep or deer—that is all the merit that the Irish and Scotch landlords can lay claim to. Let the competition of American vegetable and
animal food develop a little further, and the English landed aristocracy will do the same, at least those that can afford it, having large town estates to fall back upon. Of the rest, American food competition will soon free us. And good riddance—for their political action, both in the Lords and Commons, is a perfect national nuisance.

But how about the capitalist middle class, that enlightened and liberal class which founded the British colonial empire and which established British liberty? The class that reformed Parliament in 1831, repealed the Corn Laws, and reduced tax after tax? The class that created and still directs the giant manufactures, and the immense merchant navy, the ever spreading railway system of England? Surely that class must be at least as necessary as the working class which it directs and leads on from progress to progress.

Now the economical function of the capitalist middle class has been, indeed, to create the modern system of steam manufactures and steam communications, and to crush every economical and political obstacle which delayed or hindered the development of that system. No doubt, as long as the capitalist middle class performed this function it was, under the circumstances, a necessary class. But is it still so? Does it continue to fulfill its essential function as the manager and expander of social production for the benefit of society at large? Let us see.

To begin with the means of communication, we find the telegraphs in the hands of the Government. The railways and a large part of the sea-going steamships are owned, not by individual capitalists who manage their own business, but by joint-stock companies whose business is managed for them by paid employees, by servants whose position is to all intents and purposes that of superior, better paid workpeople. As to the directors and shareholders, they both know that the less the former interfere with the management, and the latter with the supervision, the better for the concern. A lax and mostly perfunctory supervision is, indeed, the only function left to the owners of the business. Thus we see that in reality the capitalist owners of these immense establishments have no other action left with regard to them, but to cash the half-yearly dividend warrants. The social function of the capitalist here has been transferred to servants paid by wages; but he continues to pocket, in his dividends, the pay for those functions though he has ceased to perform them.

But another function is still left to the capitalist, whom the extent of the large undertakings in question has compelled to
"retire" from their management. And this function is to speculate with his shares on the Stock Exchange. For want of something better to do, our "retired" or in reality superseded capitalists, gamble to their hearts' content in this temple of mammon. They go there with the deliberate intention to pocket money which they were pretending to earn; though they say, the origin of all property is labour and saving—the origin perhaps, but certainly not the end. What hypocrisy to forcibly close petty gambling houses, when our capitalist society cannot do without an immense gambling house, where millions after millions are lost and won, for its very centre! Here, indeed, the existence of the "retired" shareholding capitalist becomes not only superfluous, but a perfect nuisance.

What is true for railways and steam shipping is becoming more and more true every day for all large manufacturing and trading establishments. "Floating"—transforming large private concerns into limited companies—has been the order of the day for the last ten years and more. From the large Manchester warehouses of the City to the ironworks and collieries of Wales and the North and the factories of Lancashire, everything has been, or is being, floated. In all Oldham there is scarcely a cotton mill left in private hands; nay, even the retail tradesman is more and more superseded by "co-operative stores", the great majority of which are co-operative in name only—but of that another time. Thus we see that by the very development of the system of capitalists' production the capitalist is superseded quite as much as the handloom-weaver. With this difference, though, that the handloom-weaver is doomed to slow starvation, and the superseded capitalist to slow death from overfeeding. In this they generally are both alike, that neither knows what to do with himself.

This, then, is the result: the economical development of our actual society tends more and more to concentrate, to socialise production into immense establishments which cannot any longer be managed by single capitalists. All the trash of "the eye of the master", and the wonders it does, turns into sheer nonsense as soon as an undertaking reaches a certain size. Imagine "the eye of the master" of the London and North Western Railway! But what the master cannot do the workman, the wages-paid servants of the Company, can do, and do it successfully.

Thus the capitalist can no longer lay claim to his profits as "wages of supervision", as he supervises nothing. Let us remember that when the defenders of capital drum that hollow phrase into our ears.
But we have attempted to show, in our last week's issue, that the capitalist class had also become unable to manage the immense productive system of this country; that they on the one hand expanded production so as to periodically flood all the markets with produce, and on the other became more and more incapable of holding their own against foreign competition. Thus we find that, not only can we manage very well without the interference of the capitalist class in the great industries of the country, but that their interference is becoming more and more a nuisance.

Again we say to them, "Stand back! Give the working class the chance of a turn."

Written in early August 1881 Reproduced from the newspaper
First published in *The Labour Standard* (London), No. 14, August 6, 1881, as a leading article

---

*See this volume, pp. 411-14.—Ed.*
Frederick Engels

DRAFT FOR THE SPEECH OVER THE GRAVE
OF JENNY MARX

The noble-hearted woman at whose grave we stand was born in Salzwedel in 1814. Her father, Baron W[estphalen], was soon afterwards appointed Regierungsrat in Trier where he became intimately acquainted with the Marx family. The children of both families grew up together. By the time M[arx] went to the university, he and his future wife knew that their fates would henceforth be inseparable.

In 1843, after Marx had first publicly distinguished himself as editor of the first Rheinische Zeitung, and after the suppression of that Paper by the Prussian government, the marriage took place. From that day she not only followed the fortunes, the labours, the struggles of her husband; she took an active part in them with the highest intelligence and the deepest passion.

The young couple went to Paris, into an exile, first voluntary, soon compulsory. Even in Paris the Prussian government persecuted him. With regret I have to state, that a man like A. v. Humboldt so far demeaned himself as to cooperate in inducing the Government of Louis Philippe to expel M[arx] from France. The family moved to Brussels. The revolution of February ensued. During the troubles caused by this event in Brussels, the Belgian police not only arrested Marx, they must needs throw into prison his wife too, and that without the pretence of a pretext.

The revolutionary effort of 1848 collapsed in the following year. New exile followed, first again in Paris, then, owing to fresh government interference, in London. And this time it was real exile with all its bitterness. The ordinary sufferings of exiles she

---

* On June 19, 1843.—Ed.
might have overcome—though in consequence of them she had to lose three children, among them both her boys. But that all parties—governmental as well as oppositional, feudalist, liberal and so-called democratic, combined into one vast conspiracy against her husband, heaped upon him the vilest and most baseless calumnies; that the whole press without exception shut him out, that he stood helpless and defenceless before antagonists whom he and she must utterly despise—that hurt her to the life. And that lasted for years.

But not for ever. By and bye the working class of Europe found itself placed in political conditions which gave it at least some elbow-room. The International Working Men’s Association was formed; it drew into the struggle one civilized country after the other, and in that struggle, foremost amongst the foremost, fought her husband. Then a time began for her which made up for many past sufferings. She lived to see the base slanders, heaped up around her husband, fly away as chaff before the wind; she lived to hear the doctrines of her husband, to stifle which the reactionists of all countries, feudalists as well as so-called democrats, had spent all their efforts—to hear them proclaimed openly and victoriously in all civilized countries and in all civilized languages. She lived to see the revolutionary movement of the Proletariat seize one country after another, and raise its head, conscious of victory, from Russia to America. And one of her last joys, on her deathbed, was the splendid proof of irrepressible life, in spite of all repressive laws, which the German working class gave at the late elections.

What such a woman, with such clear and critical intellect, with such political tact, with such passionate energy of character, with such capacity for self-sacrifice, has done in the revolutionary movement, that has not been pushed forward into publicity, that is not registered in the columns of the periodical press. That is only known to those who lived near her. But that I know, we shall often miss her bold and prudent counsels, bold without brag, prudent without sacrifice of honor.

Of her personal qualities I need not speak. Her friends know them and will never forget them. If ever woman found her highest happiness in rendering others happy, that woman was she.

The place where we stand is the best proof that she lived and died in the full conviction of atheist Materialism. Death had no
terrors for her. She knew that one day she would have to return, body and mind, to the bosom of that nature from which she had sprung. And we, who now have laid her in her last resting-place, let us cherish her memory and try to be like her.\(^a\)

Written on December 2 or 3, 1881 Reproduced from the manuscript, verified with the newspaper
First published in L'Égalité, No. 1, December 11, 1881

\(^a\) The last paragraph is omitted in L'Égalité.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

JENNY MARX, NÉE VON WESTPHALEN

Once again death has claimed a victim from among the ranks of
the old guard of proletarian, revolutionary socialism.

On December 2 this year, the wife of Karl Marx died in London
after a long, painful illness.

She was born in Salzwedel. Her father, a state counsellor, was
soon afterwards posted to Trier, where he became a close friend
of the Marx family. The children grew up together. These two
highly talented natures found each other. When Marx entered
university, it was already decided that their future destinies were
to be inseparable.

The wedding took place in 1843, after the suppression of the
first Rheinische Zeitung, which had, for a while, been edited by
Marx. From then on, Jenny not only shared her husband's destiny,
work, and struggles; she took part in them with the deepest
understanding, with the most fervent passion.

The young couple moved to Paris, into a voluntary exile that all
too soon became an actual one. The Prussian government
persecuted Marx there, too. Alexander von Humboldt allowed
himself to become a party to procuring a deportation order
against Marx. The family was forced to leave for Brussels.

Then came the February Revolution. During the disturbances it
engendered in Brussels, too, not only Marx was arrested. The
Belgian police insisted on throwing his wife into prison as well,
without any reason.

---

a Ludwig von Westphalen.— Ed.
b On June 19.— Ed.
The revolutionary upsurge of 1848 collapsed as early as the following year. Renewed exile, first in Paris, then, as a result of further intervention by the French government, in London. And this time it was indeed, for Jenny Marx, exile with all its terrors. She would, nevertheless, have got over the material pressures beneath which she saw her two boys and a little daughter sink into the grave. But the fact that government and bourgeois opposition, from the vulgar-liberal to the democratic, combined in a great conspiracy against her husband; that they heaped the vilest, most despicable slanders on him; that the entire press closed its columns to him, depriving him of any means of defence, so that he was left momentarily helpless against opponents whom he and she must despise—this hurt her to the life. And so it remained for a very long time.

But not forever. The European proletariat regained such conditions of existence as allowed it, to a certain extent, to move independently. The International was founded. The class struggle of the proletariat pressed on from one country to another, and Jenny's husband was among the foremost, in fact he was the foremost. Then there began for her a period that made up for many harsh sufferings. She lived to see the slanders that had rained down in torrents on Marx dispersed like chaff in the wind; she lived to hear his doctrines, which all reactionary parties, both feudal and democratic, had taken such tremendous pains to suppress, now preached from the rooftops in all civilised countries and in all cultured tongues. She lived to see the proletarian movement, to which her entire being was wedded, shake the foundations of the old world from Russia to America and press onwards, increasingly certain of victory and defying all resistance. And one of her last joys was the striking evidence of indestructible vitality that our German workers provided in the last elections to the Reichstag.479

The contribution made by this woman, with such a sharp critical intelligence, with such political tact, a character of such energy and passion, with such dedication to her comrades-in-struggle—her contribution to the movement over almost forty years has not become public knowledge; it is not inscribed in the annals of the contemporary press. It is something one must have experienced at first hand. But of one thing I am sure: just as the wives of the Commune refugees will often remember her—so, too, will the rest of us have occasion enough to miss her bold and

* Edgar, Guido and Franziska.—Ed.
wise advice, bold without ostentation, wise without ever compromising her honour to even the smallest degree.\(^a\)

Written on December 4, 1881
First published in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, No. 50, December 8, 1881
Signed: Frederick Engels

Printed according to the manuscript, checked with the newspaper
Published in English for the first time

---

\(^a\) The *Sozialdemokrat* further has: London, December 4, 1881.— Ed.
Karl Marx and Frederick Engels

PREFACE TO THE SECOND RUSSIAN EDITION
OF THE MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The first Russian edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party, translated by Bakunin, was published early in the sixties by the printing office of the Kolokol. At that time the West could see in it (the Russian edition of the Manifesto) only a literary curiosity. Such a view would be impossible today.

What a limited field the proletarian movement still occupied at that time (December 1847) is most clearly shown by the last section of the Manifesto: the position of the Communists in relation to the different opposition parties in the various countries. Russia and the United States of all places are missing here. It was the time when Russia constituted the last great reserve of all European reaction, when the United States absorbed the surplus proletarian forces of Europe through emigration. Both countries supplied Europe with raw materials and were at the same time markets for its industrial products. At that time both were, therefore, in one way or another, pillars of the existing European order.

How very different today! It was precisely European immigration that enabled North America to attain gigantic agricultural production, competition from which is shaking the very foundations of European landed property—large and small. Moreover, it enabled the United States to exploit its tremendous industrial resources with an energy and on a scale that must shortly break the prevailing industrial monopoly of Western Europe, and especially of England. Both circumstances react in revolutionary manner upon America itself. Step by step the smaller and middle landownership of the farmers, the basis of the whole political

---

* See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 518-19.—Ed.
constitution, is succumbing to the competition of giant farms; simultaneously, a numerous proletariat and a fabulous concentration of capital are developing for the first time in the industrial regions.

And now Russia! During the Revolution of 1848-49, not only the European princes, but the European bourgeois as well, found their only salvation from the proletariat, which was just beginning to awaken, in Russian intervention. The Tsar, was proclaimed the chief of European reaction. Today he is a prisoner of war of the revolution, in Gatchina, and Russia forms the vanguard of revolutionary action in Europe.

The Communist Manifesto had as its object the proclamation of the inevitably impending dissolution of modern bourgeois property. But in Russia we find, face to face with the rapidly developing capitalist swindle and bourgeois landed property, which is just beginning to develop, more than half the land owned in common by the peasants. Now the question is: can the Russian obshchina, a form of primeval common ownership of land, even if greatly undermined, pass directly to the higher form of communist common ownership? Or must it, conversely, first pass through the same process of dissolution as constitutes the historical development of the West?

The only answer possible today is this: If the Russian Revolution becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that the two complement each other, the present Russian common ownership of land may serve as the starting point for communist development.

Karl Marx, Frederick Engels

London, January 21, 1882

Printed according to the manuscript


---

a Nicholas I.—Ed.
b Alexander III.—Ed.
c Obshchina: village community.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

BRUNO BAUER AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

On April 13 in Berlin a man died who once played a role as a philosopher and a theologian but was hardly heard of for years, only attracting the attention of the public from time to time as a "literary eccentric". Official theologians, including Renan, plagiarised him and therefore maintained a silence of death about him. And yet he was worth more than them all and achieved more than any of them on an issue which interests us socialists too: on the issue of the historical origin of Christianity.

Let us take his death as an occasion to give a brief account of the present position on this question and Bauer’s contribution to its solution.

The view that dominated from the free-thinkers of the Middle Ages to the Enlighteners of the eighteenth century, the latter included, that all religions, and therefore Christianity too, were the work of deceivers, was no longer sufficient once Hegel had set philosophy the task of showing a rational development in world history.¹

It is obvious that if naturally arising religions, like the fetish worship of the Negroes or the common primitive religion of the Aryans,² come into being without deception playing any part, deceit by the priests very soon becomes inevitable in their further development. But in spite of all the sincere fanaticism, artificial religions cannot even at their foundation do without deception and the falsification of history. Christianity, too, has pretty achievements to boast of in this respect from the very beginning.

as Bauer showed in his criticism of the New Testament. But that only affirms a general phenomenon and does not explain the particular case in question.

A religion that brought the Roman world empire into subjection and dominated by far the larger part of civilised humanity for 1,800 years cannot be disposed of merely by declaring it to be nonsense gleaned together by deceivers. One cannot dispose of it before one succeeds in explaining its origin and its development from the historical conditions under which it arose and reached its dominating position. This applies especially to Christianity. The question to be solved, then, is how it came about that the masses in the Roman Empire preferred this nonsense—which was preached, into the bargain, by slaves and oppressed—to all other religions so that the ambitious Constantine finally saw in the adoption of this religion of nonsense the best means of exalting himself to the position of autocrat of the Roman world.

Bruno Bauer contributed far more to answering this question than anybody else. No matter how much even the half-believing theologians of the period of reaction may have resisted it since 1849, he irrefutably proved the chronological order of the Gospels and their mutual interdependence, shown by Wilke from the purely linguistic standpoint, by the very contents of the Gospels themselves. He exposed the utter lack of scientific spirit of Strauss' vague myth theory according to which anybody can consider historical as much as he likes in the Gospel narrations. And if almost nothing from the whole content of the Gospels turns out to be historically provable—so that even the historical existence of a Jesus Christ can be questioned—Bauer has thereby only cleared the ground for the solution of the question: what is the origin of the ideas and thoughts that have been woven together into a sort

---

a See the following books by Bruno Bauer: Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte des Johannes (Bremen, 1840); Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker (Vols. 1 and 2, Leipzig, 1841) and the third volume of this book entitled Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker und des Johannes (Brunswick, 1842); Kritik der Evangelien und Geschichte ihres Ursprungs (Vols. 1-4, Berlin, 1850-52); Die Apostelgeschichte. Eine Ausgleichung des Paulinismus und des Judenhums innerhalb der christlichen Kirche (Berlin, 1850); Kritik der paulinischen Briefe (Abt. 1-3, Berlin, 1850-52).—Ed.

b Ch. G. Wilke, Der Urevevangelist oder exegetisch-kritische Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältniss der drei ersten Evangelien (Dresden and Leipzig, 1838).—Ed.

c D. Fr. Strauss. Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet (Vols. 1-2, Tübingen, 1835-36); B. Bauer, Philo. Strauss und Renan und das Urchristenthum (Berlin, 1871).—Ed.
of system in Christianity, and how did they come to dominate the world?

Bauer studied this question until his death. His research reached its culminating point in the conclusion that the Alexandrian Jew Philo, who was still living about A.D. 40 but was already very old, was the real father of Christianity, and that the Roman stoic Seneca was, so to speak, its uncle. The numerous writings attributed to Philo, which have been passed down to us do indeed originate in a fusion of allegorically and rationalistically conceived Jewish traditions with Greek, particularly stoic, philosophy. This conciliation of Occidental and Oriental outlooks already contains all the essentially Christian ideas: the innate sinfulness of man, the Logos, the Word, which is with God and is God and which becomes the mediator between God and Man; atonement, not by sacrifices of animals, but by bringing one's own heart to God, and finally the essential feature that the new religious philosophy reverses the previous world order, seeks its disciples among the poor, the miserable, the slaves and the rejected and despises the rich, the powerful and the privileged, whence the precept to despise all worldly pleasures and to mortify the flesh.

On the other hand, Augustus saw to it in his time that not only the God-man, but also the so-called immaculate conception became formulas imposed by the empire. He not only had Caesar and himself worshipped as gods, he also had it spread that he, Augustus Caesar Divus, the Divine, was not the son of a human father but that his mother had conceived him of the god Apollo. But was not that god Apollo perhaps a relation of the one sung by Heinrich Heine?

As we see, we need only the keystone and we have the whole of Christianity in its basic features: the incarnation of the Logos become man in a definite person and his sacrifice on the cross for the redemption of sinful mankind.

Truly reliable sources leave us uncertain as to how this keystone was historically introduced into the Stoic-Philonic doctrines. But this much is certain: it was not introduced by philosophers, either Philo's disciples or stoics. Religions are founded by people who feel a need for religion themselves and have a feeling for the religious needs of the masses, and as a rule this is not the case with philosophical schools. On the contrary we find that in times of general decay—now, for instance—philosophy and religious
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(a) B. Bauer, *Christus und die Caesaren. Der Ursprung des Christenthums aus dem römischen Griechenthum*, Berlin, 1877.—Ed.

(b) Philo, *Legum allegoriae; Quaestiones in Exodum; Quaestiones in Genesin.—Ed.*
dogmatism are shallowly and universally spread in a vulgarised form. While classical Greek philosophy in its last forms—particularly in the Epicurean school—led to atheistic materialism, Greek vulgar philosophy led to the doctrine of a one and only God and of the immortality of the human soul. Likewise Judaism, rationally vulgarised in mixture and intercourse with aliens and half-Jews, came to neglect the ritual and transform the formerly exclusively Jewish national god, Jahveh,* into the one true God, the creator of heaven and earth, and adopt the idea of the immortality of the soul which was alien to early Judaism. Thus monotheistic vulgar philosophy came into contact with vulgar religion, which presented it with the ready-made one and only God. And so the ground was prepared on which the elaboration among the Jews of the likewise vulgarised Philonic notions could produce Christianity which, once produced, could find acceptance among the Greeks and Romans. The fact that it was popularised Philonic notions and not Philo's own works that gave birth to Christianity is proved by the New Testament's almost complete disregard of most of these works, particularly the allegorical and philosophical interpretation of the narrations of the Old Testament. This is an aspect to which Bauer did not devote enough attention.

One can get an idea of what Christianity looked like in its early form by reading the so-called Revelation of John. Wild, confused fanaticism, only the beginnings of dogmas, of the so-called Christian morals, only the mortification of the flesh, but on the other hand a multitude of visions and prophecies. The emergence of the dogmas and moral doctrine belongs to a later period in which the Gospels and the so-called Epistles of the Apostles were written. In this—at least as regards morality—unceremonious use was made of the philosophy of the stoics, of Seneca in particular. Bauer proved that the Epistles often copy the latter word for word, in fact, even the faithful noticed this, but they maintained that Seneca had copied from the New Testament, though it had not yet been written in his.

* As Ewald has already proved, the Jews used dotted script (containing vowels and reading signs) to write under the consonants in the name of Jahveh, which it was forbidden to pronounce, the vowels of the word Adonai, which they read in its place. This was subsequently read as Jehovah. This word is therefore not the name of a god but only a vulgar mistake in grammar: in Hebrew it is simply impossible.


b B. Bauer, Christus und die Caesaren..., pp. 47-61 ("Seneca im Neuen Testament").—Ed.
time. Dogma developed, on the one hand, in connection with the evangelical legend of Jesus which was then taking shape and, on the other hand, in the struggle between Jewish Christians and those of pagan origin.

Bauer also gives very valuable data on the causes which helped Christianity to triumph and attain world domination. But here the German philosopher is prevented by his idealism from seeing clearly and formulating precisely. Phrases often replace substance at decisive points. Instead, therefore, of going into details on Bauer’s views, we shall better give our own conception of this point, based on Bauer’s works and also on our personal study.

The Roman conquest first directly dissolved in all subjugated countries the previous political systems and then indirectly also the old social conditions of life. Firstly, by substituting the simple distinction between Roman citizens and non-citizens or subjects of the state for the former organisation according to social estates (slavery apart). Secondly, and mainly, by exacting tribute in the name of the Roman state. If under the empire a limit was set as far as possible in the interest of the State to the governors’ thirst for wealth, that thirst was replaced by ever more effective and oppressive taxation for the benefit of the state treasury, an exaction which was terribly destructive. Thirdly, and finally, Roman law was administered everywhere by Roman judges while the native social systems were declared invalid insofar as they did not tally with the provisions of Roman law. These three levers were bound to develop a tremendous levelling power, particularly when they were applied for a century or two to populations the most vigorous part of which had been either suppressed or taken away into slavery in the battles preceding, accompanying and often even following the conquest. Social relations in the provinces came nearer and nearer to those obtaining in the capital and in Italy. The population became more and more sharply divided into three classes thrown together out of the most varied elements and nationalities: rich people, including not a few emancipated slaves (cf. Petronius\(^b\)), big landowners or usurers or both at once, like Seneca, the uncle of Christianity; propertyless free people, who in Rome were fed and amused by the state—in the provinces they got on as they could by themselves—and finally the great mass, the slaves. In relation to the state, i.e., the emperor, the first two classes had almost as few rights as the slaves in
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\(^a\) B. Bauer, *Christus und die Caesaren...: Philo, Strauß und Renan....— Ed.*

\(^b\) Engels is referring to Petronius’ *Satyricon* where he describes a feast in the house of an emancipated slave, Trimalchionis, who became rich.— *Ed.*
relation to their masters. From the time of Tiberius to that of Nero in particular, it was a practice to sentence rich Romans to death in order to confiscate their property. The support of the government was, materially, the army, which was more like an army of hired mercenaries than the old Roman peasant army, and morally, the general view that there was no way out of this situation; that not, indeed, this or that emperor, but an empire based on military domination was an inevitable necessity. Here is not the place to examine what eminently material facts this view was based on.

General slackening and demoralisation were consonant with the general lawlessness and despair as to the possibility of better conditions. The few surviving old Romans of the patrician type and views were either removed or died out; Tacitus was the last of them. The others were glad if they were able to keep away from public life; all they existed for was to collect and enjoy riches, and to indulge in private gossip and private intrigue. The propertyless free citizens were state pensioners in Rome, but in the provinces their condition was an unhappy one. They had to work, and to compete with slave labour into the bargain. But they were confined to the towns. Besides them, there were in the provinces peasants, free landowners (here and there probably still in communal ownership) and, as in Gaul, bondsmen for debts to big landowners. This class was the least affected by the social upheaval; it was also the one to resist the religious upheaval longest.* Finally, there were the slaves, deprived of rights and of their own will and the possibility to free themselves, as the defeat of Spartacus had already proved 489; most of them, however, were former free citizens or sons of freed citizens. It must therefore have been among them that hatred of their condition of life was still generally vigorous, though externally powerless.

We shall find that the type of ideologists at the time corresponded to this state of affairs. The philosophers were either mere money-earning schoolmasters or buffoons in the pay of wealthy revellers. Some were even slaves. What became of them if they were fortunate is shown by Mr. Seneca. This stoic and preacher of virtue and abstinence was Nero's first court intriguer, which would not have been possible without servility; he secured

* According to Fallmerayer* the peasants in Maina, Peloponnesus, still offered sacrifices to Zeus in the ninth century.

from Nero presents in money, estates, gardens and palaces, and, while he preached the poor man Lazarus of the Gospel, he was in reality the rich man in the same parable. Not until Nero wanted to get at him did he request the Emperor to take back all his presents, his philosophy being enough for him. Only a very few isolated philosophers like Persius had the courage to brandish the lash of satire over their degenerated contemporaries. But as for the second type of ideologists, the jurists, they enthused at the new system because the abolition of all differences between social estates allowed them broad scope in elaborating their favourite private law, in return for which they prepared for the emperors the vilest system of state law that ever existed.

With the political and social peculiarities of the peoples, the Roman Empire also doomed to ruin their particular religions. All religions of antiquity were naturally arising tribal and later national religions which sprang from and grew together with the social and political conditions of the respective peoples. Once these, their foundations, were destroyed and their traditional forms of society, their inherited political institutions and their national independence shattered, the religion corresponding to these naturally also collapsed. The national gods could suffer other national gods, in other nations beside them, as was the general rule in antiquity, but not above them. The transplantation of Oriental divinities to Rome was harmful only to the Roman religion, but could not check the decay of the Oriental religions. As soon as the national gods are unable to protect the independence and sovereignty of their nation, they engineer their own destruction. This was the case everywhere (except with peasants, especially in the mountains). What vulgar philosophical enlightenment—I almost said Voltaireianism—did in Rome and Greece, was done in the provinces by Roman subjugation and the replacement of men proud of their freedom by desperate subjects and self-seeking ragamuffins.

Such was the material and moral situation. The present was unbearable, the future perhaps still more menacing. There was no way out. Only despair or refuge in the commonest sensuous pleasure, for those at least who could afford it, and they were a tiny minority. Otherwise, nothing but languid surrender to the inevitable.

But in all classes there were necessarily a number of people who, despairing of material salvation, sought in its stead a spiritual salvation, a consolation in their consciousness to save them from utter despair. This consolation could not be provided by the stoics,
any more than by the Epicurean school, for the very reason that they are philosophies and therefore not intended for the common consciousness and, secondly, because the conduct of their disciples brought the doctrines of the schools into disrepute. The consolation was to be a substitute not for the lost philosophy, but for the lost religion; it had to take on a religious form, just as anything which was to grip the masses then and even as late as the seventeenth century.

We hardly need to note that of those who were pining for such consolation of their consciousness, for this flight from the external world into the internal, the majority were among the slaves.

It was in the midst of this general economic, political, intellectual and moral decay that Christianity appeared. It was decisively at odds with all previous religions.

In all previous religions ritual had been the main thing. Only by taking part in the sacrifices and processions, and in the Orient by observing the most cumbersome diet and cleanliness regulations, could one show to what religion one belonged. While Rome and Greece were tolerant in the latter respect, there was in the Orient an obsession with religious prohibitions that contributed no little to the final collapse. People of two different religions (Egyptians, Persians, Jews, Chaldeans) could not eat or drink together, perform any everyday act together, or hardly speak to each other. It was largely due to this segregation of man from man that the Orient met its demise. Christianity knows no distinctive rituals, not even the sacrifices and processions of the classical world. By thus rejecting all national religions and their common ritual and addressing itself to all peoples without distinction, it becomes the first potential world religion. Judaism, too, with its new universal god, had made a start towards becoming a world religion; but the children of Israel always remained an aristocracy among the believers and the circumcised, and Christianity itself had to get rid of the notion of the superiority of the Jewish Christians (still dominant in the so-called Revelation of John) before it could really become a world religion. Islam itself, on the other hand, by preserving its specifically Oriental ritual, limited the area of its propagation to the Orient and the North Africa conquered and populated anew by Arab Bedouins; here it could become the dominant religion, but not in the West.

Secondly, Christianity struck a chord that was bound to echo in countless hearts. To all complaints about the wickedness of the times and the general material and moral misery, Christian consciousness of sin answered: It is so and it cannot be otherwise;
thou art to blame, ye are all to blame for the corruption of the
world, thine and your own internal corruption! And where was
the man who could deny it? Mea culpa! The admission of each
one's share in the responsibility for the general misfortune was
irrefutable and was made now the precondition for the spiritual
salvation which Christianity at the same time announced. And this
spiritual salvation was so instituted that it could be easily
understood by members of every old religious community. The idea
of atonement to placate the offended deity was current in all the old
religions; how could the idea of the self-sacrifice of the mediator
atoning once and for all for the sins of humanity not easily find
ground there? Christianity, therefore, clearly expressed the
universal feeling that men themselves are guilty of the general
decay as the consciousness of sin of each one; at the same time it
provided, in the sacrificial death of its founder, a form easily
understood everywhere of the universally longed-for internal
salvation from the decadent world, the consolation of conscious-
ness; it thus again proved its capacity to become a world religion
and, indeed, a religion which suited the world as it then was.

So it happened that among the thousands of prophets and
preachers in the desert that filled that period with their countless
religious renovations the founders of Christianity alone met with
success. Not only Palestine, but the entire Orient, swarmed with such
founders of religions, and between them there raged what can be
called a Darwinist struggle for ideological existence. Thanks
mainly to the elements mentioned above, Christianity won the day.
How it gradually developed its character of a world religion by
natural selection in the struggle of sects amongst themselves and
against the pagan world is taught in detail by the history of the
Church in the first three centuries.

Written in the latter half of April 1882
First published in Der Sozialdemokrat,
Nos. 19 and 20, May 4 and 11, 1882
Signed: F. Engels

Printed according to the manu-
script, checked with the text of the
newspaper

* My fault.—Ed.
Frederick Engels

THE VICAR OF BRAY

In good King Charles's golden days
When loyalty no harm meant,
A zealous high-church man I was,
And so I got preferment;
To teach my flock I never miss'd,
Kings are by God appointed,
And damn'd are those that do resist.
Or touch The Lord's Anointed.
And this is law I will maintain,
Until my dying day, Sir,
That whatsoever king shall reign,
I'll be the vicar of Bray, Sir.

When royal James obtain'd the crown,
And popery came in fashion,
The penal laws I hooted down,
And read the Declaration:
The church of Rome I found would fit
Full well my constitution;
And had become a Jesuit,
But for the Revolution.
And this is law, &c.

When William was our King declar'd,
To ease the nation's grievance;
With this new wind about I steer'd,
And swore to him allegiance:
Old principles I did revoke,
Set conscience at a distance;
Passive obedience was a joke,
A jest was non-resistance.
And this is law, &c.
When gracious Ann became our queen,
   The Church of England's glory,
Another face of things was seen,
   And I became a Tory:
Occasional conformists base,
   I damn'd their moderation;
And thought the church in danger was,
   By such prevarication.
And this is law, &c.

When George in pudding-time came o'er,
   And moderate men look'd big, Sir,
I turn'd a cat-in-pan once more,
   And so became a Whig, Sir;
And thus preferment I procur'd
   From our new faith's-defender;
And almost ev'ry day abjur'd
   The Pope and the Pretender.
And this is law, &c.

Th'illustrious house of Hanover,
   And Protestant succession;
To these I do allegiance swear—
   While they can keep possession:
For in my faith and loyalty,
   I never more will falter,
And George my lawful king shall be—
   Until the times do alter.
And this is law I will maintain,
   Until my dying day, Sir,
That whatsoever king shall reign,
   I'll be the vicar of Bray, Sir!"}

The above song is probably the only political folk song to have remained in favour in England for more than 160 years. This is largely attributable to its fine tune, which is still sung everywhere today. Moreover, the song is far from outdated, even with regard to present-day conditions in Germany. Though, in the meantime, as is only fit and proper, we have made some progress. The good vicar of the original had only to turn his coat at every

---

The English poem is cited from Joseph Ritson, A Select Collection of English Songs, in three volumes, 2nd ed., Vol. II, London, 1813, pp. 141-43. For Engels' German translation of this poem see Note 491.—Ed.
change of monarch. But we Germans have, above our many political vicars of Bray, a true Pope of Bray, who demonstrates his infallibility by himself radically overturning the entire political doctrine at ever decreasing intervals. Yesterday free trade, today protective tariffs; yesterday freedom of craft, today compulsory guilds; yesterday Kulturkampf, today off to Canossa with flying colours—and why not? Omnia in majorem Dei gloriam (All for the greater glory of God), which in German means: everything in order to extract more taxes and more soldiers. And the poor little vicars have to go along with it; they have to “jump through the hoops”, as they themselves put it again and again, and often, at that, without compensation. With what scorn our stern old vicar would look down on these puny successors of his—he, who was genuinely proud of the courage with which he maintained his position through every storm!

Fr. Engels

Written at the end of August and the beginning of September 1882
First published in Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 37, September 7, 1882

Printed according to the manuscript of the second rough outline, checked with the newspaper
Published in English in full for the first time

---

² A reference to Bismarck.—Ed

ᵇ There is no signature in the manuscript.—Ed
Frederick Engels

THE MARK
Written in the middle of September-the first half of December 1882

First published as an appendix to F. Engels' book *Die Entwicklung des Socialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft*, Hottingen-Zurich, 1882

Printed according to the authorised English edition of Engels' pamphlet, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, 1892, checked with the fourth German edition (1891) of the book.
In a country like Germany, in which quite half the population live by agriculture, it is necessary that the socialist working-men, and through them the peasants, should learn how the present system of landed property, large as well as small, has arisen. It is necessary to contrast the misery of the agricultural labourers of the present time and the mortgage-servitude of the small peasants, with the old common property of all free men in what was then in truth their “fatherland”, the free common possession of all by inheritance.

I shall give, therefore, a short historical sketch of the primitive agrarian conditions of the German tribes. A few traces of these have survived until our own time, but all through the Middle Ages they served as the basis and as the type of all public institutions, and permeated the whole of public life, not only in Germany, but also in the north of France, England, and Scandinavia. And yet they have been so completely forgotten, that recently G. L. Maurer has had to re-discover their real significance. 496

Two fundamental facts, that arose spontaneously, govern the primitive history of all, or of almost all, nations; the grouping of the people according to kindred, and common property in the soil. And this was the case with the Germans. As they had brought with them from Asia the method of grouping by tribes and gentes, as they even in the time of the Romans so drew up their battle array, that those related to each other always stood shoulder to shoulder, this grouping also governed the partitioning of their new territory east of the Rhine and north of the Danube. Each tribe settled down upon the new possession, not according to
whim or accident, but, as Caesar expressly states, according to the gens-relationship between the members of the tribe. A particular area was apportioned to each of the nearly related larger groups, and on this again the individual gentes, each including a certain number of families, settled down by villages. A number of allied villages formed a hundred (old high German, huntari; old Norse, herad). A number of hundreds formed a gau or shire. The sum total of the shires was the people itself.

The land which was not taken possession of by the village remained at the disposal of the hundred. What was not assigned to the latter remained for the shire. Whatever after that was still to be disposed of—generally a very large tract of land—was the immediate possession of the whole people. Thus in Sweden we find all these different stages of common holding side by side. Each village had its village common land (bys almänningar), and beyond this was the hundred common land (härads), the shire common land (lands), and finally the people's common land. This last, claimed by the king as representative of the whole nation, was known therefore as Konungs almänningar. But all of these, even the royal lands, were named, without distinction, almänningar, common land.

This old Swedish arrangement of the common land, in its minute subdivision, evidently belongs to a later stage of development. If it ever did exist in Germany, it soon vanished. The rapid increase in the population led to the establishment of a number of daughter-villages on the Mark, i.e., on the large tract of land attributed to each individual mother village. These daughter-villages formed a single mark-association with the mother village, on the basis of equal or of restricted rights. Thus we find everywhere in Germany, so far as research goes back, a larger or smaller number of villages united in one mark-association. But these associations were, at least, at first, still subject to the great federations of the marks of the hundred, or of the shire. And, finally, the people, as a whole, originally formed one single great mark-association, not only for the administration of the land that remained the immediate possession of the people, but also as a supreme court over the subordinate local marks.

Until the time when the Frankish kingdom subdued Germany east of the Rhine, the centre of gravity of the mark-association seems to have been in the gau or shire— the shire seems to have formed the unit mark-association. For, upon this assumption alone

---

* Gaius Julius Caesar, *Commentarii de bello Gallico*, Book VI, Chapter 22.—*Ed.*
is it explicable that, upon the official division of the kingdom, so many old and large marks reappear as shires.\(^a\) Soon after this time began the decay of the old large marks. Yet even in the code known as the Kaiserrecht, the "Emperor's Law" of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, it is a general rule that a mark includes from six to twelve villages.\(^b\)

In Caesar's time a great part at least of the Germans, the Suevi, to wit, who had not yet got any fixed settlement, cultivated their fields in common. From analogy with other peoples we may take it that this was carried on in such a way that the individual gentes, each including a number of nearly related families, cultivated in common the land apportioned to them, which was changed from year to year, and divided the products among the families. But after the Suevi, about the beginning of our era, had settled down in their new domains, this soon ceased. At all events, Tacitus (150 years after Caesar) only mentions the tilling of the soil by individual families.\(^c\) But the land to be tilled only belonged to these for a year. Every year it was divided up anew and redistributed.

How this was done, is still to be seen at the present time on the Moselle and in the Hochwald, on the so-called "Gehöferschaften".\(^d\) There the whole of the land under cultivation, arable and meadows, not annually it is true, but every three, six, nine, or twelve years, is thrown together and parcelled out into a number of "Gewanne", or areas, according to situation and the quality of the soil. Each Gewann is again divided into as many equal parts, long, narrow strips, as there are claimants in the association. These are shared by lot among the members, so that every member receives an equal portion in each Gewann.\(^e\) At the present time the shares have become unequal by divisions among heirs, sales, etc.; but the old full share still furnishes the unit that determines the half, or quarter, or one-eighth shares. The uncultivated land, forest and pasture land, is still a common possession for common use.

The same primitive arrangement obtained until the beginning of this century in the so-called assignments by lot (Loosgüter) of the Rhein Palatinate in Bavaria, whose arable land has since been
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\(^{a}\) The German edition of 1891 has here: "als Gerichtsgaue" ("as court-shires").—Ed.

\(^{b}\) Publius Cornelius Tacitus, Germania.—Ed.

\(^{c}\) Farmstead communities.—Ed.

\(^{d}\) The 1891 German edition further has: "i.e. a plot of every stretch of land, of soil of every quality".—Ed.
turned into the private property of individuals. The Gehöferschaften also find it more and more to their interest to let the periodical re-division become obsolete and to turn the changing ownership into settled private property. Thus most of them, if not all, have died out in the last forty years and given place to villages with peasant proprietors a using the forests and pasture land in common.498

The first piece of ground that passed into the private property of individuals was that on which the house stood. The inviolability of the dwelling, that basis of all personal freedom, was transferred from the caravan of the nomadic train to the log house of the stationary peasant, and gradually was transformed into a complete right of property in the homestead. This had already come about in the time of Tacitus. The free German’s homestead must, even in that time, have been excluded from the mark, and thereby inaccessible to its officials, a safe place of refuge for fugitives, as we find it described in the regulations of the marks of later times, and to some extent, even in the “leges Barbarorum”, the codifications of German tribal customary law, written down from the fifth to the eighth century.499 For the sacredness of the dwelling was not the effect but the cause of its transformation into private property.

Four or five hundred years after Tacitus, according to the same law-books, the cultivated land also was the hereditary, although not the absolute freehold property of individual peasants, who had the right to dispose of it by sale or any other means of transfer. The causes of this transformation, as far as we can trace them, are twofold.

First, from the beginning there were in Germany itself, besides the close villages already described, with their complete ownership in common of the land, other villages where, besides homesteads, the fields also were excluded from the mark, the property of the community, and were parcelled out among the individual peasants as their hereditary property. But this was only the case where the nature of the place, so to say, compelled it: in narrow valleys,9 and on narrow, flat ridges between marshes, as in Westphalia; later on, in the Odenwald, and in almost all the Alpine valleys. In these places the village consisted, as it does now, of scattered individual dwellings, each surrounded by the fields belonging to it. A periodical re-division of the arable land was in these cases hardly

---

a The 1891 German edition has: “with allotment peasants”.—Ed.
b The 1891 German edition has here: “as in the Berg country”.—Ed.
possible, and so what remained within the mark was only the circumjacent untilled land. When, later, the right to dispose of the homestead by transfer to a third person became an important consideration, those who were free owners of their fields found themselves in an advantageous position. The wish to attain these advantages may have led in many of the villages with common ownership of the land to the letting the customary method of partition die out and to the transformation of the individual shares of the members into hereditary and transferable freehold property.

But, second, conquest led the Germans on to Roman territory, where, for centuries, the soil had been private property (the unlimited property of Roman law), and where the small number of conquerors could not possibly altogether do away with a form of holding so deeply rooted. The connexion of hereditary private property in fields and meadows with Roman law, at all events on territory that had been Roman, is supported by the fact that such remains of common property in arable land as have come down to our time are found on the left bank of the Rhine—i.e., on conquered territory, but territory thoroughly Germanised. When the Franks settled here in the fifth century, common ownership in the fields must still have existed among them, otherwise we should not find there Gehöferschaften and Loosgüter. But here also private ownership soon got the mastery, for this form of holding only do we find mentioned, in so far as arable land is concerned, in the Ripuarian law of the sixth century. And in the interior of Germany, as I have said, the cultivated land also soon became private property.

But if the German conquerors adopted private ownership in fields and meadows—i.e., gave up at the first division of the land, or soon after, any re-partition (for it was nothing more than this), they introduced, on the other hand, everywhere their German mark system, with common holding of woods and pastures, together with the over-lordship of the mark in respect to the partitioned land. This happened not only with the Franks in the north of France and the Anglo-Saxons in England, but also with the Burgundians in Eastern France, the Visigoths in the south of France and Spain, and the Ostrogoths and Langobardians in Italy. In these last-named countries, however, as far as is known, traces of the mark government have lasted until the present time almost exclusively in the higher mountain regions.

--land distributed by drawing lots.—Ed.
The form that the mark government has assumed after the periodical partition of the cultivated land had fallen into disuse, is that which now meets us, not only in the old popular laws of the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, but also in the English and Scandinavian law-books of the Middle Ages, in the many German mark regulations (the so-called Weisthümer\textsuperscript{597}) from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century, and in the customary laws (\textit{coutumes}) of Northern France.

Whilst the association of the mark gave up the right of, from time to time, partitioning fields and meadows anew among its individual members, it did not give up a single one of its other rights over these lands. And these rights were very important. The association had only transferred their fields to individuals with a view to their being used as arable and meadow land, and with that view alone. Beyond that the individual owner had no right. Treasures found in the earth, if they lay deeper than the ploughshare goes, did not, therefore, originally belong to him, but to the community. It was the same thing with digging for ores, and the like. All these rights were, later on, stolen by the princes and landlords for their own use.

But, further, the use of arable and meadow lands was under the supervision and direction of the community and that in the following form. Wherever three-field farming obtained—and that was almost everywhere—the whole cultivated area of the village was divided into three equal parts, each of which was alternately sown one year with winter seed, the second with summer seed, and the third lay fallow. Thus the village had each year its winter field, its summer field, its fallow field. In the partition of the land care was taken that each member's share was made up of equal portions from each of the three fields, so that everyone could, without difficulty, accommodate himself to the regulations of the community, in accordance with which he would have to sow autumn seed only in his winter field, and so on.

The field whose turn it was to lie fallow returned, for the time being, into the common possession, and served the community in general for pasture. And as soon as the two other fields were reaped, they likewise became again common property until seed-time, and were used as common pasturage. The same thing occurred with the meadows after the aftermath. The owners had to remove the fences upon all fields given over to pasturage. This compulsory pasturage, of course, made it necessary that the time of sowing and of reaping should not be left to the individual, but be fixed for all by the community or by custom.
All other land, i.e., all that was not house and farmyard, or so much of the mark as had been distributed among individuals, remained, as in early times, common property for common use; forests, pasture lands, heaths, moors, rivers, ponds, lakes, roads and bridges, hunting and fishing grounds. Just as the share of each member in so much of the mark as was distributed was of equal size, so was his share also in the use of the "common mark." The nature of this use was determined by the members of the community as a whole. So, too, was the mode of partition, if the soil that had been cultivated no longer sufficed, and a portion of the common mark was taken under cultivation. The chief use of the common mark was in pasturage for the cattle and feeding of pigs on acorns. Besides that, the forest yielded timber and firewood, litter for the animals, berries and mushrooms, whilst the moor, where it existed, yielded turf. The regulations as to pasture, the use of wood, etc., make up the most part of the many mark records written down at various epochs between the thirteenth and the eighteenth centuries, at the time when the old unwritten law of custom began to be contested. The common woodlands that are still met with here and there, are the remnants of these ancient unpartitioned marks. Another relic, at all events in West and South Germany, is the idea, deeply rooted in the popular consciousness, that the forest should be common property, wherein every one may gather flowers, berries, mushrooms, beechnuts and the like, and generally so long as he does no mischief, act and do as he will. But this also Bismarck remedies, and with his famous berry-legislation brings down the Western Provinces to the level of the old Prussian squirearchy.

Just as the members of the community originally had equal shares in the soil and equal rights of usage, so they had also an equal share in the legislation, administration, and jurisdiction within the mark. At fixed times and, if necessary, more frequently, they met in the open air to discuss the affairs of the mark and to sit in judgment upon breaches of regulations and disputes concerning the mark. It was, only in miniature, the primitive assembly of the German people, which was, originally, nothing other than a great assembly of the mark. Laws were made, but only in rare cases of necessity. Officials were chosen, their conduct in office examined, but chiefly judicial functions were exercised. The president had only to formulate the questions. The judgment was given by the aggregate of the members present.

The unwritten law of the mark was, in primitive times, pretty much the only public law of those German tribes, which had no
kings; the old tribal nobility, which disappeared during the
conquest of the Roman empire, or soon after, easily fitted itself
into this primitive constitution, as easily as all other spontaneous
growths of the time, just as the Celtic clan-nobility, even as late as
the seventeenth century, found its place in the Irish holding of the
soil in common. And this unwritten law has struck such deep roots
into the whole life of the Germans, that we find traces of it at
every step and turn in the historical development of our people.
In primitive times, the whole public authority in time of peace was
exclusively judicial, and rested in the popular assembly of the
hundred, the shire, or of the whole tribe. But this popular
tribunal was only the popular tribunal of the mark adapted to
cases that did not purely concern the mark, but came within the
scope of the public authority. Even when the Frankish kings began
to transform the self-governing shires into provinces governed by
royal delegates, and thus separated the royal shire-courts from the
common mark tribunals, in both the judicial function remained
vested in the people. It was only when the old democratic freedom
had been long undermined, when attendance at the public
assemblies and tribunals had become a severe burden upon the
impoverished freemen, that Charlemagne, in his shire-courts, could
introduce judgment by Schöffen, lay assessors, appointed
by the king’s judge, in the place of judgment by the whole
popular assembly.* But this did not seriously touch the tribunals
of the mark. These, on the contrary, still remained the model even
for the feudal tribunals in the Middle Ages. In these, too, the
feudal lord only formulated the issues, whilst the vassals them-
selves found the verdict. The institutions governing a village
during the Middle Ages are but those of an independent village
mark, and passed into those of a town as soon as the village was
transformed into a town, i.e., was fortified with walls and trenches.
All later constitutions of cities have grown out of these original
town mark regulations. And finally, from the assembly of the
mark were copied the arrangements of the numberless free
associations of mediaeval times not based upon common holding

* Not to be confused with the Schöffen courts after the manner of Bismarck
and Leonhardt, in which lawyers and lay assessors combined find verdict
and judgment. In the old judicial courts there were no lawyers at all, the presiding
judge had no voice at all, and the Schöffen or lay assessors gave the verdict
independently.

a The 1891 German edition has: “which disappeared during the Völkerwan-
derung or soon after it”.—Ed.
b The 1891 German edition has: “in most shire-courts”.—Ed.
of the land, and especially those of the free guilds. The rights conferred upon the guild for the exclusive carrying on of a particular trade were dealt with just as if they were rights in a common mark. With the same jealousy, often with precisely the same means in the guilds as in the mark, care was taken that the share of each member in the common benefits and advantages should be equal, or as nearly equal as possible.

All this shows the mark organisation to have possessed an almost wonderful capacity for adaptation to the most different departments of public life and to the most various ends. The same qualities it manifested during the progressive development of agriculture and in the struggle of the peasants with the advance of large landed property. It had arisen with the settlement of the Germans in Germania Magna, that is, at a time when the breeding of cattle was the chief means of livelihood, and when the rudimentary, half-forgotten agriculture which they had brought with them from Asia was only just put into practice again. It held its own all through the Middle Ages in fierce, incessant conflicts with the land-holding nobility. But it was still such a necessity that wherever the nobles had appropriated the peasants' land, the villages inhabited by these peasants, now turned into serfs, or at best into coloni or dependent tenants, were still organised on the lines of the old mark, in spite of the constantly increasing encroachments of the lords of the manor. Farther on we will give an example of this. It adapted itself to the most different forms of holding the cultivated land, so long as only an uncultivated common was still left, and in like manner to the most different rights of property in the common mark, as soon as this ceased to be the free property of the community. It died out when almost the whole of the peasants' lands, both private and common, were stolen by the nobles and the clergy, with the willing help of the princes. But economically obsolete and incapable of continuing as the prevalent social organisation of agriculture it became only when the great advances in farming of the last hundred years made agriculture a science and led to altogether new systems of carrying it on.

The undermining of the mark organisation began soon after the conquest of the Roman empire. As representatives of the nation,
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* In the German edition of 1891 this sentence ends as follows: “as soon as this [the Mark] ceased to be free”.—Ed.
* The 1891 German edition reads here: “both divided and undivided”.—Ed.
* The German edition of 1891 has here: “after the Völkerwanderung”.—Ed.
the Frankish kings took possession of the immense territories belonging to the people as a whole, especially the forests, in order to squander them away as presents to their courtiers, to their generals, to bishops and abbots. Thus they laid the foundation of the great-landed estates, later on, of the nobles and the Church. Long before the time of Charlemagne, the Church had a full third of all the land in France, and it is certain that, during the Middle Ages, this proportion held generally for the whole of Catholic Western Europe.

The constant wars, internal and external, whose regular consequences were confiscations of land, ruined a great number of peasants, so that even during the Merovingian dynasty, there were very many free men owning no land. The incessant wars of Charlemagne broke down the mainstay of the free peasantry. Originally every freeholder owed service, and not only had to equip himself, but also to maintain himself under arms for six months. No wonder that even in Charlemagne's time scarcely one man in five could be actually got to serve. Under the chaotic rule of his successors, the freedom of the peasants went still more rapidly to the dogs. On the one hand, the ravages of the Northmen's invasions, the eternal wars between kings, and feuds between nobles, compelled one free peasant after another to seek the protection of some lord. Upon the other hand, the covetousness of these same lords and of the Church hastened this process; by fraud, by promises, threats, violence, they forced more and more peasants and peasants' land under their yoke. In both cases, the peasants' land was added to the lord's manor, and was, at best, only given back for the use of the peasant in return for tribute and service. Thus the peasant, from a free owner of the land, was turned into a tribute-paying, service-rendering appanage of it, into a serf. This was the case in the western Frankish kingdom, especially west of the Rhine. East of the Rhine, on the other hand, a large number of free peasants still held their own, for the most part scattered, occasionally united in villages entirely composed of freemen. Even here, however, in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, the overwhelming power of the nobles and the Church was constantly forcing more and more peasants into serfdom.

When a large landowner—clerical or lay—got hold of a peasant’s holding, he acquired with it, at the same time, the rights in the mark that appertained to the holding. The new landlords were thus members of the mark and, within the mark, they were, originally, only regarded as on an equality with the other members of it, whether free or serfs, even if these happened to be their own
bondsmen. But soon, in spite of the dogged resistance of the peasants, the lords acquired in many places special privileges in the mark, and were often able to make the whole of it subject to their own rule as lords of the manor. Nevertheless the old organisation of the mark continued, though now it was presided over and encroached upon by the lord of the manor.

How absolutely necessary at that time the constitution of the mark was for agriculture, even on large estates, is shown in the most striking way by the colonisation of Brandenburg and Silesia by Frisian and Saxon settlers, and by settlers from the Netherlands and the Frankish banks of the Rhine. From the twelfth century, the people were settled in villages on the lands of the lords according to German law, i.e., according to the old mark law, so far as it still held on the manors owned by lords. Every man had house and homestead; a share in the village fields, determined after the old method by lot, and of the same size for all; and the right of using the woods and pastures, generally in the woods of the lord of the manor, less frequently in a special mark. These rights were hereditary. The fee simple of the land continued in the lord, to whom the colonists owed certain hereditary tributes and services. But these dues were so moderate, that the condition of the peasants was better here than anywhere else in Germany. Hence, they kept quiet when the peasants' war broke out. For this apostasy from their own cause they were sorely chastised.

About the middle of the thirteenth century there was everywhere a decisive change in favour of the peasants. The crusades\(^\text{506}\) had prepared the way for it. Many of the lords, when they set out to the East, explicitly set their peasant serfs free. Others were killed or never returned. Hundreds of noble families vanished, whose peasant serfs frequently gained their freedom. Moreover, as the needs of the landlords increased, the command over the payments in kind and services of the peasants became much more important than that over their persons. The serfdom of the earlier Middle Ages, which still had in it much of ancient slavery, gave to the lords rights which lost more and more their value; it gradually vanished, the position of the serfs narrowed itself down to that of simple hereditary tenants. As the method of cultivating the land remained exactly as of old, an increase in the revenues of the lord of the manor was only to be obtained by the breaking up of new ground, the establishing of new villages. But this was only possible by a friendly agreement with the colonists, whether they belonged to the estate or were strangers. Hence, in the documents of this time, we meet with a clear determination
and a moderate scale of the peasants' dues, and good treatment of the peasants, especially by the spiritual landlords. And, lastly, the favourable position of the new colonists reacted again on the condition of their neighbours, the bondmen, so that in all the North of Germany these also, whilst they continued their services to the lords of the manor, received their personal freedom. The Slav and Lithuanian peasants alone were not freed. But this was not to last.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the towns rose rapidly, and became rapidly rich. Their artistic handicraft, their luxurious life, thrived and flourished, especially in South Germany and on the Rhine. The profusion of the town patricians aroused the envy of the coarsely-fed, coarsely-clothed, roughly-furnished, country lords. But whence to obtain all these fine things? Lying in wait for travelling merchants became more and more dangerous and unprofitable. But to buy them, money was requisite. And that the peasants alone could furnish. Hence, renewed oppression of the peasants, higher tributes, and more corvée; hence renewed and always increasing eagerness to force the free peasants to become bondmen, the bondmen to become serfs, and to turn the common mark-land into land belonging to the lord. In this the princes and nobles were helped by the Roman jurists, who, with their application of Roman jurisprudence to German conditions, for the most part not understood by them, knew how to produce endless confusion, but yet that sort of confusion by which the lord always won and the peasant always lost. The spiritual lords helped themselves in a more simple way. They forged documents, by which the rights of the peasants were curtailed and their duties increased. Against these robberies by the landlords, the peasants, from the end of the fifteenth century, frequently rose in isolated insurrections, until, in 1525, the great Peasants' War overflowed Suabia, Bavaria, Franconia, extending into Alsace, the Palatinate, the Rheingau, and Thuringen. The peasants succumbed after hard fighting. From that time dates the renewed predominance of serfdom amongst the German peasants generally. In those places where the fight had raged, all remaining rights of the peasants were now shamelessly trodden under foot, their common land turned into the property of the lord, they themselves into serfs. The North German peasants, being placed in more favourable conditions, had remained quiet; their only reward was that they
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*The German edition of 1891 has here: "by the princes, nobles and priests".—*Ed.
fell under the same subjection, only more slowly. Serfdom is introduced among the German peasantry from the middle of the sixteenth century in Eastern Prussia, Pomerania, Brandenburg, Silesia, and from the end of that century in Schleswig-Holstein, and henceforth becomes more and more their general condition.

This new act of violence had, however, an economic cause. From the wars consequent upon the Protestant Reformation, only the German princes had gained greater power. It was now all up with the nobles' favourite trade of highway robbery. If the nobles were not to go to ruin, greater revenues had to be got out of their landed property. But the only way to effect this was to work at least a part of their own estates on their own account, upon the model of the large estates of the princes, and especially of the monasteries. That which had hitherto been the exception now became a necessity. But this new agricultural plan was stopped by the fact that almost everywhere the soil had been given to tribute-paying peasants. As soon as the tributary peasants, whether free men or coloni, had been turned into serfs, the noble lords had a free hand. Part of the peasants were, as it is now called in Ireland, evicted, i.e., either hunted away or degraded to the level of cottars, with mere huts and a bit of garden land, whilst the ground belonging to their homestead was made part and parcel of the demesne of the lord, and was cultivated by the new cottars and such peasants as were still left, in corvée labour. Not only were many peasants thus actually driven away, but the corvée service of those still left was enhanced considerably, and at an ever increasing rate. The capitalistic period announced itself in the country districts as the period of agricultural industry on a large scale, based upon the corvée labour of serfs.

This transformation took place at first rather slowly. But then came the Thirty Years' War. For a whole generation Germany was overrun in all directions by the most licentious soldiery known to history. Everywhere was burning, plundering, rape, and murder. The peasant suffered most where, apart from the great armies, the smaller independent bands, or rather the freebooters, operated uncontrolled, and upon their own account. The devastation and depopulation were beyond all bounds. When peace came, Germany lay on the ground helpless, down-trodden, cut to pieces, bleeding; but, once again, the most pitiable, miserable of all was the peasant.

The land-owning noble was now the only lord in the country
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a The German edition of 1891 has here: “to use the technical term”. — Ed.
districts. The princes, who just at that time were reducing to nothing his political rights in the assemblies of Estates by way of compensation, left him a free hand against the peasants. The last power of resistance on the part of the peasants had been broken by the war. Thus the noble was able to arrange all agrarian conditions in the manner most conducive to the restoration of his ruined finances. Not only were the deserted homesteads of the peasants, without further ado, united with the lord's demesne; the eviction of the peasants was carried on wholesale and systematically. The greater the lord of the manor's demesne, the greater, of course, the corvée required from the peasants. The system of "unlimited corvée" was introduced anew; the noble lord was able to command the peasant, his family, his cattle, to labour for him, as often and as long as he pleased. Serfdom was now general; a free peasant was now as rare as a white crow. And in order that the noble lord might be in a position to nip in the bud the very smallest resistance on the part of the peasants, he received from the princes of the land the right of patrimonial jurisdiction, i.e., he was nominated sole judge in all cases of offence and dispute among the peasants, even if the peasant's dispute was with him, the lord himself, so that the lord was judge in his own case! From that time, the stick and the whip ruled the agricultural districts. The German peasant, like the whole of Germany, had reached his lowest point of degradation. The peasant, like the whole of Germany, had become so powerless that all self-help failed him, and deliverance could only come from without.

And it came. With the French Revolution came for Germany also and for the German peasant the dawn of a better day. No sooner had the armies of the Revolution conquered the left bank of the Rhine, than all the old rubbish vanished, as at the stroke of an enchanter's wand—corvée service, rent dues of every kind to the lord, together with the noble lord himself. The peasant of the left bank of the Rhine was now lord of his own holding; moreover, in the Code Civil, drawn up at the time of the Revolution and only baffled and botched by Napoleon, he received a code of laws adapted to his new conditions, that he could not only understand, but also carry comfortably in his pocket.

But the peasant on the right bank of the Rhine had still to wait a long time. It is true that in Prussia, after the well-deserved defeat at Jena, some of the most shameful privileges of the nobles were abolished, and the so-called redemption of such peasants' burdens as were still left was made legally possible. But
to a great extent and for a long time this was only on paper. In
the other German States, still less was done. A second French
Revolution, that of 1830, was needed to bring about the
"redemption" in Baden and certain other small States bordering
upon France. And at the moment when the third French
Revolution, in 1848, at last carried Germany along with it, the
redemption was far from being completed in Prussia, and in
Bavaria had not even begun. After that, it went along more
rapidly and unimpeded; the corvée labour of the peasants, who
had this time become rebellious on their own account, had lost all
value.

And in what did this redemption consist? In this, that the noble
lord, on receipt of a certain sum of money or of a piece of land
from the peasant, should henceforth recognise the peasant's land,
as much or as little as was left to him, as the peasant's property,
free of all burdens; though all the land that had at any time
belonged to the noble lord was nothing but land stolen from the
peasants. Nor was this all. In these arrangements, the Government
officials charged with carrying them out almost always took the
side, naturally, of the lords, with whom they lived and caroused,
so that the peasants, even against the letter of the law, were again
defrauded right and left.

And thus, thanks to three French revolutions, and to the
German one, that has grown out of them, we have once again a
free peasantry. But how very inferior is the position of our free
peasant of to-day compared with the free member of the mark of
the olden time! His homestead is generally much smaller, and the
unpartitioned mark is reduced to a few very small and poor bits of
communal forest. But, without the use of the mark, there can be
no cattle for the small peasant; without cattle, no manure; without
manure, no agriculture. The tax-collector and the officer of the
law threatening in the rear of him, whom the peasant of to-day
knows only too well, were people unknown to the old members of
the mark. And so was the mortgagee, into whose clutches
nowadays one peasant's holding after another falls. And the best
of it is that these modern free peasants, whose property is so
restricted, and whose wings are so clipped, were created in
Germany, where everything happens too late, at a time when
scientific agriculture and the newly-invented agricultural machin-
ery make cultivation on a small scale a method of production more
and more antiquated, less and less capable of yielding a livelihood.
As spinning and weaving by machinery replaced the spinning-
wheel and the hand-loom, so these new methods of agricultural
production must inevitably replace the cultivation of land in small plots by landed property on a large scale, provided that the time necessary for this be granted.

For already the whole of European agriculture, as carried on at the present time, is threatened by an overpowering rival, viz., the production of corn on a gigantic scale by America. Against this soil, fertile, manured by nature for a long range of years, and to be had for a bagatelle, neither our small peasants, up to their eyes in debt, nor our large landowners, equally deep in debt, can fight. The whole of the European agricultural system is being beaten by American competition. Agriculture, as far as Europe is concerned, will only be possible if carried on upon socialised lines, and for the advantage of society as a whole.

This is the outlook for our peasants. And the restoration of a free peasant class, starved and stunted as it is, has this value,—that it has put the peasant in a position, with the aid of his natural comrade, the worker, to help himself, as soon as he once understands how.510

But how?—By means of reviving the mark, not in its old, outdated form, but in a rejuvenated form: by rejuvenating common landownership under which the latter would not only provide the small-peasant community with all the prerogatives of big farming and the use of agricultural machinery, but will also give them means to organise, along with agriculture, major industries utilising steam and water power, and to organise them without capitalists by the community itself.

To organise big farming and utilise agricultural machines means, in other words, to make superfluous the agricultural labour of most small peasants who today work their land themselves. And so that these people, made superfluous in agriculture, would not be left unemployed and would not have to go to towns and cities, it would be necessary to employ them in industry in the village itself, and that can only be profitably organised on a large scale with the aid of steam and water power.

How to arrange this? Think well on it, German peasants. Only the Social-Democrats can help you.
Frederick Engels

PREFACE TO THE FIRST GERMAN EDITION
OF SOCIALISM: UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC


The surprising success of the Lafargue translation in the French-speaking countries and especially in France itself forced me to consider the question whether a separate German edition of these three chapters would not likewise be of value. Then the editors of the Zurich Socialdemokrat informed me that a demand was generally being raised within the German Social-Democratic Party for the publication of new propaganda pamphlets, and they asked me whether I would not apply those three chapters to this purpose. I was naturally in agreement with that and put my work at their disposal.

It was, however, not originally written for immediate popular propaganda. How could what was in the first place a purely scientific work be suitable for that? What changes in form and content were required?

So far as form is concerned, only the numerous foreign words could arouse doubts. But even Lassalle in his speeches and
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511 F. Engels, “Le socialisme utopique et le socialisme scientifique”, I-III. La Revue socialiste, Nos. 9, 4 and 5, March 20, April 20 and May 5, 1880.—Ed.
propaganda writings was not at all sparing with foreign words, and to my knowledge there has been no complaint about it. Since that time our workers have read newspapers to a far greater extent and far more regularly and to the same extent they have become thereby more familiar with foreign words. I have restricted myself to removing all unnecessary foreign words. Where they were unavoidable, I have refrained from adding so-called explanatory translations. The unavoidable foreign words, usually generally accepted scientific-technical expressions, would not have been unavoidable if they had been translatable. Translation, therefore, distorts the sense; it confuses instead of explaining. Oral information is of much greater assistance.

The content on the other hand, I think I can assert, will cause German workers few difficulties. In general, only the third section is difficult, but far less so for workers, whose general conditions of life it concerns, than for the "educated" bourgeois. In the many explanatory additions that I have made here, I have had in mind not so much the workers as "educated" readers; persons of the type of the Deputy von Eynern, the Privy Councillor Heinrich von Sybel and other Treitschkes, who are governed by the irresistible impulse to demonstrate again and again in black and white their frightful ignorance and, following from this, their colossal misconception of socialism. If Don Quixote tilts his lance at windmills, that is in accordance with his office and his role; but it would be impossible for us to permit Sancho Panza anything of the sort.

Such readers will also be surprised that in a sketch of the history of the development of socialism they should encounter the Kant-Laplace cosmogony, modern natural science and Darwin, classical German philosophy and Hegel. But scientific socialism is after all an essentially German product and could arise only in that nation whose classical philosophy had kept alive the tradition of conscious dialectics: in Germany.* The materialist conception of history and its specific application to the modern class struggle

* "In Germany" is a slip of the pen. It should read "among Germans". For as indispensable, on the one hand, as German dialectics were for the genesis of scientific socialism, as equally indispensable for it were the developed economic and political conditions of England and France. The economic and political stage of development of Germany, which at the beginning of the forties was still more backward than today, could produce at the most caricatures of socialism (cf. *Communist Manifesto*, III, I. e., "German, or 'True', Socialism"). Only by the subjection of the economic and political conditions produced in England and France
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* See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 510-13.—Ed.
between proletariat and bourgeoisie was only possible by means of dialectics. And if the schoolmasters of the German bourgeoisie have drowned the memory of the great German philosophers and of the dialectics produced by them in a swamp of empty eclecticism—so much so that we are compelled to appeal to modern natural science as a witness to the preservation of dialectics in reality—we German Socialists are proud of the fact that we are descended not only from Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen, but also from Kant, Fichte and Hegel.

*Frederick Engels*

London, September 21, 1882


Printed according to the book

[This footnote was added by Engels to the third German edition of 1883.]
Frederick Engels

JENNY LONGUET, NÉE MARX  

Jenny, the eldest daughter of Karl Marx, died at Argenteuil near Paris on January 11. About eight years ago she married Charles Longuet, a former member of the Paris Commune and at present co-editor of the Justice.\(^{514}\)

Jenny Marx was born on May 1, 1844, grew up in the midst of the international proletarian movement and most closely together with it. Despite a reticence that could almost be taken for shyness, she displayed when necessary a presence of mind and energy which could be envied by many a man.

When the Irish press disclosed the infamous treatment that the Fenians sentenced in 1866 and later had to suffer in jail,\(^{515}\) and the English papers stubbornly ignored the atrocities; and when the Gladstone Government, despite the promises it made during the election campaign, refused to amnesty them\(^{516}\) or even to ameliorate their conditions, Jenny Marx found a means to make the pious Mr. Gladstone take immediate steps. She wrote two articles for Rochefort's Marseillaise\(^a\) vividly describing how political prisoners are treated in free England. This had an effect. The disclosures in a big Paris newspaper could not be endured. A few weeks later O'Donovan Rosa and most of the others were free and on their way to America.

In the summer of 1871 Jenny, together with her youngest sister,\(^b\) visited their brother-in-law Lafargue at Bordeaux. Lafargue, his wife, their sick child\(^c\) and the two girls went from there to
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\(^a\) Jenny Marx wrote eight articles on the Irish question for this newspaper (see present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 414-41).— Ed.

\(^b\) Eleanor Marx.— Ed.

\(^c\) Charles Étienne Lafargue.— Ed.
Bagnères-de-Luchon, a spa in the Pyrenees. Early one morning a gentleman came to Lafargue and said: "I am a police officer, but a Republican; an order for your arrest has been received; it is known that you were in charge of communications between Bordeaux and the Paris Commune. You have one hour to cross the border."

Lafargue with his wife and child succeeded in getting over the pass into Spain, for which the police took revenge by arresting the two girls. Jenny had a letter in her pocket from Gustave Flourens, the leader of the Commune who was killed near Paris: had the letter been discovered, a journey to New Caledonia was sure to follow for the two sisters. When she was left alone in the office for a moment, Jenny opened a dusty old account book, put the letter inside and closed the book again. Perhaps the letter is still there. When the two girls were brought to his office, the prefect, the noble Count of Kératry, well remembered as a Bonapartist, closely questioned them. But the cunning of the former diplomat and the brutality of the former cavalry officer were of no avail when faced with Jenny's calm circumspection. He left the room in a fit of rage about "the energy that seems peculiar to the women of this family". After the dispatch of numerous cables to and from Paris, he finally had to release the two girls, who had been treated in a truly Prussian way during their detention.

These two incidents are characteristic of Jenny. The proletariat has lost a valiant fighter in her. But her mourning father has at least the consolation that hundreds of thousands of workers in Europe and America share his sorrow.

London, January 13, 1883

First published in Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 4, January 18, 1883

Signed: Fr. Engels
Frederick Engels

TO THE NEW YORKER VOLKSGEZITUNG

London, March 16, 1883

Karl Marx's death occurred at 3 o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday, the 14th inst., at Argenteuil, France. For several weeks Marx had been suffering from bronchitis, this being further complicated by an abscess of the lung, and ultimately an internal haemorrhage put an end to his life. His death was an easy and painless one.

Frederick Engels

First published in the New Yorker Volkszeitung, No. 66, March 17, 1883

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time
Frederick Engels

DRAFT OF A SPEECH AT THE GRAVESIDE OF KARL MARX

Scarcely 15 months ago most of us assembled round this grave, then about to become the last resting place of a grand and noble-hearted woman. Today we have it reopened, to receive what remains of her husband.

Karl Marx was one of those pre-eminent men of whom a century produces not many. Charles Darwin discovered the law of development of organic nature upon our planet. Marx is the discoverer of the fundamental law according to which human history moves and develops itself, a law so simple and self-evident that its simple enunciation is almost sufficient to secure assent. Not enough with that, Marx had also discovered the law [which] has created our actual state of society with its great class-division of capitalists and wages-labourers; the law according to which that society has become organised, has grown until it [has] almost outgrown itself, and according to which it must ultimately perish like all previous historical phases of society. Such results render it all the more painful that he should have been taken from us in the midst of his work, and that, much as he did, still more he left uncompleted.

But science, though dear to him, was far from absorbing him entirely. No man could feel a purer joy than he when a new scientific progress was secured anywhere, no matter whether practically applicable or not. But he looked upon science above all things as a grand historical lever, as a revolutionary power in the most eminent sense of the word. And as such he used, to such

---

"Jenny Marx, néé von Westphalen.—Ed."
purpose he wielded that immense knowledge, especially of history in all its branches of which he disposed.

For he was indeed, what he called himself, a Revolutionist. The struggle for the emancipation of the class of wages-labourers from the fetters of the present capitalistic system of economic production, was his real element. And no more active combatant than he ever existed. The crowning effort of this part of his work was the creation of the International Working Men’s Association of which he was the acknowledged leader from 1864-72. The Association has disappeared, as far as outward show goes; but the fraternal bond of union of the working men of all civilised countries of Europe and America is established once for ever, and continues to live even without any outward, formal bond of union.

No man can fight for any cause without creating enemies. And he has had plenty of them. For the greater part of his political life he was the best hated and best slandered man in Europe. But he scarcely ever noticed calumny. If ever man lived calumny down, he did, and at the time of his death he could look with pride upon the millions of his followers, in the mines of Siberia as well as in the workshops of Europe and America; he saw his economical theories adopted as the undisputed creed of universal socialism, and if he still had many opponents, there was scarcely one personal enemy left.\(^2\)

Written between March 14 and 17, 1883
First published in the newspaper *La Justice*, No. 27, March 29, 1883

---

\(^{2}\) *La Justice* has two more paragraphs: “What Marx was in his private life, for his family and his friends—I have no force to express it at the moment. And there is no need to do so, because all of you who have come here to tell him your last farewell know this.

"Farewell, Marx! Your work and your name will endure through the ages."—*Ed.*
A page of *Der Sozialdemokrat* No. 13, March 22, 1883, containing Engels' article "Karl Marx's Funeral"
Frederick Engels

KARL MARX'S FUNERAL

On Saturday, March 17, Marx was laid to rest in Highgate Cemetery, in the same grave in which his wife had been buried fifteen months earlier.

At the graveside Gottlieb Lemke laid two wreaths with red ribbons on the coffin in the name of the editorial board and dispatching service of the Sozialdemokrat and in the name of the London Communist Workers' Educational Society.521

Frederick Engels then made the following speech in English:

"On the 14th of March, at a quarter to three in the afternoon, the greatest living thinker ceased to think. He had been left alone for scarcely two minutes, and when we came back we found him in his armchair, peacefully gone to sleep—but forever.

"An immeasurable loss has been sustained both by the militant proletariat of Europe and America, and by historical science, in the death of this man. The gap that has been left by the departure of this mighty spirit will soon enough make itself felt.

"Just as Darwin discovered the law of development of organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of development of human history: the simple fact, hitherto concealed by an overgrowth of ideology, that mankind must first of all eat, drink, have shelter and clothing, before it can pursue politics, science, art, religion, etc.; that therefore the production of the immediate material means of subsistence and consequently the degree of economic development attained by a given people or during a given epoch form the foundation upon which the state institutions, the legal conceptions, art, and even the ideas on religion, of the people concerned have been evolved, and in the light of which they must,
therefore, be explained, instead of *vice versa*, as had hitherto been the case.

"But that is not all. Marx also discovered the special law of motion governing the present-day capitalist mode of production and the bourgeois society that this mode of production has created. The discovery of surplus value suddenly threw light on the problem, in trying to solve which all previous investigations, of both bourgeois economists and socialist critics, had been groping in the dark.

"Two such discoveries would be enough for one lifetime. Happy the man to whom it is granted to make even one such discovery. But in every single field which Marx investigated—and he investigated very many fields, none of them superficially—in every field, even in that of mathematics, he made independent discoveries.

"Such was the man of science. But this was not even half the man. Science was for Marx a historically dynamic, revolutionary force. However great the joy with which he welcomed a new discovery in some theoretical science whose practical application perhaps it was as yet quite impossible to envisage, he experienced quite another kind of joy when the discovery involved immediate revolutionary changes in industry and in historical development in general. For example, he followed closely the development of the discoveries made in the field of electricity and recently those of Marcel Deprez.

"For Marx was before all else a revolutionist. His real mission in life was to contribute, in one way or another, to the overthrow of capitalist society and of the state institutions which it had brought into being, to contribute to the liberation of the modern proletariat, which he was the first to make conscious of its own position and its needs, conscious of the conditions of its emancipation. Fighting was his element. And he fought with a passion, a tenacity and a success such as few could rival. His work on the first *Rheinische Zeitung* (1842), the *Paris Vorwörts!* (1844), *Brüsseler Deutsche Zeitung* (1847), the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (1848-49), the *New-York Tribune* (1852-61), and in addition to these a host of militant pamphlets, work in organisations in Paris, Brussels and London, and finally, crowning all, the formation of the great International Working Men's Association—this was indeed an achievement of which its founder might well have been proud even if he had done nothing else.

*Deutsche-Brüsseler Zeitung.—Ed.*
"And, consequently, Marx was the best-hated and most calumniated man of his time. Governments, both absolutist and republican, deported him from their territories. Bourgeois, whether conservative or ultra-democratic, vied with one another in heaping slanders upon him. All this he brushed aside as though it were cobweb, ignoring it, answering only when extreme necessity compelled him. And he died beloved, revered and mourned by millions of revolutionary fellow-workers—from the mines of Siberia to California, in all parts of Europe and America—and I make bold to say that though he may have had many opponents he had hardly one personal enemy.

"His name will endure through the ages, and so also will his work!"

Then Marx's son-in-law Longuet read the following addresses which had been received in French.

1. ON THE GRAVE OF KARL MARX
FROM THE RUSSIAN SOCIALISTS

"In the name of all Russian socialists I send a last farewell greeting to the outstanding Master among all the socialists of our times. One of the greatest minds has passed away, one of the most energetic fighters against the exploiters of the proletariat has died.

"The Russian socialists bow before the grave of the man who sympathised with their strivings in all the fluctuations of their terrible struggle, a struggle which they shall continue until the final victory of the principles of the social revolution. The Russian language was the first to have a translation of Capital, that gospel of contemporary socialism. The students of the Russian universities were the first to whose lot it fell to hear a sympathetic exposition of the theories of the mighty thinker whom we have now lost. Even those who were opposed to the founder of the International Working Men's Association in respect of practical questions of organisation were obliged always to bow before his comprehensive knowledge and lofty power of thought which penetrated the substance of modern capital, the development of the economic forms of society and the dependence of the whole history of mankind on those forms of development. Even the most vehement opponents that he found in the ranks of the revolutionary socialists could not but obey the call that he and his lifelong friend sent into the world 35 years ago:

"'Proletarians of All Countries, Unite!'

"The death of Karl Marx is mourned by all who have been able to grasp his thought and appreciate his influence upon our time.

"I allow myself to add that it will be still more deeply mourned by those who associated closely with Marx, especially by those who loved him as a friend.

Paris, March 15, 1883

"P. Lavrov."

---

*Карл Маркс. Капитал. Критика политической экономии. Перевод съ нѣмецкаго. Томъ первый. Книга 1. "Процессъ производства капитала". С.-Петербургъ, 1872.—Ed.
II. TELEGRAM

"The Paris branch of the French Workers' Party expresses its grief at the loss of the thinker whose materialist conception of history and analysis of capitalist production founded scientific socialism and the present revolutionary communist movement. It also expresses its respect for Marx as a man and its complete agreement with his doctrines.

Paris, March 16, 1883

"The Secretary, Lépine."

III. TELEGRAM

"In my own name and as a delegate of the Spanish Workers' Party (Madrid Branch), I share the immense grief of the friends and daughters of Marx at the cruel loss of the great Socialist who was the master of us all.

Paris, March 16, 1883

"José Mesa y Leopold."
"The basis of science, which we owe to Marx, puts us in a position to resist all attacks of the enemy and to continue with ever-increasing strength the fight which we have undertaken.

"Marx changed the Social-Democracy from a sect, a school, into a party, the party which is now fighting undaunted and which will be victorious.

"And that is true not only of us Germans. Marx belongs to the proletariat. It was to the proletariat of all countries that his life was dedicated. Proletarians who can think and do think in all countries have grateful reverence for him.

"It is a heavy blow that has fallen on us. But we do not mourn. The deceased is not dead. He lives in the heart, he lives in the head of the proletariat. His memory will not perish, his doctrine will be effective in ever broader circles.

"Instead of mourning, let us act in the spirit of the great man who has died and strive with all our strength so that the doctrine which he taught and for which he fought will be put into practice as soon as possible. That is the best way to honour his memory!

"Deceased, living friend, we shall follow to the final aim the way you showed us. We swear it on your grave!"

Besides those mentioned there were also present at the grave, among others, Karl Marx's other son-in-law, Paul Lafargue, Friedrich Lessner, who was sentenced at the Cologne Communist Trial in 1852 to five years' imprisonment in a fortress, and G. Lochner, also an old member of the Communist League. The natural sciences were represented by two celebrities of the first magnitude, the zoologist Professor Ray Lankester and the chemist Professor Schorlemmer, both members of the London Academy of Sciences (Royal Society).525

Written on about March 18, 1883

First published in Der Sozialdemokrat,
No. 13, March 22, 1883

Signed: Fr. Engels

Printed according to the newspaper
Frederick Engels

[TO THE EDITORS OF THE NEW YORKER VOLKSZEITUNG]

[London,] April 18, [18]83
122 Regent's Park Road

TO THE EDITORS OF THE N. Y. VOLKSZEITUNG

In your issue of the 15th you print my telegram to Sorge\(^a\) as though it were addressed to you.\(^b\)

In the issue of the 17th you make me say in my telegram to you that Marx died in Argenteuil.\(^c\)

It is not our custom over here to take liberties of this kind with the names of other persons or to countenance such things if they are done to ourselves.

You have thus made it impossible for me to send you any further reports.

If you ever make similar misuse of my name in your paper again, I shall be compelled to request my old friend Sorge to announce that this was an outright falsification on your part.

Yours very truly,

F. E.


Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

---

\(^a\) Engels is referring to his telegram to Friedrich Adolf Sorge of March 14, 1883 (see present edition, Vol. 46).— Ed.

\(^b\) See an item, "London, 14. März, 1883" in the New Yorker Volkszeitung, No. 64, March 15, 1883.— Ed.

\(^c\) See this volume, p. 462.— Ed.
Frederick Engels

ON THE DEATH OF KARL MARX

I

I have subsequently received several further announcements on the occasion of this bereavement which demonstrate how widespread people's sympathy has been, and of which I have to render an account.

On 20th March Miss Eleanor Marx received the following telegram, written in French, from the Editorial Office of The Daily News:

"Moscow, 18th March. Editorial Office Daily News, London. Please be so kind as to convey to Mr. Engels, author of The Working Classes in England and intimate friend of the late Karl Marx, our request that he lay a wreath on the coffin of the unforgettable author of Capital, bearing the following inscription:

"In memory of the defender of workers' rights in theory and their implementation in practice—the students of the Petrovsky Agricultural Academy in Moscow."

"Mr. Engels is requested to tell us his address and the cost of the wreath. The amount due will be forwarded to him without delay.

"Students of the Petrovsky Academy in Moscow."

The dispatch was at any event too late for the funeral, which took place on 17th March.

In addition to that, our friend P. Lavrov in Paris remitted me an order on 31st March for 124.50 frs (£4.18s.9d.), sent in by students of the Technological Institute in Petersburg and by Russian student women, also for a wreath to go on the grave of Karl Marx.

Thirdly, last week the Sozialdemokrat announced that Odessa students also wished for a wreath in their name to be placed on Marx's grave.

---

* F. Engels, The Condition of the Working-Class in England.—Ed.
As the money received from Petersburg is easily enough for all three wreaths, I have taken the liberty of paying for the Moscow and Odessa wreaths from that as well. The preparation of the inscriptions, a somewhat unfamiliar practice here, has caused some delay, but the wreaths will be placed on the grave at the beginning of next week, and I shall then be able to render an account, in the Sozialdemokrat, of the money received.⁵

A beautiful, large wreath has reached us from Solingen, via the Communist Workers' Educational Society⁵⁰ here, "for the grave of Karl Marx from the workers of the scissors, knife and sword industry at Solingen". When we placed it on the grave on 24th March, we found that the long ends of the red silk bows on the wreaths from the Sozialdemokrat and the Communist Workers' Educational Society had been cut off and stolen by people desecrating the grave. Complaining to the trustees was to no avail, but will no doubt mean that the grave will be protected in future.

A Slavonic association in Switzerland⁵¹ expresses the hope

"that a special memorial will be established to Karl Marx through the setting-up of an international fund bearing his name in support of the victims of the great emancipation struggle and for the furtherance of that struggle itself",

and has sent an initial contribution which I have retained for the time being. Of course, the fate of this suggestion depends primarily on whether there is a response to it, and that is why I am publishing it here.

In order to counter the false rumours which are being circulated in the press with some actual facts, I am passing on the following brief details concerning the illness and death of our great theoretical leader.

Having been almost totally cured of an old liver complaint by three periods of treatment at Karlsbad, Marx was left suffering only from a chronic stomach complaint and nervous exhaustion, which took the form of headaches and, mainly, persistent insomnia. Both complaints disappeared more or less after a visit to a seaside or health resort in the summer, and did not return, with more troublesome effects, until after the New Year. Chronic throat complaints and coughing, which also contributed to the insomnia, and chronic bronchitis were, on the whole, less troublesome. But it was to those very complaints that he was to succumb. Four or five weeks before the death of his wife¹ he was suddenly seized by a severe bout of pleurisy, complicated by

---

¹ See this volume, pp. 476-77.— Ed.
² Jenny Marx died on December 2, 1881.— Ed.
bronchitis and incipient pneumonia. The affair was very dangerous, but it turned out well. He was then sent first of all to the Isle of Wight (early in 1882), and following that to Algiers. The journey was a cold one and he arrived in Algiers suffering from a renewed attack of pleurisy. In normal circumstances that would not have made so much difference. But in Algiers the winter and the spring were colder and rainier than ever. In April vain attempts were made to heat the dining room! The final result was that his overall condition became worse instead of better.

Having been sent from Algiers to Monte Carlo (Monaco), Marx arrived there, after a cold and damp voyage, suffering from a third but milder attack of pleurisy. On top of that constant bad weather, which he seemed to have brought with him specially from Africa. So here too he had to fight against a fresh bout of illness rather than have the opportunity to restore himself. Towards the beginning of summer he went to visit his daughter Madame Longuet at Argenteuil, and used his stay there to go to the sulphurous springs in the neighbouring town of Enghien to treat his chronic bronchitis. Despite the continued wet summer the treatment was a success, slow but to the satisfaction of the doctors. They now sent him to Vevey on Lake Geneva, and there he recovered most, so that he was allowed to spend the winter, not in London, it is true, but on the south coast of England. Here he wanted at last to take up his work again. When he came to London in September, he looked well and often climbed Hampstead Hill (about 900 feet above his lodging) with me, without complaint. When the November fogs threatened to descend he was sent to Ventnor, the southern tip of the Isle of Wight. Immediately he was subjected again to wet weather and fog. The inevitable consequence was a fresh cold, coughing and so on; in short, weakening through confinement to his room when he should have been restoring himself by moving about in the fresh air. Then Madame Longuet died. The next day (12th January) Marx came to London, clearly suffering from bronchitis. This was soon complicated by laryngitis, which made it almost impossible for him to swallow. Able to bear the greatest of pain with the most stoic equanimity, he preferred to drink a litre of milk (which he had loathed his whole life long) rather than eat the appropriate solids. In February an ulcer developed in his lung. The medicaments had no effect on his body, surfeited as it was with medicines administered over the previous fifteen months; at most

---

*Gustave Dourlen and Feugier.— Ed*
they weakened his appetite and inhibited his digestion. He became visibly thinner, almost by the day. All the same, the illness was taking a relatively favourable course overall. His bronchitis was almost cured and it became easier for him to swallow. The doctors* were full of hope. Then, visiting him between two and three o’clock—the best time to see him—I suddenly found the whole house in tears: he was so ill that they thought it was probably the end. And yet that very morning he had taken wine, milk and soup with relish. Faithful old Lenchen Demuth, who had raised all his children from the cradle and has been with the household for forty years, went up to him and came straight back down: “Come with me, he’s half asleep.” When we went in, he was completely asleep, but forever. One cannot wish to die an easier death than Karl Marx did in his armchair.

And now, to close with, a piece of good news:

The manuscript of the second volume of *Capital* has been preserved *completely intact*. Whether it can be printed in its present form I am not yet in a position to say. There are more than 1,000 pages of folio. But “the process of circulation of capital” and “the forms of the process as a whole” are complete in a version dating from the years 1867-1870. There is the beginning of a later version and copious material in the form of critical extracts, particularly on Russian landownership, a good deal of which may yet be put to use.

His oral instruction was that his youngest daughter Eleanor and I should be his literary executors.

*London, 28th April 1883*

Frederick Engels

II

A beautiful wreath bearing an inscription on red ribbons was sent to Argenteuil by the Social-Democrats of *Erfurt*; fortunately someone happened to be available to bring it across; when it was laid on the grave, it was noticed that the red silk ribbons of the Solingen wreath had again been stolen.

Meanwhile the three wreaths for *Moscow*, *Petersburg* and *Odessa* were completed. To prevent the ribbons from being stolen, we were obliged to make it impossible for them to be used again by

---

*a* Horatio Bryan Donkin.—*Ed.*
making little incisions on the edges. They were laid on the grave yesterday. A shower of rain had so affected the ribbon on the Erfurt wreath that it could not be used for anything else, and thus escaped being stolen.

These three wreaths cost £1.1s.8d. each, a total of £3.5s.0d. I therefore have £1.13s.9d. left from the £4.18s.9d. that was sent to me, and I shall send that back to P. Lavrov in order to comply with the wishes of the donors.—

The death of a great man provides a first-rate opportunity for small people to make political, literary and actual capital out of it. Here just a few examples which should be made public, not to speak of the many which have occurred in private correspondence.

In a letter dated 2nd April Philipp van Patten, Secretary of the Central Labor Union in New York, wrote to me as follows:

"In connection with the recent demonstration in honour of the memory of Karl Marx, when ... all factions united in testifying their regard for the deceased philosopher, there were very loud statements made by John Most and his friends to the effect that he, Most, was upon intimate terms with Karl Marx, that he had made his work *Das Kapital* popular in Germany and that Marx was in accord with the propaganda conducted by him.

"We have a high appreciation of the talents and the achievements of Marx but cannot believe that he was in sympathy with the anarchistic, disorganising methods of Most and I would like to obtain from you an expression of opinion as to Karl Marx's position upon the question of Anarchy versus Social-Democracy. Too much mischief has already been done here by the untimely and imprudent talk of Most and it is rather disagreeable for us to learn that so high an authority as Marx endorsed such tactics."

I replied to him in a letter on 18th April:

"My statement in reply to your inquiry of the 2nd April as to Karl Marx's position with regard to the Anarchists in general and Johann Most in particular shall be short and clear.

"Marx and I, ever since 1845, have held the view that one of the final results of the future proletarian revolution will be the gradual dissolution and ultimate disappearance of that political organisation called the State; an organisation the main object of which has ever been to secure, by armed force, the economical subjection of the working majority to the wealthy minority. With the disappearance of a wealthy minority the necessity for an armed repressive State-force disappears also. At the same time we have always held, that in order to arrive at this and the other, far more important ends of the social revolution of the future, the

---

a The *Sozialdemokrat* further has: "which is given here in the German translation".—Ed.
proletarian class will first have to possess itself of the organised political force of the State and with its aid stamp out the resistance of the Capitalist class and re-organise society. This is stated already in the Communist Manifesto of 1847, end of Chapter II.\(^a\)

"The Anarchists reverse the matter. They say, that the Proletarian revolution has to begin by abolishing the political organisation of the State. But after the victory of the Proletariat, the only organisation the victorious working class finds readymade for use, is that of the State. It may require adaptation to the new functions.\(^b\) But to destroy that at such a moment, would be to destroy the only organism by means of which the victorious working class can exert its newly conquered power, keep down its capitalist enemies and carry out that economical revolution of society, without which the whole victory must end in a defeat and in a massacre of the working class like that after the Paris Commune.\(^c\)

"Does it require my express assertion, that Marx opposed these anarchist absurdities from the very first day that they were started in their present form by Bakunin? The whole internal history of the International Working Men's Association is there to prove it. The Anarchists tried to obtain the lead of the International by the foulest means, ever since 1867 and the chief obstacle in their way was Marx. The result of the five years' struggle was the expulsion, at the Hague Congress, September 1872, of the Anarchists from the International, and the man who did most to procure that expulsion, was Marx. Our old friend F. A. Sorge of Hoboken, who was present as a delegate, can give you further particulars if you desire.

"Now as to Johann Most. If any man asserts that Most, since he turned anarchist, has had any relations with, or support from Marx, he is either a dupe or a deliberate liar. After the first No. of the London Freiheit had been published,\(^c\) Most did not call upon Marx and myself more than once, at most twice. Nor did we call on him or even meet him accidentally anywhere or at any time since his new-fangled anarchism had burst forth in that paper.\(^d\) Indeed, we at last ceased to take it in as there was absolutely 'nothing in it'. We had for his anarchism and anarchist tactics the

---

\(^a\) See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 505-06.— Ed.

\(^b\) In the Sozialdemokrat this sentence reads: "This state may require very important changes before it can fulfil its new functions".— Ed.

\(^c\) On January 4, 1879.— Ed.

\(^d\) The words "since his new-fangled anarchism had burst forth in that paper" are omitted in the Sozialdemokrat.— Ed.
same contempt as for that of the people from whom he had learnt it.

"While still in Germany, Most published a 'popular' extract of Das Kapital. Marx was requested to revise it for a second edition. I assisted Marx in that work. We found it impossible to eradicate more than the very worst mistakes, unless we re-wrote the whole thing from beginning to end, and Marx consented his corrections being inserted on the express condition only that his name was never in any way connected with even this revised form of Johann Most's production."

"You are perfectly at liberty to publish this letter in the Voice of the People, if you like to do so."

From America to Italy.

About two years ago a young Italian, one Signor Achille Loria from Mantua, sent Marx a copy of a book he had written on ground-rent together with a letter written in German in which he proclaimed himself to be a disciple and admirer of Marx. He also corresponded with him for some time after that. In the summer of 1882 he came to London and visited me twice. The second time I had occasion seriously to tell him my opinion about the fact that, in a pamphlet which had appeared in the meantime, he had accused Marx of having deliberately misquoted.

Now this puny fellow, who got his wisdom from the German academic socialists, has written an article on Marx in Nuova Antologia and has the effrontery to send me, "his most worthy friend" (!!), a separate offprint. What constituted this effrontery will be clear from the following translation of my reply (I wrote to him in his language, for his German is even shakier than my Italian):

"I received your piece on Karl Marx. You are at liberty to subject his teachings to your most searching criticism and even to misunderstand them if you wish; you are at liberty to draft a biography of Marx which is a work of pure fantasy. However, what you are not at liberty to do, and it is a privilege I shall never

---

a Engels is referring to Proudhon and Bakunin.—Ed.
b J. Most, Kapital und Arbeit Ein populärer Auszug aus "Das Kapital" von Karl Marx, Chemnitz [1873].—Ed.
c It appeared in Chemnitz in 1876.—Ed.
d In the Sozialdemokrat the words "in the Voice of the People" are omitted.—Ed.
e A. Loria, La teoria del valore negli economisti italiani, Bologna, 1882, pp. 38-39.—Ed.
grant to anybody, is to slander the character of my late friend.

"Already, in an earlier work, you have presumed to accuse Marx of having deliberately misquoted. When Marx read that, he compared his quotations and yours with the original texts and told me that his quotations were correct, and if anyone was deliberately misquoting, then it was you. And when I see how you now quote Marx, how you shamelessly have him speak of 'profit' where he speaks of 'surplus value'—especially in view of the fact that he was constantly at pains to avoid the error of assuming that the two things were the same (which incidentally Mr. Moore and I explained to you orally when you were in London)—then I know whom to believe and who is deliberately misquoting.

"But that is a mere trifle by comparison with your 'firm and deeply held conviction ... that they' (the teachings of Marx) 'are all dominated by a conscious sophism'; that Marx 'did not allow himself to be held up by incorrect conclusions, knowing full well that they were incorrect'; that 'he was often a sophist who, at the cost of the truth, wished to arrive at the negation of the existing society', and that, as Lamartine says, 'he played with lies and truth as children play with knucklebones'.

"In Italy, a land of ancient civilisation, that may be regarded as a compliment. Among the academic socialists too such a thing may be regarded as great praise, since, of course, those fine professors would never have been able to accomplish their numerous systems except 'at the cost of the truth'. We revolutionary communists regard the matter differently. We consider such assertions to be defamatory accusations, and since we know them to be fabrications, we hurl them back at their author who has defamed no one but himself with such inventions.

"It seems to me that you had a duty to inform the public as to the nature of that famous 'conscious sophism', which you say dominates all the teachings of Marx. But I have looked for it in vain. Nagott!’ (Lombardic swearword for: nothing at all.)

"It takes a puny soul to imagine that a man like Marx ‘always threatened his opponents with a second volume’ which ‘he never for one moment thought of writing’; that that second volume was nothing more than ‘a crafty expedient of Marx’s to avoid scientific arguments.’ That second volume is on hand and will shortly be published. Then at last you may perhaps learn to grasp the distinction between surplus value and profit.

---

a Ibid., pp. 531-32.—Ed.
b Ibid., pp. 510, 538-39.—Ed.
c Ibid., p. 532.—Ed.
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BAKUNIN: STATEHOOD AND ANARCHY

INTRODUCTION. PART 1. 1873

(Following this title on p. 1: Conflict («Борьба») in the International Working Men's Association.)

-FOREWORD-

«In Italy as in Russia there was quite a significant number of such young people, incomparably more than in any other country.»540 (p. 7).b

«Indeed, perhaps nowhere is the social revolution as close as in Italy» (p. 8).

«In Italy there predominates that destitute proletariat who are spoken of with such profound contempt by Messrs. Marx and Engels, and in their wake the whole school of German Social-Democrats, and quite mistakenly, since it is in this class and this class alone and by no means in the bourgeois stratum of the working masses referred to above that the entire intelligence and the entire strength of the coming social revolution is to be found» (p. 8).

Contrast the German situation: here the government can rely, on the one hand, on its excellent etc., army, and, on the other hand,

«on the patriotism of its loyal subjects, on boundless national ambition and on that ancient, historical and no less boundless servility and worship of power which to this day characterise the German nobility, the German burghers» (bourgeoisie), «the German bureaucracy, the German church, the entire guild of German scholars and, under their combined influence, frequently enough, alas, the German nation itself» (p. 11).

«As can be seen, Prussia has swallowed up Germany. This means that as long as Germany remains a state, it will necessarily remain the prime and chief representative and a constant source of all possible despotisms in Europe», despite any pseudo-liberal, constitutional, democratic «and even Social-Democratic forms» (p. 11).

b Here and below Marx indicates in brackets pages in Bakunin's book.— Ed.
Ever since the middle of the [16th] century and up to 1815 the chief source of all reactionary movements was Austria (i.e. as the representative of Germany); from 1815 to 1848 divided between Austria and Prussia, with the former predominating (Metternich) (p. 12): «from 1815 this Holy Alliance of pure German reaction was joined, much more for sport than for profit, by our Tartar-German, all-Russian, imperial knout» (p. 13).

To shift the responsibility from themselves the Germans try to persuade themselves and others that Russia was the chief instigator of the Holy Alliance. "In contrast to the German Social-Democrats, whose programme has as its first goal the establishment of a Pan-Germanic Empire, the Russian social revolutionaries are striving primarily to bring about the utter dissolution of our" (the Russian) "Empire", etc. (p. 13).

In the interest of the truth, «not from any wish to defend the policy of the Petersburg cabinet» (p. 13), Bakunin replies to the Germans as follows. (So as not to have to mention the creation of Prussia with Russian help, which had been forthcoming ever since Peter I, the great man overlooks the alliance under Catherine, as well as Russian influence over France since the Revolution and up to and including Louis Philippe.) (He likewise ignores the fact that from the beginning of the 18th century Russia had intrigued with England with the aim of subjugating Europe.) He starts with Alexander I and Nicholas and depicts their activities as follows:

«Alexander rushed hither and thither, bawled about and made a great fuss; Nicholas gave blank looks and uttered threats. But that was the end of it. They did nothing ... because they could not, since their friends, the Austrian and Prussian Germans, prevented them from acting; they had only been assigned an honorary role of playing the boheymen» (intimidation); «the only countries to move were Austria, Prussia and—finally [under the leadership and with the consent of both]—the French Bourbons who moved against Spain» (pp. 13, 14).

Russia only once crossed her frontiers and that was in 1849, to rescue Austria from the Hungarian revolution. Apart from that she also suppressed the Polish revolution twice in this century with the aid of Prussia, which had as great an interest in this as herself. Of course, «a Russia of the people is unthinkable without Polish independence and freedom» (p. 14).

Neither intelligence, power or wealth can give Russia such predominance as to entitle her to a «decisive say» in Europe (p. 14).

Russia can only take action at the behest of a Western power. (Thus Frederick II called on Catherine to partition Poland and almost Sweden as well.) As for the revolutionary movement in Europe, Russia, finding herself in the hands of Prussian politicians, played the role of boheymen and not infrequently that of the screen behind which they were adept at concealing their own aggressive and reactionary manoeuvres. After their recent victories, they no longer need this and don’t do it any more (p. 15).

Now with Bismarck, Berlin is the visible chief and capital of reaction in Europe (p. 16). Reaction (Roman Catholic) in Rome, Versailles, and to some extent in Vienna and Brussels; knout-reaction in Russia; but the living, «intelligent», really «powerful» reaction is concentrated in Berlin and is spreading from the new German Empire to all parts of Europe, etc. (p. 16).

* The federal organization of the workers' associations, groups, communities, voloescs and ultimately of regions and peoples, from below—this sole precondition of true, non-fictitious
Part of a page from Marx's "Notes on Bakunin's Book Statehood and Anarchy"
freedom—is as opposed to their nature as any economic autonomy is incompatible with them» (p. 17).

Representative democracy (представительная демократия) on the other hand has two requirements for its success: state centralisation and the actual subjugation of the sovereign people by an intellectual minority which governs and unswervingly exploits it, while ostensibly representing it» (p. 17).

«The essence of our Tsarist-German Empire» (p. 14).

The new German Empire is warlike; it must conquer or be conquered (pp. 17, 18); it has a «compelling aspiration to become a world state» (p. 18). Hegemony is merely the modest expression of this aspiration; its precondition is the weakness and subjugation of as many of the surrounding empires as possible. The last French Empire had this role, at present the German has it, and «In our view the German state is the only true state in Europe» (p. 19).

«State» (empire, royaume); «ruler» (souverain, monarque, empereur, roi); «rule» (régner, dominer). (In German, on the other hand, Reich originally referred only to a piece of territory (large or small) with definite boundaries, named after the tribe, etc., the people it belonged to. For example, the region of the Upper Palatinate on the Regen up to Viechtach was called the Viechtreich; Aachnerreich; Vrankryk (in the Netherlands); the Reich of Nimwegen; Reich of Megen; the district of Trarbach on the Moselle is still called Cröverreich to this day; Westrich is another region on the Moselle.)

France's «career as a state» is at an end; anyone who knows anything of the character of the French knows like us (Bakunin) that as France was able to be the «predominant power» for so long, she will find it impossible to accept a secondary position or even one of equality with others. She will prepare for a new war, for revenge, for the re-establishment of her lost primacy (primacy) (p. 19). But will she achieve it? Surely not. The latest events have shown that patriotism, the highest civic virtue (всякий национальный добродетель) no longer exists in France (p. 19). The patriotism of the upper classes is nothing more than vanity which, however, they will abandon in favour of their real interests, as the last war demonstrated. The French rural population displayed just as little patriotism. Peasants ceased to be patriots once they became property owners. Only in Alsace and Lorraine, as if in mockery of the Germans, did French patriotism make its appearance. Patriotism survives now only in the urban proletariat. This is the main reason why the hatred of the property classes turned against them. But they are not patriotic in the true sense, because they are socialist (fraternal towards the workers of all other countries). They took up arms not against the German people, but against Germanic military despotism (pp. 20-22). The war began only four years after the First Geneva Congress and the propaganda of the International created especially among the workers of Latin origin a new antipatriotic outlook (p. 22).

———

a I.e. the nature of modern capitalist production and bank speculation.—Ed.
b Bakunin has "at least all the surrounding states".—Ed.
c Kingdom.—Ed.
d Sovereign, monarch, emperor, king.—Ed.
e Govern, dominate.—Ed.
f Bakunin has: "social-estates".—Ed.
This also became apparent at a meeting in Vienna in 1868 "in response to a whole series of political and patriotic "proposals" made by the young German bourgeois democrats. The workers replied by saying that they were being exploited by them, had always been deceived and oppressed by them, and that all workers of all countries were their brothers... The international camp of working men was their only fatherland, the international world of exploiters their only enemy (pp. 22, 23). As proof they sent a telegram "to their Paris brethren, the pioneers of workers' liberation throughout the world." (p. 23). This reply raised quite a furor in Germany; it sent waves of panic through all bourgeois democrats, including even Johann Jacoby, and "not only wounded their patriotic feelings but also offended against the official faith (государственную вярву) of the school of Lassalle and Marx. Probably on the advice of the latter, Mr. Liebknecht, who is now one of the leaders of the German Social Democrats, but who was at the time still a member of the bourgeois-democratic party (the defunct People's Party), immediately left Leipzig for Vienna to have negotiations (геропонопа) with the Viennese workers about the "political taciturnity" that had given rise to the scandal. In justice to him it must be said he acted so successfully that only a few months later, namely in August 1868, at the Nuremberg Congress of German workers, all the leaders of the Austrian proletariat subscribed without protest to the narrowly patriotic programme of the Social-Democratic Party" (pp. 23, 24). This revealed "the profound gulf between the political leanings of the leaders of the Party, all of whom were more or less learned and bourgeois, and the revolutionary instincts of the Germanic or at least the Austrian proletariat itself". However, such instincts have barely developed in Germany and Austria since 1868, but have come on famously in Belgium, Italy, Spain and above all in France (p. 24). The French workers are fully conscious that, as social revolutionaries, they are working for the whole world (p. 25), "and more for the world than for themselves" (p. 25). "This dream (сна меча)" has become second nature to the French proletariat and has expelled the last vestiges of imperial patriotism from their minds and their hearts" (p. 26). When the French proletariat issued its call to arms, it was in the conviction that it was fighting as much for the freedom and rights of the German proletariat as for its own (p. 26). "They were not fighting for greatness and honour, but for victory over the hated «military power» which in the hands of the bourgeoisie had been the means of their oppression. They detected the German army, not because it was German, but because it was an army" (p. 26). The uprising of the Paris Commune against the Versailles National Assembly and against the savour of the fatherland—Thiers—makes crystal-clear the nature of the passion which alone motivates the French proletariat today for whom only a social-revolutionary war continues, etc., to exist (p. 27). In their passion for social revolution "they proclaimed the ultimate dissolution of the French Empire, the shattering of the imperial unity of France, which is incompatible with the autonomy of the French Communes (communities). The Germans only reduced the frontiers and the power (мог) of their political fatherland; they however aimed to «убить» (kill, destroy) it entirely, and as if to symbolise their reasonable intent, they toppled into the dust the Vendôme Column, the revered memorial of French glory" (p. 27).

"Hence the state on the one hand, the social revolution on the other" (p. 29). This struggle at its sharpest in France; even among the peasants, at least in Southern France (p. 30). "And this hostile antagonism between two now

---

a Bakunin has: "South German and Austrian".—Ed.
b "Die Arbeiter Wien's an die französischen und englischen Arbeiter, Wien, den 10. Juli 1868", Der Vorbote, No. 8, August 1868, pp. 120-22.—Ed.
irreconcilable worlds constitutes the second reason why it is impossible for France to become once again a state of the first rank, the predominant "state" (p. 30). The men of Versailles, the stock exchange, the bourgeoisie, etc., lost their heads when Thiers announced the withdrawal of the Prussian troops (p. 31). "That is to say, the curious patriotism of the French bourgeoisie looks to the ignominious capitulation of the fatherland for its salvation" (p. 31).

"The sympathies for the Spanish revolution, evinced so clearly nowadays by French workers, particularly in Southern France, where the proletariat evidently longs for fraternal alliance with the Spanish proletariat and would even like to form a "people's" federation with them, based on free labour and collective ownership" (p. 32).

Note s on Bakunin's Statehood and Anarchy

"despite all national differences and state frontiers—these sympathies and aspirations, I say, prove that for the French proletariat above all, as well as for the privileged classes, the age of imperial patriotism is over" (p. 32).

"How then can such an ancient, incurably sick state (like France) take on the youthful and hitherto still healthy German state" (p. 33)? No form of state, no republic however democratic, can give the people what it needs, "i.e. the free (вольный—free, but also unbridled) organisation of its own interests from below (снизу вверх), without any interference, tutelage, compulsion from above, because every such statehood (государство), even the most republican and most democratic, even the so-called people's state" (многонародное государство) "which has been thought up by Mr. Marx, is in essence nothing but the government of the masses from above by an intelligent and hence privileged minority, which rules as if it comprehended the real interests of the people better than the people itself" (pp. 34, 35).

Since therefore the propertied classes cannot satisfy the passion and the aspirations of the people, "only one means is left them—state force (государственное насилие), in a word, the "state", because the actual meaning of "state" is "force" (сила, violence, violemence, force), "government by force, concealed if possible, but if the worst comes to the worst, ruthless force", etc." (p. 35). Gambetta cannot mend matters here; the desperate struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat (in France) "calls for the deployment of all means and forces at the disposal of the government (the state), thus leaving no means and forces to spare to enable the French Empire to maintain its external supremacy over the European powers". "How could it compete with Bismarck's empire!" (p. 37). France must submit to the superior leadership, the friendly tutelage of the German Empire, just as the Italian state had to bow to the policies of the French (pp. 37, 38).

England: Influence greatly reduced. Following sentence characteristic:

"Even as recently as thirty years ago she would not have acquiesced so calmly in either the German conquest of the Rhine provinces, the re-establishment of Russian predominance on the Black Sea, or the Russian campaign in Khiva. The reason for this complaisance, etc.—the struggle of the workers' world with the exploitative and politically dominant bourgeois world (p. 39). The social revolution is not far off there, etc. (i.e.).

Spain and Italy, not worth mentioning: they will never become dangerous and powerful states, not from the absence of material means but because the "spirit of the people" is directed towards quite different objectives (p. 39).
On this point: Spain roused herself again in the people’s war against Napoleon 535 which was initiated by the untutored masses themselves. Nothing of the kind in Germany in 1812 and 1813. Remained unmoved until Napoleon’s defeat in Russia. The Tiroi the only exception 536 (pp. 40, 41).

Meanwhile:

"We have seen that the ownership of property sufficed to corrupt the French peasantry and to extinguish its last remaining sparks of patriotism" (p. 42). In Germany (1812-13) the young citizens or rather the loyal subjects (верноподданные), stirred up by philosophers and poets, took up arms to protect and restore the German Empire, for it was just at this time that the idea of the Pan-Germanic Empire was born in Germany. In the meantime, the Spanish people rose up as one man (поголомно) to defend (отстоять) the freedom of their «homeland» and the independence of their «national life» against the fierce and powerful oppressor (p. 43). Every form of government was then tried out in Spain, but to no purpose: despotism, constitutionalism, conservative republicanism, etc.; even the pettybourgeois federal republic along Swiss lines (p. 43).

"Spain was seized (possessed) in real earnest by the demon of revolutionary socialism. 537 Andalusian and Estremaduran peasants, without asking anyone’s permission or waiting for anyone’s orders, made themselves masters of the estates of the erstwhile landowners. Catalonia, and particularly Barcelona, loudly assert their independence and autonomy. The people of Madrid proclaim a federal republic and refuse to subject the revolution to the future commands of a constituent assembly. Even in the North, in territory under Carlist control, 538 the social revolution is proceeding openly: the fueros (фюеросы) 539 are proclaimed, as is the independence of the districts and communities; all legal and civil records are burnt; throughout the whole of Spain the army fraternises with the people and drives away its officers. General bankruptcy has set in, public and private—the first prerequisite for social and economic revolution" (p. 44). "An end to finance, to the army, the courts, the police; away with government forces and with the «state»: what remains is the vigorous and fresh (свежий) people, sustained now only by the passion of the social revolution. Under the collective leadership of the International and the Alliance of Social Revolutionaries 540 it rallies and organises its forces, etc.” (p. 44). The only living tradition still surviving in the Italian people is that of absolute autonomy, not only of the «областей» (province, region, district), but of the communities (общины). 6 To this, the «only political concept» which really is peculiar to the «people», we must add the historical and ethnographic «variety» of the «regions» where so many dialects are spoken that people in one «область» (which en passant also means "power, force") only understand the inhabitants of other «regions» with difficulty and sometimes not at all. But «socially», Italy is not disunited. On the contrary, there is a «common Italian character and type», by which Italians are distinguished from all other peoples, even southern ones (p. 45). The break-up of the latest Italian «state» will unfailingly have «free, social unification» as its consequence (p. 46). All this refers only to the «mass of the people».

In the «upper strata» of the Italian bourgeoisie, on the other hand, as in other countries, we find that «state unity has given rise to the social unity of the class of the privileged exploiters of the labour of the people, a unity which is now being steadily developed. This class is now known in Italy under the collective term

---

* In Bakunin this reads "not even at the level of the province, but [only] in the communities". — Ed.
Consorteria ... the whole official world, bureaucratic and military, police and judicial; big landowners, industrialists, merchants and bankers; the entire official and semi-official host of lawyers and writers, the whole parliament (p. 46).

But even the most terrible destitution (poverty), even when it afflicts «the many millions» of proletarians, is not a sufficient guarantee (sanctum) of revolution. When man (the destitute) is driven to despair, his rebellion becomes that much more possible... In desperation even the German ceases to reason; but an enormous amount is needed to drive him to despair... However, «destitution» and «despair» can do no more than provoke personal or at best local «revolts»; they are insufficient to grip «whole masses of the people». For that a «universal popular ideal» is needed which historically «always» evolves from the «depths of popular instincts», in addition a belief (σπαμ) in one's right, «it could be said, a religious belief in this right».

This together with poverty and despair provides the right recipe for social revolution (pp. 47, 48).

"This is the situation in which the Italian people finds itself today" (p. 48).

In particular, it was the International——i.e. the Alliance, which has been especially effective in Italy in the last two years (1872 and 1873)—that acted as midwife to this ideal.

«It* pointed out to it [the proletariat] the objective to be achieved and at the same time provided it with the ways and means to organise the energies of the people» (p. 48).

«It is worthy of note that in Italy as in Spain it was not «Marx's state-communist programme» which carried the day (triumphed), but that in both countries there was a widespread and passionate endorsement of the programme of the world-famous (προκάλογυτον) Alliance or «League of Social Revolutionaries» with its impalpable declaration of war on «domination, governmental tutelage, prerogative and authority» of every kind» (p. 49).

"Under these conditions the people can emancipate itself and establish its own particular mode of life «on the basis of the most extensive freedom» of each and everyone, but without constituting a threat at all to the liberty of other peoples" (p. 49).

Therefore, since Italy and Spain adhere to the programme of the Alliance, the social revolution in those countries is at hand, but no policy of conquest is to be feared from them (p. 49).

The small states——Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, «for the very same reasons» (i.e. because they have embraced the programme of the Alliance!).

"but chiefly" because of "their political insignificance" (p. 49) present no threat but, on the contrary, have many reasons to "fear annexation by the new German Empire" (p. 50).

Austria sick unto death. Divided into two states, Magyar-Slav and German-Slav* (p. 50). The Germans wish for hegemony in the latter.

* The propaganda of the International.— Ed.
"The Germans, 'state-worshippers' and bureaucrats by nature, it can be said, base their pretensions on their historic right, i.e. on the right of conquest and 'tradition', on the one hand, and on the alleged superiority of their culture, on the other" (p. 52). In recent years the Germans have been compelled to concede an independent 'existence' to the Magyars. 'Of all the tribes that inhabit the Austrian Empire, the Magyars have the 'most developed state-consciousness' after the Germans (p. 52). They assert their historic right to lord it over all the other tribes who live with them in the Kingdom of Hungary, even though they do not amount to much more than 1/8 (i.e.) (viz. 5,500,000 Magyars, 5,000,000 Slavs, 2,700,000 Romanians, 1,800,000 Jews and Germans, around 500,000 other 'tribes', making 15,500,000 all told) (i.e.). So the Austro-Hungarian Empire [divides] into 2: the Cisleithan state, Slav-German with 20,500,000 (7,200,000 Germans and Jews, 11,500,000 Slavs, about 1,800,000 Italians and other 'tribes'); and the Magyar-Slav-Romanian-German state (p. 53).

In Hungary

the "majority of the population is subject to the Magyars, does not like them, bears their yoke grudgingly, hence perpetual struggle" (p. 53). The Magyars fear revolt from the Romanians and Slavs: hence in secret league with Bismarck who, "foreseeing the inevitable war with the Austrian Empire, which is destined to disappear, "makes advances" to the Magyars" (p. 54).

In the Cisleithan state the situation is no better; there the Germans want to rule over the Slav majority: "The Germans hate the Slavs as the master is wont to hate his slaves" (p. 54), fear their emancipation, etc. "Like all conquerors of foreign land and subjugators of foreign peoples, the Germans simultaneously and highly 'unjustly' both hate and despise the Slavs" (i.e.). The Prussian Germans' main criticism of the Austrian government is that it is incapable of Germanising the Slavs. "This, in their view and also in fact, constitutes the greatest crime against German patriotic interests in general and against Pan-Germanism" (p. 55) (his emphasis). With the exception of the Poles, the Austrian Slavs have countered this Pan-Germanism with Pan-Slavism, which likewise is a piece of "nauseating folly". "an ideal incompatible with freedom and fatal to the people" (p. 55).

Here is a footnote in which Mr. Bakunin threatens to treat this question at greater length; here he just calls on Russian revolutionary youth to resist this trend; he admits that Russian agents are busy propagating Pan-Slavism among the Austrian Slavs and trying to persuade them that the Tsar is eager to free their land from the German yoke, and "this at a time when the Petersburg Cabinet is 'openly' betraying the whole of Bohemia and Moravia, selling them to Bismarck as a reward for the promised assistance in the East".

How does it come about, then, that in the Austro-Slav territories there is a whole class of educated, etc., people who either expect to be liberated by the Russians or even hope for "the establishment of a Slav great power under the supremacy of the Russian Tsar"? (p. 57).

This only goes to show "the degree to which this accursed German civilisation which is 'bourgeois' in essence and hence 'statist', has succeeded in entering the soul of the Slav patriots themselves ... they would remain completely German even

\* Bakunin's.—Ed.
though the goal they are seeking to achieve is anti-German; using ways and means borrowed from the Germans they want, they think to free the Slavs from the German yoke. Because of their German education they cannot conceive of any way of obtaining their freedom but through the formation of Slav states or a single great Slav empire. They therefore set themselves a purely German objective because the <modern state>—centralist, bureaucratic, a police and military state after the fashion, for example, of the new German or «All-Russian» Empire—is a purely German «creation». In Russia it formerly contained a certain Tartar element, «but even in Germany there is certainly no lack of Tartar civility nowadays»" (p. 57).

"The entire nature, the entire character of the Slav tribe is definitely unpolitical, i.e. non-<statist>. In vain do the Czechs hark back to (nominals) their Great Moravian Empire and the Serbs their Empire of Dušan. All such things are either ephemeral phenomena or old fairy-tales. The truth is that no single Slav tribe has ever of itself created a «state»" (p. 57).

Polish Monarchy-Republic:

founded under the dual influence of Germanism and Latinism, after the Slav people (холопъ—bondman, serv) had been suppressed by the Szlachta who are not of Slav origin in the opinion of many Polish historians (such as «Mickiewicz») (p. 58).

Bohemian state (Czech):

patched together on the German model and openly influenced by the Germans; hence soon formed an organic part of the German Empire.

Russian Empire:

Tartar knout, Byzantine blessing (благословеніе) and German bureaucratic, military and police Enlightenment (p. 58).

"Hence it is indubitable that the Slavs have never established a «state» on their own initiative. Because they have never been a tribe bent on conquest. Only warlike people found «states» and they invariably found them for their own benefit and to the detriment of subdued nations." The Slavs were predominantly peaceful, agrarian tribes; they lived off and independently in their communities, administered (управлі́ва́ть—also govern) in patriarchal fashion by their «elders» on the basis of the «electoral principle», collective ownership of land, no nobility, no special priest-case, all equal, "implementing in a patriarchal and hence imperfect manner the idea of human fraternity". No political bonds between communities; only a defensive alliance in case of attacks from outside; no Slav «state»; but social, fraternal bonds between all Slav tribes, hospitable in the highest degree (pp. 58, 59). "Such an organisation rendered them defenceless against the incursions and attacks of warlike tribes, especially the Germans who sought to extend their rule everywhere" (p. 59). "The Slavs were exterminated in part, the majority subjugated by Turks, Tartars, Magyars and above all Germans" (p. 59). "The second half of the 10th century witnesses the beginning of the tormented, but also heroic history of their slavery" (p. 59).

"Unfortunately for Poland her leading parties (руководящія партія) which to this day have belonged for the most part to the Szlachta, have not yet renounced their «statist» programme and, instead of striving for the liberation and «rebirth» of their «homeland» through social revolution, they remain the prisoners of ancient prejudices and seek either the protection of a Napoleon or else an alliance with the Jesuits and the Austrian feudal nobility" (p. 61).
In our century the Western and Southern Slavs have also awakened; Bohemia the centre for the one, Serbia for the other (pp. 61, 62).

The latest expression of the «state» the Pan-Germanic Empire: "its days are numbered and all nations expect that its collapse will bring about their ultimate emancipation... Are the Slavs envious of the Germans for having earned the hatred of all the other peoples of Europe?" (p. 63)

England does not exist for this coffee-house politician; it is the true apex of bourgeois society in Europe.

Either there will be no Slav «state» at all, or else there will be a vast, all-devouring Pan-Slav, «St. Petersburg knout State» (pp. 64, 65).

Nor is it possible to oppose Pan-Germanic centralisation by forming a Pan-Slav Federation after the manner of the United States (p. 66). Federation in North America is possible only because there is no powerful «state» like Russia, Germany or France on the American continent adjacent to the great republic. Hence, in order to counter a victorious Pan-Germanism on the level of the «state» or politics, only one way remains: to establish a Pan-Slav «state».

Universal Slav servitude beneath the «All-Russian knout» (p. 67). But even this would be impossible. Numerically, there are almost three times as many Slavs in Europe as Germans. Despite this, a Pan-Slav Empire would never be able to match the Pan-Germanic Empire in terms of power and actual «political and military strength». Why not? "Because German blood, German instinct and the German tradition are all imbued with a passion for «state» order and «state» discipline", with the Slavs the position is the reverse; "this is why they can only be disciplined by having the threat of a big stick hanging over them, while any German will swallow the stick with the conviction (в убеждении) of his own free will. To him freedom consists in «being drilled» and he «willingly bows down» to every authority. Furthermore, the Germans are earnest, diligent people, learned, thrifty, «orderly, careful and calculating», which does not prevent them from fighting splendidly if need be, namely when the authorities desire it. They proved this in the recent wars. Moreover, their military and administrative organisation has been perfected to the highest possible degree, beyond the reach of any other nation. So is it thinkable that the Slavs could ever match them on the plane of «statehood»? (pp. 68, 69). "The Germans look to the «state» for their life and their freedom; for the Slavs the «state» is a tomb. They seek their liberation outside the «state», not just in the struggle against the German «state», but in the «universal revolt» against «states» of every kind, in social revolution" (p. 69). "But «states» will not fall of their own accord; they can only be overthrown by an international social revolution which encompasses all nations and peoples" (p. 69). The Slavs' hostility to the state, which hitherto has been their weakness, becomes their strength for the present popular movement (p. 69). The moment is drawing near for the total emancipation of «the mass of unskilled workers» and for their free social organisation «from below», without any «правительственного» (directing, governmental) interference, by means of free economic, народных (popular, public) союзов (union, alliance, coalition, federation), «disregarding» all old state frontiers and all national differences, on the sole basis of productive labour, humanised through and through and with total solidarity amidst all its diversity" (p. 70).

"Nationality is no universal human principle, but an historical, local fact having, like all «genuine» and harmless facts, an undoubted right to universal «recognition». Every people and even every «little people» has its own character, its manner and these in fact (меня) are what form the essence of nationality, the product of the whole of history and the totality of the conditions of life of the nationality,
Every people, like every individual, is «inevitably» what it is and has the undoubted right to be itself. This is what the entire so-called «national right» amounts to" (p. 70).

But it does not follow from this that one should lay down his nationality and the other his individuality as a «special principle», etc.: "The less they think about themselves, and the more they «are imbued» with a common humanity, then the more the nationality of the one and the individuality of the other gain in vitality and ideas" (p. 71). The Slavs too will only be able to assume «their rightful place» in history and in the free brotherhood of peoples if, jointly with others, they embrace universal interests (p. 71).

"In Germany the Reformation very quickly abandoned its «insurrectionary» character, which is anyway incompatible with the German temperament, and assumed the shape of a «peaceful state» reform which soon came to form the basis for the «most methodical», systematic, learned «state» despotism. In France, after a long and bloody struggle which made no small contribution to the growth of free thought in that country, they (desires for reform) were crushed by the victorious Catholic Church. In Holland, England and later in the United States of America they created a new civilisation which was in essence anti-«statist», but «bourgeois-economic» and liberal" (p. 72).

This passage is very typical for Bakunin; the genuine capitalist state for him anti-governmental; secondly, the different developments in Germany, on the one hand, and Holland and England, on the other, are not the result of changes in world trade, but etc.

"The religious reform"

(also very brilliant that the Renaissance is only thought of in the context of religion)

"produced two main trends in civilised mankind: an economic and liberal-«bourgeois» trend, particularly in England and then in America, and the despotic, «statist», essentially also «bourgeois»"—

he uses this word bourgeoïs both for capitalism and for the medieval philistines [Spießbürger] in Germany—

"and the Protestant trend, even though the latter is mixed with aristocratic Catholic elements which, incidentally, became completely subordinate to the «state». The chief representatives of this trend were France and Germany, the Austrian part to begin with and then the Prussian" (p. 73).

"The French Revolution founded a new universal human interest, the ideal of unlimited human liberty, but exclusively in the political realm; contradiction, political freedom [on its own] cannot be put into practice; freedom within a «state» is a lie. Resulted in two main tendencies. Systematic exploitation of the proletariat and the enrichment of a minority. On this exploitation of the people one party desires to set up a democratic republic, the other, more consistent, strives for the monarchic, i.e. an openly «state» despotism" (p. 73).

Against all these aspirations, there is a new trend "leading directly" to Bakunin (p. 74)."564

"Therefore the Slav proletariat must join the International Working Men's Association en masse" (p. 75). "We have already had occasion to refer to the magnificent demonstration of international solidarity by the Viennese workers in
1868" (p. 75) against the Pan-Germanic programme. But the Austrian workers failed to follow this up with the necessary measures, "because they were stopped short (prevented) at the very first step by the patriotic-Germanic propaganda of Mr. Liebknecht and the other Social-Democrats who came with him to Vienna, it would seem, in July 1868 expressly for the purpose of throwing off course (leading astray) the true social instinct of the Austrian workers from the path of international revolution and diverting it towards political agitation in favour of establishing a "state", what they call «народным» (people's state), Pan-Germanic, of course—in short, for implementing the patriotic ideal of Count Bismarck, only on a Social-Democratic basis and by means of so-called legal «popular agitation»" (p. 76).

"For the Slavs this would mean voluntarily submitting to the German yoke and this [is] «repugnant» to every Slav heart (p. 77). Hence we shall not only not persuade our Slav brothers to enter the ranks of the Social-Democratic Party of the German workers which is presided over with dictatorial powers by Messrs. Marx and Engels and after them Messrs. Bebel, Liebknecht and some literary Jews; on the contrary, we must strive with all our might to prevent the Slav proletariat from «forming» a suicidal «alliance» with this party which is in no sense a «people's» party but in its tendency, its aims and its methods is purely «bourgeois» and moreover exclusively German, i.e. «fatal to Slavs»" (p. 77).

The Slav proletariat must not only not join this party, it must avoid all contact with it, and instead must strengthen its bonds with the International Working Men's Association. "The German Social-Democratic Party should on no account be confused with the International (p. 77). The political and patriotic programme of the former has almost nothing in common with the programme of the latter and is indeed diametrically opposite to it. At the Hague Congress the Marxists tried to impose it on the entire International.535 But this attempt provoked a general loud protest from Italy, Spain, part of Switzerland, France, Belgium, Holland, England and even to some extent of the United States of America, so that it became apparent to the whole world that no one wants the German programme except for the Germans themselves" (p. 78).

The Slav proletariat must join the International en masse, form sections and, if it appears necessary, a "Pan-Slav federation" (p. 78).

Serbia, «Serbian principality»: The Serbs founded a «state» after emancipation from the Turks; its yoke heavier than that of the Turks (p. 79). At the mercy of bureaucratic «robbery» and despotism (i.e.). In Turkish Serbia there is neither a nobility nor very big landowners, nor industrialists, nor even particularly rich merchants; a new bureaucratic aristocracy has grown up, educated for the most part at government expense in Odessa, Moscow, Petersburg, Vienna, Germany, Switzerland and Paris (p. 79).

The Bulgarians want nothing to do with the Serbian «Dušan Kingdom»; nor do the «Croats», the «Montenegrins» and the Bosnian Serbs. For all these lands there is only one possible means of escape, and of unification—social revolution; «certainly not a war between states» which could lead only to their subjugation by Russia or Austria or both (p. 86).

In Czech Bohemia Wenceslas's kingdom and crown366 have fortunately not yet been restored; the Viennese authorities treat it simply as a province, without even the privileges of Galicia; and yet there are as many political parties in Bohemia as in the dear & Slav «state». "Indeed, this damned German spirit of politicking and «statehood» has made such inroads into the education of Czech youth that there is

---

535 — Karl Marx

366 — Karl Marx

Ed.

a Bakunin has: "any" (p. 86). — Ed.
a serious risk of the latter ending up by «losing» the capacity «to understand their own people.»” (p. 86). “In all Austrian towns where the Slav population has intermingled with the German, the Slav workers play the most active part in all the general rallies of the proletariat. But there are almost no workers’ associations in these towns apart from those which have recognised the programme of German Social-Democracy, so that in effect the Slav workers, carried away by their social-revolutionary instincts, have been recruited into a party whose direct and loudly proclaimed goal is the foundation of a pan-Germanic «state», i.e. a vast German «prison.»” (p. 88).

They must accept the programme of the International under the leadership of Bakunin (p. 89) (the Slav section in Zurich, a member of the Jura Federation, is specially recommended as a recruiting office in the Note to p. 89).

_Austria_ (Conclusion).

The Empire continues to exist only through the calculated tolerance of Prussia and Russia who do not yet wish to proceed with dismembering it because each is waiting for a favourable opportunity to seize the lion’s share [p. 93].

_Russia:_

“There is but one constitution of benefit to the people—the destruction of the (Russian) Empire” (p. 96).

Does it have the military power to take on the new German Empire? At present this the only political issue in Russia (l.c.). “This question ... inexorably posed by Germany’s new situation, i.e. by the fact that it «has grown» overnight (за одну ночь) into a gigantic and omnipotent state». But all history shows, and rational logic confirms, that two states of equal strength cannot subsist side by side. One must conquer the other” (p. 97). This is essential for Germany. “After long, long political humiliation it has suddenly become the most powerful empire on the European continent. Can it endure beside itself, under its very nose as it were, a power entirely independent of it, one it has not yet subdued and which dares to claim equal status and the power of Russia at that, «the most hated of all»!” (p. 97).

“There can be few Russians, we believe, who are unaware of the degree to which the Germans, all Germans, but chiefly the German bourgeois, and under their influence, alas!, the German people too, hate Russia” (p. 97). This hatred is one of Germany’s most powerful national passions. (p. 98).

Initially, a genuine hatred by German civilisation for Tartar barbarism (p. 98). In the twenties the protest of political liberalism against political despotism (l.c.). They put the entire blame for the Holy Alliance onto Russia (l.c.). In the early thirties sympathy with the Poles, hatred of the Russians for suppressing the Polish uprising (l.c.). They forgot again that Prussia had helped to put down the Poles; Prussia gave her assistance because a Polish victory would have meant rebellion throughout the whole of Prussian Poland, which would have “ripped the rising power” of the Prussian monarchy in the bud” (l.c.).

In the second half of the thirties the emerging Slav question provided a new reason to hate the Russians, one which gave that hate a political and national direction: the formation in Austria and Turkey of a Slav Party which hoped for and expected help from Russia. The idea of a Pan-Slav republican federation to which the Decembrists (Pestel, Muravyov-Apostol, etc.) aspired. Nicholas took it up, but in the form of a unified, Pan-Slav and autocratic «state» under his sceptre of
iron. In the early thirties and forties Russian agents travelled to the Slav territories from Petersburg and Moscow, some officially, others as unpaid volunteers; the latter belonged to the Moscow Slavophile Society. Pan-Slav propaganda spread among the Southern and Western Slavs. Many pamphlets, some written in German, others translated into it. Fear among the Pan-Germanic public. Bohemia—Russian! Spoil their appetite and ruin their sleep (p. 99). The greatest hatred of Russia from this time; for their part the Russians have no love for the Germans. Under these circumstances what possibility is there for the All-Russian and Pan-Germanic Empires to live as neighbours? (p. 100). But there were and still are grounds for them both to keep the peace. First: Poland (i.e.). Austria opposed to partition, etc. For Austria, Poland a bulwark against Russia and Prussia. Second: Austria, which they wish to dismember. The partition of Austria will divide them, but until then nothing can separate them (pp. 100-102). Third: the new German Empire, hated by all and with no ally apart from Russia, and perhaps the United States. Still has much to do before it can achieve the idea of Pan-Germanic Empire; would have to take the whole of Lorraine away from France; to devour Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark and the Scandinavian peninsula; the Russian Baltic provinces, so as to achieve sole control of the Baltic. It would leave Hungary to the Magyars, Galicia with the Austrian Bukovina to the Russians; it would reserve its rights to the whole of Austria up to and including Trieste and also Bohemia, which the Russian Cabinet would not even dream of contesting... "Wa" (Bakunin) "have certain knowledge that secret negotiations about the partition of the Austrian Empire in the shorter or longer term have long since been in train between the Petersburg and the German courts", in the course of which each side naturally tries to dupe the other. On its own, the Prussian-German Empire [is] not capable of carrying out these great plans; "hence an alliance with Russia is and will for a long time remain an urgent necessity"... The same true of Russia. "Conquest in every direction and at any price is the normal condition of life for the Russian Empire." In which direction then? To west or east? The western route is that of Pan-Slavism and an alliance with France against the united military might of Prussia and Austria and with the probable neutrality of England and the United States. The other, eastern, route leads to India, Persia, Constantinople. The enemies there [are] Austria and England, probably joined by France; allies—Germany and the United States (pp. 102-104).

The first route (Pan-Slavism, against the German Empire). The assistance of France worthless, her unity shattered forever, etc.; this route is revolutionary; it leads to an uprising of the peoples, the Slavs especially, against their legitimate "rulers", both Austrian and Prussian-German. Nicholas rejected this course of action from instinct, principle, etc. (!) But over and above that "it must not be forgotten that the liberation of Poland is absolutely impossible to All-Russian statehood". Centuries of struggle between two opposing forms of the "state": the "will of the Szlachta" and the Tsarist knout. The Poles often seemed on the verge of victory. But as soon as the people rose up—in Moscow in 1612, and then the insurrection of the Ukrainians and the Lithuanian "serfs" under Bogdan Khmelnitsky—it was at an end. "The Russian knout triumphed thanks to the people."

This admission on p. 110.

The All-Russian knout-Empire built on the ruins of the Szlachta Polish "state", "Take these supports away from it, i.e. the provinces which formed part of the Polish "state" up to 1772, and the All-Russian Empire will vanish" (p. 110).

---

\(^a\) Here Marx has: "Bcerussische", a word coined from Russian and German.—Ed.
These are the wealthiest, most fertile and best populated provinces; if they were lost the wealth and might of the Russian Empire would be halved. This loss would be followed by that of the Baltic provinces and, on the assumption that the Polish state was really invested with new life, it would wrest from Russia control of the whole of the Ukraine, which would become either a Polish province or an independent state. Russia would thereby forfeit her frontier on the Black Sea; she would be cut off from Europe on every side and be forced into Asia. Some imagine that the Russian Empire could at least cede Lithuania to Poland. «No». The proximity of Moscow and Poland necessarily leads Polish patriotism to the conquest of the Baltic provinces and the Ukraine. Were the present Kingdom of Poland once freed, Warsaw would immediately unite with Vilna, Grodno, «Minsk» and Kiev, to say nothing of Podolia and Volhynia. The Poles a restless people that it cannot be given an inch of free space: it instantly becomes the focal point of general revolutionary resistance.\(^2\) In 1844 there remained only one free city, Cracow, and Cracow became the focal point of general revolutionary resistance. The Russian Empire can only prolong its existence by using the Muratovian system «to keep the Poles down» \(^50\) ... The Russian people has nothing in common with the Russian Empire; [their] interests are opposed.

At this point Bakunin puts forward the following proposition, a nonsensical one from the standpoint of his own system:

"As soon as the Russian Empire collapses and the Great Russians, Ukrainians and other peoples have established their freedom, the ambitious intentions of the Polish «state»-patriots will cease to hold any «terror» for them" (comment done?)\(^b\). "They can be fatal only to the Empire" (p. 111). This is why the Tsar will not voluntarily give up the least patch of Polish territory. "And without liberating the Poles, can he call on the Slavs «to rebel»?" (pp. 104-111).

And in Nicholas' day the Pan-Slav way was more promising than today. At that time an uprising of the Magyars and the Italians against Austria was still to be counted on. At present Italy probably\(^c\) neutral, since (in such an event) Austria would just hand over the few remaining Italian enclaves in her possession voluntarily. As for the Magyars, in view of their own «state»\(^d\) position vis-à-vis the Slavs, they would vigorously support the Germans against Russia. The Russian Emperor could only rely on limited support from among the Austrian Slavs; if he tried to induce the Turkish Slavs to rise up too, then [he would face a] new enemy: England. But in the Austrian Empire there are no more than 17 million Slavs; of these 5 million are in Galicia, where the Poles would paralyse the Ruthenians; this leaves 12 million, minus those serving in the Austrian army, who would fight against anyone their superiors commanded them to, as is the fashion in any army. These 12 million

(who, according to Bakunin, are exclusively male and adult)

are not concentrated in one or a few places; scattered over the whole expanse of the Austrian Empire, speaking very different dialects, mixed with Germans, Magyars, Italians and Romanians.

\(^a\) In Bakunin this part of the sentence reads: "people in it will instantly conspire and establish secret contacts with all the conquered regions so as to restore the Polish state". — Ed.

\(^b\) To be sure! — Ed.

\(^c\) Bakunin has: "undoubtedly". — Ed.

\(^d\) Bakunin has: "dominating". — Ed.
"This is a huge number with which to keep the Austrian authorities and the Germans in general in a state of constant uneasiness, but it is very little to give the Russian armies serious support against the combined forces of Prussian Germany and Austria." The Russian government knows this and so does not even contemplate a Pan-Slav war against Austria, which would inevitably turn into war against the whole of Germany. Nevertheless, it does employ agents to disseminate actual Pan-Slav propaganda in the Austrian territories. It is very useful for it to have such blind, etc., supporters in all the Austrian provinces. "This paralyses, impedes and alarms the Austrian government and strengthens the influence of Russia not just on Austria, but on the whole of Germany. Imperial Russia incites the Austrian Slavs against Magyars and Germans, knowing full well that in the last analysis it would abandon them to the mercies of those Germans and Magyars" (pp. 112, 113).

By taking the western, Pan-Slav course of action Russia has to fight against all the Germans, both Prussian and Austrian, against the Magyars and against the Poles. Could Russia defeat even Prussian Germany alone in an offensive war (which she would have to conduct under the pretext of liberating the Slavs)? The Russian nation would have no interest in a war; for peoples in general have no interest in purely political wars conducted by governments; the only instance [of a popular war] in recent history [was] Napoleon I, but he was regarded rather as continuing the Revolution; the only genuine example [was] the last Prussian war against the Second Empire. At that time Pan-Germanic interest outweighed all others in the hearts and minds of all Germans without distinction, and at the present moment this is what constitutes the special strength of Germany... Russians displayed no interest in their government even in the Crimean War, "which was a defensive war, not a war of conquest".

This on p. 117; by contrast the war against Napoleon III was evidently a mere offensive war? 572

The Russian peasant is not even aware that he is a Slav ... for the Slav peoples there must be war against all «states», to begin with in alliance with the Latin nations, who like the Slavs are threatened by the German policy of conquest... And then with the Germans, but only when they too have become opposed to the «states»... But until then an alliance of the Slavs and the Latin nations against the German politicians bent on conquest remains a necessity... "Étrange" vocation for the German tribe! By stirring up (arousing) universal alarm and universal hate against themselves, they unite the nations"... "In this sense the Russian people too [is] completely Slav." But its hostility does not extend to the point of declaring war against them on their own initiative; it will only reveal itself if the Germans invade Russia and try to set up their own rule there,—but it would take no part in an offensive war against the Germans... But do the government resources, both financial and military, suffice [for a war] against Germany?... In the situation postulated here (a Russian offensive) the Germans would be fighting on their own soil and «this time» there would be a truly «universal» uprising of all classes and of the entire population of Germany (pp. 114-120).

The Russian officer a better human being than the German... the latter a civilised wild animal... Germans, especially officers and officials, combine education with barbarism, erudition with servility... But for a regular army there is nothing more perfect than the German officer—his entire life: receiving and giving orders... Ditto the German soldier—ideal for the regular army both by nature and

---

a Strange.—Ed
training... First break the soldier's body in and thereby the spirit... Discipline, etc... The superiority of the German officers over those of other nations lies in their knowledge, their theoretical and practical grasp of military affairs, their ardent and completely pedantic devotion to soldiering, their precision, their methodicalness, «self-control», inexhaustible stamina (repartie) and, on top of it all, a relative probity (честность). The organisation and equipment of the German army are genuine and not merely something that exists on paper, as with Napoleon III and as it will be with us. And then [there is] the administrative, civil and above all military control, so that widespread deception is impossible. "With us by contrast there is nothing but back-scratching from bottom to top and from top to bottom, so that it is almost impossible to discover the truth" (pp. 121-128).

(Last sentence p. 128.)

Even if Russia maintains a million troops, half of them are needed domestically to keep an eye on the beloved people. How many needed then for the Ukraine, Lithuania and Poland (p. 128).

Germany will have a real «million»-strong army, which in organisation, «drilling», morale, knowledge and equipment will be the best in the world. And behind it the entire people in arms "which in all probability would not have risen up against the French if Napoleon III rather than the Prussian Fritz had been the victor in the last war, but which would rise up as one man against a Russian «invasion»"... But where will the Russian million be? On paper... Where the officers and the equipment?... No money... The Germans received 5 thousand million from the French. At least 2 went on armaments... "Indeed at the moment the whole of Germany is transformed into a menacing arsenal, bristling on every side." At your very first step on German soil you will be utterly defeated and your offensive war will be turned into a defensive war at a stroke: the German army will cross the frontiers of the All-Russian Empire. Then a general uprising of the Russian people? "Yes, if the Germans occupy Russian «regions» and march e.g. directly to Moscow; but if they do not commit this act of folly, but march northwards towards Petersburg, through the Baltic provinces, there they will find many friends, not just among the bourgeoises, the Protestant parsons and Jews, disaffected barons and their children, and students, but also among our countless Baltic generals, officers, officials both high and low who congregate in Petersburg but are also scattered throughout the whole of Russia; even more, they will lead Poland and the Ukraine to rise up against the Russian Empire" (pp. 128-131).

The Poles have no more dangerous or insidious enemy than Bismarck. "It appears as if he has made it his life's task to wipe (creepers) them from the face of the earth. And this does not prevent him from exhorting the Poles to rise up against Russia when German interests require it. And despite the fact that the Poles loathe him and Prussia, not to say Germany as a whole, which the Poles will not admit even to themselves, although in the depths of their souls there burns the same historical hatred of the Germans that is to be found among all the other Slav peoples... the Poles will doubtless rise up at Bismarck's summons" (p. 133).

"In Germany and in Prussia herself a numerous and serious political party has existed for a very long time; even three parties: a liberal-progressive party, a purely democratic one and a Social-Democratic party, which taken together have an undoubted majority in the German and Prussian parliaments, and an even more decisive one in society itself; these parties, which have foreseen and in part desire and, as it were, call forth a German war with Russia, have realised that the uprising

5 William I.—Ed.
and the restoration of Poland «within certain limits» will be the necessary precondition of that war" (p. 133). Neither Bismarck nor any of these parties has any wish to restore to Poland all the territories taken from her by Prussia: neither Königsberg nor Danzig, nor even the smallest portion of West Prussia; and only a very little of the Duchy of Posen. But they will give the Poles the whole of Galicia together with «Lwow» and Cracow since all this is Austrian at present, and as much of the Russian territory as they can seize. In addition, money, weapons and military aid, in the form of a Polish loan on German security of course... The Poles will jump at it... With a few exceptions the Poles do not concern themselves with the Slav question»; they «find the Magyars much closer and more comprehensible»... Numerous parties among the Poles; in the background always the restoration of the Polish «state» within the frontiers of 1772. The only difference between the parties is that some favour one means and others another to achieve this end... Bismarck will demand that they formally renounce their claims to the greater part of the old Polish territories which are now Prussian... It is true, it will be a strange Poland that will have been restored under the aegis of Count Bismarck. But better a «strange» Poland than none at all; besides the Poles envisage the possibility of freeing themselves from Bismarck’s protection at a later date... Poland will rise; Lithuania ditto, and, given a little bit of a squall, the Ukraine as well... The Polish patriots are poor socialists and at home they would not concern themselves with socialist revolutionary propaganda; even if they wished to do so, Bismarck would not permit it——«too close to Germany»... but it could be done in Russia and against Russia. A peasant «revolt» in Russia useful for the Germans and the Poles and not difficult to them; so many Poles and Germans scattered through Russia; all allies of Bismarck and the Poles: «Just picture our situation: our armies utterly defeated and in headlong flight; at their heels the Germans are marching on Petersburg, and in the south and west, the Poles are marching towards «Smolensk» and the Ukraine,—and at the same time, fired by foreign and home propaganda, a general, victorious peasants’ revolt in Russia and the Ukraine.”

(This sentence on p. 138.)

...In this way the German «state» would cut the Russian state off from Europe. "We are speaking, of course, of the Empire" (Russian) "and not of the Russian people, which, when it needs to, will find or «make a path for itself» (поколение, clear, force its way, perece, se faire jour) enody dolevy (everywhere, on all sides).”

(This sentence pp. 138-139.)

So, while the Russian people is acting as a whole and forcing its way through so as to prevent itself from being cut off from Europe, these anarchists conduct a political war. And what does Bakunin want? The Germans and Poles lay the Russian Empire in ruins but, at the same time, they trigger off a general, victorious peasants’ revolt in Russia. Bismarck and the Poles will do nothing to prevent these peasants from asserting themselves as “anarchists”. On the contrary, they make more effective propaganda among them than the “world-famous” Alliance; and once this anarchistic state of affairs has been established on such a giant scale, their Latin and Slav brethren will also catch fire. And it can change nothing

---

* Emphasis in Bakunin.—Ed.
about the matter whether this takes place as the result of a war
started by Russia against Germany, or vice versa. Incidentally,
since according to Bakunin there is nothing but a "class of
officials" in Serbia, apart from the people, what shall the Serbian
social revolution consist in, if not in the elimination of the class of
officials, since it is this class which alone constitutes the «state»
there? (pp. 138, 139)

Hence for the All-Russian Empire the road to Europe is now blocked; Count
Bismarck holds the keys to its gates and nothing in the whole world could
induce him to hand them over to Prince Gorchakov. But if the north-western route
is blocked, then there remain the southern and the south-eastern routes—Bokhara,
Persia, Afghanistan, East India and finally Constantinople. Russian politicians have
long raised the question as to whether the capital and the centre of gravity of the
Empire should not be transferred from Petersburg to Constantinople. It is true that
these insatiable patriots wanted both, the Baltic and Constantinople. But they are
getting used to the idea of giving that up; their eyes were opened above all by events
of recent years, in particular the "union of Schleswig-Holstein and Hannover with
the Prussian Kingdom,725 which was thereby transformed into a North Sea power"
(p. 139).

"All are familiar with the axiom that no «state» can lay claim to a place in the
first rank without extensive frontiers to the sea which ensure it direct
communication with the whole world and allow it direct participation in world
communication, material and social, political and moral (прагматически-
правственного)" ... without that soon stagnation... China ... A host of conditions must
be fulfilled for a people consolidated (замкнутый) into a «state» to participate in
world communication; nowadays they include (принадлежить) «natural common
sense and innate energy», education, the capacity for productive labour «and the
most extensive inner freedom, impossible as this may be for the masses within a state».
"But these conditions necessarily include also navigation, sea trade, because the sea
as a form of transport surpasses all others—the railways included—in relative
cheapness, speed and also freedom in the sense that the sea belongs to nobody. It
may be that air travel will prove to be even more serviceable in every respect and
will be particularly important because it will finally level out (уравнять) the
conditions of development and life of all countries."

This is the central issue for Bakunin—levelling out, e.g. the
whole of Europe to the level of Slovak mouse-trap sellers. ... "For
the present, navigation remains the chief instrument for bringing
about the well-being (the great progress, «the prosperity») of
the peoples." This [is] the only point at which Mr. Bakunin speaks of
economic conditions and understands that they create conditions
and differences among peoples independent of the «state»...

Once states (государств) cease to exist and "a free, fraternal union of free
productive associations, communities and «regional» federations" arises from the
ruins of all states "in complete freedom and organising themselves from below,
embracing, without distinctions of any kind, because free, peoples of all languages
and nationalities,—once this is done, the way to the sea will be open to all in equal
measure: directly for coastal dwellers and, for those living further from the sea,
with the aid of the railways, which will be completely liberated from all -т-макс
popovaniem» ([state] concern, welfare, care), «виманій» (levies), taxes, restrictions, harassment, prohibitions, authorisations and interference. But even then the coastal dwellers will enjoy a number of natural advantages, of an intellectual and ethical as well as a material kind. Direct contact with the world market and world communication in general is extraordinarily conducive to development, including that of relations not thus levelled out, those living in the interior, denied these advantages, will live and develop at a slower and more indolent pace than the coastal inhabitants. This is why air travel will be of such immense significance... but until then... the coastal inhabitants will form the vanguard in all respects and will constitute a sort of aristocracy of mankind."

As in Brittany, for example!

And the distinction between plains and highlands, river valleys, climate, soil, coal, iron, acquired productive forces, material and intellectual, language, literature, technical skills, etc. etc. Fourier tackles the problem of levelling out in a much more heroic manner (pp. 139-142).

In this connection Bakunin makes the discovery that Germany (as a non-maritime nation) is inferior to Holland in trade and to Belgium in industry (p. 143).

Prussia is now the embodiment, the head and hands of Germany, she has established (based) herself firmly on the Baltic and the North Sea (p. 145). Hamburg, Bremen, Lübeck, Mecklenburg, Oldenburg, Schleswig-Holstein—all Prussian; Prussia is building two large fleets with French money, one in the Baltic, the other in the North Sea, and with the aid of the ship-canal now being dug to join the two seas, the two fleets will soon become one. Will soon be much stronger than the Russian Baltic fleet. Then to the devil with Riga, Reval, Finland, Petersburg, Kronstadt. To the devil with the significance of Petersburg. Gorchakov had to admit this to himself on the day when his ally Prussia plundered our confederate Denmark with impunity and as if with our consent.

The Polish insurrection, «Mr.» Bakunin! 577

"He should have grasped the fact that from the day on which Prussia, basing herself now on the whole of Germany and constituting in indissoluble unity with the latter the strongest continental power; since the time, in a word, when under the Prussian sceptre the new German Empire took up its present position on the Baltic and became such a threat to all neighbouring powers, the supremacy of Petersburghian Russia over that sea was at an end. Peter's great political creation lay in ruins, and with it the power of the All-Russian «state» was destroyed, if it is not compensated for the loss of the open sea route in the north by the opening up of a new route in the south' (pp. 145-147).

But how far open, s'il vous plaît? As far as the English are concerned, [it was] "open" to the ramparts of Kronstadt.

"The approaches still in the hands of Denmark; but, after first federating with Germany of her own free will, Denmark will then find herself swallowed up by the Pan-Germanic Empire. Hence the entire Baltic soon an exclusively German sea and hence Petersburgh's loss of political significance. Gorchakov must have realised this when he agreed to the dismemberment of Denmark and the union of Schleswig-Holstein with Prussia. Either he betrayed Russia or he received a formal guarantee from Bismarck to help Russia establish a new power in the south-east.
For Bakunin it is an established fact that an offensive and defensive alliance between Prussia and Russia was concluded after the Paris Treaty\textsuperscript{376} or at least at the period of the Polish insurrection of 1863.

Hence Bismarck’s nonchalance in launching the war with Austria and the greater part of Germany in the face of the threat of French intervention, and hence the even more decisive war with France. The slightest show of force by Russia on the frontier in either war, especially in the last one, would have put a stop to the victorious advance of the Prussian army. The whole of Germany, particularly the north of Germany, was completely demurred of troops in the last war; Austria only remained inactive because of Russian threats; Italy and England only refrained from intervening because Russia did not want them to. If she had not shown herself to be such a determined ally of Prussia, the Germans would never have taken Paris. But Bismarck was obviously convinced that Russia would not let him down. On what did this conviction rest? Bismarck knows that Russian and Prussian interests are entirely antagonistic, apart from on the Polish question. War between them inevitable. But there may be grounds for delaying it since each hopes to derive greater benefit from their enforced alliance until the day of crisis arrives. The German Empire far from secure either internally or externally. Internally, still a host of petty princes. Externally, Austria and France. Obeying an inner necessity, it contemplates new adventures\textsuperscript{579} new wars. Restoration of the mediaeval Empire with its original frontiers, based on the patriotic Pan-Germanic feeling that fills the whole of German society; [dreams of] annexing the whole of Austria with the exception of Hungary, but including Trieste as well as Bohemia, the whole of German-speaking Switzerland, a part of Belgium, the whole of Holland and Denmark, essential for the establishment of its naval power: plans stirring up a considerable section of western and southern Europe against it and their implementation not feasible without Russian agreement. Hence the Russian alliance still necessary for the new German Empire (pp. 148-151).

The All-Russian Empire, for its part, cannot dispense with the Prusso-Germanic alliance. It must advance towards the south-east—the Black Sea instead of the Baltic; otherwise [it will be] cut off from Europe; and for that Constantinople essential; otherwise can always be denied access to the Mediterranean, as was the case during the Crimean War. Hence Constantinople the great goal. This in conflict with the interests of the whole of southern Europe, France included; in conflict with English interests and even those of Germany, since if Russia had absolute control over the Black Sea, the entire Danube «basin» would be made directly dependent upon Russia. Despite this Prussia has formally promised Russia to assist her in her south-eastern policy; it is no less certain that she will break her promise at the first opportunity. But such a breach of the agreement not to be expected now, at the very beginning of its fulfilment. Prussia helped Russia to nullify the clauses of the Paris Peace Treaty; will support her just as strongly on the issue of Khiva. It is of benefit to the Germans that Russia should be engaged as far to the east as possible. What is the purpose of the Russian war against Khiva?... India? Not at all. China would be much simpler; and the Russian government is indeed planning something of the sort, “It is striving quite openly to detach Mongolia and Manchuria from China”; “one fine day we shall hear of a victory of Russian forces on the western frontier (!) of China... The Chinese feel themselves constricted within their own territory, too numerous; hence emigration to Australia, California; other masses may move to the north and north-west. And then in a trice Siberia, the whole area stretching from the Gulf of Tartary to the
Urals and the Caspian Sea, will cease to be Russian. In this giant territory, 12,200,000 square kilometres, more than 20 times as large as France (528,600 square kilometres), there are at present only 6 million inhabitants, of whom only about 2,600,000 are Russian, all others are natives of Tartar or Finnish origin, and the number of troops there is quite negligible... The Chinese will be able to cross the Urals and penetrate as far as the Volga... The increase in population makes it almost impossible for the Chinese to maintain an existence within the frontiers of China. In the Chinese interior there are vigorous, warlike people, reared amidst constant civil wars in which tens and hundreds of thousands have been annihilated at a stroke... In recent times they have become acquainted with European weapons and discipline, in short, with the «state» civilisation of Europe. At the same time, great barbarity; no instinct for freedom or humanity. At present they band together under the leadership of a crowd of military adventurers, American and European, who have made their way to China since the last Anglo-French expedition (1860).\[530\] This is the great threat from the East... And our Russian authorities are playing with this threat with all the naivety of a child... They want to extend their frontiers; and yet Russia neither has been to this day, nor will she ever be able, to populate the newly acquired Amur region where in a territory of 2,100,000 square kilometres, almost four times the size of France, there are a mere 55,000 inhabitants including the army and navy; and with all this there is the wretched condition of the Russian people driving it to a general «revolt»; and despite this the Russian government hopes to extend its sway over the whole of the Asiatic East. It would have to turn its back on Europe, as Bismarck wishes, and hurl its whole army into Siberia and Central Asia, and conquer the East like Tamerlane. But Tamerlane, unlike the Russian government, was followed by his own people"... As far as India is concerned, the Russians cannot help themselves to her in the face of English opposition... "But if we cannot conquer India, we can destroy or at least weaken the hold of the English there, provoke native «rebellions» against England, assist them, maintain them, if need be even with the aid of military intervention."

"It will cost us very dear in terms of both money and men... What for?... To alarm the English ro no purpose? «No», but because the English are in our way. Where are they in our way? In Constantinople." As long as the English retain their power they will never and at no price in the world agree to Constantinople falling into our hands, becoming the new capital not just of the All-Russian Empire, but of a Slav and Eastern Empire too." This is why the Russian government is waging war in Khiva; this is the reason for its long-standing wish to move closer to India. "It is on the lookout for the spot where England is vulnerable, and, not finding one anywhere else, threatens her in India. In this way it attempts to reconcile England to the idea that Constantinople must become a Russian city"... Its supremacy in the Baltic irretrievably lost... The Russian Empire, built on the bayonet and the knout, hated by the mass of all the peoples, including the Slavs and starting with the Great Russians themselves, demoralised, disorganised, etc... is incapable of waging a war against the newly risen German Empire. Hence, "it is necessary to renounce the Baltic and to await the moment when the entire Baltic «region» will become a German province. This can be prevented only by a «popular revolution». But such a revolution would be death to the «state», and our government will not look to it for its salvation".

(This last sentence p. 160.)

For our government the only solution lies in an alliance with Germany. Sacrificing the Baltic, it must look to the Black Sea for compensation and even for
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its political survival; and this can only be achieved with German aid. "The Germans have committed themselves to assist us. We have no doubt that a formal treaty has been agreed between Bismarck and Gorchakov." Naturally, the Germans have no intention of implementing it. They cannot abandon the mouth of the Danube and their Danube trade to the arbitrary will of the Russians; to set up a great Pan-Slav Empire in southern Europe would be suicidal for the Pan-Germanic Empire. But "to guide and push the Russian armies towards Central Asia, towards Khiva, on the pretext that this is the most direct way to Constantinople, that is quite another matter." Gorchakov and Alexander II tricked by Bismarck, as Napoleon III had been before them. But this is what has happened, and there is no use crying over spilt milk. It is impossible for the feeble Russian forces (драгунские силы) to overturn the new Germanic Empire; only the revolution could do that, and as long as it is not victorious in Russia or Europe the victor will be «statist» Germany which will carry all before her, and the Russian government, like all continental governments in Europe, will survive only with her permission and by her «favour»...

"More than ever before the Germans have become our masters, and it is not for nothing that all the Germans in Russia celebrated the victory of the German armies over France with such noise and enthusiasm; it is not for nothing that all the Petersburg Germans gave such a triumphant welcome to the new Pan-Germanic Emperor." "At the present time, on the whole continent of Europe, only one truly independent «state» survives: Germany... The chief reason for this the «community instinct» which is the characteristic feature of the German people. The instinct on the one hand, for blind obedience towards the more powerful, [on the other,] for ruthless suppression of the weaker" (pp. 151-163).

There now follows a survey of the recent history of Germany (especially since 1815) as proof of her instinct for servility and suppression...

The Slavs in particular have had to suffer from the latter. The "historic mission" of the Germans at least in the north and east consisted, in their own view, in the extermination, enslavement and "forcible Germanisation" of the Slav tribes. "This long and «melancholy» history the memory of which is deeply rooted in every Slav heart will doubtless resound in the last inevitable struggle [of the Slavs] against the Germans unless the social revolution pacifies them first" (p. 164).

This is followed by a history of German patriotism since 1815. (His material from Professor Miller's History from 1816 to 1866.)

"The political existence of the Prussian monarchy (in 1807) was only preserved thanks to the intercession of Alexander I" (pp. 168-169).

Fichte's Speeches to the German Nation: «But contemporary Germans, while retaining all the outsized pretensions of their patriotic philosopher, have renounced his humanism... The patriotism of Prince Bismarck or Mr. Marx is more accessible to them» (p. 171).

After Napoleon's flight from Russia, Bakunin maintains, "Frederick William III embraced his saviour, the Emperor of all the Russians, in Berlin with tears of «emotion and gratitude.»" (l.c.).

"Only one course remained open to Austria: to avoid stifling Germany" by entering the German Confederation with all her possessions as she originally wanted, "while at the same time preventing Prussia from seizing the leadership of
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the German Confederation. Following this policy, she could reckon on the active help of France and Russia. Russian policy until recent times, i.e. up to the Crimean War, consisted above all in systematically encouraging the mutual rivalry between Austria and Prussia so that neither might gain the upper hand over the other, and at the same time, in sowing the seeds of mistrust and fear in the smaller and medium principalities of Germany, whilst protecting them from both Austria and Prussia" (p. 183). Prussia's influence chiefly moral; much expected of her (after 1815). Hence it was vital for Metternich to ensure that the (promised) constitution should not be granted and that Prussia should join Austria at the head of the reaction. "In his pursuit of this plan he discovered the most enthusiastic "support" in France which was ruled by the Bourbons and in Tsar Alexander who was manipulated by "Arakcheevs" (p. 184).

"The Germans have no need of freedom. Life for them is simply unthinkable without authority, i.e. without a supreme will, a supreme idea and an iron hand «to drive them on». The stronger this hand, the prouder they are and life is more congenial to them" (p. 192).

1830-1840. Blind imitation of the French. "The Germans stopped devouring the Gauls and instead turned all their hatred towards the Russians" (p. 196). "Everything hinged on the outcome of the Polish revolution. If it had been victorious, the Prussian monarchy, cut off (separated) from its north-east rampart and compelled" to surrender if not all then at least a considerable part of its Polish possessions, "would have been forced to seek new bases in Germany herself, and since at the time it could not achieve this by conquest... it would have had to do so by means of liberal reforms" (p. 199). Following the defeat of the Poles, Frederick William III, who had performed such important services for his son-in-law Tsar Nicholas,884 "cast off his mask and pursued the Pan-Germanic patriots even more vehemently than before" (p. 200).

"In the conviction that the mass of the people harbour all the elements of their future normal organisation in their instincts, as these have been developed to a greater or lesser extent by history, in their daily needs and their conscious or unconscious aspirations, we seek that ideal" (the ideal of social organisation) "in the people itself; and since every "state" power, every authority is by its very nature and its position placed outside the people and above it, and since it must necessarily strive to force the people to submit to rules and objectives alien to it, this is why we declare ourselves the enemies of all power vested in authority, the "state", the enemies of all "state" organisation in general and believe that the people can only be happy and free when «it creates its own life» by organising itself «from below», by means of autonomous and completely free associations (содружеств) and «without» any official tutelage «but not independently of various and equally free influences, both of people and parties" (p. 213). These are «the convictions of the social revolutionaries, and this is why we are called anarchists» (p. 215). "Idealists of every kind, metaphysicians, positivists, advocates of the primacy of science over life, doctrinaire revolutionaries, all together, with the same zeal (жаром), although with differing arguments, defend (отстаивают) the idea of the "state" and of "state" power, seeing in it, and very logically* in their way, the only salvation for society. Very logically* because, starting from the «assumption» that the idea precedes life, that abstract theory takes precedence over social practice and that therefore the science of sociology must form the starting-point for social revolutions and transformations, they necessarily arrive at the conclusion that since the idea, theory, science, at the present time at least, is everywhere the province of a very
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few people, this small number of people must therefore be entrusted with the management of society, and that they should provide not merely the inspiration, but also the leadership of every popular movement and that on the day after the revolution a new social organisation should be established not by the free association of popular organisations, communities, «districts, regions from below» in accordance with the people's requirements and instincts, but solely through the dictatorial authority of that learned minority, albeit a minority elected by the «will of the whole people»" (p. 214).

Hence the «doctrinaire revolutionaries» are never enemies of the «state», but only of existing governments whose place they wish to occupy as dictators (p. 215).

"And this is so true that at the present time when reaction is triumphant throughout Europe, when all the governments, etc., are making preparations under the leadership of Count Bismarck for a desperate struggle against the social revolution; at a time when it would seem that all sincere revolutionaries should join forces to resist the desperate onslaught of international reaction, we see the opposite, namely that under the leadership of Mr. Marx the doctrinaire revolutionaries everywhere take up the cudgels on behalf of «statehood» and the «worshippers of the state» and against the «popular revolution» (p. 216). In France they stood on the side of the «state» republican-reactionary Gambetta against the revolutionary Ligue du Midi which alone could have saved France both from the German yoke and from the much more dangerous and now victorious coalition of clerics. Legitimists, Bonapartists and Orleanists; in Spain they openly sided with Castelar, Pi y Margall and the Madrid Constituent Assembly; lastly, in Germany and around her, in Austria, Switzerland, Holland and Denmark, they serve Count Bismarck whom on their own admission they regard as an extremely useful reactionary «statesman» and assist him in the Pan-Germanisation of all these countries" (pp. 216, 217).

(Fencbach was still a metaphysician: "he had to make way for his «legitimate» successors, the leaders of the school of materialists or realists, most of whom, such as, for instance, Messrs. Böckner, Marx and others" have not yet succeeded in liberating themselves "from the dominance of metaphysical abstract thought") (p. 207).

"But the principal propagandist of socialism in Germany, at first in secret and not long afterwards in public, was Karl Marx. Mr. Marx played and still plays too important a role in the socialist movement of the German proletariat for it to be possible to overlook this remarkable personality without having made the attempt to describe some of his true characteristics. By origin Mr. Marx is a Jew. It may be said that he combines in himself all the virtues and defects of this gifted race. Nervous (нервный), as some say, to the point of cowardice, he is extraordinarily ambitious and vain, quarrelsome, intolerant and absolute like Jehovah, the God of his forefathers, and like Him, vindictive to the point of insanity. There is no lie, slander, which he would be incapable of inventing against anyone who had the misfortune to arouse his jealousy, or, what amounts to the same thing, his hatred. And he stops short at no intrigue, however «infamous», if only in his opinion (which incidentally is mostly mistaken) this intrigue can serve to strengthen his position, his influence or his power. In this respect he is a political «man» through and through. These are his negative characteristics. But he has also a great many positive qualities. He is very «clever» and extraordinarily versatile and «learned». A doctor of philosophy, it can be said that, as early as 1840 in Cologne he was the heart and soul of a very important circle of leading Hegelians with whom he began to publish an oppositional journal which was soon suppressed on...

\[\text{a Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe.—Ed.}\]
ministerial orders. To this circle belonged the brothers Edgar and Bruno Bauer, Marx. Stirner and later in Berlin the first circle of German nihilists who first time the made contact with the society of French and German communists and with his compatriot, Moritz Hess, another German Jew, who had been a learned economist and socialist even before him and who at this period exerted an important influence on the intellectual development of Mr. Marx. It is rare that one comes across a man who knows as much and has read as intelligently as Mr. Marx. Even at this early date the economy was the sole object of his concern. He studied the English economists with particular zeal since they excel all others in the positive character of their knowledge and in their practical sense, nourished by the facts of the English economy, their vigorous criticism and the scrupulous boldness of their conclusions. But to all this Mr. Marx added two new features of his own: the most abstract, most ingenuous dialectics which he had acquired in the Hegelian school and which he frequently pushed to mischievous, not to say perverted lengths, and the communist point of view. Mr. Marx read, it goes without saying, all the French socialists from St. Simon to Proudhon inclusively, the last named being someone he hated, as is well known, and there is no doubt that the merciless criticism that he directed against Proudhon contains more than a grain of truth; Proudhon, despite all his efforts to stand on the firm ground of reality, remained an idealist and a metaphysician. His point of departure was the abstract idea of law; he proceeds from law to the economic fact, while Mr. Marx, on the other hand, has stated and proved the indubitable truth, which is confirmed by the entire history of human society, of peoples and of states, both past and present, that the economic fact everywhere took and takes precedence over juridical and political law. The exposition and proof of this truth is one of the principal scientific achievements of Mr. Marx. But the most remarkable fact, and one which Mr. Marx has never acknowledged, is that in the political sphere Mr. Marx is a direct disciple of M. Louis Blanc. Mr. Marx is incomparably more intelligent and incomparably more erudite than that little unsuccessful revolutionary and statesman; but as a German and despite his respectable height, he served his apprenticeship with the diminutive Frenchman. And there is a simple explanation for this singular fact: the rhetorical Frenchman, as a bourgeois politician and a self-confessed follower of Robespierre, and the learned German in his triplefold character as Hegelian, Jew and German, are both furious worshippers of the state and preachers of state communism, only with the difference that the one rests content with rhetorical declamations instead of arguments, and the other, as befits a learned and painstaking German, supported the principle which was equally dear to him with every subtlety of Hegelian dialectics and the whole wealth of his vast erudition. In around 1845 Mr. Marx became the leader of the German communists and subsequently, together with Mr. Engels, his devoted (nervöser Freund) friend, who was just as intelligent, though less learned, albeit much more practical and no less capable of political slander, lies and intrigue, he founded a secret society of German communists or state socialists. Their central committee, which was—of course—led by himself and Mr. Engels, was transferred to Brussels when both were expelled from Paris in 1846 and it remained there until 1848. Incidentally, until that year their propaganda, although it had made some headway in Germany,
remained secret and «therefore did not penetrate to the outside world» (pp. 221-225).

At the time (of the revolution of 1848) the urban proletariat in Germany, at least in its vast majority, was still beyond the reach of Marx's propaganda and beyond the organisation of his communist party. The latter was concentrated chiefly in the industrial towns of Rhenish Prussia, especially in Cologne; branches in Berlin, Breslau and, «finally», in Vienna, but very weak. Instinctively the German proletariat was naturally in favour of socialist aspirations, but no conscious demands for social revolution in 1848-49 even though the Communist Manifesto had been published as early as March 1848. It made almost no impression at all on the German people. The urban revolutionary proletariat still under the direct influence of the political party of radicals or at best the democrats (p. 230). At that time there was one more element in Germany, which now does not exist there, the revolutionary peasantry, or a peasantry at least ready to become revolutionary ... at that time it was ready for anything, even for a «general revolt». "In 1848 as in 1830 the German liberals and radicals feared nothing so much as such a «revolt»; nor do socialists of Marx's school like it any better. It is a well-known fact that Ferdinand Lassalle who confessed to being a direct disciple of the supreme leader of the communist party in Germany, which did not prevent his teacher from giving vent, after Lassalle's death, to his jealous and envious (malevolent—завистливое) dissatisfaction with his brilliant pupil, who had left his teacher far behind him in terms of practical politics; it is a well-known fact ... that Lassalle more than once gave it as his opinion that the defeat of the peasants' uprising in the 16th century and the subsequent strengthening and blossoming of the bureaucratic «state» in Germany was a real victory for the revolution. For the communist or socialist democrats of Germany, the peasantry, any peasantry, is reactionary; and the «state», every «state», even the Bismarckian one, revolutionary. And let no one imagine that we are slandering them. As proof that they actually think in this way we shall point to their speeches, their pamphlets, journalistic statements and lastly their letters—all these things will be made available (представлень) to the Russian public in due course. Moreover, the Marxists cannot in fact think in any other way: «state worshippers» at any price, they must inevitably abominate every popular revolution, especially peasant ones, peasant* by their very nature and directly aiming at the destruction of the «state». As all-devouring Pan-Germanisers they must repudiate peasant revolution if only because that is the specific form of the Slav revolution" (pp. 250-252).

"Not only in 1848, but even now the German workers blindly submit to their leaders, while the leaders, the organisers of the German Social-Democratic Party, lead them neither to liberty nor to international fraternity, but beneath the yoke of the Pan-Germanic «state»" (p. 254).

Bakunin recounts how Frederick William IV was afraid of Nicholas (reply to the Polish deputation in March 1848 and Olmütz, November 1850)*a (pp. 254-257).

1849-1858: The German Confederation counted for less than nothing among the other great powers. "Prussia was more than ever the slave of Russia... Her subservience to the interests of the Petersburg court went so far that the Prussian Minister of War and the Prussian ambassador to the English court, a friend of the
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King's, were both dismissed because they had revealed their pro-Western sympathies." Nicholas furious about Schwarzenberg's and Austria's ingratitude.

"Austria, the natural enemy of Russia on account of her interests in the east, openly took sides with England and France against her. To the great indignation of the whole of Germany, Prussia remained "true to the last" (p. 259). "Manteuffel became Prime Minister in November 1850 to put his signature to all the conditions of the Olmütz conference, which were humiliating in the extreme for Prussia, and to put the finishing touches to subjecting both Prussia and the whole of Germany to the hegemony of Austria. Such was the will of Nicholas ... such too were the aspirations of the major part of the Prussian Junkers or nobles who could not even hear to talk of merging Prussia into Germany and who were even more devoted to the Austrian" (?) "and All-Russian Emperors than to their own king" (p. 261).

"At this time (1866 et seq.) the so-called People's Party came into existence. Its centre Stuttgart. A group wanting federation with republican Switzerland was the main impetus behind the founding of the Ligue de la Paix et de la Liberté595 (p. 271).

"Lassalle founded a mainly political party of German workers, organised it hierarchically and subjected it to strict discipline and to his dictatorship; in a word he did what Mr. Marx intended to do in the International in the next three years. Marx's attempt failed, but Lassalle was completely successful" (p. 279).

"The first act of the people's «state»" (according to Lassalle) "will be the granting of unlimited credit to the workers' production and consumption associations, for only then will these be able to fight bourgeois capital and to defeat and absorb it in the not too distant future. When the process of absorbing it is completed, then the period of the radical transformation of society will commence. This is Lassalle's programme and this is the programme of the Social-Democratic Party. In actual fact it belongs not to Lassalle, but to Marx, who gave a complete «exposition» of it in the celebrated Manifesto of the Communist Party, published by him and Engels in 1848. And there is a «definite pointer to it» in the first Manifesto of the International Associationa written by Marx in 1864, in the words: 'the great duty of the working classes', etc., or, as it is put in the Communist Manifesto, 'the first step in the revolution', etc., and ending with 'to concentrate all instruments of production in the hands of the «state»', i.e. of the proletariat «raised to the level of the ruling estate»'b (pp. 275, 276).

"But is it not «clear» that Lassalle's programme is indistinguishable from that of Marx whom he acknowledged as his teacher? In the pamphlet directed against Schulze-Delitzsch, Lassalle, having explained his basic conception of the social and political development of modern society, says explicitly that the ideas themselves and even the terminology he uses belong not to him but to Mr. Marx c... All the «stranger» is it, therefore, to see the protest printed by Mr. Marx after the deathb of Lassalle in the Preface to Capital. Marx complains bitterly that Lassalle has robbed him by appropriating his ideas.594 This protest, a very «stranger» one from a communist who preaches collective ownership but who does not comprehend the fact that an idea, once uttered, ceases to be the property of an individual. It would be another matter if Lassalle had «copied one or more pages»..." (p. 276). "In contrast to his teacher Marx, who is strong on theory and on intrigue behind the scenes or under cover, but loses all importance and force in the public arena, Lassalle was made by nature
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for open struggle in practical politics" (p. 277). "The entire liberal and democratic bourgeoisie deeply detested him; «like-minded comrades», socialists, Marxists and Marx himself, concentrated on him all the force of their malevolent envy (ненависть). Indeed, their loathing of him equalled that felt by the bourgeoisie; during his life they did not venture to express their hatred because he was too strong for them" (pp. 277, 278).

"We have already expressed our deep aversion to the theory of Lassalle and Marx which recommends to the workers, if not as an ultimate ideal, at least as the principal immediate objective, the establishment of a people's state (народное государство), which, as they put it, will be nothing other than 'the proletariat «raised to the level of the ruling estate»'. The question is, if the proletariat is to be the ruling class, over whom will it rule? This means (this implies—таким образом) that another proletariat will remain which will be subject to this new domination, this new state (государство)."

It implies that as long as the other classes, above all the capitalist class, still exist, and as long as the proletariat is still fighting against it (for when the proletariat obtains control of the government its enemies and the old organisation of society will not yet have disappeared), it must use forcible means, that is to say, governmental means: as long as it remains a class itself, and the economic conditions which give rise to the class struggle and the existence of classes have not vanished they must be removed or transformed by force, and the process of transforming them must be accelerated by force.

"For example, the «крестьянская чернь», the vulgar peasants, the peasant rabble, who, as is well known, do not enjoy the goodwill of the Marxists and who, standing on the lowest rung of civilisation, will probably be governed by the urban and factory proletariat" [p. 278].

That is to say, where peasants en masse exist as owners of private property, where they even form a more or less considerable majority, as in all the states of the West European continent, where they have not yet disappeared and have not been replaced by agricultural day labourers, as in England, there the following may happen: either the peasants prevent or bring about the downfall of every workers' revolution, as they have done hitherto in France; or else the proletariat (for the peasant proprietor does not belong to the proletariat, and even if he does belong to it in terms of his actual position, he does not think of himself as belonging to it) must, as the government, take the measures needed to enable the peasant to directly improve his condition, i.e. to win him over to the revolution; these measures, however, contain the seeds which will facilitate the transition from the private ownership of the land to collective ownership, so that the peasant arrives at this economically of his own accord; but it is important not to antagonise the peasant, e.g. by proclaiming the
abolition of the right of inheritance or the abolition of his property; the latter is possible only where the capitalist tenant farmer has ousted the peasants, so that the actual farmer is as much a proletarian, a wage-labourer, as the urban worker, so that he has the same interests as the latter directly and not indirectly. Still less should smallholdings be strengthened by increasing the size of allotments simply by dividing up the large estates among the peasantry, as in Bakunin’s revolutionary campaign.

“Or, if this question is considered from the national point of view, then it must be assumed that for the Germans the Slavs will, for the same reason, be placed in the same relationship of slavish dependency on the victorious German proletariat as that in which the latter finds itself vis-à-vis its own bourgeoisie” (p. 278).

Schoolboyish rot! A radical social revolution is bound up with definite historical conditions of economic development; these are its premises. It is only possible, therefore, where alongside capitalist production the industrial proletariat accounts for at least a significant portion of the mass of the people. And for it to have any chance of victory, it must be able mutatis mutandis a at the very least to do as much directly for the peasants as the French bourgeoisie did in its revolution for the French peasantry at that time. A fine idea to imagine that the rule of the workers implies the oppression of rural labour! But this is where we glimpse Mr. Bakunin’s innermost thought. He understands absolutely nothing of social revolution, only its political rhetoric: its economic conditions simply do not exist for him. Now since all previous economic formations, whether developed or undeveloped, have entailed the enslavement of the worker (whether as wage labourer, peasant, etc.), he imagines that radical revolution is equally possible in all these formations. What is more, he wants the European social revolution, whose economic basis is capitalist production, to be carried out on the level of the Russian or Slav agricultural and pastoral peoples, and that it should not surpass this level, even though he can see that navigation creates distinctions among brethren; but of course he only thinks of navigation because this distinction is familiar to all politicians! Willpower, not economic conditions, is the basis of his social revolution.

“Where there is a state (государство), there is inevitably domination (господство) and consequently there is also «slavery»; domination without slavery, hidden b or masked, is unthinkable—that is why we are enemies of the «state»” (p. 278).

“What does it mean to talk of the proletariat «raised to the level of the ruling estates»”? a

---

a With the necessary changes having been made.—Ed.
b Bakunin has: “open”.—Ed.
It means that the proletariat, instead of fighting in individual instances against the economically privileged classes, has gained sufficient strength and organisation to use general means of coercion in its struggle against them; but it can only make use of such economic means as abolish its own character as wage labourer and hence as a class; when its victory is complete, its rule too is therefore at an end, since its class character will have disappeared.

"Will perhaps the entire proletariat stand at the head of the government?"

In a trades union, for example, does the entire union form its executive committee? Will all division of labour in the factory come to an end as well as the various functions arising from it? And with Bakunin's constitution «from below», will everyone be «at the top»? If so, there will be no one «at the bottom». Will all the members of the community at the same time administer the common interests of the «region»? If so, there will be no distinction between community and «region».

"There are about 40 million Germans. Does this mean that all 40 million will be members of the government?"

Certainly! For the system starts with the self-government of the communities.

"The entire people will rule, and no one will be ruled."

When a person rules himself, he does not do so according to this principle; for he is only himself and not another.

"Then there will be no government, no state, but if there is a state, there will be both rulers and slaves."

That just means when class rule has disappeared there [will] be no state in the present political sense (p. 279).

"The dilemma in the theory of the Marxists is easily resolved. By people's government they" (i.e. Bakunin) "understand the government of the people by means of a small number of representatives chosen (elected) by the people."

Asine! This is democratic twaddle, political claptrap! Elections—a political form found in the tiniest Russian commune and in the artel. The character of an election does not depend on this name but on the economic foundation, the economic interrelations of the voters, and as soon as the functions have ceased to be political, 1) government functions no longer exist; 2) the distribution of general functions has become a routine matter which entails no domination; 3) elections lose their present political character.

"The universal suffrage of the whole people"—

---

a Ass.—Ed.
such a thing as the whole people, in the present meaning of the word, is an illusion—

"to elect its representatives and «rulers of state»—that is the last word of the Marxists and also of the democratic school—is a lie which conceals the despotism of the ruling minority, a lie that is all the more dangerous as it appears as the expression of the so-called will of the people."

With collective ownership the so-called will of the people disappears and makes way for the genuine will of the cooperative.

"So the result is the control of the vast majority of the people by a privileged minority. But this minority, the Marxists say,"

Where?

"will consist of workers. Yes, quite possibly of former workers, but, as soon as they have become the representatives or rulers of the people, they cease to be workers"—

no more than a factory owner today ceases to be a capitalist when he becomes a municipal councillor—

"and will gaze down upon the whole world of the common workers from the eminence of «statehood»; they will no longer represent the people, but only themselves and their «claims» to govern the people. Anyone who can doubt this knows nothing of human nature" (p. 279).

If Mr. Bakunin were familiar even with the position of a manager in a workers’ co-operative factory, all his fantasies about domination would go to the devil. He should have asked himself: what forms could management functions assume within such a workers’ state, if he wants to call it that? (p. 279).

"But these chosen people will become passionately convinced as well as learned socialists. The words 'learned socialism'—

never used—

"scientific socialism"—

used only in contrast to utopian socialism which wishes to foist new illusions onto the people instead of confining its scientific investigations to the social movement created by the people itself; see my book against Proudhon—a—

"which recur repeatedly in the writings and speeches of the Lassalleans and Marxists, prove themselves that the so-called people’s state will be nothing more than the highly despotic direction of the masses of the people by a new and very small aristocracy of genuinely or supposedly learned men. The people is not scientific; that means it will be wholly liberated from the cares of government; it will be completely incorporated into the herd that is to be governed. A fine liberation!" (pp. 279, 280).
"The Marxists perceive this" (!) "contradiction and, recognising that a government of scholars" (quelle révélerie) "will be the most oppressive, most hated and most despicable in the world, and that for all its democratic forms it will actually be a dictatorship, they console themselves with the thought that this dictatorship will be provisional and brief" [p. 280].

*Non, mon cher!—The class rule of the workers over the strata of the old world who are struggling against them can only last as long as the economic basis of class society has not been destroyed.*

"... they say that their sole concern and objective will be to educate and uplift the people" (ale-house politician!) "both economically and politically to such a level that all government will soon become unnecessary and the state will completely lose its political, i.e. its <dominating> character, and will change of its own accord into the free organisation of economic interests and communities. This is an evident contradiction. If their state is truly a people's state, why destroy it, and if its abolition is necessary for the real liberation of the people, then how dare they call it a people's state?" (p. 280).

Apart from his harping on Liebknecht's people's state, which is nonsense directed against the Communist Manifesto, etc., it only means that, as the proletariat in the period of struggle leading to the overthrow of the old society still acts on the basis of the old society and hence still moves within political forms which more or less correspond to it, it has at that stage not yet arrived at its final organisation, and hence to achieve its liberation has recourse to methods which will be discarded once that liberation has been attained. Hence Mr. Bakunin deduces that the proletariat should rather do nothing at all... and just wait for the day of universal liquidation—the Last Judgement.

"By our polemics against them"

(which appeared, of course, before my book against Proudhon and the Communist Manifesto, and even before St. Simon) (a beautiful οστέρων πρότερον)

"we have forced them to admit that freedom or anarchy"

(Mr. Bakunin has only translated Proudhon's and Stirner's anarchy into the barbaric idiom of the Tartars),

"i.e. the free organisation of the working masses from below" (nonsense!) "is the ultimate goal of social development and that every <state>, the people's state included, is a yoke which engenders despotism, on the one hand, and slavery, on the other" (p. 280).

"They assert that this authoritarian yoke, dictatorship, is a transitional phase essential to the attainment of the complete liberation of the people: anarchy or freedom—the end; domination or dictatorship—the means. Hence in order to

---

*a* What a fantastic ideal—*Ed.*

*b* Hysterion proteron: a figure of speech in which what should come last (*hysteron*) is put first (*proteron*); inversion of natural order.—*Ed.*
liberate the mass of the people, it is first necessary to enslave them. It is on this contradiction that our polemics rest. They assure us that only a dictatorship, their own of course, can form the basis of the people’s freedom; we reply that no dictatorship can ever have any goal but to “perpetuate itself” and that it is “capable only of breeding and nurturing slavery in the people that is forced to endure it; freedom can only be created by freedom” (the freedom] of the permanent citizen Bakunin), “i.e. by the “rebellion of the whole people” and the free organisation of the masses from below” (p. 281).

“Whereas the political and social theory of the anti-state socialists or anarchists leads “inevitably” and directly to a complete break with all governments, with all modes of bourgeois politics, leaving no alternative but social revolution,” (leaving nothing of the social revolution but phrases),

“the opposite theory, the theory of the state communists and of scientific authority, on the pretext of political tactics, lures its supporters no less “inevitably” and ensnares them in an incessant process of “horse trading” with governments and the various bourgeois political parties; that is to say, it drives them directly into the arms of the reaction” (p. 281). “The best proof of this is Lassalle. Who is ignorant of his relations and his deals with Bismarck? The liberals and democrats [...] used this to accuse him of venality. The same, though not so openly, has been “whispered” among various a followers of Mr. Marx in Germany” (p. 282).

Lassalle’s attitude towards the mass of common workers was more like that of a doctor towards his patients than one brother to another. He would not have betrayed the people for anything in the world (i.e.). Lassalle had openly declared war on the liberals and democrats; he detested and despised them. Bismarck’s attitude to them was the same. This was the first reason for their rapprochement. “The chief basis for this “rapprochement” was implicit in Lassalle’s political and social programme, in the theory of communism founded by Mr. Marx” (p. 283).

“The principal point of this programme: the (supposed) liberation of the proletariat by means of the “state alone”... Two means... the proletariat must carry out revolution in order to subject the state to it—this the heroic method... according to the theory of Mr. Marx”... the people must then put all power into his own hands and the hands of his friends... “They will found a single state bank, concentrating in their hands all commercial, industrial, agricultural and even scientific production, and divide the population into two armies, industrial and agricultural, under the direct command of engineers of the state who will form a new privileged scientific and political estate” (pp. 283, 284).

As for making a revolution, Germans themselves do not believe in it.—”It is necessary for another people to make a start or for some external “force” to drag them along or “give” them “a push”. Hence some other means required to obtain control of the state. Necessary to gain the sympathy of people who stand or can stand at the head of the state. In Lassalle’s day, as today, Bismarck stood at the head of the state... Lassalle chiefly endowed with practical instinct and “intelligence”, which are missing in Mr. Marx and his followers. Like all theoreticians, Marx a lifelong and “incorrigible” dreamer in practice. He demonstrated this by his hapless campaign in the International Association, whose goal was to set up his dictatorship in the International and to extend it through the International to the entire revolutionary movement of the proletariat in Europe and America. To set yourself such a goal you must be either a madman or a completely abstract

a Bakunin has: “personal”.—Ed
theorician. This year Mr. Marx suffered a complete and thoroughly merited defeat, but it "is unlikely to rid (избавить) him of his ambitious dreaming" (pp. 284, 285). "Such dreams, together with his desire to gain admirers and adherents among the bourgeoisie, led and lead Marx again and again to drive the proletariat into negotiations with the bourgeois radicals. Gambetta and Castelar—those are his «true» ideals" (pp. 254, 285). "These attempts, which have intensified in Marx in recent years, to make deals (сделки) with the radical bourgeoisie, testify to two different dreams: first, if the radical bourgeoisie attains power, it will perhaps be in a position to «want» to use that power to the advantage of the proletariat, and second, it will be able to hold out against the reaction whose roots are hidden within itself" (p. 285).

As a practical man Lassalle realised this (i.e. that the radical bourgeoisie is neither willing nor able to liberate the people, but wishes only to exploit it); moreover he detested the German bourgeoisie; Lassalle also knew his fellow countrymen too well to expect any revolutionary initiative from them. Only Bismarck remained to him. "What brought them together was provided to him by Marxian theory itself: a unified, forcibly centralised state. Lassalle wanted this and Bismarck created it. How could they not come together?" Bismarck the enemy (!) of the bourgeoisie. His present activities prove that he is no fanatic and no slave of the aristocratic-feudal party... "His chief purpose, like that of Lassalle and Marx—the state. And therefore Lassalle proved himself to be incomparably more logical and practical than Marx, who acknowledges Bismarck as a revolutionary, «albeit in his own way», and who dreams of his overthrow, probably because he occupies the first place in the state, a position which in Mr. Marx's opinion ought to be his." Lassalle lacked such vanity, therefore he did not recoil from the idea of forming an alliance with Bismarck. "In complete conformity with the political programme propounded by Messrs. Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto, Lassalle put only one demand to Bismarck: that he should make government credit available to workers' production associations." And at the same time, "in agreement with the programme, he began peaceful and legal agitation among the workers to achieve the introduction of the franchise" (pp. 286-289).

After Lassalle's death, alongside the workers' educational societies and Lassalle's General Association of German Workers, "a third party—the Social-Democratic Party of the German Workers—was formed under the direct influence of the friends and followers of Mr. Marx. At its head were Bebel, полупроботник, a semi-worker, and Liebknecht, a complete theorist and agent of Mr. Marx" (p. 289).

We have already referred to Liebknecht's activities in Vienna in 1868. These resulted in the Nuremberg Congress (August 1868) at which the Social-Democratic Party was finally organised. "The desire (intention) of its founders, acting under the direct leadership of Marx was to make it the Pan-Germanic section of the International Working Men's Association." But the German and, above all, the Prussian laws were opposed to such a union. Hence it was only touched on indirectly: "The Social-Democratic Party of the German Workers enters into relations with the International Working Men's Association within the limits permitted by German laws." "There can be no doubt that this new party was founded in Germany with the secret hope and intention of making use of it to introduce into the International the entire programme of Marx which the first Geneva Congress (of 1866) had rejected." 286 "Marx's programme became the programme of the Social-Democratic Party", the «conquest» of "political power" became the "first and immediate

---

* "Direct disciple" in Bakunin.— Ed.
* Italicised in Bakunin too.— Ed.
objective”, a recommendation followed by this significant phrase: “The conquest of political power (universal suffrage, freedom of the press, freedom of association and meetings, etc.) as the indispensable preliminary (предварительное) condition of the economic emancipation of the workers.” “This phrase means: before advancing towards social revolution, the workers must carry out the political revolution, or, as better suits the German character, conquer, or, better still, acquire, political rights by means of peaceful agitation. But since every political movement preceding or, what amounts to the same thing, occurring outside the social one can be none other than a bourgeois movement, it follows that this programme recommends the German workers first and foremost to acquire bourgeois interests and objectives and to carry out the political movement for the benefit of the radical bourgeoisie which then in gratitude will not liberate the people, but will subject it to a new rule and new exploitation” (pp. 289-291).

“On the basis of this programme a moving reconciliation took place between the German and Austrian workers and the bourgeois radicals of the People’s Party.” On the basis of “the Nuremberg Congress delegates nominated by the Congress for the purpose went to Stuttgart where a formal defensive and offensive alliance was concluded between the elders of the deceived workers and the ring-leaders of the bourgeois radical party. As a consequence of this alliance both groups appeared together at the second Congress of the Ligue de la Paix et de la Liberté, which opened in September in Bern. But a very remarkable fact. There was a split between the bourgeois socialists and the radicals on the one hand—and the social revolutionaries belonging to the party of the Alliance on the other” (pp. 291, 292).597 “Marx’s school has provided us with many examples of this (ability to call oneself a socialist and a friend of the people while remaining opposed to popular socialism); and the German dictator is very hospitable under the indispensable condition that people bow down to him, so that his banner covers a very large number of people—bourgeois socialists and democrats from top to toe; even the Ligue de la Paix et de la Liberté could find refuge there if it were only prepared to acknowledge him as the top man (человек). If the bourgeois congress had proceeded in this fashion, the position of the Alliés would have been incomparably more difficult; it would have led to the same struggle between the League and the Alliance that now rages between the Alliance and Marx. However, the League showed itself to be more stupid, but also more honest than the Marxists; it denied equality” (nonsense!) “in the economic sphere. It thereby cut itself off from the proletariat, died and left behind it only two shades who roam around uttering lamentations: Amand Goegg and the St. Simonist millionaire, Lemonier... Another fact about this Congress: the delegates who came from Nuremberg and Stuttgart, i.e. the workers mandated by the Nuremberg Congress of the new Social-Democratic Party of the German Workers and the bourgeois Swabian ‘People’s Party’, together with the majority of the League, voted unanimously against equality... And a further remarkable fact is that the Brussels Congress of the International, which concluded its deliberations some days before the one in Berne, repudiated all solidarity with the latter, and all the Marxists who took part in the Brussels Congress spoke and voted along those lines.” How could it come about then that other Marxists, acting like the first under the direct influence of Marx, should have gone along in such touching harmony with the majority at the Berne Congress? All that remained an enigma which has still not been resolved to the present day. The same contradiction became manifest throughout 1868 and even into 1869 in the Volksstaat... At times very powerful articles were printed in it against the bourgeois League: these were then followed by unmistakable «declarations» of affection, and at other times friendly remonstrances. The paper as a whole invoked the League to «moderate» its over-enthusiastic pronouncements of
bourgeois instincts which compromised its defenders in the eyes of the workers. This indecision persisted in Mr. Marx’s party up to September 1869, i.e. up to the Basle Congress. This Congress is epoch-making in the history of the International” (pp. 293-296).

For the first time the Germans appeared at an international congress, and they came as a party organised around a bourgeois political programme rather than a national people’s a one. Under the leadership of Liebknecht they voted as one man. His first concern, understandably in view of his programme, was to put the political question before everything else. The Germans decisively defeated. The Basle Congress retained the programme of the International in all its purity; it refused to allow the Germans to mutilate it by introducing their bourgeois policies. It was in this way that the split in the International came about, and it was the Germans who were responsible for it. They wished to impose their narrowly bourgeois, national-political, exclusively German and Pan-Germanic programme on an association which was first and foremost international. “They were squarely defeated and the League of Social Revolutionaries, the Alliancists, were not slow to make use of this defeat.” Hence the bitter hatred of the Germans for the Alliance. The end of 1869 and first half of 1870 were filled with venomous attacks and even more insidious and not infrequently base intrigues by the Marxists against the Alliance people” (p. 296).

A victory by Napoleon III would not have had such long-lasting adverse effects as the German one (p. 297).

All Germans without exception rejoiced at the victory, even though they knew that it would set the seal on the predominance of the military; “not a single German, or scarcely one, was dismayed, all joined together in unanimous jubilation”. Their passion: domination and slavery (p. 298). “And what about the German workers? Well, the German workers did nothing at all, not a single vigorous demonstration of sympathy, of compassion for the workers of France. A few meetings where a few phrases were mouthed in which victorious national pride fell silent, so to speak, before the demonstration of international solidarity. But no one went beyond phrases, even though in Germany cleared of all troops at the time it would have been possible to start and do something. It is true that a majority of workers had been drafted into the army where they distinguished themselves in carrying out their duty as soldiers, killed everyone, etc., at the command of their superiors and even took part in plundering. Some of them, while carrying out their warlike duty in this way, at the same time wrote heart-rending letters to the Volkstaat with vivid accounts of the barbarous crimes committed by the German armies in France” (pp. 298, 299). Meanwhile there were a few instances of bolder opposition: the protests of Jacoby, Liebknecht and Bebel; these were isolated and also very rare cases.

“We cannot forget the article published in the Volkstaat in September 1870 in which Pan-Germanic victory jubilation is openly expressed. It begins with the words: ”Thanks to the victories gained by the German armies, the historical initiative has finally passed from France to Germany: we Germans, etc.” (p. 299).

“In a word, we can say without any exception that the triumphant feeling of national military and political victory predominated and still predominates among all Germans. It is upon this that the power of the Pan-Germanic Empire and its great Chancellor, Count Bismarck, may be said chiefly to be founded” (p. 299).

“And do you know what ambition now predominates in the mind of the

---

a Bakunin has: "social people's".— Ed.
b Bakunin has: “made no small contribution to this defeat”.— Ed.
instinct of every German: The desire to expand (распространять) "far, wide" the German Empire" (p. 309). This passion is "now also the entire activity of the Social-Democratic Party. And do not imagine that Bismarck is such an ardent enemy of that party as he pretends (притворяется). He is too <cunning> not to perceive that it serves him as an advance guard, spreading the idea of the Germanic state in Austria, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Holland and Switzerland. The dissemination of this Germanic idea is at present the principal aspiration of Mr. Marx who, as we have already remarked, has attempted to renew (восстановить) to his own advantage within the International the exploits and the victories of Count Bismarck. Bismarck holds all parties in his hand and is hardly likely to hand them over to Mr. Marx" (p. 304).

"Through the voice of its great Chancellor, this" (Pan-Germanic) "Empire has declared a war to the death on social revolution. Count Bismarck uttered this death sentence in the name of 40 million Germans who stand behind him and support him. Marx too, his envious rival, and behind him all the [ring]-leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party, for their part declared the same desperate war on social revolution. We shall discuss all this in depth in the next section" (pp. 307, 308). "Hitherto, it" (the social revolution) "has concentrated its forces in Southern Europe: Italy, Spain, France; but soon, we hope, the peoples of the north-west will rise up beneath its banner: Belgium, Holland and, above all, England, and then at last the Slav tribes too" (p. 308).

APPENDIX

"The main features of the ideal" of the Russian people: 1. "the universal conviction, shared by the entire people, that the earth, the whole earth watered by their sweat and fertilised by the labour of their own hands, belongs to the people; 2. that the right to use it belongs not to the individual, but to the «community» to the «communal assembly» which shares it out among individuals for «a fixed period»; 3. quasi-absolute autonomy, communal self-administration and in consequence the resolutely hostile attitude of the «community» towards the state" (p. 10).

"The three negative features are: 1. the patriarchal state; 2. the engulfing of the individual by the «communal assembly»; 3. faith in the Tsar. One could add 4, the Christian faith, whether of the established church or the sects (p. 10); but this plays a less significant part in Russia than in Western Europe" (l.c.).

Points 2 and 3 are "natural consequences" of point 1, the «patriarchal state». Father, «communal assembly», the Tsar (p. 15). "The «community» is his world. It is nothing but the natural extension of his family, his clan. It is for this reason that the patriarchal principle dominates in it, the same odious despotism and the same general submissiveness and hence too the коренная (quintessential, deeply rooted) injustice and the same radical denial of every right of the individual, as in the family too. The decisions of the «communal assembly», whatever they may be, are law. «Who dares to go against the communal assembly?» enthuses the peasant with amazement... In the «communal assembly» only the «elders», the heads of the family, have the right to vote... But above the «community», above all the communities, stands the Tsar, the «universal» patriarch and progenitor, the father of all Russia. Hence his power is without limit" (p. 15). "Every community forms a «closed whole» and in consequence no community has, or feels the need for, any independent organic bonds with other communities. They are only joined to each other through the «Tsar, the Father», and only by virtue of the supreme, fatherly power which he wields" (pp. 15, 16).
Frederick Engels

NOTE ON PAGE 29 OF THE HISTOIRE DE LA COMMUNE

(M. THIERS' CEASEFIRE OF OCTOBER 30, 1870)

It took all the stupidity and deceitfulness of the men of September 4 to call the news of this cease-fire "good news". Good indeed—for the Prussians.

The capitulation of Metz had just restored freedom of action to 6 Prussian army corps—120,000 men. Nobody but Trochu and Jules Favre could have failed to see that the imminent arrival of this new army in the centre of France would make any attempt to relieve Paris almost impossible, that this was not the moment for concluding ceasefires but for mounting a supreme military effort. Only a fortnight remained to do this; but this fortnight was precious, it was the critical phase of the war.

This was the situation.

In order to effect the blockade of Paris, the Germans had had to employ all their troops, with the exception of 5 divisions of infantry. They had no reserves, for these 5 divisions had, by occupying Orléans and Châteaudun forfeited this capacity, being held in check by the army of the Loire. To the west, north and east there was nothing but cavalry which, despite observing and covering a wide expanse of country, was incapable of holding it against infantry.

By the end of October the German line encircling Paris was already very heavily fortified towards the city; but any attack coming from outside would of necessity encounter the Prussians in open country. The appearance of 50,000 men, even young troops such as those which France then had at its disposal, would have been sufficient to break the blockade and restore communications between Paris and the rest of the country. But we have seen that it was necessary to act swiftly, and this is what happened:
The Paris government accepted a ceasefire which, although of short duration, gave relief to the German troops exhausted by the labours and sleepless nights of the blockade (October 30).

For his part, d’Aurelle de Paladines concentrated his army on November 2 at Vierzon with the intention of marching on Beaugency, of crossing the Loire there and advancing between the Prussians (22nd Division) occupying Châteaudun and the Bavarians who were holding Orléans. The march from Vierzon to Beaugency was about 45 kilometres and could easily be accomplished in two days. But if we are to believe a German source (\textit{Militärische Gedanken und Betrachtungen etc.}), Gambetta was simple enough to believe that an army of 40,000 men could travel by railway at the same speed as an ordinary person. So he ordered the general—instead of making his army march—to transport it by railway from Vierzon to Tours and from there to Beaugency. The general protested; Gambetta insisted. So instead of a march of two days and 45 kilometres, the army of the Loire made a railway journey of 180 kilometres which took it five days and which, moreover, could not remain hidden from enemy reconnaissance. Not until the 7th was it once again concentrated at Beaugency and ready for action. But three precious days had been lost, and the enemy had knowledge of the movement carried out.

And what days! November 3 was the most critical day: the Prussian cavalry, a whole brigade, was forced to abandon Mantes and to retire to Vert in the face of numerous \textit{francs-tireurs} on; on the other hand, considerable French forces of all the arms were observed marching from Courville in the direction of Chartres. If the army of the Loire, instead of riding around in railway carriages, had attacked on the 4th, which it could have done; if it had pushed on between the Bavarians and the 22nd Prussian Division, which was an easy matter; if it had used its great numerical superiority to inflict a comprehensive defeat on them in turn and then to advance on Paris—then Paris would almost certainly have been liberated.

Moltke was by no means oblivious to the danger and had decided, if need be, to act as Napoleon had acted at Mantua: to lift the blockade, to sacrifice the siege park under formation at Villacoublay, to concentrate his army for action in open country and not to restore the blockade until victory was won, that is, after the arrival of the Metz army. The baggage of the Versailles

\footnote{\textit{[H. von Hannecken,] Militärische Gedanken und Betrachtungen über den deutsch-französischen Krieg der Jahre 1870 und 1871 vom Verfasser des "Krieges um Metz", Mainz, 1871, pp. 185-86.—Ed.}}
headquarters had already been loaded on to waggons; all was ready for departure, all that remained was to harness the horses (according to the Swiss colonel von Erlach, an eye-witness\textsuperscript{a}).

If the Prussians had been forced to lift the blockade of Paris, this might have given rise to pressure from the rest of Europe and an honourable peace.\textsuperscript{b} In any event, the moral effect of such a feat would have been immense, first on Europe and then particularly on France and finally, in the opposite sense, on the Germans. And the material effects of such a feat! Paris would have had fifteen to twenty days at least to take in fresh supplies by all the railway lines from the south and the west, which would have enabled it to prolong its defence by one or two months. Moreover, an equivalent respite would have been obtained to organise the armies of the provinces; it would then no longer have been necessary to send them into battle without discipline, without training, without equipment, almost without arms. To give France a chance of success all that was needed was time; the opportunity to obtain it occurred on November 3 and 4; we have seen how this opportunity was missed.

Let us, however, follow the course of events.

Paris did not even make a sortie.

For a week the forces approaching Paris from the west made no attempt to attack. This is not surprising. These forces must have been rather weak; Gambetta's decree instructing M. de Kératry to organise the army of the west is dated October 22!

There remained the army of the Loire, which had come into the line on November 7 at Beaugency. Not until the 9th did d'Aurelle attack the Bavarians at Coulmiers; as soon as the latter saw that the retreat of the 22nd Prussian Division, which was marching towards them from the direction of Chartres, was assured, they retired to Tours, where this division joined them the following day, November 10. D'Aurelle moved no more. Meanwhile, three corps, 60,000 men, of the Metz army were approaching from the Seine by forced marches. Two more Prussian divisions (the 3rd and the 4th), which had been sent by rail from Metz, had already arrived outside Paris. Moltke could therefore afford to direct the 17th Prussian Division to Tours, where it arrived on the 12th. There were thus 4 German divisions, about 35,000 men, in the


\textsuperscript{b} For details, see F. Engels, "Fortified Capitals" (present edition, Vol. 28).—\textit{Ed.}
line against the army of the Loire, which henceforth ceased to cause them any anxiety.

However, on November 14 considerable French forces moved from Dreux towards Houblon, two days' march from Versailles. Moltke, who still had nothing but his cavalry in this direction, was unable to conduct sufficient reconnaissance to discover what forces might lie behind this advance guard. On that day he was once again about to abandon Versailles and to lift the blockade (Blume*). This time, however, it was not a matter of days but of hours only. The first corps of the Metz army (IXth) reached Fontainebleau the same day; the IIIrd was due at Nemours between the 16th and the 18th; and the Xth on the 19th at Joigny sur Yonne. Moltke directed the 17th Division to Rambouillet, the 22nd to Chartres, the Bavarians to Auneau, that is between the army of the Loire, to which he left open the road to Paris, and the troops who were threatening Versailles from the west. This time d'Aurelle's inactivity was his salvation; if he had advanced into the gap that had opened up in front of him he would have been crushed between the two German forces ready to fall on his flanks. On November 19 the three corps of the 2nd Prussian army occupied Fontainebleau and Nemours, with their reserves on the Yonne; on November 20 the 1st army under Manteuffel had assembled on the line of the Oise from Compiègne to Noyon; the Metz army was protecting the blockade of Paris to the north and the south; the last chance of lifting the blockade had been lost, thanks to Trochu, Gambetta and d'Aurelle, whose mutual failings complemented one another, one might say, with the much-vaulted precision of the Prussian battalions.

Written at the beginning of February 1877
Printed according to the manuscript
Translated from the French
Published in English for the first time

* W. Blume, Die Operationen der deutschen Heere von der Schlacht bei Sedan bis zum Ende des Krieges..., Berlin, 1872, pp. 69-71.— Ed.
Karl Marx

[MARGINAL NOTES ON ADOLPH WAGNER'S LEHRBUCH DER POLITISCHEN OEKONOMIE (SECOND EDITION), VOLUME I, 1879] 604

1. Mr. Wagner's conception, the "socio-legal conception" (p. 2).* Thereby finds itself "in accord with Rodbertus, Lange and Schäffle" 605 (p. 2). For the "main points of the foundation" he refers to Rodbertus and Schäffle. Mr. Wagner says even of piracy as "unlawful acquisition" by entire peoples, that it is only robbery if "a true jus gentium" is presumed to obtain" (p. 18, Note 3).

His research is primarily devoted to the "conditions of economic life in a community" and he "determines from them the sphere of the economic freedom of the individual" (p. 2).

"The 'instinct to satisfy one's needs'" "does not function, and is not meant to function, as a pure force of nature, but, like every human instinct, it is subject to the guidance of reason and conscience. Every act resulting from it is therefore an answerable one, and is always governed by a moral judgment, though this is admittedly" (!) "itself liable to historical change" (p. 9).

As for "Labour" (p. 9, § 2), Mr. Wagner does not distinguish between the concrete character of each kind of labour and the expenditure of labour power common to all these concrete types of labour (pp. 9, 10).

"Even the mere management of wealth for the purpose of procuring revenue always necessitates activities which belong to the concept of labour, and likewise the employment of the income thus acquired for the satisfaction of needs" (p. 10, Note 6).

According to Wagner the historico-legal are the "social categories" (Note 6, p. 13).

"In particular natural monopolies of location have the effect, especially in urban" (natural monopoly of the location in the City of London!) "conditions, then under

* Here and below Marx gave in brackets pages of Adolph Wagner's book.— Ed.
* International law.— Ed.
the influence of the climate for the agricultural production of entire countries, further, natural monopolies of the specific fertility of the land, e.g. with especially good vineyards, and indeed even between different peoples, e.g. in the sale of tropical products to countries of the temperate zone”. //“One example are the export duties on products of a kind of natural monopoly, which are imposed in some countries (Southern Europe, tropical countries) on the assumption that they will be passed on to the foreign consumers” (Note 11, p. 15). In deducing export duties in the Southern countries from this, Mr. Wagner shows that he knows nothing of the "history" of these duties/*a*—"that goods at least partially free in nature become purely economic ones, sold as a matter of business to the highest bidder" (p. 15).

The sphere of regular exchange (sale) of goods is their market (p. 21).

Among economic goods: "Relations to persons and things (res incorporeae) whose material completeness is based on an abstraction: a) from absolutely free commerce: the cases of customers, firms, etc., when advantageous relations with other people, which have been formed through human activity, may be granted and acquired for payment; b) due to certain legal limitations of commerce: exclusive manufacturing rights, real equities, privileges, monopolies, patents, etc.” (pp. 22, 23).

Mr. Wagner subsumes "services" under “economic goods” (p. 23, Note 2 and p. 28). His real motive in doing so is his desire to portray Privy Councillor Wagner as a “productive worker”; for, he says

"the answer is prejudicial to an assessment of all of those classes which professionally perform personal services, such as servants, the members of the liberal professions, and hence also of the state. Only if services are reckoned in with economic goods, are the aforesaid classes productive in the economic sense" (p. 24).

The following is highly characteristic of the way of thinking of Wagner and company:

Rau had observed: it depends on the “definition of wealth and also of economic goods” whether “services also belong to them or not”/*b*. Whereupon Wagner states: "such a definition" of "wealth" must be "undertaken which includes services among economic goods" (p. 28).

"The decisive reason" is, however,

"that the means of satisfaction cannot possibly consist solely of material goods, because needs are not only related to the latter, but also to personal services (in particular those of the state, such as legal protection, etc.)" (p. 28).

Wealth:

1. purely economic ... "the supply of economic goods available at a given time as the real stock for the satisfaction of needs" is "wealth as such", "parts of the total or people’s or national wealth".

---

*a* Square brackets encountered in Marx’s actual manuscript have been replaced with two oblique lines.—Ed.

2. "As an historico-legal concept ... the stock of economic goods in the possession or property of an entity"; "possession of wealth" (p. 32). The latter is an historico-legal relative concept of property. Property conveys only certain powers of disposal and certain powers of exclusion vis-à-vis others. The extent of these powers varies" //i.e. historically// (p. 34). "All wealth in the second sense is individual wealth. the wealth of a physical or a legal entity" (l.c.).

**Public wealth,**

...in particular the wealth of compulsory communal economies, thus especially the wealth of states, regions and communities. This wealth is designated for public use (such as roads, rivers, etc.) and ownership thereof is assigned to the state etc., as the legal representative of the public (nation, local population, etc.) or it is actual state and communal wealth, namely, administrative wealth, which also goes to make possible the fulfilment of public services, or finance wealth, employed by the state to acquire revenues as the means for the fulfilment of its services" (p. 33).

**Capital, capitale,** is a translation of κεφάλαιον signifying the claim in respect of a sum of money, as opposed to the interest (τόκος). In the Middle Ages there emerged capitale, caput pecuniae for the main thing, the essential, the original (p. 37). In German the word Hauptgeld was used (p. 37),

"Capital. source of earnings, stock of goods bearing interest; a supply of mobile means of acquisition." As opposed to: "stock for use: a quantity of mobile consumable wares put together in any respect at all" (p. 38. Note 2).

**Circulating and standing capital** (p. 38, 2(a) and 2(b)).

**Value.** According to Mr. Wagner, Marx's theory of value is the "cornerstone of his socialist system" (p. 45). As I have never established a "socialist system", this is a fantasy of Wagner, Schäffle e tutti quanti. *

Further: according to which Marx

"finds the common social substance of exchange-value, the only thing he is here concerned with, in labour, the magnitude of exchange-value in the socially necessary labour time", etc. [p. 45].

Nowhere do I speak of "the common social substance of exchange-value"; I rather say that exchange-values (exchange-value, without at least two of them, does not exist) represent something common to them, which "is quite independent of their use-values" //i.e. here their natural form//, namely "value". This is what I write: "Therefore, the common substance that manifests itself in the exchange-value of commodities, whenever they are exchanged, is their value. The progress of our investigation will lead us back to exchange-value as the only form in which the value of commodities can manifest itself or be expressed. For the present,

* And all such people.—Ed.
however, we have to consider the nature of value independently of this, its form” (p. 13)."

Thus I do not say “the common social substance of exchange-value” is “labour”, and as I deal with the form of value, i.e. the development of exchange-value, at some length in a separate section, it would be curious if I were to reduce this “form” to a “common social substance”, labour. Mr. Wagner also forgets that for me neither “value” nor “exchange-value” are subjects, but the commodity.

Further:

“This" (Marxian) “theory is, however, not so much a general theory of value as a theory of cost, related to Ricardo" (loc. cit.).

Mr. Wagner could have familiarised himself with the difference between me and Ricardo both from Capital and from Sieber’s work^ if he knew Russian. Ricardo did indeed concern himself with labour solely as a measure of the magnitude of value, and was therefore unable to find any link between his theory of value and the nature of money.

When Mr. Wagner says that it is not a “general theory of value”, he is quite right in his own sense, since he means by a general theory of value the hair-splitting over the word “value”, which enables him to adhere to the traditional German professorial confusion between “use-value” and “value”, since both have the word “value” in common. But when he goes on to say that it is a “theory of cost”, then either it amounts to a tautology: commodities, as values, only represent something social, labour, and as far as the magnitude of value of a commodity is determined, according to me, by the quantity of the labour-time contained, etc., in it, in other words the normal amount of labour which the production of an article costs, etc.; and Mr. Wagner proves the contrary by declaring that this, etc., theory of value is not the “general” one, because it does not correspond with Mr. Wagner’s view of the “general theory of value”. Or else he says something incorrect: Ricardo (following Smith) lumps value and production costs together; I have already expressly pointed out in A Contribution to the Critique of Political

---


^ Б. Зибер, Теория стоимости и капитала Д. Рикардо в связи с подобными дополненными и различениями. Опыт критико-экономического исследования. Киев, 1871.—Ed.
Economy as well as in the notes in Capital\(^a\) that values and production prices (which merely express in money the costs of production) do not coincide. Why not? That I have not told Mr. Wagner.

Furthermore, I "proceed arbitrarily" when I

"attribute these costs solely to what is termed labour output in the narrowest sense of the term. That always presupposes proof which is hitherto lacking, namely that the production process is possible entirely without the mediation of the activity of private capitalists in amassing and employing capital" (p. 45).

Quite the reverse: instead of foisting such future proofs on me, Mr. Wagner first ought to have proved that a social production process, not to mention the production process in general, did not exist in the very numerous communities which existed before the appearance of private capitalists (the Old Indian community, the South Slav family community, etc.). Besides, Wagner could only say: the exploitation of the working class by the capitalist class, in short, the character of capitalist production as depicted by Marx, is correct, but he is mistaken in regarding this economy as transitory, while Aristotle, on the contrary, was mistaken in not regarding the slave economy as transitory.

"As long as such proof has not been furnished" /in other words, as long as the capitalist economy exists//, "Then profit on capital is also in fact /the club-foot or ass's ear reveals itself here/ "a 'constitutive' element of value. not, as in the socialist view, simply a deduction from, or 'robbery' of, the worker" (pp. 45, 46).

What "a deduction from the worker" is, deduction from his skin, etc., is not evident. At any rate, in my presentation even, "profit on capital" is in actual fact not "a deduction from, or robbery of, the worker". On the contrary, I depict the capitalist as the necessary functionary of capitalist production and demonstrate at great length that he not only "deducts" or "robs" but enforces the production of surplus value, thus first helping to create what is to be deducted; what is more, I demonstrate in detail that even if only equivalents were exchanged in the exchange of commodities, the capitalist—as soon as he pays the worker the real value of his labour-power—would have every right, i.e. such right as corresponds to this mode of production, to surplus-value. But all this does not make "profit on capital" the "constitutive" element of value but only proves that the value not "constituted" by the labour of the capitalist conceals a portion which he can appropriate

---

"legally", i.e. without infringing the law corresponding to the exchange of commodities.

"That theory is unduly preoccupied with this single value-determining element"

//1. Tautology. The theory is false because Wagner has a "general theory of value" which does not agree with it; his "value" is thus determined by "use-value", as is actually proved by the professorial salary; 2. Mr. Wagner substitutes for value the "market-price" at a given time, or the commodity-price diverging from it, which is something very different from value//. "[it considers] the costs, not the other, usefulness, utility, the demand element" //i.e. it does not lump together "value" and use-value, which is, after all, such a desirable thing for a born Confusius a like Wagner//.

"Not only does it not correspond to the formation of exchange-value in present-day commerce"

//he means price formation, which does not affect the determination of value in any way: moreover, the formation of exchange-value certainly does take place in present-day commerce, as any speculator, adulterater of goods, etc., knows, and this has nothing in common with value formation, but has a keen eye for formed values; what is more, in, e.g., the determination of the value of labour power I proceed from the assumption that it is really paid at its full value, which is in fact not the case. Mr. Schäffle is of the opinion in Capitalismus, etc., that that is "magnanimous" or some such thing. He simply means a scientifically necessary procedure//,

"but neither, as Schäffle excellently and indeed conclusively" (!) "demonstrates in the Quintessenz and especially in the Soziale Körper, b does it correspond to conditions as they are bound to take shape in the Marxian hypothetical social state".

//That is the social state, which Mr. Schäffle was courteous enough to "shape" for me, is transformed into "the Marxian" (not the "social state" foisted on to Marx in Schäffle's hypothesis)//

"This may be strikingly demonstrated with the example of grain and such like, whose exchange-value would—owing to the influence of fluctuating harvests when demand is fairly constant—of necessity have to be regulated in some other way than simply according to costs even in a system of 'social taxes,' " [p. 45].

//So many words, so much nonsense. First, I have nowhere spoken of "social taxes", and in my investigation of value I have dealt with bourgeois relations, not with the application of this

---

a A pun on Confucius and confusion.— Ed.
b A. Schäffle, Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers.— Ed.
theory of value to a “social state” not even constructed by me but by Mr. Schäffle for me. Second, if the price of grain rises after a bad harvest, then its value rises, for one thing, because a given amount of labour is contained in a smaller product; for another thing, its selling price rises by much more still. What has this to do with my theory of value? The more the grain is sold over its value, the more other commodities, whether in their natural form or in money form, will be sold under their value by exactly the same amount, even if their own money price does not fall. The total value remains the same, even if the expression of this total value in its entirety were to increase in money, in other words, if the sum total of “exchange-value” according to Mr. Wagner were to rise. This is the case if we assume that the drop in price of the total of the other commodities does not cover the over-value price (excess price) of the grain. But in this case, the exchange-value of money has fallen pro tanto\(^a\) beneath its value; the total value of all commodities does not only remain the same, but even remains the same expressed in money, if money is included among the commodities. Further: the rise in price of grain beyond the increase in its value determined by the bad harvest will in any case be smaller in the “social state” than it is with present-day profiteering in grain. But then the “social state” will organise production from the outset in such a way that the annual supply of grain is only minimally dependent on changes in the weather. The volume of production—including supply and consumption—will be rationally regulated. Finally, supposing Schäffle’s fantasies about it come true, what is the “social tax” meant to prove for or against my theory of value? Just as little as the coercive measures taken during a food shortage on a ship or in a fortress or during the French Revolution, etc., which pay no regard to value; and how terrible for the “social state” to infringe the laws of value of the “capitalist (bourgeois) state”, hence, too, the theory of value! Nothing but infantile rot!\(//\)

The same Wagner graciously quotes from Rau:

“...In order to avoid misunderstandings, it is necessary to establish what is meant by value pure and simple, and it is in conformity with German usage to choose use-value for this purpose”\(b\) (p. 46).

Derivation of the concept of value (p. 46 ff.)

It is from the value-concept that use-value and exchange-value are

---

\(a\) Accordingly.—Ed.

\(b\) K. H. Rau, Grundsätze der Volkswirtschaftslehre, I. Abt., Leipzig and Heidelberg, 1868, p. 88.—Ed.
supposed to be derived d'abord by Mr. Wagner, not as with me from a concretum, the commodity, and it is interesting to follow this scholasticism in its latest Grundlegung.\textsuperscript{b}

"It is a natural striving of man to arrive at a clear awareness and understanding of the relationship which inner and outer goods bear to his needs. This is done through the appreciation (valuation) by which value is attributed to goods or things of the outside world and this value is measured" (p. 46), and he says, p. 12: "All means of satisfying one's needs are called goods."

Thus, if in the first sentence we replace the word "goods" with its Wagnerian conceptual content, then the first sentence of the passage quoted becomes:

"It is a natural striving of 'man' to arrive at a clear awareness and understanding of the relationship which 'the inner and outer means of satisfying his needs' bear to his needs." We may simplify this sentence somewhat by dropping "the inner means", etc., as Mr. Wagner happens to do immediately in the very next sentence by means of the word "or".

"Man"? If the category "man" is meant here, then he has "no" needs at all; if man in isolated juxtaposition with nature, then each individual must be considered a non-gregarious animal; if a man already existing in some kind of society—and this is what Mr. Wagner implies, since his "man" does have a language, even though he lacks a university education—then as a starting-point the specific character of this social man must be presented, i.e. the specific character of the community in which he lives, since in that case production, i.e. the process by which he makes his living, already has some kind of social character.

But for a professorial schoolmaster the relations between men and nature are a priori not practical, that is, relations rooted in action, but theoretical, and two relations of this kind are packed up together in the first sentence.

First: as the "outer means of satisfying his needs" or "outer goods" become transformed into "things of the outside world" in the next sentence, the first interlocked relation assumes the following form: man finds himself in relation to the things of the outside world as means of satisfying his needs. But men do not by any means begin by "finding themselves in this theoretical relationship to the things of the outside world". They begin, like every animal, by eating, drinking, etc., that is not by "finding themselves" in a relationship, but actively behaving, availing themselves of certain things of the outside world by action, and thus satisfying their needs. (They

\textsuperscript{a} first of all.— Ed

\textsuperscript{b} Grundlegung (Foundation)—the title of Part One of Wagner's work.— Ed.
start, then, with production:) By the repetition of this process the
capacity of these things to "satisfy their needs" becomes imprinted
on their brains; men, like animals, also learn "theoretically" to
distinguish the outer things which serve to satisfy their needs from
all other. At a certain stage of evolution after their needs, and the
activities by which they are satisfied, have, in the meanwhile,
increased and further developed, they will linguistically christen
entire classes of these things which they distinguished by
experience from the rest of the outside world. This is bound to
occur, as in the production process—i.e. the process of appropriating
these things—they are continually engaged in active
contact amongst themselves and with these things, and will soon
also have to struggle against others for these things. But this
linguistic label purely and simply expresses as a concept what
repeated activity has turned into an experience, namely that
certain outer things serve to satisfy the needs of human beings
already living in certain social context //this being an essential
prerequisite on account of the language//. Human beings only give
a special (generic) name to these things because they already know
that they serve to satisfy their needs, because they seek to acquire
them by more or less frequently repeated activity, and therefore
also to keep them in their possession; they call them "goods" or
something else which expresses the fact that they use these things
in practice, that these things are useful to them, and they give the
thing this character of utility as if it possessed it, although it would
hardly occur to a sheep that one of its "useful" qualities is that it
can be eaten by human beings.

Thus: human beings actually started by appropriating certain
things of the outside world as means of satisfying their own needs,
etc. etc.; later they reached a point where they also denoted them
linguistically as what they are for them in their practical
experience, namely as means of satisfying their needs, as things which
"satisfy" them. Now, if one terms the fact that human beings not
only treat such things practically, as means of satisfying their
needs, but also denote them in their thoughts and then
linguistically as things which "satisfy" their needs, and hence
themselves //as long as the need of man is not satisfied he is at
variance with his needs and thus with himself//; if one terms this,
"according to German linguistic usage", "attributing value" to
them, then one has proved that the general concept "value" stems
from the behaviour of human beings towards the things found in
the outside world which satisfy their needs, and consequently that
this is the generic concept of "value", and that all other kinds of
value, such as the chemical value [valency] of the elements, are no more than variations of it."

It is "the natural striving" of a German economics professor to derive the economic category "value" from a "concept", and this he achieves by simply renaming what is vulgarly called "use-value" in political economy as "value" pure and simple, "according to German linguistic usage". And as soon as "value" pure and simple has been found, it serves in turn to derive "use-value" from "value pure and simple". To do this, one merely has to replace the "use" fragment, which one dropped earlier, in front of "value" pure and simple.

In fact it is Rau (see p. 88d) who tells us plainly that it "is necessary" (for the German professorial schoolmasters) "to lay down what is meant by value pure and simple", naively adding: "and it is in accordance with German linguistic usage to select use-value to this end". //In chemistry the chemical valency of an element is the number at which one of its atoms is able to combine with the atoms of other elements. But the combining weight of the atoms is also called "equivalency", the equal value of different elements, etc., etc. Therefore one must first define the concept "value pure and simple", etc., etc.//

If man relates to things as "means of satisfying his needs", then he relates to them as "goods", according to Wagner. He grants them the attribute of being "goods"; the content of this operation is in no way altered by the fact that Mr. Wagner renames this "attributing value". His own lazy consciousness immediately arrives at "an understanding" in the following sentence:

"This is done through the appreciation (valuation) by which value is attributed to goods or things of the outside world and this value is measured" [p. 46].

We shall waste no words on the fact that Mr. Wagner derives value from valuation (he himself adds "valuation" in brackets after the word appreciation in order to arrive "at a clear awareness and understanding" of the matter). "Man" has the "natural

---

a A play on Wert meaning "value" and also "valency".—Ed.

b Deleted in the manuscript: "In the case of Mr. Wagner, however, this 'deduction' becomes even more splendid, since he deals with 'man' not with 'men'. This very simple deduction is expressed by Mr. Wagner like this: 'It is a natural striving of man' (read: of the German economics professor), 'the relationship' whereby things of the outside world are not only means of satisfying human needs, but are acknowledged linguistically as such, and therefore also serve...".—Ed.

c Commonly.—Ed.

d 'The page reference is to Rau's Grundsätze der Volkswirtschaftslehre.—Ed.
striving" to do this, to "appreciate" goods as "values", and thus permits Mr. Wagner to derive the promised achievement of the "concept of value in general". Not for nothing does Wagner smuggle in with the word "goods" the phrase "or the things of the outside world". His starting point was that man "relates" to the "things of the outside world", which are means of satisfying his needs, as to "goods". So he appreciates these things by the very fact that he relates to them as "goods". And we have already had an earlier "paraphrase" for this appreciation, to the effect that, e.g.:

"As a needy being, man is in constant contact with the outside world surrounding him and acknowledges that therein lie many of the conditions for his life and well-being" (p. 8).

This, however, means no more than that he "appreciates the things of the outside world" insofar as they satisfy his "needy being", being means of satisfying his needs and therefore, as we have already heard, relates to them as "goods".

Now it is possible, particularly if one feels the "natural" professorial "striving" to derive the concept of value in general, to do this: to give "the things of the outside world" the attribute of "goods" and dub it "attributing value" to them. One might also have said: Since man relates to the things of the outside world which satisfy his needs as to "goods", he "prizes" them, thus attributing "price" to them, and thus the derivation of the concept "price pure and simple" by "man"'s own methods is supplied ready cut to the German professor. Everything that the professor is unable to do himself, he makes "man" do; but this man is himself nothing more than the professorial man who claims to have understood the world once he has arranged it under abstract headings. But in so far as "attributing value" to the things of the outside world is simply another way of phrasing the expression of giving them the attribute of "goods", this is far from being the same, as Wagner wishes to make out, as attributing "value" to the "goods" themselves as a designation distinct from their "being goods". It is simply substituting the word "value" for the word "goods". //As we have seen, the word "price" could also be substituted. Even the word "treasure" could be substituted; since "man" labels certain "things of the outside world" "goods", he "treasures" them, and therefore relates to them as to a "treasure". Thus it can be seen how the three economic categories value, price and treasure could be conjured up by Mr. Wagner at a stroke out of "man's natural striving" to provide the professor with his bone-headed system of concepts (fancies)./ But Mr. Wagner has the dim instinct to step out of his labyrinth of tautology and worm
his way into a "further something" or a "something further". Hence the phrase: "by which value is attributed to goods or things of the outside world, etc." Since the labelling of "things of the outside world" as goods, i.e., the distinguishing and fixing of these (in the mind) as means of satisfying human needs, is also dubbed by Mr. Wagner "attributing value to things", he can no more call this attributing value to "the goods" themselves than he could talk about attributing value to the "value" of the things of the outside world. But the salto mortale is performed with the words "attributing value to goods or the things of the outside world". Wagner should have said: the dubbing of certain things of the outside world "goods" may also be called "attributing value" to these things, and this is the Wagnerian derivation of the "concept of value" pure and simple or in general. The content is not altered by this change of linguistic expression. It is still only the distinguishing or fixing in the mind of the things of the outside world which are means of satisfying human needs; in fact, simply the perception and acknowledgement of certain things of the outside world as means of satisfying the needs of "man" (who as such, however, is actually suffering from a "need of concepts").

But Mr. Wagner wishes to make us, or himself, believe that instead of giving two names to the same content he has progressed from the designation "goods" to a further developed designation "value", distinct from the first, and he does this simply by substituting the word "goods" for "things of the outside world", a process which is further "obscured" by the fact that he rather substitutes the "things of the outside world" for "the goods". His own confusion thus achieves the certain effect of confusing his readers. He might also have reversed this splendid "derivation" as follows. By differentiating the things of the outside world, which are means of satisfying his needs, as such means of satisfaction, from the other things of the outside world, and therefore according them special distinction, he pays tribute to them, attributes value to them, or gives them the attribute of "value". This can also be expressed by saying that he grants them the attribute of "goods" as a characteristic, or respects or values them as "goods". Thereby the concept "goods" is attributed to the "values" or to the things of the outside world. And thus the concept of "goods" in general is "derived" from the concept of "value". All derivations of this kind are simply concerned with diverting attention from a problem which one is not capable of solving.

But in the same breath Mr. Wagner proceeds in all haste from the "value" of goods to the "measurement" of this value.
Notes on Wagner's *Lehrbuch der politischen Oekonomie*

The content would remain exactly the same if the word "value" had not been smuggled in at all. It might be said: By dubbing certain things of the outside world which, etc., as "goods", man will eventually come to compare these "goods" with one another, and according to the hierarchy of his needs will arrange them in a certain order, i.e. if one likes to call it so, "measure" them. Wagner may not speak at all of the development of the real measure of these goods here, i.e. of the development of their measure of quantity, as this would remind the reader too sharply how little what is otherwise meant by "measure of value" is dealt with here.

//That the distinguishing of (reference to) things of the outside world which are means of satisfying human needs as "goods" may be dubbed "attributing value to these things"—this Wagner was able to prove not only by means of "German linguistic usage", as Rau did, but also: there is the Latin word dignitas = dignity, merit, rank, etc., which when applied to things also means "value"; dignitas is derived from dignus, and this from dic, point out, show, auszeichnen, zeigen; dignus thus means "pointed out"; hence, too. dignus, the finger with which one points out a thing, refers to it; Greek δείκνυμι, δείχ-νυλος (finger); Gothic: ga-tecta (dico); German: zeigen; and we could arrive at a lot more "derivations" bearing in mind that δείκνυμι (or δείχνω) (to make visible, to bring to light, to refer to) has the same basic stem as δέχομαι—that is δέχ (to hold out, to take).//

What a lot of banality, tautological confusion, hair-splitting and underhand manoeuvring Mr. Wagner manages to pack into not quite 7 lines.

No wonder that after this feat, the obscure man (vir obscurus) continues with great self-assurance:

"The much disputed concept of value, still obscured by many investigations frequently of merely apparent depth, resolves itself" (indeed) //rather—"involves" itself// "if, as has been done hitherto" //namely by Wagner//, "we take the needs and the economic nature of man as our starting-point and on arriving at the concept of goods—tie it up with the concept of value" (p. 46).

Here we have the concept juggling, whose supposed development according to the vir obscurus boils down to "tying up", and to a certain extent "tying on".

Further derivation of the concept of value:

Subjective and objective value. Subjective and, in the most general sense, the value of goods = importance which "is attributed to the goods on account of their usefulness ... not a quality of the things in themselves, even if it objectively presupposes the usefulness of a thing" //thus presupposing "objective" value//. In the objective
sense one also understands by "value" and "values" the value-
possessing goods, in which (!) good and value, goods and values
become essentially "identical concepts" (pp. 46, 47).

After taking what is usually termed "use-value" and dubbing it
"value in general" and then the "concept of value" pure and simple,
Wagner can surely not fail to recall that the "value" "derived" (!) "in
this way" (well, well!) is "use-value". After dubbing "use-value" the
"concept of value" in general, or "value pure and simple", he
discovers, on second thought, that he has simply been drivelling on
about "use-value", and has thus "derived" it, drivelling and deriving
now being for him "essentially" identical mental operations. But at
this juncture we discover how subjective the hitherto "objective"
confusion of ideas of the aforesaid Mr. Wagner really is. For he
reveals a secret to us. Rodbertus had written a letter to him which
may be read in the Tübingen Zeitschrift\(^a\) of 1878, in which he,
Rodbertus, expounds why there is "only one kind of value",
use-value.

"1" (Wagner) "have come to support this view, the importance of which I have
already emphasised in the first edition" [p. 48].

Of what Rodbertus says, Wagner says:

"This is quite correct and necessitates an alteration of the usual illogical
'division' of 'value' into use-value and exchange-value, which I had still undertaken in
§ 3 [in Wagner § 33] of the first edition" (p. 48, Note 4),

and the same Wagner places me (p. 49, Note) amongst those
according to whom "use-value" should be entirely "removed"
"from the science".

All this is "drivel". \textit{De prime abord},\(^b\) I do not proceed from
"concepts", hence neither from the "concept of value", and am
therefore in no way concerned to "divide" it. What I proceed
from is the simplest social form in which the product of labour
presents itself in contemporary society, and this is the "commodity". This I analyse, initially in the \textit{form in which it appears}. Here I
find that on the one hand in its natural form it is a \textit{thing for use},
alias a use-value; on the other hand, a \textit{bearer of exchange-value}, and
from this point of view it is itself an "exchange-value". Further
analysis of the latter shows me that exchange-value is merely a
"form of expression", an independent way of presenting the \textit{value}
contained in the commodity, and then I start on the analysis of the

\(^{a}\) A. Wagner, "Einiges von und über Rodbertus-Jagetzow". Zeitschrift für die

\(^{b}\) To begin with.—\textit{Ed.}
latter. I therefore state explicitly, p. 36, 2nd ed.\footnote{K. Marx, \emph{Das Kapital}, Bd. I, Hamburg, 1872. See K. Marx, \emph{Capital}, Vol. I, Part I, Chapter I, Section 3, Point 4: "The Elementary Form of Value Considered as a Whole" (present edition, Vol. 35).—Ed.}: "When, at the beginning of this chapter, we said, in common parlance, that a commodity is both a use-value and an exchange-value, we were, precisely speaking, wrong. A commodity is a use-value or object of utility, and a 'value'. It manifests itself as this two-fold thing which it is, as soon as its value assumes an independent form of expression distinct from its natural form—the form of exchange-value", etc. Thus I do not divide value into use-value and exchange-value as opposites into which the abstraction "value" splits up, but the concrete social form of the product of labour, the "commodity", is on the one hand, use-value and on the other, "value", not exchange-value, since the mere form of expression is not its own content.

Second: only a \textit{vit obscurus} who has not understood a word of \textit{Capital} can conclude: Because Marx in a note in the first edition of \textit{Capital}\footnote{K. Marx, \emph{Das Kapital}, Bd. I, Hamburg, 1872. See K. Marx, \emph{Capital}, Vol. I, Part I, Chapter I, Section 1: "The Two Factors of a Commodity: Use-Value and Value (the Substance of Value and the Magnitude of Value)" (present edition, Vol. 35).—Ed.} rejects all the German professorial twaddle about "use-value" in general, and refers readers who want to know something about real use-values to "manuals dealing with merchandise"—for this reason use-value plays no part in his work. Naturally it does not play the part of its opposite, of "value", which has nothing in common with it, except that "value" occurs in the term "use-value". He might just as well have said that "exchange-value" is discarded by me because it is only the form of expression of value, and not "value" itself, since for me the "value" of a commodity is neither its use-value nor its exchange-value.

When one comes to analyse the "commodity"—the simplest concrete element of economics—one must exclude all relations which have nothing to do with the particular object of the analysis. Therefore I have said in a few lines what there is to say about the commodity in so far as it is a use-value, but on the other hand I have emphasised the characteristic form in which use-value—the product of labour—appears here, that is: "A thing can be useful, and the product of human labour, without being a commodity. Whoever [directly] satisfies his needs with the produce of his own labour, creates, indeed, use-values but not commodities. In order to produce commodities, he must not only produce use-values, but use-values for others, social use-values" (p. 15).\footnote{This the root of...}
Rodbertus' "social use-value".// Consequently use-value—as the use-value of a "commodity"—itself possesses a specific historical character. In primitive communities in which, e.g., means of livelihood are produced communally and distributed amongst the members of the community, the common product directly satisfies the vital needs of each community member, of each producer; the social character of the product, of the use-value, here lies in its (common) communal character. //Mr. Rodbertus on the other hand transforms the "social use-value" of the commodity into "social use-value" pure and simple, and is hence talking nonsense.//

As may be seen from the above, it would be sheer nonsense, in an analysis of the commodity—since it presents itself on the one hand as a use-value or goods, on the other hand as "value"—to "tie up" at this juncture all sorts of banal reflexions about use-values or goods which do not enter into the world of commodities, such as "state goods", "communal goods", etc. as Wagner and the German professor in general does, or about goods like "health", etc. Where the state is itself a capitalist producer, as in the exploitation of mines, forests, etc., its product is a "commodity" and hence possesses the specific character of every other commodity.

On the other hand the *Vor obscurus* has overlooked the fact that even in my analysis of the commodity I do not come to a halt with its dual way of presenting itself, but immediately proceed to show that in this duality of the commodity there presents itself the dual character of the labour whose product it is: of useful labour, i.e. the concrete modes of the labours which create use-values, and of abstract labour, of labour as expenditure of labour power, regardless of the "useful" way in which it is expended (on which the presentation of the production process later depends); that in the development of the value form of the commodity, in the final instance its money form, and thus of money, the value of a commodity presents itself in the use-value of the other commodity, i.e. in its natural form; that surplus-value itself is derived from a "specific" use-value of labour power belonging to it exclusively, etc., etc., that, in other words, for me use-value plays an important part quite different from its part in economics hitherto, but note bene it still only comes under consideration when such a consideration stems from the analysis with regard to economic formations, not from arguing hither and thither about the concepts or words "use-value" and "value".

For this reason when analysing the commodity I do not immediately drag in definitions of "capital", not even when
dealing with the "use-value" of the commodity. Such definitions are bound to be sheer nonsense as long as we have advanced no further than the analysis of the elements of the commodity.

What annoys (shocks) Mr. Wagner about my presentation, though, is that I will not do him the favour of complying with the patriotic German professorial "striving" for confusing use-value with value. Although German society is very much post festum, it has nevertheless gradually emerged from the feudal subsistence economy, or at least its predominance, into capitalist society, but the professors are still standing with one foot in the old muck—naturally enough. From being the serfs of landowners they have turned into the serfs of the state, vulgo the government. Therefore our *vir obscurus* too, who has not even noticed that my analytic method, which does not proceed from *man* but from a given economic period of society, has nothing in common with the German-professorial association-of-concepts method ("words are excellent for fighting with, with words a system may be built" 37*), therefore he says:

"In harmony with the view of Radbertus and also of Schäffle I place the *use-value* character of all value in the fore, and emphasise the assessment of *use-value* all the more, since the assessment of exchange-value is simply not applicable to many of the most important economic goods",

what compels him to speak out? so, as a civil servant, he feels obliged to confuse use-value and value!

"neither to the state and its services, nor to other social economic relations" (p. 49, Note).

//This reminds one of the old chemists before the science of chemistry: as cooking butter, which is simply called butter in everyday life (according to the Nordic custom), has a soft consistency, they called *chloride, butter of zinc, butter of antimony*, etc. butter juices, thus, to use the words of the *vir obscurus*, "firmly adhering to the *butter* character of all chlorides, zinc and antimony compounds".// The whole rigmarole boils down to this: Because certain goods, especially the *state* (goods!) and its "services" //particularly the services of its professors of political economy// are not "commodities", the opposing characteristics contained in the "commodities" themselves //which also appear explicitly in the commodity form of the product of labour// must therefore be confused with one another! In the case of Wagner and Co. it is anyway hard to maintain that they have more to gain if their "services" are determined according to their "use-

---

value”, according to their tangible “content” [Gehalt], rather than according to their “salary” [Gehalt] (through a “social tax”, as Wagner expresses it [p. 45], i.e. are “assessed” according to their payment.

The only thing which clearly lies at the bottom of the German stupidity is the fact that linguistically the words value [Wert] or worth [Würde] were first applied to the useful things themselves which existed for a long time, even as “products of labour”, before becoming commodities. But this has as little to do with the scientific determination of the “value” of the commodity as the fact that the word salt was first used by the ancients for cooking salt, and consequently sugar, etc. also figure as varieties of salt from Pliny onwards (indeed, all colourless solids soluble in water and with a peculiar taste), and therefore the chemical category “salt” includes sugar, etc.//

As the commodity is bought by the purchaser not because it has value but because it is a “use-value”, and is used for definite purposes, it goes without saying that 1. use-values are “assessed” i.e. their quality is investigated (just as their quantity is weighed, measured, etc.); 2. if different sorts of commodities can be substituted for one another for the same use, one or the other will be given preference, etc., etc.//

In Gothic there is only one word for Wert and Würde: vairths, τωτῷ. //τόμαο, assess, i.e. evaluate; to determine the price or value, to rate; metaphorically: to appreciate, esteem, honour, distinguish. Τωτῷ — assessment, hence: determination of value or price, evaluation, valuation. Then: estimation, also, value, price itself (Herodotus, Plato), or τιμαί — expenses in Demosthenes. Then: estimation, honour, respect, place of honour, honorary post, etc., Rost’s Greek-German Dictionary.//

Value, price (Schulze, Glossar) Gothic: vairths, adj., τίμως, τιμανός.

Old Norse: verðh, worthy, verðh, value, price; Anglo-Saxon: veordh, veordh; English: worth, adj. and noun, value and dignity

(“Middle High German: wert, genitive werdes, adj. dignus and likewise pfennig-wert; wert, gen. werdes value, worth, splendour; aestimatio, commodity of definite value, e.g. pfennwert, pennyworth; werde: merium, aestimatio, dignitas, precious character” (Ziemann: Middle High German Dictionary).

---

a German Gehalt means both content and salary.—Tr.

b V. Ch. Fr. Rost, Deutsch-Griechisches Wörterbuch, Zweite Abteilung, M-Z, Göttingen, 1829, p. 359.—Ed.
c E. Schulze, Gothisches Glossar, Magdeburg, 1847, p. 411.—Ed.
d A. Ziemann, Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch zum Handgebrauch, Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1838, pp. 634-35.—Ed.
Wert and Würde [value and worth] are thus closely related in both etymology and meaning. What conceals the fact is the inorganic (incorrect) inflexion of Wert which has become customary in Modern High German: Werth, Werthes instead of Werdes, since Gothic th corresponds to High German d, not th = t, and this is indeed still the case in Middle High German (wert, gen. werdes, loc. cit.). According to the rule in Middle High German, d at the end of a word became t, giving Wert instead of Werd, but genitive Werdes.

But all this has as much or as little to do with the economic category "value" as with the chemical valency of the chemical elements (atomicity) or with the chemical equivalents or equal values (combining weights of the chemical elements).

Furthermore it should be noted that—even in this linguistic connection—if it follows automatically, as if by the nature of the thing, from the original identity of Würde and Wert that this word also referred to things, products of labour in their natural form—it was later directly applied unchanged to prices, i.e. value in its developed value-form, i.e. exchange-value, which has so little to do with the matter that the same word continued to be used for worth in general, for honorary offices, etc. Thus, linguistically speaking, there is no distinction here between use-value and value.

Let us now turn to the authority quoted by the vir obscurus, to Rodbertus // whose essay may be scrutinised in the Tübinger Zeitschrift/. The passage by Rodbertus cited by the vir obscurus is as follows:

From the text on page 48:

"There is only one kind of value, and that is use-value. This is either individual use-value or social use-value. The former stands in a relation to the individual and his needs, quite regardless of any social organisation."

//This is sheer nonsense (cf. Capital, p. 171"), where, however, it says that the labour-process, as a useful activity for the production of use-values, etc., is "equally common to all its" (human life's) "forms of society" and "is independent of each of them".// //First, it is not the word "use-value" which stands in relation to the individual, but concrete use-values, and which of these "stand in a relation" to him (for these people everything always "stands"; everything is a question of "standing") is entirely dependent on the level of the social production process, therefore also corresponding to "a social organisation". But if Rodbertus only wishes to

---


b A play on words: "steh"—stands and "ständisch"—of, or related to, the social estates.—Ed.
make the trivial statement that use-value which really stands in
relation to an individual as an object of utility, relates to him as an
individual use-value for him—then this is either a trivial tautology
or it is incorrect, since not to mention such things as rice, maize,
wheat or meat //which does not stand in any relation to a Hindu
as food//, an individual's need for the title of Professor or Privy
Councillor or an order is possible only in quite a definite "social
organisation"/.

"The second is use-value, which a social organism consisting of many individual
organisms (or individuals) has" (p. 48, text).

Lovely German! Is it the "use-value" of the "social organism" which is meant here, or is it a use-value in the possession of a
"social organism" (as e.g. land in primitive communities), or is it
the definite "social" form of use-value in a social organism, as e.g.
in places where commodity production predominates, the use-
value which a producer supplies must be a "use-value for others" and in this sense a "social use-value"? This is nothing but hot air
and will lead us nowhere.

And so on to the second proposition of Wagner's Faust:*

"Exchange-value is simply the historical mantle and appendage of the social
use-value from a particular period of history. By taking an exchange-value as the
logical opposite of use-value, one is placing an historical concept in logical contrast to
a logical concept, which is logically not admissible" (p. 48, Note 4). "That is quite
correct!" crow Wagner ibidem.

Who is the "one" who is committing this? That Rodbertus
means me, we may take for granted, since according to R. Meyer,
his famulus, he has written a "big, fat manuscript" against
Capital.† Who is placing things in logical contrast? Mr. Rodbertus,
for whom "use-value" and "exchange-value" are both by nature mere "concepts". In fact in every price-list every individual sort of
commodity undergoes this illogical process, distinguishing itself
from the others as goods, use-value, as cotton, yarn, iron, grain, etc.,
and representing "goods" qualitatively different from the others toto
cœlo,‡ but simultaneously representing its price as qualitatively the
same but quantitatively different of the same essence. It presents itself in
its natural form for him who uses it, and in value-form, which is quite
different from it and "common" to all other commodities, i.e. as
exchange-value. The only "logical" contrast here is in Rodbertus and
the German professorial schoolmasters related to him who proceed
from the "concept" of value, not from the "social thing", the

---

* I. e. Rodbertus.— Ed.
† R. Meyer, Briefe und Socialpolitische Aufsätze von Dr. Rodbertus-Jagetzow, Berlin
[1881], Vol. 1, p. 42.— Ed.
‡ In every respect.— Ed.
“commodity”, who get this concept to split up into itself (duplicate itself), and then argue about which of these two phantoms of the mind is the real Jacob!*

But what lurks in the gloomy background to these high-flown phrases is simply the immortal discovery that in all circumstances man must eat, drink, etc. //one cannot even continue: “clothe himself, or have a knife and fork or bed and dwelling”, as this is not the case //in all circumstances//; in short, that in all circumstances he must find external things already available in nature to satisfy his needs and appropriate them or fashion them out of what nature provides; in this actual procedure of his he thus always relates practically to certain external things as “use-values”, i.e. he always treats them as objects for his use; hence according to Rodbertus use-value is a “logical” concept; thus, since man must also breathe, “breathing” is a “logical” concept, but not a “physiological” one at all. The entire shallowness of Rodbertus, however, emerges in his contrast between “logical” and “historical” concepts! He grasps “value” (the economic value, in contrast to the use-value of the commodity) only in its form of expression, in exchange-value, and since this only occurs when at least some part of the products of labour, the objects of utility, function as “commodities”—this not, however, happening from the outset, but only at a certain period of social development, in other words, at a definite stage of historical development—then exchange-value is a “historical” concept. Now if Rodbertus—and I will point out later why he did not see it—had gone on to analyse the exchange-value of commodities—for it only exists where commodity occurs in the plural, different sorts of commodities—then he would have found “value” behind this form of expression. If he had further gone on to investigate value, he would have further found that here the thing, the “use-value”, amounts to a mere concretisation of human labour, as the expenditure of equal human labour-power, and therefore this content is presented as the concrete character of the thing, as a character appertaining essentially to the thing itself, although this objectivity does not appear in its natural form //which, however, necessitates a special form of value//. He would have found, then, that the “value” of the commodity merely expresses in a historically developed form something which also exists in all other historical forms of society, albeit in a different form, namely the social character of labour, insofar as it exists as expenditure of “social” labour-power. If, then, “the value” of the commodity is merely a

---

* Genesis 25:26.—Ed.
particular historical form of something which exists in all forms of society, the same must be true of the "social use-value", as it characterises the "use-value" of the commodity. Mr. Rodbertus has the measure of the magnitude of value from Ricardo; but he himself has neither examined nor grasped the substance of value any more than Ricardo did; e.g. the "communal" character of the [labour process] in the primitive community as the common organism of the labour-powers belonging together, and hence that of their labour, i.e. the expenditure of these powers.

Further treatment of Wagner's twaddle on this issue superfluous.

Measure of the magnitude of value. Mr. Wagner incorporates me here, but finds to his regret that I have "eliminated" the "labour involved in capital formation" (p. 58, Note 7).

"In commerce regulated by social organs, the determination of tariff values or tariff prices must be carried out with due consideration to this cost-element" [his term for the quantum of labour expended in production, etc./, "as used to happen in principle in the case of the former state and trade tariffs, and would again have to take effect under any new tariff system" //read "socialist"//. However, in free commerce the costs are not the sole basis for determining exchange-values and prices, and cannot be in any conceivable social situation. For regardless of costs, there must always occur fluctuations in use-value and need, whose influence on exchange-value and prices (both contract and tariff prices) then modifies the influence of costs, and is bound to do so", etc. (pp. 58, 59). "The" //i.e. this!! "astute correction of the socialist doctrine of value... we owe to Schäffle"(l), who says in Soz. Körpera III, p. 278: "No matter what kind of social influence over needs and production exists, there is no avoiding the fact that all needs always remain in equilibrium qualitatively and quantitatively with production. But if this is so, the social cost-value quotients cannot simultaneously be considered proportionally as social use-value quotients" (p. 59, Note 9).

That this merely amounts to the triviality of market-prices rising and falling above or below value and to the assumption that the theory of value developed by him for bourgeois society is predominant in the "Marxian social state" is shown by Wagner's phrase:

"They" (prices) "will occasionally deviate from them" [costs] to a lesser or greater extent, rising for goods whose use-value has become greater and falling for those whose use-value has become smaller. Only in the long run will costs continually assert themselves as the decisive regulator", etc. (p. 59).

Law. As for the fantasies of the vir obscurus about the economically creative influence of the law, one phrase will suffice, although he is forever dragging out the absurd point of view which it exemplifies:

"Individual enterprise has at its head, as the organ of its technical and economic

---

a A. E. Fr. Schäffle, Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers.— Ed.
activity... a person as a legal and economic subject. Furthermore, this person is no purely economic entity but at the same time dependent on the arrangement of the law. For the latter determines who is to count as a person, and consequently who can stand at the head of a business", etc. (p. 85).

Communications and transport (pp. 75-76), p. 80 (Note).
From p. 82: where the "exchange in the (natural) constituents of the mass of goods" //of an economy, alias dubbed "exchange of goods" by Wagner, is declared to be Schäffle's "social exchange of matter"—at least, one case of it; but I also used the word in the "natural" process of production for the exchange of matter between man and nature// has been borrowed from me, where exchange of matter first occurs in the analysis of C—M—C² and interruptions in the exchange of form, later also termed interruptions in the exchange of matter.

What Mr. Wagner goes on to say about the "inner exchange" of the goods in one branch of production (in his case an "individual enterprise"), partly with reference to their "use-value", partly with reference to their "value", is also discussed by me in the analysis of the first phase of C—M—C, namely C—M, in the example of the linen-weaver (Capital, pp. 85, 86-87), where I conclude by saying: "Our owners of commodities therefore find out that the same division of labour that turns them into independent private producers, [also] makes the social process of production and their relations within that process independent of them themselves, and that the seeming mutual independence of the individuals from one another is supplemented by a system of all-round material dependence" (Capital, p. 87).b

Contracts for the commercial acquisition of goods. Here the vir obscursus places mine and his on their heads. For him the law is first, and then comes commerce; in reality it is the other way round: first there is commerce, and then a legal system develops out of it. In the analysis of the circulation of commodities I have demonstrated that in developed bartering the participants tacitly acknowledge one another as equal persons and owners of the respective goods to be exchanged by them; they already do that while offering their goods to each other and agreeing to trade with each other. This actual relation, which only arises through and in the exchange, is later given legal form in the contract, etc.;

---

a Commodity—money—commodity. — Ed.
but this form neither creates its content, the exchange, nor the relationship between the persons inherent in it, but vice versa. Wagner, on the other hand:

"This acquisition" //of goods through commerce// "necessarily presupposes a definite legal system, on whose basis" (!) "commerce takes place", etc. (p. 84).

Credit. Instead of giving the development of money as a means of payment, Wagner immediately turns the process of circulation, insofar as it occurs in such a form that the two equivalents do not confront each other as C—M at the same time, into a "credit transaction" (p. 85 ff.), which is "tied up" with the fact that this is frequently linked with the payment of "interest"; it also serves to "inspire confidence" and thus to depict "confidence" as a basis for "credit".

About Puchta's, etc., juridical conception of "wealth", according to which debts, too, belong to it as negative components (p. 86, Note 8).

Credit is "consumptive credit" or "productive credit" (p. 86). The former predominating chiefly on a lower level of culture, the latter on a "higher".

As for the causes of debt //causes of pauperism: fluctuations in the harvest, war service, slave competition// in Ancient Rome (Jhering, 3rd ed., p. 234, II, 2. Geist des römischen Rechts).d

According to Mr. Wagner, "consumptive credit" prevails on the "lower level" among "lower, distressed" and "higher, extravagant" classes. In fact, in England and America "consumptive credit" is generally prevalent with the development of the deposit-bank system!

"In particular ... productive credit proves to be an economic factor of the economy based on private ownership of land and movable capital and allowing free competition. It is tied up with the possession of wealth, not with wealth as a purely economic category", and is therefore only a "historico-legal category" (!) (p. 87).

Dependence of individual enterprise and wealth on the effects of the outside world, especially the influence of the state of the economy.

1. Changes in use-value: improve in some cases with the passage of time, being the condition for certain processes in nature (wine, cigars, violins, etc.).

"Deteriorate in the great majority of cases... dissolve into their material constituents, coincidences of every kind." Corresponds to "change" in exchange-value in the same direction, "increase in value" or "decrease in value" (pp. 96, 97). Vid. concerning the house-rent agreement in Berlin (p. 97, Note 2).

---

a F. G. Puchta, Pandekten, Leipzig, 1877, §§ 34 and 219.—Ed.
b In the manuscript: "latter".—Ed.
c In the manuscript: "former".—Ed.
d Rudolph von Jhering, Geist des römischen Rechts auf den verschiedenen Stufen seiner Entwicklung, Leipzig, 1874, pp. 234-59.—Ed.
2. Changes in human knowledge of the properties of the goods: thereby "increasing wealth" in a positive case. //Use of coal for the smelting of iron in England around 1620, when the decline in forests was already threatening the existence of the ironworks; chemical discoveries, such as that of iodine (utilisation of iodine-bearing salt springs). Phosphorite as a fertiliser, anthracite as a heating agent. Substances for gas-lighting, photography. Discovery of dyes and medicines, Gutta-percha, rubber, Vegetable ivory (from Phytelephas macrocarpa).667 Creosote. Paraffin-wax candles. The use of asphalt, of pine-needles (pine-needle wool), of the gases in the blast-furnace, coal-tar for the preparation of aniline, woollen rags, sawdust, etc., etc.// In negative cases, a decrease in utility and therefore in value (as following the discovery of trichinae in pork, poisons in dyes, plants, etc.) (pp. 97, 98). Discovery of mining products in the earth, of new useful properties of these products, discovery of a new application for them increases fortune of the landowner (p. 98).

3. Economic situation.

Influence of all of the external "conditions", which "essentially determine the production of goods for commerce, demand and sale" ... hence their "exchange-value", also that of "the individual finished goods" ... "entirely or mainly independently" of the "economic subject", "or proprietors" (p. 98). The economic situation becomes a "crucial factor" in the "system of free competition" (p. 99). Thus someone—"by means of the principle of private property"—gains "what he has not earned", and so someone else incurs a "forfeit", "economically unwarranted losses".

Concerning speculation (Note 10, p. 101). Housing prices (p. 102, Note 11). Coal and iron industry (p. 102, Note 12). Innumerable changes in technology reduce the value of industrial products as the instruments of production (pp. 102, 103).

In "an economy progressing in population and prosperity, the favourable chances ... preponderate, albeit with occasional temporary and local setbacks and fluctuations, in the case of landed property, especially in the case of urban (city) property" (p. 102).

"Thus the economic situation directs profits into the hands of the landed proprietor" (p. 103). "These, like most other profits on value due to the state of the economy... are simply nothing but "gambling winnings", to which correspond "gambling losses" (p. 103).

Ditto about "Grain Trade" (p. 103, Note 15).

It must thus be

"openly acknowledged: ... the economic situation of the individual or family" is "essentially another product of the economic situation" and this "necessarily undermines the significance of personal economic responsibility" (pp. [104,] 105).
If, therefore, "the present organisation of the economy and the legal basis for it" (1), "hence private ownership of ... land and capital" etc. is "for them mainly an immutable institution", then, after a good deal of prattle, there are no means "of combating ... the causes" //of the ensuing evils, such as stagnation in sales, crises, the dismissal of workers, wage-cuts, etc., //, "hence not of the evil itself", whereas Mr. Wagner imagines he is combatting the "symptoms", the "consequences of the evil" by meeting "profits arising from the state of the economy" with "taxes"—the "losses", "economically unwarranted", the product of the state of the economy, by a "rational ... system of insurance" (p. 105).

This, says the obscure man, is the result of considering the present mode of production and its "legal basis" as "immutable"; but his research, going more deeply than socialism, will get to grips with the "issue itself". Nous verrons, won't we?

Chief individual elements affecting the state of the economy.

1. Fluctuations in the harvest yields of staple foods under the influence of the weather and political conditions, such as disruptions in cultivation due to war. Producers and consumers affected by it (p. 106). //On grain merchants: Tooke, History of Prices\(^b\); for Greece: Böckh, Staatshaushalt der Athener, I, 1, § 15; for Rome: Jhering, Geist, p. 238.\(^c\) Increased mortality among the lower strata of the population nowadays with every slight rise in prices, "certainly a proof how little the average wage of the mass of the working classes exceeds the amount absolutely essential for life" (p. 106, Note 19). // Improvements in means of communication //“at the same time”, he adds in Note 20, "the most important condition for a speculative grain trade able to level out prices" //, changes in cultivation methods //“crop rotation economy”, by means of “the cultivation of various products which are favoured or handicapped differently by varying weather conditions” //; hence smaller fluctuations in grain prices within shorter periods of time compared with "the Middle Ages and antiquity". But fluctuations still very great even now (see Note 22, p. 107; facts ibid.).


\(^a\) We'll see.—Ed.


\(^c\) Rudolph von Jhering, Geist des römischen Rechts auf den verschiedenen Stufen seiner Entwicklung.—Ed.
3. Changes in the means of communication and transport, influencing the spatial movement of men and goods. Thereby in particular... the value of land and the articles of low specific value; whole branches of production compelled to make a difficult transition to other working methods (p. 107).

//In addition Note 24, ib.

The increase in land value in the vicinity of good communications on account of the better sales of products made there; the facilitation of population concentration in towns, hence enormous rise in value of urban land and land value in the vicinity of such places. Transport made easier from areas with hitherto low prices for grain and other agricultural and forestry raw materials, mining products to areas with higher prices; the result being a deterioration of the economic situation for all elements of the population with a more stable income in the former areas, and on the other hand the favouring of the producers and particularly the landowners in the same places. The easier transport (import) of grain and other substances of low specific value has the reverse effect. Favour the consumers but prejudicial to the producers in the country of origin; necessitating a transition to other kinds of production, as in England from grain cultivation to stock-raising in the forties, as a result of the competition from cheap East European corn in Germany. Difficult situation for German farmers (first) owing to the climate, then owing to the recent large wage increases, which they are not able to add on to the products as easily as the industrialists, and so on.//

4. Changes in taste! Fashions, etc., often occurring rapidly in a short space of time.

5. Political changes in the sphere of national and international commerce (war, revolution, etc.); insofar as confidence and lack of confidence [become] more and more important with increasing division of labour, the extension of international etc., commerce, the role of the credit factor, the monstrous dimensions of modern warfare, etc. (p. 108).


7. Changes in the geographic distribution and overall economic situation of the whole population, such as migration from the country into the towns (pp. 108, 109).

8. Changes in the social and economic situation of individual strata of the population, such as through granting the freedom of coalition, etc. (p. 109). //The French & milliards, Note 29, ib.//

Costs in the individual enterprise. In the "value"-producing "labour", in which all costs resolve themselves, "labour" in the proper broad sense, in particular, must also be included, whereby it "embraces everything which is necessary by way of purposeful human activities for the creation of revenues", hence particularly "the intellectual labour of the leader and the activity whereby

---

* In the manuscript: "latter".—Ed
capital is created and employed”, “therefore” the “capital gain” financing this activity also belongs to the “constitutive elements of costs”. “This view stands in contradiction to the socialist theory of value and costs and critique of capital” (p. 111).

The obscure man falsely attributes to me the view that “the surplus-value produced by the workers alone remains, in an unwarranted manner, in the hands of the capitalist entrepreneurs” (Note 3, p. 114). In fact I say the exact opposite: that the production of commodities must necessarily become “capitalist” production of commodities at a certain point, and that according to the law of value governing it, the “surplus-value” rightfully belongs to the capitalist and not the worker. Instead of engaging in such sophistry, the academic socialist character of the vir obscurus proves itself with the following banality, that the

“uncompromising opponents of the socialists” “overlook the numerous actual cases of exploitative relations in which net profits are not properly” (!) “distributed, and the individual enterprise production costs of the companies are reduced far too much to the detriment of the workers (including the lenders of capital) and to the advantage of the employers” (l.c.).

National income in England and France (p. 120, χ—ψ).

The annual gross income of a nation:

1. Sum total of goods newly produced that year. Domestic raw materials being included entirely according to their value; the articles manufactured out of these and out of foreign materials //to avoid a double assessment of raw products// at the amount of increase in value attained by manufacturing labour; raw materials and semi-manufactured goods sold and transported in trade, at the amount of the increase in value effected thereby.

2. Import of money and commodities from abroad in the form of interest from the claims of the country arising from credit business, or from capital investments by home nationals abroad.

3. Freightage actually paid to domestic shipping companies by means of the import of foreign goods during the course of foreign trade and transit-trade.

4. Cash or commodities imported from abroad in the form of remittances to aliens staying in the country.

5. The import of non-repayable gifts, such as permanent tributes to the country from abroad, or continuing immigration and consequent regular immigration wealth.

6. Value surplus from the import of commodities and money resulting from international trade //but then deduct, 2. export abroad//.

---

* Marx has mistakenly written “domestic” for “international”. — Ed
7. **Sum value of revenue from useful wealth** (as from dwelling-houses, etc.) (pp. 121, 122).

For the *net income* deduct, among other things, the "export of goods in payment for the freightage of foreign shipping companies" (p. 123). //The matter is not so simple: the *price of production* (domestic) + freight = selling price. If the country exports its own commodities in its own ships, then the foreign country pays the freight charges, if the market price prevailing there, etc.//

"Besides permanent tributes, regular payments to foreign subjects abroad (bribes and retainers, as paid by Persia to Greeks, payments to foreign scholars under Louis XIV. St. Peter's Money⁹⁶) must be taken into account" (p. 123, Note 9).

Why not the *subsidies* which the German princes regularly used to receive from France and England?

*Vid.* the naïve sorts of income components of private individuals consisting of "services performed by state and Church" (p. 125, Note 14).

**Individual and national assessment of value.**

The destruction of a part of a stock of goods in order to sell the rest at a higher price is called by Cournot, *Recherches sur les principes mathématiques de la théorie des richesses, 1838, "une véritable création de richesse dans le sens commercial du mot"*” (p. 127, Note 3).

Cf. as regards the decline of private individuals' consumption supplies, or, as Wagner terms it, of their "useful capital", in our cultural period, in *Berlin* in particular, p. 128, Note 5, p. 129, Notes 8 and 10; in addition, too little money or *working capital* proper in the *production enterprise* itself, p. 130 and ibid., Note 11.

**Comparatively greater importance of foreign trade nowadays**, p. 131, Note 13, p. 132, Note 3.

---

Manuscript completed after January 1881

First published, in Russian, in the Marx-Engels Archives, Book V, Moscow, Leningrad, 1980

---

⁹⁶ "A true creation of wealth in the commercial sense of the word".—*Ed.*
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[DECLARATION BY KARL MARX ON HIS NATURALISATION IN ENGLAND] 610

I, Carl Marx

of No. 1 Maitland Park Road Haverstock Hill in the County of Middlesex, Doctor of Philosophy, do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

That the statements contained in the paper writing now produced and shown to me marked with the letter "A" purporting to be a Memorial addressed by myself to The Right Honourable Richard Assheton Cross, Esq., M.P., Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, praying for the Grant of a Certificate of Naturalisation under the provisions of the Act of Parliament made and passed in the 33rd year of the Reign of Her present Majesty Queen Victoria, Cap. 14 intituled "An Act to amend the Laws relating to the Legal Condition of Aliens and British Subjects", are true as therein set forth.

And I make this solemn Declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of an Act made and passed in the 6th year of the Reign of His late Majesty King William IV intituled "An Act to repeal an Act of the present Session of Parliament intituled 'An Act for the more effectual Abolition of Oaths and Affirmations taken and made in various Departments of the State, and to substitute Declarations in law thereof and for the more entire suppression of voluntary and contra-judicial Oaths and Affidavits and to make other provisions for the abolition of unnecessary Oaths'".

Declared at Number 82 Saint Martin's Lane in the County of Middlesex this first day of August One thousand eight hundred and seventy four

Before me
Christ. R. Cuff,
A London Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery.

[signed]
Karl Marx
METROPOLITAN POLICE OFFICE

Scotland Yard

Detective Officer's
Special Report

17th August 1874

Carl Marx.—Naturalisation.

With reference to the above I beg to report that he is the notorious German agitator, the head of the International Society, and an advocate of Communistic principles. This man has not been loyal to his own King and Country.

The referees Messrs Seton, Mathesen, Manning, and Adcock are all British born subjects, and respectable householders. The statements made by them with reference to the time they have known the applicant are correct.

W. Reimers—Sergeant
J. Williams—Sergeant

First published in: K. Marx and F. Engels, 
Works, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 45, 
Moscow, 1975

Reproduced from a photocopy of the originals

Published in English for the first time
Comrade Carl Marx then spoke about the work of the Society since its inception. The Society had been founded in 1840 by Carl Schapper in collaboration with 6 other like-minded persons. There existed an organisation within the Society, “The League of the Just”, which had its seat in various countries and opposed the oppression of the people. Four or five nationalities had been involved in the foundation of this Society. In 1845 a congress had been convened in London at which the Communist Manifesto had been worked out and whose motto was: “Proletarians of All Countries, Unite!” Marx then gave a most interesting account of the associations in those days, stating that the number of members had reached a level of 400-500. In March 1848 the Society was closed down by the British government, which was otherwise not so swift to resort to police measures. The Chartist movement, which had received a great deal of support from the Society, may have been the cause of the closure. The organisation called “The League of the Just” was dissolved in 1849, whereupon many members moved to America. In the fifties the Society worked more by itself, though it had always remained a refuge for the persecuted and oppressed. Marx then went on to discuss the present movement, stressing that the Society had contributed to its rise and he hoped that it would continue to do so.

Comrade Frederick Engels then recalled a faithful champion of truth and justice, Wilhelm Weitling. He was in fact the first person to try to spread the Communist idea in Germany. He was extradited by Switzerland to the Prussian government, which kept him in prison for a considerable time without any grounds. Weitling had died in America. His book Garantien der Harmonie
Appendice

und Freiheit had appeared at the advice of his friends. The speaker further recalled Comrade Moll, who had been one of the first members and had been killed in Southern Germany in the battle for freedom. The speaker then came to the movement in Germany, saying that in his view it had achieved a strength unmatched in any country hitherto. The speaker was of the opinion that the socialist movement was bound to go forward, since agitators such as Bismarck, Eulenburg and Tessendorf were active on its behalf.

Comrade Wroblewski, speaking in French, said: As long as there are Poles alive, the great movement of workers will have defenders in them; they will show by word and deed that their place is wherever the cause of the proletariat is being fought for. Speaker pays tribute to the workers' movement in all countries.

Comrade Engels translates Wroblewski's speech into German and then provides information on his activities. Wroblewski was a general and in 1863, during the Polish revolution, managed to keep 2 Russian armies in check with a small band; he was sentenced to death by the Russian government and succeeded at some risk in escaping to France, where he earned his daily bread as a worker. When the Paris Commune rose up, he took part in its battles and defended the southern part of Paris; also condemned to death by the Versailles people, he was fortunate enough to escape; he was still suffering greatly from the wounds he had incurred.

First published in Der Volksstaat, No. 24, February 27, 1876
Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time
I herewith notify my friends in Germany that in the course of last night death deprived me of my wife Lydia, née Burns.

London, September 12, 1878

*Frederick Engels*

First published in *Vorwärts*, No. 110, September 18, 1878

Printed according to the newspaper

Published in English for the first time
[ACCOUNT OF KARL MARX'S INTERVIEW WITH THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE CORRESPONDENT]

KARL MARX

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE OF THE TRIBUNE

_London_, Dec. 18.—In a little villa at Haverstock Hill, in the northwest portion of London, lives Karl Marx, the corner-stone of modern Socialism. He was exiled from his native country—Germany—in 1844, for propagating revolutionary theories. In 1848 he returned, but in a few months was again exiled. He then took up his abode in Paris, but his political theories procured his expulsion from that city in 1849, and since that year his headquarters have been in London. His convictions have caused him trouble from the beginning. Judging from the appearance of his home, they certainly have not brought him affluence. Persistently during all these years he has advocated his views with an earnestness which undoubtedly springs from a firm belief in them, and, however, much we may deprecate their propagation, we cannot but respect to a certain extent the self-denial of the now venerable exile.

OUR CORRESPONDENT HAS CALLED UPON HIM

twice or thrice, and each time the Doctor was found in his library, with a book in one hand and a cigarette in the other. He must be over 70 years of age. His physique is well-knit, massive, and erect. He has the head of a man of intellect, and the features of a cultivated Jew. His hair and beard are long, and iron-gray in color. His eyes are glittering black, shaded by a pair of bushy eyebrows. To a stranger he shows extreme caution. A foreigner can generally gain admission; but the ancient-looking German woman who waits upon visitors has instructions to admit none

[a Helene Demuth.—Ed]
who hail from the Fatherland, unless they bring letters of introduction. Once into his library, however, and, having fixed his one eye-glass in the corner of his eye, in order to take your intellectual breadth and depth, so to speak, he loses that self-restraint, and unfolds to you a knowledge of men and things throughout the world apt to interest one. And his conversation does not run in one groove, but is as varied as are the volumes upon his library shelves. A man can generally be judged by the books he reads, and you can form your own conclusions when I tell you a casual glance revealed Shakespeare, Dickens, Thackeray, Molière, Racine, Montaigne, Bacon, Goethe, Voltaire, Paine; English, American, French blue-books; works political and philosophical in Russian, German, Spanish, Italian, etc., etc. During my conversations I was struck with

**HIS INTIMACY WITH AMERICAN QUESTIONS**

which have been uppermost during the past twenty years. His knowledge of them, and the surprising accuracy with which he criticised our National and State legislation, impressed upon my mind the fact that he must have derived his information from inside sources. But, indeed, this knowledge is not confined to America, but is spread over the face of Europe. When speaking of his hobby,—Socialism,—he does not indulge in those melodramatic flights generally attributed to him, but dwells upon his utopian plans for “the emancipation of the human race” with a gravity and an earnestness indicating a firm conviction in the realization of his theories, if not in this century, at least in the next.

Perhaps Dr. Karl Marx is better known in America as the author of “Capital”, and the founder of the International Society, or at least its most prominent pillar. In the interview which follows, you will see what he says of this Society as it at present exists. However, in the meantime, I will give you a few extracts from the printed general rules of

**THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY.**

published in 1871, by order of the General Council, from which you can form an impartial judgment of its aims and ends. The preamble sets forth* “That the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves; that

---

* Further come quotations from the *General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association* which appeared in London in December 1871 (see present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 3-20).—Ed.
the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties, and the abolition of all class rule; that the economical subjection of the man of labor to the monopolizer of the means of labor—that is, the sources of life—lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation, and political dependence; that all efforts aiming at the universal emancipation of the working classes have hitherto failed from want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labor in each country”, and the preamble calls for “the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements”. It goes on to say that the International Association acknowledge “no rights without duties, no duties without rights”,—thus making every member a worker. The Association was formed at London “to afford a central medium of communication and co-operation between the Workingmen’s Societies in the different countries, aiming at the same end, namely: the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation of the working classes”. “Each member,” the document further says, “of the International Association, on removing his domicile from one country to another, will receive the fraternal support of the associated workingmen.”

THE SOCIETY CONSISTS

of a General Congress, which meets annually; a General Council, which forms “an international agency between the different national and local groups of the Association, so that the workingmen in one country can be constantly informed of the movements of their class in every other country”. This Council receives and acts upon applications of new Branches or Sections to join the International, decides differences arising between the Sections, and, in fact, to use an American phrase, “runs the machine”. The expenses of the General Council are defrayed by an annual contribution of an English penny per member. Then come the Federal Councils or Committees, and local Sections, in the various countries. The Federal Councils are bound to send one report at least every month to the General Council, and every three months a report on the administration and financial state of their respective branches. Whenever attacks against the Internationals are published, the nearest Branch or Committee is bound to send at once a copy of such publication to the General Council. The formation of Female Branches among the working classes is recommended.
comprises the following: R. Applegarth, M. J. Boon, Frederick Bradnick, G. H. Butterly, V. Delahaye, Eugène Dupont (on mission), William Hales, G. Harris, Hurliman, Jules Johannard, Harriet Law, Frederick Lessner, Lochner, Charles Longuet, C. Martin, Zévy Maurice, Henry Mayo, George Milner, Charles Murray, Pfander, John Roach, Rühl, Sadler, Cowell Stepney, Alfred Taylor, W. Townshend, E. Vaillant, John Weston. The Corresponding Secretaries for the various countries are: Leo Frankel, for Austria and Hungary; A. Herman, Belgium; T. Mottershead, Denmark; A. Serrailier, France; Karl Marx, Germany and Russia; Charles Rochat, Holland; J. P. McDonnell, Ireland; Frederick Engels, Italy and Spain; Walery Wroblewski, Poland; Hermann Jung, Switzerland; J. G. Eccarius, United States; Le Moussu, for French branches of United States.

During my visit to Dr. Marx I alluded to the platform given by J. C. Bancroft Davis in his official report of 1877, as the clearest and most concise exposition of Socialism that I had seen. He said it was taken from the report of the Socialist reunion at Gotha, Germany, in May, 1875. The translation was incorrect, he said, and he

\[ \text{VOLUNTEERED A CORRECTION.} \]

which I append as he dictated:

First—Universal, direct, and secret suffrage for all males over 20 years, for all elections, Municipal and State.

Second—Direct legislation by the people. War and peace to be made by direct popular vote.

Third—Universal obligation to militia duty. No standing army.

Fourth—Abolition of all special legislation regarding press-laws and public meetings.

Fifth—Legal remedies free of expense. Legal proceedings to be conducted by the people.

Sixth—Education to be by the State,—general, obligatory, and free. Freedom of science and religion.

Seventh—All indirect taxes to be abolished. Money to be raised for State and Municipal purposes by a direct progressive income tax.

Eighth—Freedom of combination among the working classes.

Ninth—The legal day of labor for men to be defined. The work of women to be limited, and that of children to be abolished.
Tenth—Sanitary laws for the protection of life and health of laborers, and regulation of their dwellings and places of labor, to be enforced by persons selected by them.

Eleventh—Suitable provision respecting prison-labor.

In Mr. Bancroft Davis’ report there is

A TWELFTH CLAUSE,

the most important of all, which reads: "State aid and credit for industrial societies, under democratic direction." I asked the Doctor why he omitted this, and he replied:

"When the reunion took place at Gotha, in 1875, there existed a division among the Social Democrats. The one wing were partisans of Lassalle; the others, those who had accepted in general the programme of the International organization, and were called the Eisenach party. That twelfth point was not placed on the platform, but placed in the general introduction by way of concession to the Lassallians. Afterwards it was never spoken of. Mr. Davis does not say that it was placed in the programme as a compromise having no particular significance, but gravely puts it in as one of the cardinal principles of the programme."

"But," I said, "Socialists generally look upon the transformation of the means of labor into the common property of society as the grand climax of the movement."

"Yes; we say that this will be the outcome of the movement, but it will be a question of time, of education, and the institution of a higher social status."

"This platform," I remarked, "applies only to Germany and one or two other countries."

"Ah!" he returned, "if you draw your conclusions from nothing but this, you know nothing of the activity of the party. Many of its points have no significance outside of Germany. Spain, Russia, England, and America have platforms suited to their peculiar difficulties. The only similarity in them is the end to be attained."

"And that is the supremacy of labor?"

"That is the

EMANCIPATION OF LABOR."

"Do European Socialists look upon the movement in America as a serious one?"

"Yes; it is the natural outcome of the country’s development. It has been said that the movement has been imported by foreigners."
When labor movements became disagreeable in England, fifty years ago, the same thing was said; and that was long before Socialism was spoken of. In America, only since 1857 has the labor movement become conspicuous. Then Trades Unions began to flourish; then Trades-Assemblies were formed, in which the workers in different industries united; and after that came National Labor Unions. If you consider this chronological progress, you will see that Socialism has sprung up in that country without the aid of foreigners, and was merely caused by the concentration of capital and the changed relations between the workmen and their employers."

"Now," asked our correspondent, "what has Socialism done so far?"

"Two things," he returned. "Socialists have shown the general universal struggle between capital and labor,—

THE COSMOPOLITAN CHARACTER,

in one word,—and consequently tried to bring about an understanding between the workmen in the different countries, which became more necessary as the capitalists became more cosmopolitan in hiring labor, pitting foreign against native labor not only in America, but in England, France, and Germany. International relations sprang up at once between the workingmen in the different countries, showing that Socialism was not merely a local, but an international problem, to be solved by the international action of workmen. The working classes moved spontaneously, without knowing what the ends of the movement will be. The Socialists invent no movement, but merely tell the workmen what its character and its ends will be."

"Which means the overthrowing of the present social system," I interrupted.

"This system of land and capital in the hands of employers, on the one hand," he continued, "and the mere working power in the hands of the laborers to sell as a commodity, we claim is merely an historical phase, which will pass away and give place to

A HIGHER SOCIAL CONDITION.

We see everywhere a division of society. The antagonism of the two classes goes hand in hand with the development of the industrial resources of modern countries. From a Socialistic standpoint the means already exist to revolutionize the present
historical phase. Upon Trades-Unions, in many countries, have been built political organizations. In America the need of an independent Workingmen's party has been made manifest. They can no longer trust politicians. Rings and cliques have seized upon the Legislature, and politics has been made a trade. But America is not alone in this, only its people are more decisive than Europeans. Things come to the surface quicker. There is less cant and hypocrisy than there is on this side of the ocean."

I asked him to give me a reason for the rapid growth of the Socialistic party in Germany, when he replied: "The present Socialistic party came last. Theirs was not the Utopian scheme which made some headway in France and England. The German mind is given to theorizing, more than that of other peoples. From previous experience the Germans evolved something practical. This modern capitalistic system, you must recollect, is quite new in Germany in comparison to other States. Questions were raised which had become almost antiquated in France and England, and political influences to which these States had yielded sprang into life when the working classes of Germany had become imbued with Socialistic theories. Therefore, from the beginning almost of modern industrial development, they have formed an

INDEPENDENT POLITICAL PARTY.

They had their own representatives in the German Parliament. There was no party to oppose the policy of the Government, and this devolved upon them. To trace the course of the party would take a long time; but I may say this: that, if the middle classes of Germany were not the greatest cowards, distinct from the middle classes of America and England, all the political work against the Government should have been done by them."

I asked him a question regarding the numerical strength of the Lassallians in the ranks of the Internationalists.

"The party of Lassalle," he replied, "does not exist. Of course there are some believers in our ranks, but the number is small. Lassalle anticipated our general principles. When he commenced to move after the reaction of 1848, he fancied that he could more successfully revive the movement by advocating co-operation of the workingmen in industrial enterprises. It was to stir them into activity. He looked upon this merely as a means to the real end of the movement. I have letters from him to this effect."

"You would call it his nostrum?"

"Exactly. He called upon Bismarck, told him what he de-
signed, and Bismarck encouraged Lassalle’s course at that time in every possible way.”

“What was his object?”

“He wished to use the working classes as a set-off against the middle classes who instigated the troubles of 1848.”

“It is said that you are the head and front of Socialism, Doctor, and from your villa here pull the wires of all the associations, revolutions, etc., now going on. What do you say about it?”

The old gentleman smiled: “I know it.

**IT IS VERY ABSURD:**

yet it has a comic side. For two months previous to the attempt of Hoedel, Bismarck complained in his North German Gazette that I was in league with Father Beckx, the leader of the Jesuit movement, and that we were keeping the Socialist movement in such a condition that he could do nothing with it.”

“But your International Society in London directs the movement?”

“The International Society has outlived its usefulness and exists no longer. It did exist and direct the movement; but the growth of Socialism of late years has been so great that its existence has become unnecessary. Newspapers have been started in the various countries. These are interchanged. That is about the only connection the parties in the different countries have with one another. The International Society, in the first instance, was created to bring the workmen together, and show the advisability of effecting organization among their various nationalities. The interests of each party in the different countries have no similarity. This spectre of the Internationalist leaders sitting at London is a mere invention. It is true that we dictated to foreign societies when the Internationalist organization was first accomplished. We were forced to exclude some Sections in New York, among them one in which Madam Woodhull was conspicuous. That was in 1871. There are several American politicians—I will not name them—who wish to trade in the movement. They are well known to American Socialists.”

---

a See the Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, Nos. 229, 234, 251 and 259, September 30, October 5 and 24, November 2, 1877 (“Politischer Tagesbericht”).—Ed.

"You and your followers, Dr. Marx, have been credited with all sorts of incendiary speeches against religion. Of course you would like to see the whole system destroyed, root and branch."

"We know," he replied after a moment's hesitation, "that violent measures against religion are nonsense; but this is an opinion: as Socialism grows,

RELIGION WILL DISAPPEAR.

Its disappearance must be done by social development, in which education must play a great part."

"The Rev. Joseph Cook, of Boston,—you know him—"

"We heard of him; a very badly informed man upon the subject of Socialism."

"In a lecture lately upon the subject, he said: 'Karl Marx is credited now with saying that, in the United States, and in Great Britain, and perhaps in France, a reform of labor will occur without bloody revolution, but that blood must be shed in Germany, and in Russia, and in Italy, and in Austria.'"" a

"No Socialist," remarked the Doctor, smiling, "need predict that there will be a bloody revolution in Russia, Germany, Austria, and possibly in Italy if the Italians keep on in the policy they are now pursuing. The deeds of the French Revolution may be enacted again in those countries. That is apparent to any political student. But those revolutions will be made by the majority. No revolution can be made by a party,

BUT BY A NATION."

"The reverend gentleman alluded to," I remarked, "gave an extract from a letter which he said you addressed to the Communists of Paris in 1871. Here it is: 'We are as yet but 3,000,000 at most. In twenty years we shall be 50,000,000-100,000,000 perhaps. Then the world will belong to us, for it will be not only Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, which will rise against odious capital, but Berlin, Munich, Dresden, London, Liverpool, Manchester, Brussels, St. Petersburg, New York,—in short, the whole world. And before this new insurrection, such as history has not yet known, the past will disappear like a hideous nightmare; for the popular conflagration, kindled at a hundred

---

points at once, will destroy even its memory."'"a Now, Doctor, I suppose you admit the authorship of that extract?"
"I never wrote a word of it. I never write

SUCH MELODRAMATIC NONSENSE.

I am very careful what I do write. That was put in Le Figaro, over my signature, about that time. There were hundreds of the same kind of letters flying about then. I wrote to the London Times and declared they were forgeries; but, if I denied everything that has been said and written of me, I would require a score of secretaries."

"But you have written in sympathy with the Paris Communists?"
"Certainly I have, in consideration of what was written of them in leading articles; but the correspondence from Paris in English papers is quite sufficient to refute the blunders propagated in editorials. The Commune killed only about sixty people; Marshal MacMahon and his slaughtering army killed over 60,000. There has never been a movement so slandered as that of the Commune."

"Well, then, to carry out the principles of Socialism do its believers advocate assassination and bloodshed?"
"No great movement," Karl Marx answered, "has ever been inaugurated

WITHOUT BLOODSHED.

The independence of America was won by bloodshed, Napoleon captured France through a bloody process, and he was overthrown by the same means. Italy, England, Germany, and every other country gives proof of this, and as for assassination," he went on to say, "it is not a new thing, I need scarcely say. Orsini tried to kill Napoleon; Kings have killed more than anybody else; the Jesuits have killed; the Puritans killed at the time of Cromwell. These deeds were all done or attempted before Socialism was known. Every attempt, however, now made upon a Royal or State individual is attributed to Socialism. The Socialists would regret very much the death of the German Emperor' at the present time.

---

"Ibid.—Ed."

"b See K. Marx and F. Engels, "To the Editor of The Times"; K. Marx, "To the Editorial Boards of the Volkstaat and the Zukunft" and "To the Editor of De Werker" (see present edition, Vol. 22, pp. 285, 288-90 and 291).—Ed.

"c William I.—Ed."
He is very useful where he is; and Bismarck has done more for the cause than any other statesman, by driving things to extremes."

I asked Dr. Marx

WHAT HE THOUGHT OF BISMARCK.

He replied that "Napoleon was considered a genius until he fell; then he was called a fool. Bismarck will follow in his wake. He began by building up a despotism under the plea of unification. His course has been plain to all. The last move is but an attempted imitation of a coup d'etat; but it will fail. The Socialists of Germany, as of France, protested against the war of 1870 as merely dynastic. They issued manifestoes foretelling the German people that, if they allowed the pretended war of defense to be turned into a war of conquest, they would be punished by the establishment of military despotism and the ruthless oppression of the productive masses. The Social Democratic party in Germany, thereupon holding meetings and publishing manifestoes for an honorable peace with France, were at once prosecuted by the Prussian Government, and many of the leaders imprisoned. Still their Deputies alone dared to protest, and very vigorously too, in the German Reichstag, against the forcible annexation of French provinces. However, Bismarck carried his policy by force, and people spoke of the genius of a Bismarck. The war was fought, and, when he could make no more conquests, he was called upon for original ideas, and he has signaly failed. The people began to lose faith in him. His popularity was on the wane. He needs money, and the State needs it. Under a sham Constitution he has taxed the people for his military and unification plans until he can tax them no longer, and now he seeks to do it with no Constitution at all. For the purpose of levying as he chooses, he has raised the ghost of Socialism, and has done everything in his power

TO CREATE AN EMEUTE."

"You have continual advices from Berlin?"

"Yes," he said, "my friends keep me well advised. It is in a perfectly quiet state, and Bismarck is disappointed. He has expelled forty-eight prominent men,—among them Deputies Hasselmann and Fritzche, and Rackow, Baumann, and Auer, of the Freie Presse. These men kept the workmen of Berlin quiet. Bismarck
knew this. He also knew that there were 75,000 workmen in that city upon the verge of starvation. Once those leaders were gone, he was confident that the mob would rise, and that would be the cue for a carnival of slaughter. The screws would then be put upon the whole German Empire; his pet theory of blood and iron would then have full sway, and taxation could be levied to any extent. So far no emeute has occurred, and he stands to-day confounded at the situation and the ridicule of all statesmen."

First published in *The Chicago Tribune*, Reproduced from the newspaper No. 6, January 5, 1879

Signed: *H.*

---

*x* An allusion to Bismarck's speech at the 94th session of the Budget Commission of the Prussian Chamber of Deputies on September 30, 1862. *Berliner Allgemeine Zeitung*, No. 458, October 2, 1862 (morning issue).—*Ed.*
February 1, 1879

Madam,

Your Imperial Highness, when I last had the honour of seeing you, chanced to express some curiosity about Carl Marx and to ask me if I knew him. I resolved accordingly to take the first opportunity of making his acquaintance; but that opportunity did not arise till yesterday when I met him at luncheon and spent three hours in his company.

He is a short, rather small man with grey hair and beard which contrast strangely with a still dark moustache. The face is somewhat round, the forehead well shaped and filled up—the eye rather hard but the whole expression rather pleasant than not, by no means that of a gentleman who is in the habit of eating babies in their cradles—which is I daresay the view which the Police takes of him.

His talk was that of a well-informed nay learned man—much interested in Comparative Grammar which had led him into the Old Slavonic and other out of the way studies and was varied by many quaint turns and little bits of dry humour, as when speaking of Hesekiel's life of Prince Bismarck he always referred to it, by way of contrast to Dr. Busch's book, as the Old Testament.\(^a\)

It was all very positif slightly cynical—without any appearance of enthusiasm—interesting and often, as I thought, showing very correct ideas when he was conversing of the past or the present; but vague and unsatisfactory when he turned to the future.

---

\(^a\) Victoria Adelaide Mary Louisa.—Ed.

\(^b\) See G. Hesekiel, Das Buch vom Grafen Bismarck, Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1869; M. Busch, Graf Bismarck und seine Leute während des Kriegs mit Frankreich, Vols. 1-2, Leipzig, 1878.—Ed.
He looks, not unreasonably, for a great and not distant crash in Russia; thinks it will begin by reforms from above which the old bad edifice will not be able to bear and which will lead to its tumbling down altogether. As to what would take its place he had evidently no clear idea, except that for a long time Russia would be unable to exercise any influence in Europe.

Next he thinks that the movement will spread to Germany taking there the form of a revolt against the existing military system.

To my question “But how can you expect the army to rise against its commanders?” he replied—you forget that in Germany now the army and the Nation are nearly identical. These Socialists you hear about are trained soldiers like anybody else. You must not think of the standing army only. You must think of the Landwehr—and even in the standing army there is much discontent. Never was an army in which the severity of the discipline led to so many suicides. The step from shooting oneself to shooting one’s officer is not long and an example of the kind once set is soon followed.

But supposing I said the rulers of Europe came to an understanding amongst themselves for a reduction of armaments which might greatly relieve the burden on the people what would become of the Revolution which you expect it one day to bring about?

Ah was his answer they can’t do that. All sorts of fears and jealousies will make that impossible. The burden will grow worse and worse as science advances for the improvements in the Art of Destruction will keep pace with its advance and every year more and more will have to be devoted to costly engines of war. It is a vicious circle—there is no escape from it. But I said you have never yet had a serious popular rising unless there was really great misery. You have no idea he rejoined how terrible has been the crisis through which Germany has been passing in these last five years.

Well I said supposing that your Revolution has taken place and that you have your Republican form of Government—it is still a long long way to the realization of the special ideas of yourself and your friends. Doubtless he answered but all great movements are slow. It would merely be a step to better things as your Revolution of 1688 was—a mere stage on the road.

The above will give Your Imperial Highness a fair idea of the kind of ideas about the near future of Europe which are working in his mind.
They are too dreamy to be dangerous except just in so far as the situation with its mad expenditure on armaments is obviously and undoubtedly dangerous.

If however within the next decade the rulers of Europe have not found means of dealing with this evil without any warning from attempted revolution I for one shall despair of the future of humanity at least on this continent.

In the course of conversation Carl Marx spoke several times both of Your Imperial Highness and of the Crown Prince and invariably with due respect and propriety. Even in the case of eminent individuals of whom he by no means spoke with respect there was no trace of bitterness or savagery—plenty acrid and dissolvent criticism but nothing of the Marat tone.

Of the horrible things that have been connected with the International he spoke as any respectable man would have done.

One thing which he mentioned showed the dangers to which exiles who have got a revolutionary name are exposed. The wretched man Nobiling, he had learned, had when in England intended to come to see him. If he had done so he said I should certainly have admitted him for he would have sent in his card as an employé of the Dresden Bureau of Statistics and as I occupy myself with Statistics it would have interested me to talk with him—What a pleasant position I should have been in he added if he had come to see me!!

Altogether my impression of Marx, allowing for his being at the opposite pole of opinion from oneself, was not at all unfavourable and I would gladly meet him again. It will not be he who whether he wishes it or not will turn the world upside down.

First published in A. Rothstein's article "A Meeting with Karl Marx", The Times, Literary Supplement, July 15, 1949
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KARL. MARX

One of the most remarkable men of the day, who has played an
inscrutable but puissant part in the revolutionary politics of the
past forty years, is Karl Marx. A man without desire for show or
fame, caring nothing for the fanfaronade of life or the pretence of
power, without haste and without rest, a man of strong, broad,
elevated mind, full of far-reaching projects, logical methods, and
practical aims, he has stood and yet stands behind more of the
earthquakes which have convulsed nations and destroyed thrones,
and do now menace and appal crowned heads and established
frauds, than any other man in Europe, not excepting Joseph
Mazzini himself. The student of Berlin, the critic of Hegelianism,
the editor of papers, and the old-time correspondent of the New
York Tribune, he showed his qualities and his spirit; the founder
and master spirit of the once dreaded International and the
author of "Capital", he has been expelled from half the countries
of Europe, proscribed in nearly all of them, and for thirty years
past has found refuge in London. He was at Ramsgate,687 the
great seashore resort of the Londoners, while I was in London,
and there I found him in his cottage, with his family of two
generations. The saintly-faced, sweet-voiced, graceful woman of
suavity who welcomed me at the door was evidently the mistress of
the house and the wife of Karl Marx. And is this massive-headed,
generous-featured, courtly, kindly man of 60, with the bushy
masses of long revelling gray hair, Karl Marx? His dialogue
reminded me of that of Socrates—so free, so sweeping, so
creative, so incisive, so genuine—with its sardonic touches, its
gleams of humor, and its sportive merriment. He spoke of the
political forces and popular movements of the various countries of
Europe—the vast current of the spirit of Russia, the motions of the German mind, the action of France, the immobility of England. He spoke hopefully of Russia, philosophically of Germany, cheerfully of France, and sombrely of England—referring contemptuously to the "atomistic reforms" over which the Liberals of the British Parliament spend their time. Surveying the European world, country after country, indicating the features and the developments and the personages on the surface and under the surface, he showed that things were working toward ends which will assuredly be realized. I was often surprised as he spoke. It was evident that this man, of whom so little is seen or heard, is deep in the times, and that, from the Neva to the Seine, from the Urals to the Pyrenees, his hand is at work preparing the way for the new advent. Nor is his work wasted now any more than it has been in the past, during which so many desirable changes have been brought about, so many heroic struggles have been seen, and the French republic has been set up on the heights. As he spoke, the question I had put, "Why are you doing nothing now?" was seen to be a question of the unlearned, and one to which he could not make direct answer. Inquiring why his great work "Capital", the seed field of so many crops, had not been put into English as it has been put into Russian and French,\(^6\) from the original German, he seemed unable to tell, but said that a proposition for an English translation had come to him from New York.\(^63\) He said that that book was but a fragment, a single part of a work in three parts, two of the parts being yet unpublished, the full trilogy being "Land", "Capital", "Credit",\(^63\) the last part, he said, being largely illustrated from the United States, where credit has had such an amazing development. Mr. Marx is an observer of American action, and his remarks upon some of the formative and substantive forces of American life were full of suggestiveness. By the way, in referring to his "Capital", he said that any one who might desire to read it would find the French translation much superior in many ways to the German original.\(^66\) Mr. Marx referred to Henri Rochefort the Frenchman, and in his talk of some of his dead disciples, the stormy Bakunin, the brilliant Lassalle, and others, I could see how his genius had taken hold of men who, under other circumstances, might have directed the course of history.

---

The afternoon is waning toward the twilight of an English summer evening as Mr. Marx discourses, and he proposes a walk through the seaside town and along the shore to the beach, upon which we see many thousand people, largely children, disporting themselves. Here we find on the sands his family party—the wife, who had already welcomed me, his two daughters with their children, and his two sons-in-law, one of whom is a Professor in King's College, London, and the other, I believe, a man of letters. It was a delightful party—about ten in all—the father of the two young wives, who were happy with their children, and the grandmother of the children, rich in the joyousness and serenity of her wifely nature. Not less finely than Victor Hugo himself does Karl Marx understand the art of being a grandfather; but, more fortunate than Hugo, the married children of Marx live to cheer his years. Toward nightfall he and his sons-in-law part from their families to pass an hour with their American guest. And the talk was of the world, and of man, and of time, and of ideas, as our glasses tinkled over the sea. The railway train waits for no man, and night is at hand. Over the thought of the babblement and rack of the age and the ages, over the talk of the day and the scenes of the evening, arose in my mind one question touching upon the final law of being, for which I would seek answer from this sage. Going down to the depth of language, and rising to the height of emphasis, during an interspace of silence, I interrogated the revolutionist and philosopher in these fateful words, "What is?" And it seemed as though his mind were inverted for a moment while he looked upon the roaring sea in front and the restless multitude upon the beach. "What is?" I had inquired, to which, in deep and solemn tone, he replied: "Struggle!"

At first it seemed as though I had heard the echo of despair; but, peradventure, it was the law of life.

First published in *The Sun*, No. 6. Reproduced from the newspaper September 6, 1880

---

a Jenny and Charles Longuet with their children—Jean, Henri and Edgar—and Laura and Paul Lafargue.—Ed.
b Paul Lafargue.—Ed.
c Charles Longuet.—Ed.
The editorial board of *L'Égalité* had concluded an agreement with a printer for two years, under which the latter bore the expenses and shared the profits equally with the editorial board. A sale of 6,000 copies would cover the expenses. The first issue sold 3,800 copies straightaway. But by the third issue the printer already declared that he no longer wished to pay out money in order to disseminate ideas which he did not share; henceforth he would pay only for the setting and the paper, the editorial board would have to provide the rest. Reference to the contract did not help. Accept or the paper closes (c'est à prendre ou à laisser). In return, he finally allowed the editorial board to receive the income from advertisements and sales outside Paris. Four days later the printer declared that this also had to stop; the editorial board would have to take over the newspaper on its own account. Since the board lacked the resources to do this, the newspaper was thus doomed. The editorial board will sue the man for breach of contract, but the newspaper remains dead and buried. The whole secret is that the man is being given a large *Orleanist* paper to print and has evidently been told that he must first show the damned socialists the door; after all, they had committed the crime of advocating the confiscation of the Orleans fortune.

---

Sent by Engels to Zurich on March 1, 1883
First published in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, No. 11, March 8, 1883
Printed according to the newspaper
Published in English for the first time

---

a Gabriel Deville, Jules Guesde, Paul Lafargue, Emile Massard.—*Ed.*
b A. Le Tailleur.—*Ed.*
NOTES
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NOTES

1 Engels worked on the Refugee Literature series, with interruptions, from mid-May 1874 to April 1875. The articles were published as they were completed in the German Social-Democrats' newspaper, Der Volksstaat.

In 1875, Article V appeared as a separate pamphlet under the title Soziales aus Rußland (see Note 52).

Articles I, II and V were included by Engels in a collection of his works, Internationales aus dem "Volksstaat" (1871-75), Berlin, 1894.

Individual articles were published in English, in full or abridged, in a number of collections.

p. 5

2 This article from the Refugee Literature series was written by Engels in mid-May-early June 1874 and printed in Der Volksstaat, No. 69, June 17, 1874 under his signature. The subtitle, "A Polish Proclamation", was added by Engels when the article was reprinted in 1894 (see Note 1).

The article was prompted by the address of the society called "The Polish People" (see Note 4) to the English people on the occasion of Alexander II's visit to England in May 1874. The stated purpose of the visit was the Emperor's wish to see his daughter Maria, the Duke of Edinburgh's wife, but actually it was undertaken to relax the tensions between Russia and England engendered by their clash of interests in Central Asia and Iran. Alexander II, who resided in Windsor Castle during his visit, came to London on May 15 and 18. On the measures taken by the London police see also Marx's letter to Ludwig Kugelmann of May 18, 1874 (present edition, Vol. 45).

This article was published in English for the first time in: K. Marx and F. Engels, The Russian Menace to Europe, London [1953], pp. 109-15, under the title "A Polish Proclamation".

p. 5

3 A reference to the assassination attempt on the Russian Emperor Alexander II made by Antoni Berezowski in Paris in 1867. Berezowski was sentenced to twenty years of hard labour.

p. 5

4 The Polish People (Związek Ludu Polskiego)—a revolutionary-democratic society set up in September 1872 on the initiative of Walery Wróblewski, Ludwik Oborski and Jan Kryński. The society included a number of Polish revolutionaries, members of the Paris Commune, and supported the line pursued by the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. It drew
on the best traditions of the society Lud Polski of the 1840s, and linked the
national and social emancipation of the Polish people with the international
working-class movement. Its newspaper was the Wici.

5 Engels is referring to the war between the Kingdom of Sardinia (Piedmont) and
France, on the one hand, and Austria, on the other, which lasted from April 29
to July 1859.

Before the war Russia and France signed a secret treaty in Paris (on
March 3, 1859) whereby Russia undertook to observe benevolent neutrality in
the case of a Franco-Italian war against Austria.

The Austro-Prussian war of 1866 for supremacy in Germany was a major
stage in the unification of Germany "from above" under Prussian hegemony,
while the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 between France, on the one hand,
and Prussia, Bavaria and Saxony, on the other, completed Germany's national
unification under the aegis of the Prussian monarchy.

6 Engels is referring to the invasions of the Huns in the 5th century, of the Avars
in the 6th century, and of the Mongols and Tartars in 1241, 1259 and 1287.

7 The reference is to the Polish-Turkish wars of the 17th century (1620-21,
1672-76 and 1683-99). On September 12, 1683, Polish troops led by Jan
Sobieski, in collaboration with the Austrian army and the armies of the German
principalities, smashed the Turkish army at Vienna. In 1699 the last war with
Turkey ended with the Karlowitz Peace Treaty and the Turks' pledge to cease
warring with Poland.

8 Engels gives this quotation according to the Address of the Polish Refugees to the
English People, p. 3, which differs from the corresponding passage in Pogodin's
book (see М. П. Погодин, Польский вопрос, Moscow, 1867, pp. 54-55).

9 On February 6 (17), 1772, on the initiative of Prussia, a convention was signed
in St. Petersburg, soon joined by Austria, defining preliminary terms for the
partition of Poland. The final version was signed on July 25 (August 5) of the
same year. This partition undermined the national independence of Poland,
which was in a state of deep social and political crisis (see Note 72). By the
fourth state, Engels probably meant Rzecz Pospolita, which was left with about
two-thirds of its territory (on the role of the Polish nobility in these events, see
this volume, p. 55).

10 The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791 (Ustawa Rezowa, Prawo Uchwalone)
conveyed the aspirations of the progressive sections of the nobility and the
urban bourgeoisie. It abolished the liberum veto and the elective monarchy (see
Note 72). To consolidate the central authority and put an end to anarchy, it
introduced hereditary monarchy and granted the urban bourgeoisie certain
political and economic rights. Having removed some of the drawbacks of the
state system of Rzecz Pospolita and crippled the political position of the big
feudal aristocracy, the Constitution left virtually intact the feudal mode of
production. The peasantry was still in bondage to the feudal aristocracy and the
szlachta. But the Constitution alleviated to some extent the position of peasant
serfs by recognising the legal force of commutation agreements between
landowners and peasants (see also Engels' article "The Frankfurt Assembly

11 A reference to the opposition of the Polish magnates to the introduction of
the Constitution of May 3, 1791. They summoned troops from Russia
which smashed the resistance of the Polish army and overthrew the government. Simultaneously, Prussia renounced its allied treaty with Poland under the pretext of its having been concluded prior to the Constitution of May 3. These events eventually led to a second partition of Poland between Russia and Prussia on January 12 (23), 1793. Soon after the second partition a resistance movement against the invaders gained strength in Poland, and in March 1794, an uprising headed by Tadeusz Kościuszko flared up. It led to the establishment of a provisional Polish government, on which Russia and Prussia declared war. The defeat of the uprising resulted in the third partition of Poland on the basis of the St. Petersburg Convention of October 13 (24), 1795, signed by Russia, Prussia and Austria. This partition put an end to Polish statehood.

p. 7

12 The Manifesto of December 4, 1830 was issued in Paris by the refugee organisation Towarzyswo Demokratyczne Polskie. As a whole it was of a bourgeois-democratic character.

The Manifesto, drawn up in late 1845 and published on February 22, 1846, was issued by the revolutionary government in Cracow.

The Manifesto of January 22, 1863 was a programme of action published by the provisional committee Rząd Narodowy (Komitet Centralny) on the day when the Polish uprising began (see Note 14). The Manifesto and the decrees published at the same time outlined the insurgents' programme and called on the Polish people to take up arms. They also demanded that the estates' privileges and distinctions be abolished, and land be turned over to the peasants.

p. 7

13 The free city of Cracow (the Cracow Republic) was set up in 1815 by decision of the Congress of Vienna (1814-15). The formation of the Cracow Republic was a compromise reached by the governments of Russia, Austria and Prussia which laid claims to Cracow. This independence was purely nominal since in practice the Republic's constitution, which was determined by the above states of "guardians" and consolidated the rule of the landowners and bigger merchants, was limited by the residents of these states. After the suppression of the anti-feudal uprising of 1846 the Cracow Republic was abolished (see Note 25).

p. 8

14 A reference to the national uprising of 1863-64 in the Kingdom of Poland, the territory annexed to Russia by decision of the Vienna Congress of 1815. The uprising, which was directed against the tsarist autocracy, was provoked by the crisis of feudal relations within the Kingdom of Poland. The uprising began in January 1863. Its principal motive forces were the urban masses: artisans, workers and students. From the summer of 1863 a substantial part of the insurgent detachments was made up of peasants. However, the National Central Committee, which headed the uprising (see Note 12) and consisted mostly of the representatives of the petty-bourgeoisie and lesser nobility, did not dare encroach on the privileges of big landowners, and this isolated the movement from the majority of peasants. This was one of the main reasons for the defeat of the uprising. The governments of West European states, on whose interference the conservative leaders of the uprising pinned their hopes, did not go beyond diplomatic démarches and in fact betrayed the insurgents.

The uprising was, by and large, crushed by the Tsarist government by the autumn of 1863, though some units of the insurgents continued the struggle until the end of 1864.

The Polish uprising of 1863-64 met with warm support and sympathy in
Russian and European revolutionary-democratic quarters. The solidarity of the European workers with the Polish national liberation movement played a certain part in organising the International Working Men’s Association (the First International). p. 8

The Peace of Teschen was signed on May 13, 1779 on the conclusion of the war between Prussia and Austria for the Bavarian succession (1778-79). Russia was initially a mediator between the belligerents and after the signing of the treaty was, together with France, declared the guarantor state. p. 9

On April 21, 1849, Francis Joseph of Austria appealed for help to Nicholas I, and in May 1849 the Russian army entered Hungary to take part in the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848-49. The capitulation of the Hungarian revolutionary army at Villagos on August 13, 1849 sealed the defeat of the revolution in the European countries. p. 9

The reference is to the uprising of the Paris proletariat (June 23-26, 1848), which was brutally suppressed by the French bourgeoisie. It was the climax of the 1848 revolution in France and had an impact on revolutionary events in other European countries. Marx and Engels appraised the uprising and its historic significance in a series of articles published in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, and in The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850 (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 130-49; Vol. 10, pp. 67-70). p. 9

In May and October 1850 Warsaw was the scene of conferences in which representatives of Russia, Austria and Prussia were involved. They were convened on the initiative of the Russian Tsar in view of the mounting struggle between Austria and Prussia for mastery in Germany. The Tsar acted as arbiter in the dispute between Austria and Prussia and used his influence to make Prussia abandon its attempts to form a political confederation of German states under its own ægis.

On November 28, 1850 in Olmütz (Olomouc), an agreement was signed between Prussia and Austria under which Prussia was forced to temporarily renounce its claims to hegemony in Germany (see also this volume, p. 103). p. 9

The Crimean war (1853-56), or the Eastern war, was waged by Russia against the allied forces of Britain, France, the Kingdom of Piedmont and Turkey for supremacy in the Near East. It ended with the signing of the Paris Peace Treaty (1856). The war is described by Marx and Engels in the articles included in volumes 13-15 of the present edition. p. 9

During the Austro-Italian-French war of 1859 (see Note 5), the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs Alexander Gorchakov issued a circular on May 27, 1859, which effectively prevented the intervention of the small German states in the conflict. p. 9

Engels is referring to the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 (see Note 5). p. 9

Probably a hint at the Declaration of Neutrality issued by the Russian government and carried by Pravitelstvenny vestnik (The Government Herald), No. 148, July 11 (23), 1870. For Austria-Hungary, the Russian stand was virtually a warning not to get involved into the war between France and Prussia. p. 9

Engels uses the term Haupts- und Staatsaktionen (principal and spectacular actions), which has several meanings. In the 17th and the first half of the 18th century it meant plays performed by German touring companies. The plays,
which were rather formless, presented tragic historical events in a bombastic and at the same time coarse and farcical way.

Secondly, the term can be used to denote major political events. It was used in this sense by a trend in German historical science known as "objective historiography". Leopold Ranke was one of its chief representatives. He regarded Haupt- und Staatsaktionen as the main subject-matter of history.

24 Engels is referring to the decisive battle of the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 (see Note 5), which took place on July 3, 1866, at Königgrätz (Hradec Králové), near the village of Sadowa. The battle of Sadowa ended in a crushing defeat for the Austrian troops and decided the outcome of the war. p. 9

25 The reference is to the national liberation and anti-feudal uprising in the city of Cracow (Galicia). The insurgents seized power on February 22, 1846 and set up a National Government which issued a manifesto abolishing feudal services. The uprising was put down in early March 1846. In November 1846 Austria, Prussia and Russia signed a treaty incorporating Cracow in the Austrian Empire.

On the uprising of 1868-69 see Note 14. p. 10

26 In the days of the Paris Commune about 400 Polish revolutionary refugees fought side by side with the Paris workers. The best-known among them were Wacław Wróblewski and Jarosław Dąbrowski. General Wróblewski commanded one of the three Commune's armies. In early May 1871 General Dąbrowski was appointed commander-in-chief of all the Commune's armed forces.

p. 10

27 Kulturkampf (struggle for culture)—the name given by bourgeois liberals to a system of measures implemented in the 1870s by Bismarck's government under the banner of a campaign for secular culture. It was directed against the Catholic Church and the Party of the Centre (see Note 299). Under the pretext of the anti-Catholic struggle Bismarck's government also intensified the national oppression of the Polish lands which had fallen under Prussia's sway. With this end in view it passed laws restricting the rights of the Catholic clergy. The law of March 1872 stripped the clergy of the right to supervise school education, thus undermining the influence of the Polish clergy in this field. Education was now controlled by the Empire's officials. Additionally, by the edicts of October 26, 1872 and October 27, 1873, all schools in Posen were to use German.

p. 10

28 Article II in Engels' Refugee Literature series was prompted by the pamphletAux Communeux (To Communards), which was published in London in June 1874 on behalf of a group of Paris Commune refugees. It was a kind of programme of the Blanquists, members of La Commune révolutionnaire (see Note 51).

Engels' article appeared in Der Volkstaat, No. 73, June 26, 1874, under the heading "Flüchtlings-Literatur". Engels changed it to "Programm der Blanquistischen Kommune-Flüchtlinge" when reprinting this article in 1894 in the collection Internationales aus dem Volkstaat (1871-75).

It was published in English for the first time in the collection: K. Marx, The Civil War in France, Enlarged edition. Chicago, Kerr, 1934, pp. 133-44, under the title "The Program of the Blanquist Fugitives from the Paris Commune".

p. 12

29 A reference to the emigration of royalists at the time of the French Revolution.

40-1317
It grew sharply after the uprising of August 10, 1792 in Paris and the overthrow of Louis XVI.

By the "secret Alliance" Engels calls here the Alliance of Socialist Democracy. Central Section which was founded by Bakunin in Geneva in May 1859, and in fact guided the activities of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy. It was dissolved in 1871 and in place of it the Section of Propaganda and Revolutionary Action was founded in Geneva on September 6, 1871. The Section of Propaganda was organised by the former members of the Central Section, Nikolai Zhukovsky, Charles Perron and others, and some French refugees, Jules Guesde and Benoit Malon in particular. On September 8, October 4 and 20, 1871, the section applied to the General Council with the request to be admitted to the International. The General Council refused to comply because it had received a negative opinion on the matter from the Romance Federal Committee in Geneva.

The Alliance of Socialist Democracy was founded by Bakunin in Geneva in October 1868 as an international organisation of the anarchists. In 1869 the Alliance approached the General Council of the International Working Men's Association with a request to be admitted to the International. The General Council agreed to admit individual sections of the Alliance provided the latter dissolved as an independent organisation. On entering the International Bakunin did not actually comply with this decision and incorporated the Alliance into it under the guise of a section (called the "Alliance of Socialist Democracy. Central Section"). Marx, Engels and the General Council vigorously fought the Alliance exposing it as a sect hostile to the working-class movement (for details see present edition, Vol. 23). The Hague Congress of the International (1872) dealt a severe blow to the Bakunists and expelled the Alliance's leaders from the International (see Note 38).

Late in 1872 the French Blanquist refugees withdrew from the International as a protest against the decision of the Hague Congress to transfer the seat of the General Council to New York. They set out their position in the pamphlet Internationale et Révolution. A propos du Congrès de la Haye par des Réfugiés de la Commune. Ex-membres du Conseil Général de l'Internationale, London, 1872. The Blanquists also accused the International of "escaping from revolution". In 1873 they set up the society called La Commune révolutionnaire.

Engels is referring to the uprising of May 12-13, 1839 in Paris prepared by the Society of the Seasons (La Société des Saisons), a secret republican socialist organisation that existed in Paris in 1837-39. It was founded by Auguste Blanqui and Armand Barbès for the purpose of overthrowing Louis Philippe's bourgeois monarchy, establishing a republic and implementing revolutionary egalitarian ideas. As a result of its conspiratorial tactics the society was suppressed when it attempted to stage the uprising.

A reference to the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, the siege of Paris and the suppression of the Communards between May 21 and 28, 1871.

The monarchists had an absolute majority in the French National Assembly which began its work in Versailles in 1871, but the supplementary elections of 1873 showed that the republicans' influence was increasing.

An allusion to the "de-Christianisation" policy pursued with particular vigour in the autumn of 1793 by the Left Jacobins. The campaign was spearheaded against the counter-revolutionary sections of the clergy. However, the mass of the population, particularly the peasantry, opposed the closing down of
churches. In late November, the Jacobin leader Maximilien Robespierre
condemned this policy, and on December 5–8, 1793, the Convention passed a
decree on the freedom of worship.

36 A reference to the former members of the International's General Council
Arthur Arnaud, Edouard Vaillant, Frédéric Cournet, Constant Martin,
Edouard Marguerittes and Gabrielle Ranvier (see Note 31). Speaking about
"those five", Engels probably excluded Ranvier from this group (see Engels'

37 Engels' third article in the Refugee Literature series was written in late
July-September 1874 in connection with the publication, in a journal entitled
Veoprod (Forward!), of Pyotr Lavrov's article "Aktyvism rabochego dvizheniya" (A
Chronicle of the Labour Movement), and his polemic with the Russian
revolutionary Pyotr Tkachov. Engels considers the following pamphlets:
П. Н. Ткачёв, Задачи революционной пропаганды в России. Письмо на
редактору журнала "Вперёд!" (The Tasks of Revolutionary Propaganda in
Russia. A Letter to the Editor of the Forward! Magazine), and [П. А. Лавров,]
Русской социально-революционной молодежи. По поводу брошюры: "Задачи
революционной пропаганды в России" (To the Russian Social-Revolutionary
Youth. Apropos of the Pamphlet: The Tasks of Revolutionary Propaganda in
Russia).

Engels' article was printed in Der Volksstaat, Nos. 117 and 118, October 6
and 8, 1874. Italicisation in the quotations is by Engels. He does not always
observe the authors' italics. This article is published in English for the first
time.

38 When discussing the mandates at the Hague Congress of the First
International (September 2-7, 1872), the question arose of the Bakuninist
Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see Note 39) as a secret sectarian organisation whose existence
within the framework of the International went against its Rules. On the
suggestion of Marx and some other delegates, a commission was set up to
investigate the Alliance's clandestine activities. On September 5, 1872 it discussed
Engels' report (see present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 228-38) and the reports of other
Congress delegates concerning the Alliance. Having examined the materials, the
commission arrived at the conclusion that the Alliance's activities were
incompatible with the line of the International, and at the Congress meeting of
September 7 it proposed that Bakunin and Guillaumie, as well as a number of
other members of the secret Alliance, be expelled from the International
Association. The Congress approved as a whole the proposal of the commission and
decided to make public the documents it had at its disposal which
pertained to the Alliance. In pursuance of this decision, in April-July 1873,
Marx and Engels in collaboration with Paul Lafargue wrote The Alliance of
Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association, which was
published as a pamphlet in French in August 1873 (see present edition,
Vol. 23).

39 The German translation of the work by Marx and Engels, The Alliance of
Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association (see Note 38),
appeared in 1874 under the title: "Ein Complot gegen die Internationale
Arbeiter-Association. Im Auftrage des Haager Kongresses verfaßter Bericht über
das Treiben Bakunins und der Alianz der socialistischen Demokratie. Deutsche
Ausgabe von 'L'Alliance de la démocratie socialiste et l'association internationale
des travailleurs'. Uebersetzt von S. Kokosky. Braunschweig. Druck
und Verlag von W. Bracke, 1874". Kokosky's translation was edited by Engels (see

40 Sergei Nechayev, a Russian revolutionary, conspirator and anarchist, set up an underground organisation Narodnaya rasprava (People's Judgment) in Moscow in late 1869, consisting mostly of students of the Agricultural and Forestry Academy (see Note 527). Blackmail, mystification and deceit practised by Nechayev provoked a protest by student Ivan Ivanov, a member of the organisation. Fearing exposure, Nechayev staged his assassination and fled abroad. In Geneva, he tried to justify the assassination in the People's Judgment magazine, No. 2, 1870, and to print a programme of the organisation which, in Marx's and Engels' definition, was "a beautiful model of barrack-room communism" (see present edition, Vol. 23, p. 543). With the exception of individual Bakuninists and Pyotr Tkachov, the various trends in the Russian liberation movement unanimously condemned Nechayev's methods. p. 22

41 Engels is referring to the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, the Greek leader in the Trojan War. It is described in Book I of Homer's Iliad. p. 24

42 Mons veneris—literally the Mountain of Venus. Situated between Sonabe and Thüringe the mountain was, according to medieval German legends, the place where Venus lived. There, she held her court with heathen splendour and revelry. None of those who, charmed by music and sensuous allurements, entered her abode ever returned except Tannhäuser. p. 26

43 Lavrov probably hints at the fictitious World Revolutionary Alliance, on behalf of which Bakunin and Nechayev published, in 1869, a number of leaflets and pamphlets urging immediate revolution. p. 26

44 Engels wrote the fourth article in the Refuge Literature series on the advice of Marx. Having acquainted himself with Tkachov's Offener Brief an Herrn Friedrich Engels. Verfaesser der Artikel "Flüchtlings-Literatur": in Nr. 117 und 118 des "Volksstaat" (Zurich, 1874), Marx passed it on to Engels with the following note upon the cover: "Go to it, but in jovial fashion. So stupid, that Bakunin may have contributed. What Peter Tkachov is above all trying to tell his readers is that you had treated him as an enemy, and he therefore invents all manner of disputes that never occurred" (see Marx's letter to Engels, February-March 1875, present edition, Vol. 45).

The article was printed by Der Volksstaat, Nos. 36 and 37, March 28 and April 2, 1875.

Excerpts from it were published in English for the first time in the collection: K. Marx, F. Engels, On Literature and Art, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978, pp. 114, 408-09. In full, it appears in English for the first time. p. 29

45 This story is ascribed to Canning. He mentions three London tailors from Tooley Street who addressed a petition to the House of Commons opening with the words "We, the people of England!" p. 29

46 An ironical allusion to the law of July 9, 1873, which introduced a single monetary system in Germany, including a 10-mark coin. p. 29

47 Bashkobazaks—irregular detachments of the Turkish army in the 18th and 19th centuries; the name was also given to troops noted for cruelty, plunder and lack of discipline. p. 33

48 A hint at Nikolai Chernyshevsky's What Is to Be Done? written in 1862 at the time of his imprisonment at the Peter and Paul Fortress (St. Petersburg).
novel was a kind of programme of action for the more aware sections of Russia’s young people. It had great impact on public consciousness and an important formative influence upon many revolutionaries. p. 35

46 The 1870s saw a new period in the development of Narodism (Russian populism), a movement of the intelligentsia, representatives of all strata of the population, at the bourgeois-democratic stage of the emancipation struggle in Russia (1861-95). Thousands of revolutionaries, as well as representatives of the democratic intelligentsia, began propaganda work in the countryside ("going into the thick of the people") in order to prepare a peasant revolution. In the spring and summer of 1874 the Narodniki launched large-scale mass action. In the autumn of 1874 mass arrests began, which Engels mentions in this article. He probably took the information about them, including the arrests of workers, from the editorial in Vperyod headed "Panic in the Government" (written by Lavrov). "Going into the thick of the people" had been stopped by the government by late 1875. p. 37

50 See Note 40.

51 Marx believed that the Revolutionary Catechism was written by Bakunin in the summer of 1869 (see K. Marx and F. Engels, The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men’s Association, present edition, Vol. 29, pp. 544-45). The real author of the Catechism was, most probably, Nekhayev. The text was coded and several copies of it were printed in Geneva. p. 37

52 Article V from Engels’ Refuge Literature was printed by Der Volkstaat, Nos. 43, 44 and 45 on April 16, 18 and 21, 1875, and as a separate pamphlet in Leipzig in late June-early July 1875 under the title Soziales aus Rußland (On Social Relations in Russia). In the second half of May Engels wrote an introduction to the pamphlet (see this volume, pp. 100-04), which was reproduced together with the article in the 1894 edition: F. Engels, Internationales aus dem "Volkstaat" (1871-75).

This article was printed in English for the first time in: K. Marx, F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Volume Two, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969, pp. 387-98. p. 39

53 The corvée (labour rent)—one of the forms of feudal land rent, unpaid forced labour of the serf peasant working on the estate of the feudal landowner and using his own tools. After the abolition of serfdom in Russia in 1861, part of the peasants that earlier belonged to the landowner (the so-called temporarily bound peasants) were obliged to perform gratuitous labour for the landowner or to pay quit-rent for the use of land. In 1881 a law was passed making the redemption of the peasants’ plots obligatory, and abolishing the corvée in its overt form. However, it continued to exist as a statute labour up to the 1900s. p. 41

54 On February 19, 1864 the Russian Tsar passed an edict introducing an agrarian reform in Poland: the land that was in the peasants’ use was to become their own property. Some of landless peasants were returned plots taken away earlier by the landlords. The latter were compensated from the treasury for the land that passed to the peasants. Despite the tiny size of most of the new holdings, and the fact that their owners were compelled to work on the landed estates, the reform of 1864 cleared the way for the development of capitalism in Poland to a larger extent than the reform of 1861 did in Russia. p. 41

55 A reference to the reform of 1864 in Russia, which introduced Zemstvos—
elective bodies for administering local matters (the building of roads and bridges, the organisation of schools, supplies of hospitals, expert agricultural assistance).

p. 41


p. 42

57 Engels is referring to the sub-lease system in Ireland, under which middlemen, whose number could be up to a dozen, stood between the big landowner and the peasant working on the leased plot of land.

p. 42

58 A reference to the Russian version of utopian socialism developed in the early 1850s by Alexander Herzen, a founder of revolutionary Narodism (see Note 49). Herzen believed that Russia would pass on to socialism in an "original" way thanks to the village commune, emancipation of peasants with land, peasant self-government, and the traditional right of the peasants to land.

p. 43

59 Samoyed— an old Russian name for a number of Siberian minor nationalities (Nentsi, Ents, Nganasani and Selkups), which spoke Uralic languages.

p. 43


p. 44

61 A reference to the Peasant War (1773-75) headed by Yemelyan Pugachov.

p. 49

62 Engels is referring to the uprising which was launched in July 1873 by petty bourgeois republicans and the Bakuninists in Andalusia and Valencia. It undermined the position of the left-republican government of Francisco Pi y Margall which came into office in 1873 as a result of the declaration of the first republic in Spain during the revolution of 1868-74. For more details, see Engels' *The Bakuninists at Work* (present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 585-95).

p. 49

63 *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne* is a forceful work in which Marx exposed the unseemly methods used by the Prussian police state against the communist movement. The pamphlet was published in Basle in January 1858, but in March almost the whole edition (2,000 copies) was confiscated by the police in the Baden frontier village of Weill on the way to Germany. In the USA the work was first published in instalments (on March 6 and April 2 and 28, 1858) in the Boston democratic newspaper *New-England-Zeitung* and at the end of April 1859 it was printed as a separate pamphlet by the same publishing house.

In 1874 this work was reprinted in 13 instalments in *Der Volksstaat* (Leipzig), with Marx named as its author for the first time. Preparing a separate edition of the *Revelations*, Wilhelm Liebknecht, the editor of the newspaper, on October 29, 1874 requested Marx to write a preface for it. On January 27, 1875, *Der Volksstaat* published Marx's epilogue to the *Revelations* dated January 8, 1875. The *Revelations* appeared as a book in Leipzig in 1875, reproducing the text from *Der Volksstaat* with this epilogue.

p. 51

64 Documents of which Marx was not aware, specifically the letter of Moses Hess to Joseph Weydemeyer of July 21, 1850, confirm that Hess was the author of
the Red Catechism (Rother Kathedchismus für das deutsche Volk, New York and Boston [1849 or 1850]). The place of publication is fictitious; the pamphlet was published in Germany in 1850.

65 The reptile funds—special money funds at the disposal of Bismarck which he used to buy venal journalists, nicknamed reptiles. The nickname was current in Germany in the 1870s. Bismarck was the first to use it, although in a different sense, speaking in the Prussian Chamber of Deputies on January 30, 1869 (by reptiles, he referred to the circles hostile to the government). However, the Left-wing press began to apply the word to the semi-official press bribed by the government. Speaking in the Reichstag on February 9, 1876, Bismarck was forced to admit that the new meaning of the word “reptiles” had gained wide currency in Germany.

66 By the State Inquisition Marx means the Council of Ten set up in the Republic of Venice in the 14th century, and the Collegium of State Inquisitors formed by it in the 15th century.

67 A conference of Austrian, Prussian, Bavarian, Saxonian and other ministers held in Karlsbad in 1819 adopted decrees to fight opposition movements spearheaded against the reactionary customs and laws in the German states and advocating the unification of Germany. The Karlsbad Decrees in particular made it possible to prosecute participants in the political demonstration in Gambach (May 1832) and in the actions of revolutionary democrats, including members of the Burschenschaften (see Note 151) in Frankfurt am Main in April 1833. They were repealed by the Federal Diet (see Note 150) on April 2, 1848.

68 The Programme of the International Working Men's Association was set forth by Marx in the “Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association” and in the preamble to the “Provisional Rules of the Association”. These documents were published for the first time by the General Council of the International in the pamphlet Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association, Established September 28, 1864, at a Public Meeting Held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London (see present edition, Vol. 20).

69 An allusion to the defeat of Prussia by Napoleonic France at Jena on October 14, 1806. The defeat led to Prussia's capitulation and revealed the instability of the social and political system of the Hohenzollern feudal monarchy.

70 Marx has “inneres Düppel”, an expression first used in the meaning of “enemy within” (“Düppel im Innern”) in a political survey published in the Bismarckian Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung on September 30, 1864. It became widely current later. Düppel (Dybbøl)—Danish fortification in Schleswig which the Prussians captured by storm on April 18, 1864, during the war of Prussia and Austria against Denmark.

71 This article reproduces Marx’s and Engels' speeches at the meeting of January 23, 1875 in London organized by the Polish People society (see Note 4) to mark the 12th anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863-64. It was written by Engels for Der Volksstaat and printed in it on March 24, 1875. The meeting was chaired by Wacław Wroblewski. Speaking at it were members of the more advanced section of the revolutionary-democratic refugees from Poland, Russia, Germany, France and some other countries. Among them were members of the
Paris Commune Leo Frankel and Prosper Olivier Lissagaray. A report of the meeting, including the text of Marx's and Engels' speeches, was carried by the Polish magazine Wici (Zurich) on January 30, 1875, the Russian newspaper Vpered! (Forward!) (February 15), and other periodicals. p. 55

Engels is referring to the system of constitutional principles of Rzecz Pospolita introduced after the formation of this state in 1569. Rzecz Pospolita was a limited monarchy headed by an elective Diet, the king and the Polish nobility enjoying unlimited rights. The most odious principle was that of liberum veto, the right of any member of the Diet to ban any of its decisions, which by the 18th century resulted in extreme political anarchy and social and economic crisis.

On the first partition of Poland, see Note 9. p. 55

The reference is to the participation in the American War of Independence (1775-83) of Tadema Kościuszko and Kazimierz Pułaski, who were promoted to brigadier general for their service. p. 55

It is the first French Constitution, passed on September 3, 1791 by the National Convention. It was based on the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen adopted by the French Constituent Assembly on August 26, 1789, during the French Revolution. It proclaimed the main principles of the revolution: sovereignty of the people and the natural rights of man, the right to freedom, property, security and resistance to oppression. p. 55

The reference is to the military alliance concluded on February 7, 1792 by Austria and Prussia, supported by Russia, against the revolutionary France. On September 20, 1792, in the battle of Valmy, the French revolutionary army defeated the forces of the Austro-Prussian coalition. p. 55

The Italian region Venice, part of the Austrian Empire in 1797-1805 and 1814-66, was a centre of the Italian national liberation movement against Austrian oppression.

By "a threefold Venice" Engels implies the territories acquired by Prussia as a result of the three partitions of Poland (see notes 9 and 11) and the Vienna Treaty of 1815, as well as Schleswig-Holstein annexed by Prussia as a result of the Danish war of 1864 and Alsace-Lorraine annexed in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71. p. 56

See Note 14. p. 56

As is clear from the report in Vpered! (Forward!), No. 3, February 15 (3), 1875, "The Anniversary of the Polish Uprising of 1863 in London", the secretary of the newspaper's editorial board, Valerian Smirnov, spoke at the meeting of January 23, 1875 (see Note 71). Stressing the identity of interests of the Russian and the Polish workers, he declared, on behalf of the Russian revolutionaries, that each of them was ready, "when the time of the Polish people's revolution would arrive", to join the ranks of the Poles in order to gain "social freedom for the Polish people". Also speaking at the meeting was another Russian refugee, Dmitriy Solovyo, who warned against the possible compromise between the szlachta liberal party and the Tsarist government. p. 57

The reference is to the amnesty of the Polish patriots kept prisoners in Prussia for an attempted uprising in Posen in 1846. The amnesty was declared by Frederick William IV in March 1848 under pressure of public opinion. p. 58

On May 15, 1848, Paris workers led by Blanqui, Barbès and others took revolutionary action against the anti-labour and anti-democratic policy of the
bourgeois Constituent Assembly, which opened on May 4. The demonstrators forced their way into the assembly premises, demanded the formation of a Ministry of Labour and presented a number of other demands, e.g., that assistance be rendered to the insurgent Poles in Posen. An attempt was made to form a revolutionary government. National Guards from the bourgeois quarters and the regular troops succeeded, however, in restoring the power of the Constituent Assembly. The leaders of the movement were arrested and put on trial.

81 In the report on this meeting carried by Vperyod! (Forward!), No. 3, February 15 (3), 1875—"The Anniversary of the Polish Uprising of 1863 in London"—the following sentence was added: "It is therefore necessary to popularise the principles of the International Association among the Polish people." This sentence, which was not included in the reports printed by the Polish periodicals (see Note 71) or in Engels' text for Der Volksstaat, was written in by Valerian Smirnov, who prepared the report for Vperyod! and insisted that he had heard it from Marx himself. In a letter to Marx of February 15, 1875, Smirnov asked him to confirm this fact. Marx's reply has not been found.

82 Engels wrote this article at the moment when, in the spring of 1875, relations between the German Empire and France sharply deteriorated after the French National Assembly approved the Projet de loi relatif à la constitution des cadres et des effectifs de l'armée active et de l'armée territoriale. Resolute Russian diplomatic interference prevented a war in Europe. Attaching great importance to Engels' article, which contained a critique of German militarism from the proletarian internationalist stand, the Volksstaat editorial board intended to publish it as a separate pamphlet. However, this intention was not carried out.

83 See Note 65.

84 In German the word Gründung is used here: a reference to Gründertum, the period of "prosperity" in Germany in 1871-73. It was made possible, to a large extent, by the war reparations of five thousand million francs and the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine under the terms of the Frankfurt Peace Treaty (1871), which concluded the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71. Railway construction and the building of heavy-industry enterprises was in full swing, accompanied by the investment of enormous capital; industrial, construction and commercial joint-stock companies were mushrooming, as were banks and social security companies.

By 1875, the period of Gründertum in Germany had resulted in a crash followed by a protracted economic crisis that also affected Austria, Belgium, Britain, France, Holland, Italy, Russia and the USA, and continued up to 1879.

85 Landsturm—military militia formed in Prussia in 1813-14 from persons between the ages of 18 and 42 ineligible for military service because of disability, age, health, etc. The Landsturm was a reserve of the third levy. The Landsturm Law (Gesetz über den Landsturm) of February 12, 1875 developed the law of November 9, 1867 and provided for replenishing the Landwehr (see Note 90) from the Landsturm in case of threat of a hostile invasion.

86 Engels analyses the new French Cadre Law (of March 12, 1875) on the basis of the information contained in the article "Das Gesetz über die Cadres in Frankreich" published in the Kölnische Zeitung, Nos. 90-92 and 94, on April 1-3 and 5, 1875.
Zouaves—French colonial troops first formed in 1830. Originally they were composed of Algerians and French colonists and later of Frenchmen only, while Algerians were formed into special regiments of riflemen.

Tunros (Algerian riflemen)—French light infantry recruited, from 1842, from among the Algerians, with the exception of the officer corps and, partly, non-commissioned officers.

In the French army breech-loaders were called Chassepots (from the inventor's name). They were adopted in the French army in 1867-68.

Under the law of 1868, the mobile guards were composed of persons of call-up age, fit for military service, who had not done either active military service or service in the reserves, and were intended for guard duty at the frontiers, service at the rear, and for garrison duties. By the beginning of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, the formation of mobile guards had not yet taken place; persons between the ages of 20 and 40 were recruited to it at the time of war.

Landwehr (the army reserve) in Prussia was formed at the time of the struggle against Napoleonic rule. In the 1840s, it was made up of persons up to 40 years of age who had served three years in the army and had been on the reserve list for at least two years. In peacetime, the Landwehr units were engaged in occasional military exercises; at the time of war, they were to do rear and garrison service. During the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, the Landwehr was used in active service along with the regular troops.

See Note 24.

The reference is to the 200,000-strong Second Loire Army formed in October-November 1870 by the French government mostly from recruits. This is also a reference to the battle at Loigny-Poupard, near Orleans, on December 2, 1870, where two French corps of the Loire Army suffered a defeat, and the battle of Le Mans, Western France, on January 10-12, 1871, where the Loire Army was also forced to retreat and sustained considerable losses.

Under the law of May 2, 1874 ("Reichs-Militärgesetz", Reichsgesetzblatt, Berlin, 1874, No. 1002), the second reserve (Ersatzreserve) consisted of men of call-up age who had been given grace due to insignificant disability or family circumstances. In wartime, it was used to replenish the army.

A punning reference to the name The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation founded in 962 by the German King Otto I. It included, at different times, German, Italian, Austrian, Hungarian and Bohemian lands, Switzerland and the Netherlands, forming a motley conglomeration of feudal kingdoms and principalities, church lands and free towns with different political structures, legal standards and customs. By the 16th century, the Empire, with a Hapsburg at its head, lost all political significance, and ceased to exist on August 6, 1806 as a result of the victory of Napoleon's army.

Engels' letter to August Bebel written between March 18 and 28, 1875 is closely connected with Marx's Critique of the Gotha Programme (see this volume, pp. 75-99) and is traditionally published together with the latter work. It conveyed the joint opinion of Marx and Engels concerning the fusion of two German workers' parties, the Eisenachers and the Lassalleans, scheduled for early 1875. The immediate reason for the letter was the publication of the draft programme of the future united Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany (Programm der deutschen Arbeiterpartei) in Der Volksstaat (the organ of the
Eisenachers) and the Neuer Social-Demokrat (the organ of the Lassalleans) on March 7, 1875. The draft programme was approved with slight changes by the unity congress at Gotha on May 22-27, 1875, and came to be known as the Gotha Programme.

This letter was first published by Bebel, after the lapse of 36 years, in his Aus meinem Leben, Zweiter Teil, Stuttgart, 1911. In the present edition the letter is printed according to this book.

It was published in English for the first time in: K. Marx, Critique of the Gotha Programme, Lawrence, London [1933], pp. 51-62.

96 A reference to one of Lassalle's programme theses on the establishment of workers' producer associations with the aid of the state. Lassalle and his followers repeatedly emphasised that what they had in mind was a state in which power would pass into the hands of the working people through universal suffrage.

97 Engels is referring to the Programm und Statuten der sozial-demokratischen Arbeiter-Partei, adopted at the general German workers' congress in Eisenach in August 1869 and published in the Demokratisches Wochenblatt on August 14, 1869. The congress founded the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany. By and large the programme complied with the principles of the International Working Men's Association.

98 The "honest men"—nickname of the members of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (the Eisenachers), as distinct from the members of the General Association of German Workers (the Lassalleans), the "dishonest men".

99 The German People's Party, established in September 1868, embraced the democratic section of the bourgeoisie, mostly in the South-German states. The party opposed the establishment of Prussian hegemony in Germany and advocated the idea of a federative German state.

100 A reference to the following articles of the draft Gotha Programme:

"The German workers' party demands as the free basis of the state:

1. Universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot for all males who have reached the age of 21, for all elections in the state and in the community.
2. Direct legislation by the people with the right to initiate and to reject bills.
3. Universal military training. A people's militia in place of the standing army. Decisions regarding war and peace to be taken by a representative assembly of the people.
4. Abolition of all exceptional laws, in particular the laws on the press, associations and assembly.
5. Jurisdiction by the people. Administration of justice without fees.

"The German workers' party demands as the intellectual and moral basis of the state:

1. Universal and equal education of the people by the state. Compulsory school attendance. Free instruction.

101 The reference is to the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71.

102 The League of Peace and Freedom—a pacifist organisation set up in Switzerland in 1867 with the active participation of Victor Hugo, Giuseppe Garibaldi and other democrats. The League asserted that it was possible to prevent wars by creating the "United States of Europe". Its leaders did not disclose the social sources of wars and often confined anti-militarist activity to mere declarations.
At the General Council meeting of August 13, 1867 Marx spoke against the International's official participation in the League's Inaugural Congress, since this would have meant solidarity with its bourgeois programme, but recommended that some members of the International should attend the Congress in their personal capacity in order to support revolutionary-democratic decisions (see present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 426-27, and Marx's letter to Engels of September 4, 1867, present edition, Vol. 42).  

103 On page 5 of his Arbeiterlesebuch Lassalle quotes a passage about the "iron law of wages" from his pamphlet Offenes Antwortschreiben an das Central-Comité zur Berufung eines Allgemeinen Deutschen Arbeitercongresses zu Leipzig, Zürich, 1868, pp. 15-16.  

104 Philippe Joseph Buchez, one of the first ideologists of the so-called Christian socialism, advanced a plan for the establishment of workers' producer associations with the aid of the state.  

105 On October 12, 1875 Engels wrote to Bebel concerning this programme that, since both workers and their political opponents "interpreted it communally", "it is this circumstance alone which has made it possible for Marx and myself not to dissociate ourselves publicly from a programme such as this. So long as our opponents as well as the workers continue to read our views into that programme, we are justified in saying nothing about it" (see present edition, Vol. 45).  

106 In March 1872 August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht were sentenced to two years' confinement in a fortress for their adhesion to the International Working Men's Association and their socialist views. In April Bebel was sentenced, in addition, to nine months' imprisonment and deprived of his mandate as a Reichstag member for "insulting His Majesty". Liebknecht was released on April 15, 1874, while Bebel was freed on April 1, 1875.  

107 Marx's Critique of the Gotha Programme, which analyses the draft programme of the future united Social-Democratic party, is a major contribution to the key theoretical issues of scientific communism and an example of uncompromising struggle against opportunism. It was written in April-early May 1875 and intended for the leadership of the Eisenachers. The manuscript Marginale Notes on the Programme of the German Workers' Party (Randglossen zum Programm der deutschen Arbeiterpartei) is prefaced by Marx's letter to Wilhelm Bracke of May 5, 1875 and forms a single whole with it. The work was sent to the leadership of the Eisenach party (specifically, to Wilhelm Bracke) on May 5.  

For the first time, Critique of the Gotha Programme was published by Engels in 1891, together with Marx's letter to Bracke, despite opposition on the part of the opportunist German Social-Democratic leaders. It appeared in the theoretical organ of the German Social-Democrats, Die Neue Zeit, Vol. 1, No. 18, with Engels' foreword. As is known from Engels' letter to Karl Kautsky of February 29, 1891 (see present edition, Vol. 49), he had to agree to certain changes and omissions.  

The Critique was published in English for the first time, according to the text in Die Neue Zeit, in The Socialist Series, number one, under the title: "The Socialist Programme. By Karl Marx", The Socialist Labour Press, Glasgow (1918).  

108 The authorised French translation of Volume One of Capital was published in instalments in Paris between 1872 and 1875 (Le Capital. Par Karl Marx.
Marx is referring to the following passage in the Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association: "That the economical subjection of the man of labour to the monopoliser of the means of labour, that is the sources of life, lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation, and political dependence" (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 441). p. 78

109 An allusion to Lassalle's secret contacts with the Bismarck government (mid-May 1863-February 1864). He promised support to the Prussian government in its struggle against the liberal bourgeois in exchange for the introduction of universal suffrage in the country. p. 83

110 The reference is to the address "An die Parteigenossen!" (Der Volksstaat, No. 105, October 31, 1873) issued by the leadership of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party before the elections to the German Reichstag on January 10, 1874. p. 89

111 An ironical reference to Hasselmann, the editor-in-chief of the Neuer Sozial-Demokrat. p. 89

112 In its editorial article (the "Politischer Tagesbericht" section) the Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 67, March 20, 1875, wrote in connection with the draft programme of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany that "the Social-Democratic propaganda has become cautious in some ways: it has disavowed internationalism". p. 90

113 See Note 108. p. 91

114 See Note 96. p. 93

115 The Liverpool Financial Reform Association was founded in 1848, and for a long time Robertson Gladstone was its President. Its aim was to "advocate the adoption of a simple and equitable system of direct taxation, fairly levied upon property and income, in lieu of the present unequal, complicated, and expensively-collected duties upon commodities" (Tracts of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association, Liverpool, 1851, p. VII). p. 96

116 See Note 27. p. 97

117 Engels wrote this introduction for a separate edition of Article V from his Refugee Literature series (see Note 52). p. 100

118 Engels is referring to his own and Marx's articles in the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Organ der Demokratie, which was edited by Marx in 1848-49 and published in Cologne, and, above all, to his "The Frankfurt Assembly Debates the Polish Question" and their joint work "German Foreign Policy and the Latest Events in Prague" (present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 337-81 and 212-15). p. 103

119 Engels is referring to the talks that took place in Warsaw in October 1850 between Francis Joseph I of Austria and the Prussian Minister-President Friedrich Wilhelm von Brandenburg, with the Russian Tsar Nicholas I as the mediator. p. 103
121 The Russian Tsar Alexander II and the Minister for Foreign Affairs Alexander Gorchakov visited Berlin in May 1875 at the time of the sharp deterioration of relations between France and Germany (see Note 82). p. 103

122 Engels is referring to the confidential circular of the International's General Council ("An alle Sectionen und Mitglieder der IAA, New York, 16. Mai 1875"). The Council proposed changing the decision to hold a general congress in September 1875, adopted at the Geneva Congress of the International in 1873, and convening a congress or conference in July 1876 in Philadelphia (USA) during the world industrial exhibition there. This was a calculation to guarantee the security of working-class delegates from Europe. p. 105

123 The reference is to the German Workers' Educational Society founded in London in February 1849. After the establishment of the Communist League in 1847 its members played the leading role in the Society. During various periods of its activity the Society had branches in working-class districts in London. In 1847, 1849-50 and in the late 1850s-mid-1870s, Marx and Engels took an active part in the Society's work. Its members were involved in the activity of the International Working Men's Association. The Society at large joined the International in 1865 as a section. It existed up to 1918, when it was closed down by the British government. p. 105

124 On December 25-26, 1872 Brussels hosted the Congress of the Belgian Federation of the International, at which the anarchists had a majority. The Congress voted down the decisions of the Hague Congress, stated its refusal to maintain contacts with the General Council in New York, and resolved to support the decisions of the international congress of anarchists which was held in Saint-Izére on September 15, 1872 and which openly declared the split of the International. In a resolution of May 30, 1873, the General Council said that the Belgian Federation had, in consequence of its actions, dissociated itself from the International.

For the Alliancists see Note 30. p. 105

125 The contacts of the General Council of the International in New York with Austria, Germany and Switzerland were maintained through Friedrich Adolph Sorge, who corresponded with Wilhelm Liebknecht, Johann Philipp Becker, Johann Schwarzinger and others. p. 106

126 Engels made this speech in German at the international meeting held on January 22, 1876 to mark the anniversary of the Polish uprising of 1863 and sponsored by the Polish People society (see Note 4). Afterwards, between January 22 and February 1, at the request of Walery Wroblewski, the Polish socialist who had chaired the meeting, Engels wrote the speech in French. This manuscript was used for the translation in this volume. The French text was probably used as the original for the first publication of the speech in Vperyod, since the Russian text printed there (in the report on the meeting in the section "A Chronicle of the Labour Movement") is identical to the French text. p. 107

127 As some of his contemporaries stated, when Nicholas I received the news of the February revolution of 1848 in France, he exclaimed: "Gentlemen, mount your horses! A republic has been proclaimed in France!" p. 107

128 See Note 119. p. 107
Prussian Schnapps in the German Reichstag was written by Engels in February 1876. Its publication in Der Volksstaat and as a separate impression provoked irritation on the part of the authorities. As Engels wrote to Karl Kautsky on May 23, 1884, "Prussian Schnapps' was a personal insult to Bismarck" (see present edition, Vol. 47). p. 109

A reference to the first Peace of Paris concluded on May 30, 1814 between the principal members of the sixth anti-French coalition (Russia, Austria, Britain and Prussia) and France after Napoleon's defeat. p. 112

Under the impact of the July Revolution of 1830 in France, urban dwellers in Saxony, Brunswick, Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, and other German lands launched revolutionary action, and an anti-feudal peasant revolt flared up in Hesse-Darmstadt, which was suppressed by troops. p. 116

A reference to the Anglo-French commercial treaty signed on January 28, 1860, which signified a triumph for the advocates of free trade in both countries and served the interests of the British industrial bourgeoisie. Under one of its articles tariffs for French wine were cut by half, and England undertook to further reduce them depending on the percentage of alcohol in the wine (see K. Marx, "The New Treaty Between France and England", present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 541-44). p. 118

A Greek myth says that at the time of the campaign against Troy the Greeks mistakenly engaged in combat with the troops of their ally Telephus, the son of Heracles. Telephus was wounded by Achilles and got cured when some rust from Achilles' spear was applied to his wound, following the oracle's prophecy. p. 119

As legend has it, Antonio da Correggio uttered these words standing before Raphael's Saint Cecilia. p. 119

Der Volksstaat, No. 24, February 27, 1876, p. 2, had "along Russian lines". The misprint was pointed out in Der Volksstaat, No. 27, March 5 in the "Berichtigung" section. p. 120

A reference to the administrative reform of 1872 in Prussia (Kreisordnung für die Provinzen Preußen, Brandenburg, Pommern, Posen, Schlesien und Sachsen. Vom 13. Dezember 1872. In: Gesetz-Sammlung für die Königlichen Preußischen Staaten, No. 41, Berlin, 1872). It abolished the patrimonial power of the Junkers and introduced elements of local self-government (elective elders in the communities, district councils at the Landrats elected in accordance with the representation system, etc.). The reform was aimed at consolidating the state apparatus and strengthening centralisation in the interests of the Junkers as a class. The Junkers in fact retained power in their localities themselves or by their protégés holding most of the elective posts. p. 121

Engels is referring to the following works by Theodor von der Goltz: Beitrag zur Geschichte der Entwicklung ländlicher Arbeiterverhältnisse im nordöstlichen Deutschland bis zur Gegenwart, Berlin, 1846; Ländliche Arbeiterwohnungen, Königsberg and Tilsit, 1865; Die ländliche Arbeiterfrage und ihre Lösung, Danzig, 1872; Die Lage der ländlichen Arbeiter im Deutschen Reich, Berlin, 1873; Die soziale Bedeutung des Gesindewesens, Danzig, 1873. p. 121
By decision of the Congress of Vienna (September 18, 1814-June 9, 1815), the greater part of the lands on the left and right banks of the Rhine and of those adjoining Westphalia were incorporated into Prussia. p. 121

The reference is to the uprisings in Western and Southern Germany (May 1849), which were part of the German people's campaign for the implementation of the Imperial Constitution approved in March 1849 by the Frankfurt National Assembly. The most powerful struggle in support of it developed in the Bavarian Palatinate and Baden. The combined Palatinate-Baden insurgent army, which included many workers' units, put up strong resistance to the Prussian-Bavarian-Württemberg troops who greatly exceeded the insurgents in numbers and strength. The insurgents' last stronghold, Rastatt, fell on July 23. The uprisings in the Palatinate and Baden in the spring and summer of 1849 were the closing events of the German revolution (see also F. Engels, "The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution", present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 147-239). p. 121

Little Germany—a plan for the unification of Germany from above under Prussia's aegis and excluding Austria; it was supported by the majority of the German bourgeoisie. p. 121

The Federal Council (Bundesrat), the supreme organ of the German Empire, consisted of 58 appointed representatives of 25 German states. With the Reichstag, which was elected by direct universal and equal ballot, it formed the Empire's legislative power. At the time of Bismarck, the Federal Council was a counter-weight to the Reichstag. Its policies were shaped mostly by Prussia, which was represented by 17 deputies and had the right of veto in questions pertaining to amendments in the constitution. p. 122

See Note 132. p. 124

A reference to the commercial treaty between Italy and the Customs Union signed on December 31, 1865. The Customs Union (Zollverein) of German states, which established a common customs frontier, was set up in 1834 and headed by Prussia. By the 1840s the Union embraced most of the German states with the exception of Austria, the Hanseatic cities (Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck), and a few small states. Brought into being by the need to create an all-German market, the Customs Union became a factor in the promotion of the political unification of Germany. p. 124

Under the Frankfurt Peace Treaty of May 10, 1871, which concluded the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, France, among other things, was obliged to pay war reparations of five thousand million francs. p. 125

The Holy Alliance, an association of European monarchs, was founded in September 1815 on the initiative of the Russian Tsar Alexander I and the Austrian Chancellor Metternich to suppress revolutionary movements and preserve feudal monarchies in European countries. During the 1848-49 revolution and subsequently, counter-revolutionary circles in Austria, Prussia and Russia attempted to revive the Holy Alliance in a modified form. p. 125

Engels wrote Wilhelm Wolff in June-September 1876 for Die Neue Welt, a journal edited by Wilhelm Liebknecht. Marx himself had intended to write a short biography of Wolff, one of the most prominent German proletarian
revolutionaries, to whom he dedicated the first volume of his Capital. Marx's "Biographical Notes on Wilhelm Wolff" exist, written immediately after Wolff's death (see present edition, Vol. 19, pp. 335-36). However, Marx could not carry out his plan since at that time he did not have the necessary information on the earlier period of Wolff's life.

With the biographical material, Engels gives a synopsis of Wolff's series of articles on the condition of the Silesian peasants written for the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1849. The publication of Wolff's articles was one of the steps taken by the newspaper to involve Germany's peasant masses in the revolution. The articles present a broad factual and statistical picture of the exploitation of the peasants and demand that the peasants be given back the milliard marks that the landowners had stolen from them in the form of redemption payments. His articles entitled Die schlesische Milliarde were a tremendous success with the readers. In Silesia the Peasants' Union made 10,000 copies of the issues carrying these articles and distributed them among the peasants free of charge.

In 1886 Engels' Wilhelm Wolff was published as the first part of the introduction to Wolff's book Die schlesische Milliarde. Abdruck aus der "Neuen Rheinischen Zeitung" März-April 1849. Mit Einleitung von Friedrich Engels, Hottingen-Zürich, 1886; the second part of the introduction was a newly written work "On the History of the Prussian Peasants" (see present edition, Vol. 26). In that edition, Engels substantially supplemented the text of Wilhelm Wolff and omitted the chapters containing a synopsis of Wolff's articles.

In the passages dealing with Wolff's articles Engels renders rather than quotes the author.

Wolff was prosecuted for his report Die oberschlesiischen Wilddiebe und das preußische Militär. Breslau, published in Freiikugeln, No. 27, February 13, 1845, and sentenced to three months' confinement in a fortress.

The reference is to the Edikt den erleichterten Besitz und den freien Gebrauch des Grund-Eigenthums, so wie die persönlichen Verhältnisse der Land-Bewohner betreffend, which was passed on October 9, 1807 and came into force on November 11, 1810.

Demagogues (in Germany) were participants in the opposition movement of intellectuals. The name became current after the Karlsbad conference of ministers of the German states in August 1819 (see Note 67), which adopted a special decree against the intrigues of the Demagogues.

The Federal Diet (Bundestag)—a representative body of the German Confederation, an ephemeral union of German states, founded in 1815 by decision of the Congress of Vienna. Though it had no real power it was nevertheless a vehicle for feudal and monarchist reaction. During the 1848-49 revolution in Germany reactionary circles made vain attempts to revive the Federal Diet, intending to use it to prevent the democratic unification of Germany. After the defeat of the revolution the Federal Diet received its former rights in 1850 and survived till 1866.

Students' Associations (Burschenschaften) were formed in Germany during the liberation struggle against Napoleon I. They advocated the unification of Germany. In them, progressive ideas existed side by side with extreme nationalism. On the persecution of the Burschenschaften, see Note 67.

Wilhelm Wolff's letter to Fritz Reuter of December 30, 1863 which Engels mentions was first published in the Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, No. 6, 1907, pp. 1244-45.
Fritz Reuter's allusion is to the so-called constitutional conflict in Prussia between the government and the liberal opposition of the Chamber of Deputies (1860-66). In the course of it Bismarck was appointed Minister-President (September 24, 1862). He exercised authority in the absence of a budget approved by the Chamber and, therefore, his power could be effectively restricted only through refusal to pay taxes.

Wolff was released from the fortress on July 30, 1838. See Marx's "Biographical Notes on Wilhelm Wolff" (present edition, Vol. 19, p. 335).

Having been pardoned, Wolff lived in the estate of the Polish landowner Tytus Adam Działyński as a tutor. In the summer of 1840 he returned to Silesia.

Quoted from The Old Testament (Psalms 35:20). Engels is referring here to the Pietists. The Pietists—adherents of a Lutheran trend which arose in Germany in the 17th century. Distinguished by extreme mysticism, it rejected rites and attached special importance to personal religious experience.

A reference to the Allgemeines Landrecht für die Preußischen Staaten promulgated in 1794. It included criminal, state, civil, administrative and ecclesiastical law and bore a distinct imprint of obsolete feudal legal standards.

After the annexation of the Rhine Province to Prussia in 1815 (see Note 138), the Prussian government tried to introduce Prussian Law into various legal spheres there to replace the French bourgeois codes in force in the province. This was accomplished by passing a series of laws, edicts and instructions aimed at restoring the feudal privileges of the nobility (primogeniture), Prussian criminal and marriage law, etc. These measures were resolutely opposed in the province and repealed after the March revolution by special decrees issued on April 15, 1848.

In his letter of December 30, 1863 to Fritz Reuter (see Note 152), Wilhelm Wolff wrote that the manuscript of one of his articles, which had fallen in the hands of the police, served as a pretext to institute court proceedings against him for infringing the press law (see Note 147).

This book was written by the police officials Wermuth and Stieber. The appendices to the first part, which purported to tell the history of the workers' movement for the information of police agents, reproduce some of the Communist League's documents that had fallen into the hands of the police. The second part contained a "black list" and biographical particulars of people connected with the workers' and democratic movement.

See Note 129.

Engels is referring to the Bureau de Correspondence set up in Brussels in 1845 by the German democratic journalist Sebastian Seiler (later a member of the Communist League). In October 1847, when Seiler withdrew from the bureau for reasons unknown, it was headed by Wilhelm Wolff and Louis Heilberg.

The German Workers' Society in Brussels was founded by Marx and Engels at the end of August 1847. Its aim being the political education of the German workers who lived in Belgium and the dissemination of the ideas of scientific communism among them. With Marx, Engels and their followers at its head, the Society became the legal centre rallying the revolutionary proletarian forces.
in Belgium. Its most active members belonged to the Communist League. The Society played an important part in founding the Brussels Democratic Association. After the February 1848 revolution in France, the Belgian authorities arrested and banished many of its members. p. 136

165 Wolff arrived in Breslau (Silesia) on April 13, 1848. There he joined the newly established Democratic Club, and was active in the propaganda campaign during the elections to the Frankfurt Parliament and the Berlin National Assembly. p. 137

164 Wolff arrived in Cologne in mid-June 1848. p. 137

165 The Democratic Society in Cologne was set up in April 1848; it embraced workers and artisans, as well as small businessmen. Marx, Engels and other editors of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung, who directed the Society's work, wanted to orientate it towards a struggle against the counter-revolutionary policy of the Prussian ruling circles and to expose the liberal bourgeoisie's policy of agreement. In April 1849, Marx and his followers, who had actually begun to organise an independent mass proletarian party, considered it best to dissociate themselves from the petty-bourgeois democrats and withdrew from the Society. Meanwhile, they continued to support the revolutionary actions of the German democratic circles. p. 138

168 See Note 17. p. 138

167 On August 26, 1848 in the Swedish city of Malmö, an armistice was signed in the war between Denmark and Prussia, which was part of the revolutionary struggle of the German people for the unification of Germany. In September 1848, the Frankfurt National Assembly ratified the armistice, which the Prussian government accepted from fear of the mounting revolutionary mood in Germany. This provoked a wave of protest and led to an uprising in Frankfurt am Main on September 18, 1848, which was suppressed by Prussian and Austrian troops. p. 138

168 The Agreement Assembly (Vereinbarungsversammlung) was the name given to the Prussian National Assembly convened in Berlin in May 1848 to draw up a constitution and consisting mostly of liberals leaning towards a compromise with the King. Frederick William IV, who spoke at the opening of the Assembly on May 22, demanded that when working out the constitution the deputies should be "in agreement with the Crown". p. 138

169 The immediate reason for the conflict was the shooting down on July 31, by the garrison of the Schweidnitz fortress in Silesia, of the civil guard and townspeople, as a result of which 14 people were killed and 92 seriously wounded. In the resolution of the Prussian National Assembly of August 9, 1848 the Minister of War was asked to warn officers to abstain from "reactionary tricks", and it was recommended that they resign from the army if they disagreed with the resolution. The Auerwald-Hansemann Ministry raised no objections because it was sure the deputies would not demand faithful implementation of the resolution. But the Minister of War's non-observance of the Assembly's recommendations led to a conflict between the Government and the Assembly and to a ministerial crisis. p. 138

170 Public meetings took place in Cologne on September 7, 13, 17 and 20, 1848. One of them, held on September 13 and organised by Wolff on behalf of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung editorial board, the Democratic Society and the Cologne Workers' Association, elected a Committee of Public Safety con-
sisting of 30 people. It included the leaders of the above-mentioned organisations and editors of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Engels proposed a draft address to the Berlin Assembly urging its deputies not to abandon their posts even under threat of armed force. The draft was unanimously approved.

p. 138

171 The first issue of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* that appeared after the lifting of the state of siege in Cologne was dated October 12, 1848; under the procedure prevailing at that time it was printed on October 11.

p. 140

172 These events took place on February 28, 1849.

p. 140

173 The reference is to the transfer of the sittings of the Prussian National Assembly (see Note 168) from Berlin to Brandenburg. This was the beginning of a counter-revolutionary coup d'état in Prussia, which ended with the dissolution of the National Assembly and the imposition of a Constitution by the King on December 5, 1848 (the so-called imposed constitution; see Note 178).

p. 140

174 The agrarian bill was submitted for consideration to the Prussian National Assembly on July 11, 1848. The debate began on October 10 and was not finished due to the dissolution of the Assembly (see Note 173). See Marx's article "The Bill Proposing the Abolition of Feudal Obligations" (present edition, Vol. 7, p. 295).

p. 141

175 Under the Law of 1821 the peasant was either to transfer to the landowner one-third to a half of his plot or pay its value in cash as redemption for the corvée and obligations.

p. 142

176 See Note 25.

p. 143

177 Between August 1848 and January 1849 the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* published a series of feature articles by Georg Wercrth entitled *Leben und Thaten des berühmten Ritters Schnapphanski*, which ridiculed Prince Lichnowski, a big Silesian landowner killed during the September insurrection in Frankfurt am Main (see Note 167). He was described under the name of Ritter Schnapphanski (from Schnappholtn, a highwayman, scrounger, and rogue).

p. 144

178 On December 5, 1848 the Prussian National Assembly was dissolved and the Constitution imposed by the King made public (see Note 173). The Constitution introduced a two-chamber system; the age and property qualifications made the First Chamber a privileged Chamber of Gentry. By the electoral law of December 6, 1848, the right to vote in the two-stage elections to the Second Chamber was granted only to the so-called independent Prussians. The royal authority was vested with sweeping powers—the King was authorised to convene and dissolve the Chambers, appoint ministers, declare war and conclude peace. He was vested with full executive power, while sharing legislative power with the Chambers.

p. 147

179 *Gardeners* (Gärtner) and *cottagers* (Häusler) had small plots of land but no draught animals, while the "livers-in" (Zuhausinnewohnern) were landless day-labourers.

p. 148

180 *Land registers* (Urbarien)—inventories of feudal land possessions in Germany, Austria, Hungary and Bohemia introduced in the 12th century. They also contained the lists of peasant landholders and their duties. From the 13th
century the term *Urbanien* also began to be applied to inventories of taxes and other incomes as provided by law.


182 *Mediatised peers* in Germany—owners of the imperial fiefs who formerly used to be in direct bondage to the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (see Note 94), and were then subordinated to major princes, in the given case to the King of Prussia.

183 *Walter* (Heuler)—the name of the republican democrats in Germany in 1848-49 applied to the moderate constitutionists who, in turn, called their opponents “agitators” (Wühlert).

184 Engels uses the word *Sportelgelder* here, which means fees payable by peasants for the conduct of legal cases.

185 *Mortmain*—in the Middle Ages the right of the feudal lord to inherit the property of a dead serf peasant. Since the property and the land of the dead peasant usually went to his heirs, the latter were obliged to pay an onerous fee for them to the lord.

186 *Water-Polachs* (Wasserpolacken)—original name of ferrymen on the Oder who were mainly natives of Upper Silesia. Subsequently it became widespread in Germany as a nickname for Silesian Poles.

187 A hint at Marx’s and Engels’ dissatisfaction with the line pursued by Wilhelm Liebknecht, editor-in-chief of *Der Volksstaat*, the official organ of the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party (from October 1876, Vorwärts became the party’s central organ; Liebknecht was also on its editorial board). Specifically, their displeasure was provoked by the publication of articles of a more general nature giving “pictures of future society” to the detriment of those “ontological questions” (see Engels’ letter to Marx of May 28, 1875, present edition, Vol. 45).

188 See Note 183.

189 On May 14, 1849, on the order of Frederick William IV, the Prussian deputies were recalled from the Frankfurt Parliament. Wolff began his work in Parliament on May 21.


192 After Frederick William IV of Prussia refused to accept the Imperial Crown offered him by the Frankfurt National Assembly, Prussia and Austria recalled their deputies. Deputies of other German states also left the Assembly. The left-wing petty-bourgeois deputies who remained in Frankfurt transferred the sessions to Stuttgart, on May 30, 1849, where the Assembly was dispersed by the Württemberg government’s troops.
The Federal Council (Bundesrat)—the Swiss government which, in accordance with the Constitution of September 12, 1848, had legislative and executive power.

The letters of Marx, Engels and Marx's wife Jenny show that Wolff moved to Manchester in September 1859.

This letter opens a new period in Engels' work for the Italian newspaper La Plebe. He had contributed to it in 1871-72, when it was the organ of the International's sections and sided with the General Council in its struggle against the Bakuninists. At the request of its editor, Enrico Bignami, Engels resumed work for it in 1877, when La Plebe again began to appear regularly. Between late February 1877 and late March 1879 Engels wrote a number of articles on various subjects which appeared in the "Da Londra" section without a title.

The elections to the German Reichstag were held on January 10, 1877.

At the elections to the German Reichstag on January 10, 1877 the German Social-Democrats received more votes (493,288) than at the 1874 elections (see Note 204).

By the abstentionists Engels means the Italian anarchists, specifically Andrea Costa, Carlo Cafiero, Enrico Malatesta and Carmelo Palladino, who did not recognise the need for political struggle on the part of the working class. They believed that the workers' participation in elections to representative bodies would only consolidate the power of the bourgeois state.

See Note 96.

The reference is to a public meeting in Tivoli convened on the initiative of the Central Electoral Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany.

A notice about it was printed in the Vorwärts No. 7, January 17, 1877.

In late February 1877 Engels received several January and February issues of La Plebe sent by Enrico Bignami from Italy. In a letter to Marx of March 6 he wrote about his intention to prepare this material for the Vorwärts, central organ of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany (see present edition, Vol. 45). Engels realised his plan in this article.


See notes 30 and 38.


At the 1874 elections the German Social-Democrats received 351,952 votes.

The Swiss Workers' Association (Schweizer Arbeiterbund) was set up at the congress of workers of trade, co-operative and other organisations, which took
place in Olten on June 1-3, 1873. Eighty delegates attended the Congress. This
was the country’s first mass, nation-wide workers’ organisation. p. 176

206 The North-Italian Federation was established on October 15, 1876 in Milan on
the initiative of the local circle for the study of social problems, at a meeting
which was also attended by representatives of the socialist sections and circles of
Lombardy, Veneto, Piedmont, Ferrara and the canton of Ticino (Switzerland).

p. 177

207 This and the following articles (see this volume, pp. 181-82, 203-05) were
printed unsigned in La Pléie (see also Note 195). p. 179

208 The meeting chaired by John Bright was held on May 16, 1877 at Exeter Hall
in London. Of the 2,594 participants, 1,218 were members of the National
Agricultural Labourers’ Union, set up in May 1872, whose membership had
reached 86,000 by 1874. Joseph Arch, the Union’s leading activist, spoke on the
attitude of English agricultural labourers to the Russo-Turkish war. He said
that they 'were determined their blood should not be spilt and their treasure
expended in the support of Turkey ... there was not a class of her Majesty’s
subjects in the British realm that suffered more from the Crimean war than
did the farm labourers. They had felt the pinch of hunger and want for twenty
years in consequence of it' (quoted from “The County Franchise”, The Daily
News, No. 9694, May 17, 1877). p. 179

209 The following two resolutions were passed by the meeting of May 16, 1877 at
Exeter Hall: "That in the opinion of this Conference it would be desirable to
adopt an uniform Parliamentary franchise for borough and county constitu-
cencies; ... That it would be desirable to redistribute political power as to obtain
more complete representation of the opinion of the electoral body” (quoted

p. 179

210 Probably a reference to the appeal to Prime Minister Disraeli, Lord
Beaconsfield, signed by representatives of the workers from England, Scotland
and Ireland on March 6, 1877 (see “The Premier and Factory Operatives”, The
Times, No. 28883, March 7, 1877). p. 180

211 See Note 208. p. 181

212 A reference to the strikes of agricultural labourers in the counties of Central
and Eastern England for a shorter working day and higher wages. They took
place in 1872-74 and were headed by the National Agricultural Labourers' Union. By April 1874 the strikers managed to secure a pay rise. p. 181

213 See Note 208. p. 182

214 Engels wrote this work in mid-June 1877 at the request of Wilhelm Bracke, a
leader of the Social-Democratic Workers’ Party of Germany, for the Volks-
Kalender which he edited (see Bracke’s letter to Engels of April 13, 1877). It
was published in English for the first time in: Karl Marx, Man, Thinker and

p. 183

215 A reference to Marx’s stay in Kreuznach in May-October 1843, the time when
he conceived the idea of his Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of

When writing this work, he felt the need for more historical material, and
with this in mind he began to study problems related, not only to the theory and history of the state as a whole, but also to the history of particular countries (England, France, Germany, the United States, Italy, Sweden) and major world-historical events, in particular the French Revolution, as can be seen from his five notebooks containing excerpts (the Kreuznach Notebooks). Having moved to Paris in 1844, Marx concentrated on political economy in his scientific studies. Their results were set forth in the work known as the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (see present edition, Vol. 3, pp. 229-346).

Engels is referring above all to Marx's "Critical Marginal Notes on the Article 'The King of Prussia and Social Reform. By a Prussian'" (see present edition, Vol. 3, pp. 189-206), which was one of the reasons for the closing down of the *Vorwärts* and the expulsion of Marx and a number of other contributors from France by Guizot's order of January 16, 1845 issued under pressure from the Prussian government.

Engels' supposition has not been substantiated by facts.

The "Speech on the Question of Free Trade" was based on the material prepared by Marx for a speech he was to have delivered at the Congress of Economists in September 1847 (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 279-81, 287-90). Marx intended to speak at the Congress but its organisers closed the debate and refused to give him the floor. An account of Marx's speech appeared in the Belgian newspaper *Atelier Démocratique* on September 29, 1847.

See Note 162.

The First Congress of the Communist League was held in London on June 2-9, 1847. It was a final stage in the reorganisation of the League of the Just (see Note 378). The activity of Marx and Engels directed towards the ideological and organisational unity of the socialists and advanced workers prompted the leaders of the League, who resided in London from November 1846, to ask for their help in reorganising the League and drafting its new programme. When Marx and Engels were convinced that the leaders of the League of the Just were ready to adopt the principles of scientific communism as its programme, they accepted the offer to join the League made to them late in January 1847. Engels' active participation in the work of the Congress affected the course and the results of its proceedings. The League was renamed the Communist League, the old motto of the League of the Just "All men are brothers" was replaced by a new, Marxist one: "Working Men of All Countries, Unite!" The last sitting on June 9 approved the draft programme and the draft Rules of the League, which had been drawn up either by Engels or with his involvement (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 96-103 and 585-88).

The Second Congress of the Communist League was held on November 29-December 8, 1847. It instructed Marx and Engels to draw up the League's programme. In pursuance of this decision, the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* was written in January (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 477-519).

This refers to the Austro-Italian-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). On July 11, the French and Austrian emperors concluded a separate preliminary peace in Villafranca. p. 189

235 See Note 191. p. 189

236 See Note 84. p. 193

237 Marx wrote this letter to the Otchestvennye Zapiski editorial board probably in November 1877, soon after the magazine had printed, in October 1877, an article by the ideologist of Russian Narodism (populism) Nikolai Mikhailovsky, "Karl Marx Before the Tribunal of Mr. Zhukovsky". Mikhailovsky's article was a reply to the review of Volume One of Marx's Capital written by the Russian bourgeois economist Yuly Zhukovsky, "Karl Marx and His Book on Capital", and printed by Vestnik Yevropy, No. IX, 1877.

Marx's manuscript has come down to us in the form of a rough draft and contains many corrections and deletions. Two versions of the second part of the letter are extant, a concise and a longer one. With slight stylistic changes, the concise version repeats the more detailed one. The letter had not been posted and was found by Engels among Marx's papers after his death. Engels considered it necessary to make copies of the manuscript and enclosed one of them in his letter to Vera Zasulich in Geneva of March 5, 1894 (see present edition, Vol. 47). Marx's letter was first published in Russian in 1886 in Vestnik Narodnoi Voli, No. 5, in Geneva, and in German in the New Yorker Volkzeitung, No. 5, May 3, 1887 and in the Sozialdemokrat, No. 23, June 3, 1887 in Zurich.

The letter was published in English for the first time in: K. Marx, "The Economic Development of Russia", The Plebs, No. 5, May 1920, pp. 70-72. p. 196

238 The term poor whites was applied in the ante-bellum South to those non-slaveholders who fell in the social class below yeomen farmers, artisans and sturdy frontiersmen. As originally used, the term carried a stigma beyond poverty and was applied only to a small group, usually squatters on the poorest lands. p. 201

239 This article, published unsigned in La Plebe, No. 3, January 22, 1878 (in the "Da Londra" section), had a short editorial preface: "From our vast and important correspondence from London we cite passages which are relevant to our present-day political and social situation."

The article was published in English for the first time, abridged, in: K. Marx, F. Engels, On the United States, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979. p. 208

240 Engels borrowed the data pertaining to the development of the socialist press in these countries mostly from the Vorwärts, No. 152, December 90, 1877, and No. 9, January 9, 1878. p. 208

241 Kathedersozialisten (armchair or academic socialists)—representatives of a trend in bourgeois socialism that emerged in Germany in the 1860s-70s. In 1873 its champions (Gustav Schmoller, Adolph Wagner and Lujo Brentano) set up the society Verein für Sozialpolitik which had its own printed organ, Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik. Kathedersocialists supported Bismarck's social policy, advocated class harmony and opposed the workers' revolutionary action. The term was used by a liberal, one Heinrich Bernhard Oppenheim, in the polemic with Adolph Wagner (see National-Zeitung, No. 573, December 7, 1871). p. 203
232 The attempt on Bismarck’s life was made by a cooper’s apprentice, Eduard Kulmann, on July 13, 1874 in Bad-Kissingen. It was staged by the Catholic clergy, which was outraged by the Kulturkampf policy (see Note 27). Bismarck was slightly wounded in the arm.

233 The reference is to the attempt of the French President Marshal MacMahon, the monarchists’ placeman, to accomplish an anti-republican coup d’état. On May 16, 1877, the government herald Journal Officiel carried MacMahon’s letter, which expressed dissatisfaction with the actions of Jules Simon, a bourgeois republican and Chairman of the Council of Ministers. The following day, a new ministry headed by Duke de Broglie, a monarchist, was appointed. On June 25 the Chamber of Deputies, formed mostly of republicans, was dissolved, and new elections were scheduled for October 14, 1877. However, at these elections the republicans scored a decisive victory. The attempt of MacMahon and his supporters (General Auguste Ducrot, Orleanist Anselme Batbie, and others) to bring about a coup d’état on December 13 met with the resistance of junior officers and particularly the soldiers, who shared the republican leanings of the French peasantry. On December 14 a government headed by Jules Dufaure was formed. MacMahon was forced to retire in January 1879 before his time was up. Moderate republican Jules Grévy was elected President. The bourgeois-republican system was established in France.

234 In 1877, a struggle between the workers and the employers flared up in the USA. One of its major features was the railway strike in Eastern Virginia in July 1877, triggered off by a 10-per cent cut in the wages at the three main railway lines leading to the West: Pennsylvania, Baltimore-Ohio, and New York Central. It took government troops and armed detachments of employers to suppress the strike.

235 On the financial crisis of 1879, see Note 84.

236 A reference to the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78.

237 The year 1789—the beginning of the French Revolution; 1793—the period of the Jacobin dictatorship.

238 Engels wrote this article for the American weekly The Labor Standard published in 1876-1900 by Joseph Patrick McDonnell, an activist in the Irish workers’ movement who had emigrated to the USA. It appeared in Nos. 43-47 on March 3, 10, 17, 24 and 31, 1878.

239 The reference is to the Bakuninists. See notes 30 and 38.

240 The battle of Sedan took place on September 1, 1870, in the course of the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71), in which the French army was defeated. The Sedan catastrophe brought nearer the collapse of the Second Empire and led to the declaration of the republic in France on September 4, 1870.

241 Engels is referring to the behaviour of the Prussian middle class at the time of the Franco-Prussian war. On January 18, 1871, during the siege of Paris, the German Empire was ceremonially proclaimed at Versailles: 30 deputies of the Reichstag handed an address to King William I requesting him to accept the Imperial Crown.

242 See Note 38.

243 The international anarchist congresses, in which representatives of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy’s secret organisations took part, were held in Saint-Imier...
The reference is to the abortive attempt of Italian anarchists to launch an uprising in Bologna early in the morning of August 8, 1874. p. 214

In 1877, 26 Italian anarchists, who attempted an insurrection, captured the villages of Letton and Gallo not far from Naples. It was promptly suppressed by the police. p. 214

The Ghent Socialist Congress of September 9-16, 1877 was an attempt to unite the various socialist trends on an international scale. The Congress was attended by representatives of socialist parties (both established ones and those in the process of formation), as well as delegates of the anarchist International. Wilhelm Liebknecht represented the German Social-Democratic Party. On the major issues, the Congress adopted decisions directed against the anarchist minority. Specifically, it confirmed Article 7a added to the International's Rules by the Hague Congress on the need to set up an independent political party of the proletariat (see present edition, Vol. 23, p. 243). The Congress showed that the anarchist trend was falling apart and that Marxism prevailed in the international working-class movement. To a certain extent the Ghent Congress paved the way for the formation of the Second International. Marx wrote to Friedrich Adolph Sorge on September 27, 1877: "The Ghent Congress, whatever else it left to be desired, at least had the advantage that Guillaume and Co. were totally abandoned by their former allies" (see present edition, Vol. 45). p. 215

See Note 62. p. 216

At the Ghent Congress (see Note 246), the Spanish Federation was represented by the Bakunists José García Viñas and Tomás González Morago. It is possible that the third delegate mentioned by Engels was Trinidad Soriano. p. 216

See Note 45. p. 216

The reference is to the New Madrid Federation (Nueva Federación Madrileña) formed on July 8, 1872 by the members of the Emancipación editorial board, who had been expelled from the Madrid Federation by an anarchist majority when the newspaper exposed the activities of the secret Alliance in Spain (José Mesa, Francisco Mora, Pablo Iglesias, etc.). Paul Lafargue played an active part in the organisation and work of the New Madrid Federation. The Federation fought against the spread of anarchist influence in Spain, popularised the ideas of scientific socialism, and campaigned for the establishment of an independent proletarian party in Spain. Engels contributed to its newspaper, La Emancipación. p. 216

That was the first workers' congress in Portugal; it was held in Lisbon on February 1-4, 1877. The congress signified the final formation of the Portuguese Socialist Party founded in 1875; it adopted the Rules and a programme similar to the Gotha programme of the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany (see this volume, pp. 81-99) and elected the Party Central Committee. p. 217
252 After the Paris Commune the government adopted measures aimed against the organisations of the First International in Italy. In the summer of 1871 the International Democratic Society of Florence, which had twice publicly stated its sympathy with the Commune, and the Naples section of the International were dissolved.  

p. 217

253 The Grüti Society (Grütliverein), a Swiss petty-bourgeois reformist organisation, was founded in 1838 as an educational society for artisans and workers. The name Grütliverein was chosen to emphasise the Swiss national character of the association. Legend has it that in 1897, representatives of three Swiss cantons met at Grüti meadow and formed an alliance to fight against the arbitrary rule of the Habsburgs.

For the "Workmen's Confederation" mentioned in the text see Note 205.

p. 218

254 The new Swiss Factory Law of March 23, 1877 was put into force by the referendum of October 21, 1877 despite the resistance by the bourgeoisie.

p. 218

255 In April 1870 the first Social-Democratic group was set up in Copenhagen on the initiative of Niels Lorenzo Petersen, a representative of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. In the summer of 1871 the first section of the I.W.M.A. and somewhat later the Danish Federal Council were set up.

p. 219

256 Members of the International in Denmark managed to win over to their side a substantial part of the peasantry. The United Left received 53 mandates at the elections to the Folketing in November 1878, and 71 mandates in April 1876.

p. 219

257 See Note 17.

p. 221

258 Napoleon's coup d'état of December 2, 1851 resulted in the regime of the Second Empire.

p. 221

259 The mass revolutionary action in Paris which took place on September 4, 1870 led to the fall of the Second Empire and the declaration of the republic headed by the bourgeois government of National Defence.

p. 222

260 See Note 233.

p. 223

261 The reference is to the elections of October 14, 1877 (see Note 253), in which the republicans received 521 seats; the monarchists won 208 votes.  

p. 223

262 The law of 1872 in France introduced universal military service. At the same time it abolished the system of substitutes under which a person liable to military service could hire a substitute for money to serve instead of himself.

p. 224

263 Engels is referring to the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78.

p. 227

264 See Note 14.

p. 228

265 This letter, signed by Marx, was written by Engels and him on June 12, 1878; a fragment of this letter in Engels' handwriting remains extant.

p. 230

266 The reference is to the international congress (June 13-July 13, 1878) convened in Berlin on the initiative of Austria-Hungary and Britain, which opposed the consolidation of Russia's position in the Balkans. The Congress ended with the signing of the Treaty of Berlin which altered the terms of the San Stefano
Peace Treaty of 1878 that concluded the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78. The new terms were unfavourable for Russia and the Slavic nations of the Balkan Peninsula. (See also Note 509.)

In his will drawn up on August 27, 1864, five days before his death, Lassalle named Bernhard Becker as his successor as President of the General Association of German Workers, and the Berlin lawyer Aurel Holthoff and Lothar Bucher as the executors of his will.

The reference is to the assassination attempt on William I made on May 11, 1878 by former Emil Hödel (Hoedel), who had been earlier expelled from the Leipzig Social-Democratic Association, and to that of June 2 made by the German anarchist Karl Eduard Nobiling who had never been a member of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party. These events gave rise to a vicious campaign against the socialists and were an excuse for the promulgation of the Anti-Socialist Law in October 1878.

The German battleship Großer Kurfürst sank on May 31, 1878 in Pax de Calais at Folkestone (England) as a result of a collision with the German ship König Wilhelm.

See Note 65.

Marx's letter "Herr Bucher" (see this volume, pp. 230-31) was reprinted from The Daily News by many German papers. A number of errors were made in the translations; this prompted Bucher to come up with his "Declaration", to which Marx replied with the given item printed in German newspapers under the title "Marx und Bucher".


By the congress, Howell is referring to the London Conference of the International held on September 25-29, 1865; taking part in its work were members of the Central Council (later renamed the General Council) and delegates from the International's sections in France, Germany, Belgium and Switzerland. The Conference heard the report of the Central Council, approved its financial statement and the programme of the International's first congress to be held in Geneva in September 1866. The London Conference, which Marx did a great deal to organise, played an important role at the time of the International's establishment. For the minutes of the Conference see The General Council of the First International, 1864-1866. The London Conference 1865. Minutes, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974.

The agenda of the London Conference, which was drawn up by Marx and approved by the General Council on July 25, 1865, thus defined the paragraph on the attitude of the working class to the struggle for the independence of Poland: "The Muscovite invasion of Europe, and the re-establishment of an integral and independent Poland" (see The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866. The London Conference 1865. Minutes. p. 305). At the Conference session of September 27, 1865, the delegates adopted the following resolution: "4th. That it is imperative to annihilate the invading influence of
Russia in Europe by applying to Poland 'the right of every people to dispose of itself', and re-establishing that country on a social and democratic basis' (ibid., p. 246).

273 Marx did not put the religious question on the agenda of the London Conference of 1865 (see Note 274). At the September 27 session this question, supported by Le Lubez, Fribourg, Holorp, Howell and Tolain, was included on the agenda of the prospective congress. However, drawing up "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council. The Different Questions", whose main provisions were adopted by the Geneva Congress as resolutions, Marx simply wrote under point 11: "Religious Question. To be left to the initiative of the French" (see The General Council of the First International, 1864-66. The London Conference 1865. Minutes, p. 351). p. 236

276 See notes 30 and 38. p. 286

277 By the "Fenian troubles" Marx means the abortive attempt at an uprising staged by the Fenians in February-March 1867. It was scheduled for February 11; the plan was drawn up with the assistance of the French republican Gustave Paul Clusereit, the future military delegate of the Paris Commune. The British authorities learned about the preparations; the uprising, which assumed the form of isolated actions, was brutally suppressed.

The Fenians were Irish revolutionaries who named themselves after the " Féne", the ancient population of Ireland. Their first organisations appeared in the 1850s in the USA among the Irish immigrants and later in Ireland itself. The secret Irish Revolutionary Brotherhood, as the organisation was known in the early 1860s, aimed at establishing an independent Irish republic by means of an armed uprising. The Fenians, who expressed the interests of the Irish peasantry, came chiefly from the urban petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals, and believed in conspiratorial tactics. The British government attempted to suppress the Fenian movement by severe police reprisals.

p. 237


279 The French Rural Assembly—a derogatory nickname of the National Assembly which met in Bordeaux on February 12, 1871 and consisted mostly of monarchists: provincial landowners, officials, rentiers and tradesmen elected in the rural constituencies.

In late 1871 the Assembly undertook an investigation of the events of the Paris Commune. Its findings were published in Enquête parlementaire sur l'insurrection du 18 mars, Vols. I-III, Versailles, 1872. p. 237

280 See Note 268. p. 238

281 Pseudomorph—a term designating a natural or synthetic mineral having the crystalline form of another mineral rather than that normally characteristic of its composition. p. 238

282 Marx probably sets forth the circular issued by the Spanish government to the governors of the Spanish provinces. It said, in part: "This communist sect is a veritable conspiratorial society opposing everything existing. Having declared its absolute negation of God and the State, property and the family, it tries to elevate its socio-political theories to the category of principles. Its theories cannot be
considered by organised society otherwise than as a criminal philosophical utopia" (Gaceta de Madrid, No. 17, January 17, 1872).

The reference is to Pius IX's encyclical issued on December 8, 1864, "Quanta cura", and Syllabus complectens praecipuos nostrae aeaeis errores qui notantur in Allocautionibus consistorialibus, in Encyclicis aliusque Apostolici litteris sanctissimi Domini Nostri Pii Papae IX", Cologne, 1864, pp. 25 and 29. p. 238

On March 14, 1872 the French National Assembly promulgated a law banning the International's organisations in France. At their meetings in Bad Gastein in August 1871 and Salzburg in September 1871, the German and the Austrian emperors specially discussed a joint campaign against the International. p. 239

By mid-1878, Social-Democratic parties existed in Germany (from 1869), Switzerland (from June 1878), Denmark (from 1876), Portugal (from 1875), and Belgium (from 1877). In the USA, the unity congress of socialist organisations held in Philadelphia founded the Labor Party of the USA, which in December 1877 was named the Socialist Labor Party of the USA. p. 239

Marx wrote these notes on the basis of the stenographic report on the first debate in the Reichstag of the Anti-Socialist Law (Gesetz gegen die gemeingefährlichen Bestrebungen der Sozialdemokratie. See: Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstags, Vol. 1, Berlin, 1878, pp. 29-91). The report was sent to Marx by Wilhelm Bracke, a leader of the German Social-Democrats. Marx's and Engels' letters (Marx to Engels on September 17, Engels to Marx on September 18 and Marx to Jenny Marx on September 17, 1878, see present edition, Vol. 45) show that they closely followed the debates in the Reichstag and the comments of the British press. The Law was passed on October 21, 1878 (see Note 289).

Marx intended this piece to be the basis for an article in The Daily News (see Marx's letter to Engels of September 24, 1878, present edition, Vol. 45), but his plan remained un realised.

For the first time, Marx's manuscript was published in Russian in the Marx-Engels Archives, Vol. 1 (VI), 1992, pp. 389-460. It appeared in German in Werke, Bd. 34, S. 491-500.


In the present edition the work is printed according to the manuscript. The italics in the quotations are Marx's. p. 240

The King's speech on the occasion of the opening of the newly elected Reichstag (July 30, 1878) was made on September 9 by Count Otto Stolberg-Wernigerode, Vice-Chancellor of the German Empire, on the instruction of Crown Prince Frederick III (see Stenographische Berichte..., Vol. 1, Berlin, 1878, pp. 1-2). p. 240

The Exceptional Law against the Socialists (Gesetz gegen die gemeingefährlichen Bestrebungen der Sozialdemokratie—the Law against the Harmful and Dangerous Aspirations of Social-Democracy) was introduced by the Bismarck government, supported by the majority in the Reichstag, on October 21, 1878.
to counter the socialist and workers' movement. This law, better known as the Anti-Socialist Law, made the Social-Democratic Party of Germany illegal, banned all party and mass workers' organisations, and the socialist and workers' press; on the basis of this law socialist literature was confiscated and Social-Democrats subjected to reprisals. However, during its operation the Social-Democratic Party, assisted by Marx and Engels, uprooted both opportunist and "ultra-Left" elements and managed to substantially strengthen and widen its influence among the people by skilfully combining illegal and legal methods of work. Under pressure from the mass workers' movement, the Anti-Socialist Law was abrogated on October 1, 1890. For Engels' assessment of the law, see his article "Bismarck and the German Working Men's Party" (this volume, pp. 407-09).

Bebel is probably referring to the official despatch "Die Frevelthat vom 2. Juni" carried by the special issue of the Neue Preußische Zeitung, No. 126, June 4, 1878, with the note: "with some corrections". p. 241

At the sitting of September 12, 1878 the Navy Minister Albrecht von Stosch promised to promote the publication of the materials pertaining to the sinking of the battleship Großer Kurfürst (see Note 269) on which the Reichstag was insisting (see Begründung, Beantwortung und Bestreitung der Interpellation des Abgeordneten Mosle, betreffend den Zusammenstoß der Panzerschiffe "König Wilhelm" und "Großer Kurfürst"). p. 242

The Ultramontane—representatives of a religious and political trend in Catholicism, advocates of the right of the Pope to interfere into the domestic affairs of any state.

In this case, the Ultramontane party Marx means the so-called Party of the Centre, a political party of German Catholics formed in 1870-71, which mirrored the separatist tendencies prevailing among the higher clergy, landowners and bourgeoisie in Western and South-Western Germany. The party had a certain influence among the peasantry, petty bourgeoisie and workers and was in opposition to the Bismarck government, which was waging a vigorous campaign against it (see Note 27). p. 243

Eulenburg is referring to his speech in the Reichstag on May 23, 1878 during the debate of the Anti-Socialist Law submitted for consideration after Hödel's assassination attempt on May 11, 1878 (see Note 258). On May 24 the Reichstag rejected the Bill by 251 votes against 57 (see Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstags, Vol. 2, Berlin, 1878, p. 1511). p. 243

Hödel was executed on August 16, 1878. Nobiling died on September 10, 1878, as a result of an attempt to shoot himself in the head after the assassination attempt on William I's life (see Note 268). p. 244

See Note 65. p. 244

Marx probably made this remark on the basis of what Wilhelm Bracke said about the series of essays in the Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung in his speech of September 17, 1878, during the debate of the Anti-Socialist Law in the Reichstag (see Stenographische Berichte..., Vol. 1, Berlin, 1878, p. 83). p. 244

Vera Zasulich made an assassination attempt on St. Petersburg's Governor Trepov on January 24 (February 5), 1878, who had ordered the arrested revolutionary Bogolyubov to be lashed; the gendarme chief Mezentsov was murdered by Sergei Stepyak-Kravchinsky on August 4 (16) of the same year.
Vera Zasulich was acquitted by the jury. Her trial in St. Petersburg provoked a lively response in the European press. p. 245

The congress of the anarchist Jura Federation was held on August 3-5, 1878 in Fribourg (Switzerland). Its resolution was printed by L'Avant-Garde, No. 33, August 26, 1878, p. 2.

The Jura Federation, an anarchist organisation in Switzerland which was founded at a congress in Sonvilier (1871), united a number of small sections of the First International. It played the role of the international ideological and organisational centre of the anarchist movement and was led by members of the Bakuninist secret Alliance of Socialist Democracy, James Guillaume and Adhémar Schwitzguébel. In 1873 the Jura Federation was expelled from the International for its refusal to adhere to the decisions of the Hague Congress of the International (1872). The Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs was, in fact, the anarchists' central theoretical organ. The Federation ceased to exist in 1878. p. 246

Marx and Engels exposed the activities of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see notes 30 and 38) in their work The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association (written in collaboration with Paul Lafargue) (see present edition, Vol. 23). It was published as a pamphlet in French (L'Alliance de la Démocratie Socialiste et l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, London, Hamburg, 1873) and in the German translation (Ein Complot gegen die Internationale Arbeiter-Association, Brunswick, 1874).

By the attempts on the members of the "Marxian tendency", Marx is referring to assaults on Nikolai Utin in Zurich on June 18, 1872, on Francisco Mora in September 1872, on Pablo Iglesias in Madrid on November 12, 1872, and on Anselmo Lorenzo in the same year (see present edition, Vol. 23). p. 246

The Puritans and Levellers—two political groups at the time of the English Revolution of the 17th century. The Puritans expressed the interests of the Calvinist Protestants; from the first half of the 17th century their movement was a political opposition to absolutism, the ideological banner of the Revolution. The complexity of the Puritans' social and political composition and religious convictions (by the early 17th century, two main trends, the Presbyterians and the Independents, were already clearly discernible) inevitably led to a sharp controversy within the "Puritan" parliamentary faction in the course of the Revolution. In 1645-47 a split took place among the Independents, as a result of which their Left wing, the Levellers, parted company with them. The Levellers were representatives of a radical democratic trend. They wanted to transform England into a republic with a one-House Parliament elected by universal suffrage, to remove all inequalities and introduce other democratic reforms. Attempting to get their programme accepted as the basis of the republican system, the Levellers instigated army mutinies in May and September 1649 but were defeated; after that, the movement declined.

The Hébertistes, at the time of the French Revolution, a political group in the Left Jacobin camp which was named after Jacques René Hébert, one of its leaders, and took its final shape in the winter of 1793-94. The trend conveyed the social discontent of small working men, demanded that the maximum be strictly observed and that profiteering and sabotage be ruthlessly combated. In March 1794, the Hébertistes threatened to rise against the Jacobin Committee of Public Safety but failed to gain the support of the revolutionary sections. On
March 14, 1794, most of their leaders and activists were arrested and guillotined.

301 The National Association (Deutscher National-Verein) (September 15, 1859 to October 19, 1867) was a party of the German liberal bourgeoisie which advocated the unification of Germany (without Austria) in a strong centralised state under the ægis of the Prussian monarchy. Its inaugural congress was held in Frankfurt in September 1859.

302 The reference is to the American Civil War (1861-65) and the French Revolution at the end of the 18th century.

303 This passage from the Manifesto of the Communist Party reads: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions" (see present edition, Vol. 6, p. 819). The Manifesto was published in February 1848 on behalf of the Communist League, whose first congress took place in June 1847 (see notes 220 and 590).

304 Eulenburg is referring to Bebel's statement in his speech of September 16 that at one time the "socially dangerous" aspirations of Social-Democracy were extensively supported by the Prussian government with a view to counteracting the opposition of the bourgeoisie.

305 At the 1871 elections to the Reichstag, Social-Democrats received 124,655 votes (3.2 per cent) and two mandates in the Reichstag; in 1874—351,952 votes (6.8 per cent) and ten mandates, one of which was lost as a result of supplementary elections; in 1877—493,288 (9.1 per cent) and 13 mandates, one of which was lost in supplementary elections; and in 1878—457,158 votes (7.6 per cent) and nine mandates.

306 This article was the last one in the series of articles sent by Engels to La Plebe. It appeared there on March 30, 1879 (No. 12), in the section "Nostra corrispondenza. Da Londra" without a title and was signed by Engels' name. It was prefaced by a short editorial introduction: "We have received a report from London from our outstanding friend F. Engels, one of the most prominent and illustrious leaders of international socialism.

"This report deserves particular attention thanks to the appreciation by Engels of the present situation in Germany and Russia. Therefore we find it useful to acquaint our readers with it too.

"We give almost the whole translation of this report."

307 The reference is to the supplementary elections to the Reichstag which were held in the Western electoral district of Breslau on February 5, 1879 because of the death of its deputy Heinrich Bürgers. The elections, which took place after the promulgation of the Anti-Socialist Law (see Note 289), demonstrated the strength and unity of the working class. The workers nominated their own candidate Julius Kräcker, who received 7,544 votes, which, however, were not enough to get elected. (Engels wrote to Wilhelm Liebknecht on March 1, 1879: "The election in Breslau has made a splendid impression here too." See present edition, Vol. 45.) At the supplementary elections of February 27 in the Saxonian electoral district of Waldheim-Debela, the Social-Democratic candidate won 4,322 votes.

308 When "going into the thick of the people" in 1873-75 failed (see Note 49), the Narodniki who had managed to escape arrest set up a new organisation in
St. Petersburg in 1876, which in 1878 came to be known as Zemlya i Voïa
(Land and Freedom). In their practical work, its members founded permanent
"settlements" of revolutionaries in the countryside for the purpose of
establishing close contacts with the peasantry and preparing a popular
revolution. As the rest of the Narodniki, they believed that Russia's
development could follow a non-capitalist social and economic path; its basis
was to be the village commune. Regarding the peasantry as the main
revolutionary force, members of Land and Freedom also conducted propagan-
da among workers, students and soldiers. Their achievement was the formation
of a strong, battleworthy revolutionary organisation. Proceeding from the
inevitability of a "forceful overthrow"; they placed primary importance with
"agitation through action" (strikes, mutinies, demonstrations). They considered
terrorism acceptable only as a means of self-protection and taking vengeance on
the government. Engels is referring specifically to the actions of Vera Zasulich
and Sergei Stepnyak-Kravchinsky (see Note 297).

509 The reference is to the decisions of the Berlin international congress which
revised the terms of the San Stefano Peace Treaty (see Note 266). In
accordance with these decisions, the territory of self-governing Bulgaria
covised by the San Stefano Treaty was cut by over a half, and an
autonomous province, Eastern Roumelia, was formed out of Bulgarian regions
to the south of the Balkans that was to remain under the Turkish rule; the
territory of Montenegro was also substantially curtailed. The Treaty of Berlin
confirmed that part of Bessarabia, which Russia had lost in 1856, was to be
returned to her, but it also authorised the occupation of Bosnia and
Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary. The Russian government was forced to
submit the San Stefano Treaty for revision to the international congress under
pressure from Britain, which had seized Cyprus on the eve of the congres-

The Treaty of Berlin was signed by representatives of Russia, Germany,
Austria-Hungary, France, Great Britain, Italy and Turkey.

510 After the Anti-Socialist Law came into force in October 1878 (see Note 289),
the publication of the Parry's central organ, Vorwärts as well as of other Party
newspapers, was banned in Germany. In July-September 1879, when preparing
to start the publication, in Zürich, of a new central organ of the Socialist Workers'
Party of Germany, the newspaper Der Sozialdemokrat, lively negotiations (mostly
through correspondence), concerning the newspaper's political line and the
composition of its editorial board, were under way between Leipzig (see
Note 316), Zürich (see Note 315), Paris (Karl Hirsch) and London (Marx and
Engels).

The draft of this letter was written by Engels after September 11 (see
Engels' letter to Marx of September 11, 1879, present edition, Vol. 45) as a
reply to August Bebel's letter of August 20, and on September 17-18, when
Marx returned to London (see Note 311), it was discussed by them and given
its final shape. This document, which has come down into history as the
"Circular Letter", is one of the principal statements of Marx and Engels against
Right-wing opportunism. In a letter to Sorge of September 19, 1879, Marx
called it a circular letter intended "just for private circulation among the
German leaders" (see present edition, Vol. 45).

In English, the letter was first published in the magazine International Press
Correspondence, No. 39, Berlin, 1931, pp. 737-38 (an excerpt), and practically in
full in: K. Marx and F. Engels, Correspondence 1846-1895, Lawrence, London.
1934, pp. 362-77. The italics in the letters of third persons to each other and to Marx and Engels are Engels'.

Between August 8 and 20, Marx stayed on the Isle of Jersey, and between August 21 and September 17, 1879, he visited his eldest daughter Jenny in Ramsgate.

A reference to the programme article "Rückblicke auf die sozialistische Bewegung in Deutschland" written by Karl Höchberg (pen-name Ludwig Richter), Eduard Bernstein, and Karl August Schramm and printed anonymously in the Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft und Socialpolitik (Jg. 45, 1. Hälfte, Zurich-Oberstrass, 1879) published by Höchberg in Zurich. This issue was received by Engels on August 28, 1879 immediately upon his return from Eastbourne.

On September 13 Höchberg visited Engels in London (on Engels' assessment of the authors' stand, see Note 315).  

Engels' letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht of August 20, 1879 has not been found (for its content, see Engels' letter to Marx of August 20, 1879, present edition, Vol. 45). Bebel wrote to Engels on the same day (August 20) and could not, of course, see this letter.

Liebknecht's letter of July 28, 1879 was in fact received by Hirsch, which is borne out by his letter to Marx of August 2, 1879.

The supervisory committee or the Zürihers—Eduard Bernstein, Karl Höchberg and Karl August Schramm. On September 15, 1879 Engels wrote to Johann Philipp Becker concerning the stand of this committee: "The Zurich editorial committee which, under the general management of the Leipzigers, is to supervise and censor the paper, consists of Höchberg, Schramm and Bernstein ... all three are revealed to be common or garden bourgeois and pacific philanthropists" (see present edition, Vol. 45).

The Leipzig controlling committee or theLeipzigers—August Bebel, Wilhelm Liebknecht and Louis Vierbeck to whom Engels is referring, drawing on Hirsch's information. In actual fact the Leipzig editorial committee originally comprised August Bebel, Wilhelm Friszche and Wilhelm Liebknecht, who were later joined by Karl Grillenberger and Ignaz Ausen, who did not reside in Leipzig.

On May 17, 1879 the Social-Democratic Deputy Max Kayser made a speech in the Reichstag in support of the government's project for protective customs tariffs. Marx and Engels sharply condemned Kayser, who supported the proposal introduced in favour of the big industrialists and landowners to the detriment of the masses, as well as the licence given to Kayser by some of the German Social-Democratic leaders (see letters: Engels to Marx of August 20, Marx to Engels of September 10, Marx to Sorge of September 19, and Engels to Bebel of November 14 and 24, 1879, present edition, Vol. 45).


Hirsch and Höchberg met in Paris on August 15 and 16, 1879.

Engels is referring here to the German Workers' Educational Society in London (see Note 13), which he ironically calls "the local association, Freiheit". The newspaper Die Freiheit was published at the time by Johann Most on the instruction and with the means of the Society.
Hirsch received this information from Höchberg when they met in Paris (see Note 318) and conveyed it to Engels in a letter of August 23, 1879, p. 259

See Note 289.

Bismarck's plan to introduce state management of all the German railways (see this volume, pp. 277-79) was discussed at the congress of the German Social-Democrats in Gotha in August 1876. The congress voted for the transfer of the privately owned railways to the state but noted also that the concentration of the railways in the hands of the Imperial government would promote the class interests of the bourgeoisie and the militarists (see Protokoll des Socialisten-Congresses zu Gotha vom 19. bis 23. August 1876, Berlin, 1876, p. 89). p. 261

The reference is to the barricade fighting in Berlin on March 18, which marked the beginning of the 1848-49 revolution in Germany. p. 265

An ironical reference to Johann Miquel, a former member of the Communist League and subsequently a leader of the National Liberals' right wing, who was founder and member of various joint-stock companies.

On "the crash of 1873" that followed the period of "prosperity" in Germany, see Note 84. p. 266

The reference is to the Anti-Socialist Law passed by the German Reichstag in October 1878 (see Note 289). p. 266

See Note 316.

Marx and Engels wrote this item at the request of Maltman Barry, a British journalist, formerly a member of the General Council of the First International. Barry intended to publicly expose Karl Blind, a former democrat, a National Liberal from the 1860s, who printed an article "Prince Napoleon and European Democracy" in Fraser's Magazine (Vol. 20, London, 1879, pp. 504-21).

Marx made several additions to the extant manuscript, which was written mostly by Engels.

It was published in English for the first time in MEGA2, Abt. 1, Bd. 25, Berlin, 1985, S. 186-87. p. 270

Throughout his London emigration, Karl Blind contributed to a number of newspapers: Hermann (London), The North British Daily Mail (Glasgow), The Morning Star (London), The Daily News (London), and The Pall Mall Gazette (London). For an assessment of his activity, see Marx's letter to Liebknecht of April 6, 1871 (present edition, Vol. 43). p. 270

The reference is to the provisional government headed by the petty-bourgeois democrat Brentano, which was formed in Baden in the spring of 1849 during the uprising in Southern and Western Germany in defence of the Imperial Constitution (see Note 139). p. 270

See Note 190.

Having suppressed the bourgeois revolution in Italy (1848-49), the French troops, sent to the Papal States in 1849 for the restoration of the Pope's secular power, continued to occupy Rome up to 1870. For this reason, at the beginning of the Franco-Prussian War the Italian government rejected the proposal to conclude an alliance against Prussia, and on September 20, 1870 incorporated Rome into the Kingdom of Italy. The Pope's secular power ceased to exist. p. 271

This work was written for the French socialist newspaper L'Égalité in late
February 1880. When working on it, Engels used facts found in Rudolph Meyer's *Politische Gründer und die Korruption in Deutschländ*, Leipzig, 1877 (see Engels' letter to August Bebel of November 24, 1879, present edition, Vol. 45).

p. 272

333 See Note 289.

p. 272

334 In 1862, when the German working-class movement was livening up, Lassalle began a propaganda campaign with a view to establishing a political organisation of the German proletariat. Its outcome was the founding of the *General Association of German Workers* (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein) at the congress of workers' associations held in Leipzig on May 23, 1863. The formation of the Association was an important step in the development of an independent nation-wide workers' movement in Germany and helped emancipate the workers from the ideological influence of the liberal bourgeoisie. However, the Association had a sectarian character and was guided in its work by Lassalle's somewhat outdated and utopian ideas.

When the International Working Men's Association (the First International) was formed, the sectarian, nationalistic line of the General Association's Lassallean leadership began to hinder the involvement of German workers in the international proletarian organisation. As the ideas of Marxism and the experience of the class struggle spread among them, the authority of the Lassallean doctrines was undermined, and the Association began to draw closer to the other trend in German Social-Democracy, the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (the Eisenachers) founded in 1869 and headed by Bebel and Liebknecht. At the congress held in Gotha in May 1875 the General Association of German Workers and the Social-Democratic Workers' Party united into a single organisation, the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany.

p. 273

335 An allusion to the reparations received by Germany as a result of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 (see Note 144).

p. 273

336 The *Crédit mobilier* (Société générale du Crédit mobilier)—a French joint-stock bank founded in 1852 by the Péreire brothers. Closely connected with and protected by the government of Napoleon III, it engaged in large-scale speculation. The bank was involved, in particular, in the railway-building business. It went bankrupt in 1867 and was liquidated in 1871.

p. 273

337 The campaign for the introduction of protectionist laws unfolded in Germany at the outset of the 1873 crisis (see Note 84). On February 15, 1876 a number of protectionist unions formed a single organisation, *Centralverband Deutscher Industrieller zur Beförderung und Wahrung nationaler Arbeit*. In 1876, during the agrarian crisis, big landowners, Prussian Junkers above all, joined the campaign. In October 1877 the industrial and agrarian advocates of the reform concluded an agreement. In March 1878 a non-partisan *Freie wirtschaftliche Vereinigung* was formed, which 204 deputies joined at the very first session of the Reichstag in September-October 1878. In December of that year, Bismarck submitted his preliminary draft of the customs reform to a specially appointed commission. On July 12, 1879 the final draft was approved by the Reichstag, and came into force on July 15. The new customs tariff provided for a substantial increase in import taxes on iron, machinery and textiles, as well as on grain, cattle, lard, flax, timber, etc.

p. 274

338 The *Discount Society* (Discontogesellschaft)—a discount bank founded in 1851 by David Hansemann in Berlin which later served as the model for this type of
establishment. In the 1870s, it mostly engaged in speculation in railway shares.

338 The Imperial Railways Office (Reichseisenbahnamt) was founded on June 27, 1873 and began to function on September 19 of that year. Its first director, Alfred Scheele, was involved in all speculations of the Discount Society (see Note 338), having a seat on its Board of Directors.

340 See Note 141.

341 The reference is to the Prussian Maritime Trading Company (Preussische Seehandlungsgesellschaft), a trade and credit society founded in 1772 and enjoying a number of important state privileges. It granted large credits to the government and from 1820 in fact acted as its banker and broker. In 1904 it was made the official Prussian State Bank.

342 A paraphrase of the following passage from the "First Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian War" written by Marx between July 19 and 23, 1870: "After her victory did Prussia dream one moment of opposing a free Germany to an enslaved France? Just the contrary. While carefully preserving all the native beauties of her old system, she superadded all the tricks of the Second Empire, its real despotism and its mock democracy, its political shams and its financial jobs, its high-flown talk and its low légèrdomains. The Bonapartist regime, which till then only flourished on one side of the Rhine, had now got its counterfeit on the other. From such a state of things, what else could result but war?" (see present edition, Vol. 22, pp. 5-6).

343 In 1880, at Paul Lafargue's request, Engels rewrote three chapters of Anti-Dühring—Chapter I of the Introduction and chapters I and II of Part III (see present edition, Vol. 25)—into a separate popular work first printed in three issues of the French journal La Revue socialiste, in March-May 1880, and then, in the same year, as a separate pamphlet entitled Socialisme utopique et socialisme scientifique. Working on it, Engels made a number of additions and changes in the text. The translation into French was done by Paul Lafargue. A major impetus to the international currency of the work was the publication, in 1882, of the first authorised German edition entitled Die Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft in which Engels also made some additions. Already in Engels' lifetime, the work was translated into many European languages and gained wide currency among the workers, thus effectively promoting the dissemination of Marxist ideas. The translations were made from the French pamphlet and, mostly, from the German edition.

The fourth authorised German edition of the work appeared in Berlin in 1891. Engels made a number of additions in it, which he did not include in the last edition of Anti-Dühring published in his lifetime, in 1894 (see these additions in the present edition, Vol. 25, pp. 630-42).

In the publication of Socialism: Utopian and Scientific a significant place attaches to the authorised English translation, made by Edward Aveling from the fourth German edition of 1891, which appeared in London in 1892. Engels called the first English-language publication in The People, a socialist New York newspaper (August-October 1891), a 'pirated' edition with its miserable English (see Engels' letter to Friedrich Adolph Sorge, October 24, 1891, present edition, Vol. 49).

In the present edition, the work is reproduced from the authorised English edition of 1892 checked against the French edition of 1880 and the German
edition of 1891. The English translation is practically identical to the text of the fourth German edition; the more or less significant discrepancies are indicated in footnotes.

See Note 289.

According to Rousseau’s theory, originally people lived in the natural state of equality. The emergence of private property led to property and political inequality which was consolidated by the appearance of the state. In the future only the state based on the people’s voluntary accord was supposed to be capable of securing the citizens’ political and economic equality (the *Contrat social* of Rousseau).

This theory is developed in Rousseau’s *Discours sur l’origine et les fondemens de l’inégalité parmi les hommes*, Amsterdam, 1755, and *Du contrat social; ou, Principes du droit politique*, Amsterdam, 1762.

The *Reformation* (16th century)—a broad socio-political and ideological anti-feudal movement of complex social content and composition. It assumed a religious form of struggle against the Catholic doctrine and Church and spread over most of Western and Central Europe. Its climax was the Peasant War in Germany in 1524-25.

The *Anabaptists* (rebaptisers) belonged to one of the most radical and democratic religious-philosophical trends spread in Switzerland, Germany and the Netherlands during the Reformation. Members of this sect were so called because they repudiated infant baptism and demanded a second, adult baptism.

Engels is referring to the “true Levellers” or “Diggers”, who broke away from the democratic republican Levellers’ movement during the English bourgeois revolution of the mid-17th century. Representing the poorest sections of the population suffering from feudal and capitalist exploitation in town and countryside, the Diggers, in contrast to the rest of the Levellers, who defended private property, carried on propaganda for community of property and other ideas of egalitarian communism, attempting to establish common ownership of the land through collective ploughing of communal waste land.

Engels has in mind, above all, Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516) and Tommaso Campanella’s *City of the Sun* (1623).

The *Reign of Terror*, the period from May 31, 1793 to July 26, 1794, was one of the Jacobin revolutionary democratic dictatorship in France, when the Jacobins used revolutionary terror in response to the counter-revolutionary terror of the Girondists and the Royalists.

The *Directorate* or *Directory* (consisting of five directors of whom one was re-elected every year) was the leading executive body in France set up under the 1795 Constitution, adopted after the fall of the Jacobin revolutionary dictatorship in the summer of 1794. It governed France until Bonaparte’s coup d’état of 1799 and expressed the interests of the big bourgeoisie.

The reference is to the motto of the French Revolution “*Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*”.

Saint-Simon’s first work, *Lettres d’un habitant de Genève à ses contemporains*, was written in Geneva in 1802 and published anonymously in Paris in 1803, without specifying the place and date of publication. Engels made use of: G. Hubbard, *Saint-Simon, sa vie et ses travaux. Suivi de fragments des plus célèbres écrits de
Saint-Simon, Paris, 1857. This edition contains inaccuracies in dating some of Saint-Simon’s works.

Fourier’s first major work was Théorie des quatre mouvements et des destinées générales written in the first years of the 19th century and anonymously published in Lyons in 1808 (Leipzig was indicated on the title page as the place of publication, probably for reasons of censorship).

New Lanark—a cotton mill near the Scottish town of Lanark; it was built in 1784 together with a small settlement. p. 289

Saint-Simon’s idea that the purpose of society ought to be to improve the “lot of the class that is the most numerous and the most poor” is conveyed most distinctly in his last work, Nouveau christianisme, which first appeared anonymously in Paris in 1825. p. 291

A reference to the Correspondance politique et philosophique. Lettres de H. Saint-Simon à un Américain. The letters were published in the collection: H. Saint-Simon, L’industrie, ou Discussions politiques, morales et philosophiques, dans l’intérêt de tous les hommes livrés à des travaux utiles et indépendans, Vol. 2, Paris, 1817. In Hubbard’s edition (see Note 351), this passage is to be found on pp. 155-57. p. 292

The allied armies of the sixth anti-French coalition (Russia, Austria, Britain, Prussia, and others) entered Paris on March 31, 1814. Napoleon’s empire fell, and he was forced to abdicate and was exiled to the Island of Elba. The first restoration of the Bourbon monarchy took place in France.

The Hundred Days—the period of the short-lived restoration of Napoleon’s empire, which lasted from the day of his arrival in Paris from Elba on March 20, 1815 to his second deposition on June 22 following his defeat at Waterloo (see Note 356). p. 292

The reference is to the following two works written by Saint-Simon with his follower Augustin Thierry: De la réorganisation de la société européenne, ou de la nécessité et des moyens de rassembler les peuples de l’Europe en un seul corps politique, en conservant à chacun son indépendance nationale, Paris, 1814, and Opinion sur les mesures à prendre contre la coalition de 1815, Paris, 1815. In Hubbard’s edition (see Note 351), passages from the first work are to be found on pp. 149-54, and the content of both works is set forth on pp. 68-76. p. 292

On June 18, 1815 at Waterloo (Belgium), Napoleon’s army was defeated by the Anglo-Dutch troops commanded by Wellington and the Prussian army commanded by Blücher. p. 292

Charles Fourier wrote in his Théorie des quatre mouvements: “Social advances and changes of periods are brought about by virtue of the progress of women towards liberty, and the decadences of the social order are brought about by virtue of the decrease of liberty of women.” And further: “The extension of the privileges of women is the general principle of all social progress” (Fourier, Œuvres complètes, Vol. 1, Paris, 1841, pp. 195-96). p. 293

Robert Owen, The Revolution in the Mind and Practice of the Human Race; or, the Coming Change from Irrationality to Rationality, London, 1849. The facts from Owen’s biography were borrowed from the same source. p. 295

In January 1815, at a public meeting in Glasgow, Owen proposed a number of measures to improve the conditions of children and adults employed at
factories. The Bill tabled on Owen's initiative in June 1815 was passed by Parliament only in July 1819, and only with reference to child labour. It forbade the employment of children under nine years of age in cotton spinning and weaving mills and also night work of children under sixteen; for this category the working day was limited to twelve hours, not counting breaks for meals; since these were arranged by mill-owners as they thought fit, the working day often lasted fourteen hours or more.  

In October 1833 a congress of co-operative societies and trade unions was held in London with Owen in the chair, at which the *Grand National Consolidated Trades' Union of Great Britain and Ireland* was formally established; its Charter was adopted in February 1834. According to Owen's idea, the Union was to take over the management of production, organise it along co-operative lines, and accomplish a complete transformation of society by peaceful means. Having met with strong resistance from the state and industrialists, the Union ceased to exist in August 1834.  

The reference is to the *Equitable Labour Exchange Bazaars* which were founded by workers' co-operative societies in various English towns and cities; the first of these bazaars set up by Robert Owen in London on September 3, 1832 existed until mid-1834.  

Proudhon's idea of organising a bank of exchange was first expounded in his *Organisation du Crédit et de la Circulation et Solution du problème social* which appeared in early April 1848, and was developed in detail in his later works. Proudhon's main idea was to replace gold and silver, as means of circulation, with bank-notes which were, in fact, impersonal bills. These notes were secured by products of labour which, as Proudhon believed, made them drastically different from the paper money issued by banks and secured by precious metals, landed estates, etc.

An attempt to carry through this project was the foundation, on January 31, 1849, of the Banque du peuple (People's Bank), which, however, went bankrupt and was closed down in early April 1849.  

*Le neveu de Rameau* was written by Denis Diderot around 1762 and later revised twice by him. It was first published, in Goethe's German translation, in Leipzig in 1805. The French original was published in *Oeuvres inédites de Diderot*, Vol. 2, Paris, 1821, which was actually put out in 1823.  

The *Alexandrian period* (Alexandrian culture, Alexandrian age) derives its name from the Egyptian city of Alexandria, a major centre of Hellenic culture. Alexandria, to which thousands of Greeks moved in the 3rd century B.C., saw the flourishing of mathematics, mechanics (Euclid and Archimedes), geography, astronomy, physiology and other sciences.  

Kant's nebular hypothesis, according to which the solar system was originally formed out of a rotating nebulous mass, is expounded in his *Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels, oder Versuch von der Verfassung und dem mechanischen Ursprunge des ganzen Weltgebäudes nach Newtonischen Grundsätzen abgehandelt*, Königsberg and Leipzig, 1755. The book was published anonymously.

Laplace's hypothesis of the origin of the solar system was set out for the first time in the last chapter of his treatise *Exposition du système du monde*, Vols. I-II, Paris, 4th year of the French Republic [1796]. In the sixth edition of
this book (1835), the last one prepared in Laplace's lifetime and published after his
death, the hypothesis is expounded in Note VII to the work.

The existence in space of incandescent masses of gas similar to the original
nebulous mass, which was postulated by the Kant-Laplace nebular hypothesis,
was proved in 1864 by the English astronomer William Huggins, who made an
extensive use of spectral analysis introduced in 1859 by Gustav Kirchhoff and
Robert Bunsen. Here Engels uses the book by P. A. Secchi, Die Sonne,
Brunswick, 1872, pp. 787, 789-90.

566 Carl von Linné, the Swedish natural scientist, was opposed to the theory of the
historical development of the organic world. He believed that the number of
species remained constant and stable since the time of their "creation" (see

567 Engels is referring to the uprising of Lyons weavers in late November 1831,
which was brutally suppressed by the government.

568 The Chartists—participants in the first mass political revolutionary movement
of the English proletariat in the 1830s-50s, who campaigned for the
introduction of the People's Charter (see Note 427). It was the highest stage of
the struggle of the working class in the period before the emergence of
Marxism.

569 These wars were waged by the major European states for hegemony in trade
with India and America and for colonial markets. Initially, the principal rivals
were Britain and the Netherlands, later, Britain and France. Britain emerged
victorious, controlling nearly all world trade by the end of the 18th century.

570 See Note 322. In 1879-82, the bulk of private railways in Prussia were handed
over to the state. Later, it continued buying out the railways.

571 See Note 341.

572 The figures showing the total wealth of Great Britain and Ireland are cited
from Robert Giffen's report, "Recent Accumulations of Capital in the United
Kingdom", made at the Statistical Society on January 15, 1878 and printed by
the London Journal of the Statistical Society, Vol. XI.1, Part. I, March 1878,
pp. 12, 21.

573 Marx probably wrote this "Note" at the request of L'Égalité's editorial board in
late March or early April 1880 as the editorial introduction to his work to be
published by the newspaper (it published only the foreword and § 1 of
Chapter I).

The introduction was published in English for the first time in: Marx,
p. 34.

574 Marx is referring, above all, to Proudhon's speech in the French National
Assembly on July 31, 1848 (see Compte rendu des séances de l'Assemblée nationale,
"Proudhon's Speech against Thiers" which was published in the Neue Rheinische

575 Marx drew up this questionnaire in the first half of April 1880 at the request
of Benoit Malon, publisher of La Revue socialiste. It was printed on April 20
there anonymously and also appeared as a separate leaflet (25,000 copies).
which was distributed throughout France. That Marx was its author was established from his letter to Sorge of November 5, 1880 (see present edition, Vol. 48). As distinct from Marx's manuscript, in the French edition the items were numbered consecutively and two more questions were added (No. 88: "Describe the action by the members of arbitration boards", and No. 101: "General observations"); besides there were some other additions.

The introduction opening the questionnaire noted that it was the first serious attempt to form an opinion of the condition of the French workers, and called on all urban and agricultural workers, as well as all socialists of France, to take part in it. It said: "We hope to find support for our cause among all the urban and agricultural workers, who understand that they alone can describe the hardships they endure with the full knowledge of the matter; that they alone, and not the saviours sent by Providence, can vigorously apply remedies in the struggle against social evils from which they suffer; we count also on the socialists of all schools who, striving for a social reform, must strive for an exact and definite knowledge of the conditions under which the working class, the class to which the future belongs, works and begins to move.

"These instructions of labour must be the first act which the Social-Democrats must perform in order to prepare a social renovation."

The French edition of the "Questionnaire" was the basis for the Italian (La Lotta, Milan, Nos. 1, 2, 3, July 1, 2, 3, 1880), the Polish (Kwestyjmanyjusz robotniczy, 1880, supplement to Nos. 10-11 of the Równi, July-August 1880), and the Dutch (Recht voor Allen, October 30, 1880) translations.

The "Questionnaire" was published in English for the first time as a leaflet, A Workers' Enquiry. By Karl Marx, London, Communist Party of Gr. Britain [1826].

In the present edition the "Questionnaire" is printed according to Marx's manuscript written in English and, in part, in French. p. 328

976 The Introduction to the French edition of Engels' Socialism: Utopian and Scientific (see Note 343) was written by Marx on about May 4-5, 1880. The manuscript contains a postscript in Marx's handwriting: "Dear Lafargue, here is the outcome of my consultations (yesterday evening) with Engels. Tidy up the language, leave the substance intact." The Introduction was initialed P.L. (Paul Lafargue) in the pamphlet.

The French version of the Introduction was used as the basis for the Polish (in: Przedwiat, No. 6/7, December 1, 1881, and in: Fr. Engels, Socjalizm uтопиjsy a naukowy, Geneva, 1882, pp. III-V) and Russian translations (in: Sotsialistitcheskoye znanie, No. 1, Moscow, 1884, pp. 89-92).

In the present edition the Introduction is printed according to Marx's manuscript checked against the 1880 edition. The main discrepancies are pointed out in the footnotes. p. 335

977 A reference to the Communist Correspondence Committee formed by Marx and Engels at the beginning of 1846 in Brussels. Its aim was to prepare the ground for the creation of an international proletarian party. The Committee had no strictly defined composition. Besides the Belgian communist Philippe Gigon, Joseph Weydemeyer, Wilhelm Wolff, Edgar von Westphalen and others were its members at various times. As a rule, the Committee discussed problems of communist propaganda, corresponded with the leaders of existing proletarian organisations: the League of the Just (see Note 378) and the Chartists (see Note 363), tried to draw Proudhon, Cabet and other socialists into its work, and issued lithographed circulars. On the initiative of Marx and Engels,
correspondence committees and groups connected with the Brussels Committee were set up in Silesia, Westphalia and the Rhine Province, Paris and London. These committees played an important role in the development of international proletarian contacts and the organisation of the Communist League in 1847.

p. 335

378 The *League of the Just*, the first political organisation of German workers and artisans, was formed between 1836 and 1838 as a result of a split in the Outlaws' League, which consisted of artisans led by petty-bourgeois democrats. Besides Germans, the League of the Just included workers of other nationalities. The views of its members showed the influence of various utopian socialist ideas, primarily those of Wilhelm Weitling.

p. 336

379 Prominent members of the League of the Just (see Note 378): typesetter Karl Schapper, watchmaker Joseph Moll and others, were connected with the Blanquist secret *Société des Saisons*, which organised the Paris uprising of May 12-13, 1839 (see Note 32). Schapper and Moll took part in the uprising, were prosecuted by the French authorities and compelled to leave for England, where they headed local branches of the League.

p. 336

380 See Note 220.

p. 336

381 The *Democratic Association* (Association démocratique) was founded in Brussels in the autumn of 1847 and united proletarian revolutionaries, mainly German emigrants, and advanced bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats. On November 15, 1847, Marx was elected its Vice-President (the President was Lucien Jottrand, a Belgian democrat), and under his influence it became a centre of the international democratic movement.

p. 336

382 The events of this period are described in Engels' *The Campaign for the German Imperial Constitution* (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 147-239).

p. 336

383 After the socialist congress held in Marseilles in October 1879 set up the French Workers' Party (Parti Ouvrier Français), a group of French socialists headed by Jules Guesde addressed Marx and Engels, through Paul Lafargue, requesting them to help to draft an electoral programme of the French Workers' Party. Its preamble was formulated by Marx who dictated it to Guesde. Engels wrote to Eduard Bernstein about it on October 25, 1881: "A masterpiece of cogent reasoning, calculated to explain things to the masses in a few words" (see present edition, Vol. 46). Marx and Engels also took part in drawing up the practical section of the programme (the minimum programme; see Note 384).

The programme was first published in *Le Précurseur*, No. 25, June 19, 1880; however, Malon adulterated some of its senses and "introduced sundry changes for the worse", Engels wrote to Eduard Bernstein on October 29, 1882 (see present edition, Vol. 46). The preamble in *L'Égalité*, No. 24, June 30, 1880 was probably printed from Guesde's notes. The programme appeared also in *Le Proletaire*, July 10, 1880, *La Revue socialiste*, No. 10, July 20, 1880, and in a number of other French newspapers.

In 1880, the electoral programme was adopted as "the minimum programme" of the French Workers' Party at the Havre Congress. Its first separate edition appeared in Paris in 1883 under the title *Le Programme du Parti Ouvrier*.

Further, L'Égalité printed the minimum programme:

A. Political Programme

1. Abolition of all laws on the press, meetings and associations, and especially the law against the International Working Men's Association.—Suppression of labour-books, this registration of the working class, and all articles of the code of law which place the workers in an unequal position vis-à-vis the employer.

2. Suppression of the budget for the cults and the return to the nation of "property, movable and immovable, belonging to religious corporations and considered unalienable" (the decree of the Commune of April 2, 1871), including the industrial and commercial enterprises of these corporations.

3. Universal arming of the people.

4. The commune is the master of administration and the police.

B. Economic Programme

1. Weekly day of rest on Mondays, in other words, the issue of a law forbidding the employers to demand that the employees work on Mondays.—Legal reduction of the working day to 8 hours for adults.—A ban on the use of child labour under the age of 14 by private enterprises, and legal reduction of the working day to 6 hours for the ages 14 to 18.

2. The fixing of minimum wage by law determined annually in accordance with the local prices for foodstuffs. [This item was entered into the programme on Guesde's insistence; see Marx's letter to Sorge, November 5, 1880, present edition, Vol. 46.]

3. Equal wages for workers of both sexes.

4. Scientific and technical instruction for all children at the expense of society provided by the state and the commune.

5. Elimination of any interference whatsoever of the employers in the management of the workers' mutual aid societies, insurance funds, etc., restoration of the exclusively workers' management in these matters.

6. The employers' responsibility for accidents guaranteed by their paying a deposit in proportion to the number of employed workers and those dangers that the work at the given enterprise presents.

7. Workers' participation in drawing up special rules for the various workshops.—Abolition of the employers' self- usurped right to impose fines on the workers or detract from their wages (the Commune's decree of April 27, 1871).

8. Revision of all contracts pertaining to the alienation of public property (banks, railways, mines, etc.), and exploitation of all state enterprises by the workers employed there.

9. Abolition of all indirect taxes and the transformation of all direct taxes into a progressive tax on incomes exceeding 6,000 francs and on legacies exceeding 20,000 francs.

This letter of greeting was read out at the meeting held on November 29, 1880 in Geneva to commemorate the Polish uprising of 1830 (see Note 383). The meeting was convened by the editorial board of the Polish magazine Równość and attended by nearly 500 socialists of different nationalities: Poles, Russians, Germans, Austrians, Frenchmen, Italians and Swiss. For Engels' assessment of the magazine's stand, see his letter to Kautsky of February 7, 1882 (present edition, Vol. 46).

The original of the letter is not extant. It was published for the first time in
French in the *Précurseur*, No. 49, December 4, 1880, and in Polish (translation from the French) in *Sprawozdanie z międzynarodowego zebrania zwołanego w 50-letnią rocznicę listopadowego powstania przez redakcję „Równości” w Genewie*, Geneva, 1881, pp. 30-32. The discrepancies between the texts are indicated in the footnotes.

In English, the letter was published for the first time in the magazine *The Class Struggle*, Vol. 2, No. 5, New York, 1918, pp. 573-75. p. 343

386 On the first partition of Poland, see Note 9.
On the participation of Poles in the American War of Independence, see Note 73. p. 343

387 The reference is to the Polish national liberation uprising of March 12-November 16, 1794 led by Tadeusz Kościuszko. p. 343

388 After the defeat of the 1794 uprising and the third partition of Poland (see Note 11), some of the participants in the uprising emigrated to France. In October 1796, the Polish general Jan Henryk Dąbrowski submitted to the Directory (see Note 349) a plan for the formation of Polish legions which could fight against Austria. In January 1797 two Polish legions were formed within General Bonaparte’s army. p. 348

389 This refers to the *Polish national liberation uprising* of November 1830-October 1831. Its participants belonged mostly to the revolutionary gentry, and its leaders to the aristocracy. The uprising was crushed by Russia aided by Prussia and Austria. Lack of support from the peasantry, due to the leaders’ refusal to abolish serfdom, contributed to its defeat. p. 343

390 On the Cracow uprising of 1846, see Note 25.
The programme drawn up during the Cracow uprising by Edward Dembowski and expressing the interests of the peasantry and the urban poor demanded that the landless be given land, and that the condition of the working class be drastically improved by establishing national or “social” workshops. p. 344

391 See Note 220. p. 344

392 The public meeting in Brussels of February 22, 1848 was held to mark the second anniversary of the Cracow uprising. Marx and Engels were present and made speeches of greeting (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 545-52). p. 344

393 The reference is to the participation of Polish refugees in the European revolutionary movement of 1848-49. A number of prominent Polish revolutionaries took an active part in the revolutionary events in Hungary (Józef Bern, Henryk Dembiński and Ludwik Wysocki) and in the final stage of the revolution in Germany (Wiktor Heitman, Aleksander Krzyżanowski, Ludwik Mieroslawski). The poet Adam Mickiewicz organised a Polish legion in Italy for the struggle against Austrian oppression. Mierosławski led the struggle of the Sicilian insurgents against the troops of the Neapolitan King Ferdinand Bourbon. A Polish Southern legion was formed on the territory of the Danubian Principalities, which was involved in the liberation struggle of the local population. p. 344

394 See Note 17. p. 344

395 See Note 14. p. 344
Dissent on issues of tactics and theory in the Narodnik Land and Freedom (see Note 308) led to its split into two organisations in 1879. People's Will and the Black Revolution. A major theoretical problem in the Russian revolutionary movement of the time was that of the role of the village commune in the country's political and social transformation. On February 16, 1881, on behalf of her comrades, members of the Black Revolution who later joined the Marxist Emancipation of Labour group, Vera Zasulich asked Marx to express his opinion on the prospects of Russia's historical development, and particularly the future of the village commune: "You are not unaware that your Capital is enjoying great popularity in Russia... but what you probably do not know is the role which your Capital plays in our discussions of the agrarian question in Russia and our rural commune. You know better than anyone else how important and urgent this question is in Russia... especially for our socialist party..."

"You will therefore understand, Citizen, to what extent we are interested in your opinion on this question and what great service you will be rendering us by conveying your ideas on the possible future of our rural commune and the theory of the historical inevitability for all countries of the world to pass through all the phases of capitalist production."

Marx wrote four drafts of his reply to Vera Zasulich's letter. Their analysis and comparison with the final version show that he went from a more detailed exposition of his views to a more laconic one. The first three drafts are published in this volume; the fourth, consisting of only two paragraphs, which have been included into the final version posted to Zasulich on March 8, 1881 (see this volume, pp. 370-71), is not reproduced in this edition.

For the first time, Marx's letter to Vera Zasulich and its drafts were published by the Marx-Engels Institute in: Marx-Engels Archive, Moscow, 1924 (in Russian translation), and Marx-Engels-Archiv. Zeitschrift des Marx-Engels-Instituts in Moskau, Vol. I, Frankfurt am Main (1925) (in the original French). However, due to the complex structure of the manuscript (see Note 298), in these editions some paragraphs were inserted into the wrong place and certain words deciphered incorrectly. The original version of the drafts, in strict accordance with the manuscript, was first published in: MEGA's, Abt. I, Bd. 25, Berlin, 1985, S. 219-42.


The first and second drafts of Marx's letter to Vera Zasulich (see this volume, pp. 346-64) contain many deletions, insertions and marks for transferring passages from one page to another, etc. The first draft, the longest one, has seven large-size sheets filled in on both sides and contains many repetitions. The second draft is shorter and consists of three sheets: it is an attempt at a more concise exposition of the problem. The most significant deletions and indications for the transfer of fragments of the text are given in footnotes.

An allusion to the following passage from Zasulich's letter to Marx of February 16, 1881: "... the theory of the historical inevitability for all countries..."
of the world to pass through all the phases of capitalist production" (see Note 397).

43-131

400 Zasulich wrote to Marx on February 16, 1881: "Recently we have often heard the opinion that the rural commune is an archaic form which history, scientific socialism—in a word all that is the most indisputable—condemns to death" (for Marx's interpretation of "the archaic form" of the commune, see this volume, p. 350).  

401 The expression "new pillars of society" (nouvelles colonnes de la société) dates back to Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin's Восстание Многопо (The Monreper Asylum), St. Petersburg, 1880, pp. 181, 189. There was a copy of this book in Marx's library containing his numerous marginal notes and markings.

402 The reference is, in particular, to the conquest of Italy by the Germanic tribe of Ostrogoths in 493 under the leadership of Theodoric. They founded a vast kingdom with Ravenna as the capital, which incorporated Italy, Sicily, Dalmatia and the lands to the north of Italy.

403 Артель—an association of small producers in pre-revolutionary Russia. There were carpenters', fishermen's, masons', wood-cutters', agricultural and other artels.

404 In 321 B.C. during the second Samnite war the Samnites defeated the Roman legions in the Caudine pass, near the ancient Roman town of Caudium, and compelled them to go under the "forks", which was the greatest shame for the defeated army. Hence the expression "to go under the Caudine Forks", i.e., to undergo extreme humiliation.

405 In 1237-41 Russian territories were invaded by the Mongols and Tartars who established a harsh rule there in the interests of the Mongol nomadic military-feudal nobility. After 240 years of resistance Russia finally threw off the Mongol yoke in 1480.

406 Волост—an administrative-territorial division in Russia in the 11th-first half of the 20th centuries. Marx wrote the word in Russian in the original.

407 Decurions at the time of the decline of the Roman Empire, an estate embracing landowners of medium means. They were entrusted with the distribution and collection of taxes and the spending of public money. When entering office, they contributed considerable sums, and were then obliged to spend money for public needs and compensate for arrears when collecting taxes out of their own property. As the taxes in money and in kind rose, the decurions' position deteriorated to such an extent that by the edicts of 316 and 325 they were made to hold their offices for life, while their duties became hereditary and were only cancelled by death or financial ruin.

408 See Note 398.

409 The reference is to the general statute on the organisation of cities passed by Catherine II on April 21, 1785. Among other things, it included the regulations concerning the organisation of the trades into guilds and the rights and obligations of the craftsmen and apprentices.

410 Marx is probably referring to a similar passage from the French edition of his Capital, p. 341: "Private property, based on personal labour, this property which welds, so to say, an isolated and autonomous worker to the external
conditions of labour, will be supplanted by capitalist private property, based on the exploitation of the labour of others, on wage labour."

411 Marx replies to the following passage in Vera Zasulich’s letter: "Recently we have often heard the opinion that the rural commune is an archaic form which history, scientific socialism—in a word all that is the most indisputable—condemns to death. The people preaching this call themselves your disciples 
par excellence: 'Marxists'. Their strongest argument is often: 'Marx says so.'

"But how do you deduce this from his Capital? In it, he does not deal with the agrarian question and does not speak about Russia,' the objection is put to them.

"He would have said this if he had spoken about our country,' your disciples reply, possibly just a bit too boldly."

412 Marx is referring, above all, to Pyotr Lavrov, Hermann Lopatin and Nikolai Danielson, with whom he kept in touch for years, as well as Lev Gartman, Nikolai Morozov and others, with whom he became acquainted in 1880-81.

413 The third draft consists of three single and one double sheet. Marx made a fair copy of the first four pages of the draft (a rough copy of the third and fourth pages is also extant). The last paragraph on p. 4 is crossed out (it is given in the footnote on p. 368 of this volume). The next two paragraphs beginning with "The English themselves attempted" up to the words "amidst a general turmoil in Russian society" are written on the third sheet on which earlier Marx started to write a letter and where the words "9 March 1881. My dear Sir, I shall in...", written in English, are extant. The end of the draft from the words "The familiarity of the Russian peasant" is on p. 1 and the top of p. 2 of the double sheet, with a note in its left corner "II Ende", and contains many deletions.

On the fourth draft, see notes 397 and 414.

414 The final version of Marx’s letter to Vera Zasulich written on March 8, 1881 includes the full text of the fourth draft consisting of only two paragraphs ("A nervous complaint ... my so-called theory" and "Hence the analysis provided in Capital ... conditions of spontaneous development"); for this reason, it has not been printed separately in this edition.

Marx’s letter to Zasulich was known to many Russian revolutionary Marxists, Georgi Plekhanov among them.

415 Marx is probably referring to the request to write a work on the Russian rural commune made by the revolutionary Narodnik Nikolai Morozov in December 1880 on behalf of the Executive Committee of the People’s Will (see Note 417).

416 On March 21, 1881 Russian, Polish, Czech and Serbian socialists held a meeting in London to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Paris Commune. It was organised by the Russian revolutionary Narodniks Lev Gartman and Hermann Lopatin, with Gartman as the chairman.

Having been invited but unable to attend the meeting, Marx and Engels greeted it with an address to the chairman written in Engels’ hand on March 21, 1881.

In English the address was published for the first time in: K. Marx and F. Engels, On the Paris Commune, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1986, pp. 271-72.

417 On March 1, 1881 in pursuance of the sentence passed by the People’s
Will Executive Committee. Emperor Alexander II was assassinated in St. Petersburg.

People's Will was a revolutionary Narodnik organisation formed in Russia in August 1879 after the split in the Land and Freedom (see Note 308). Its founders were professional revolutionaries, advocates of political struggle against the autocracy. People's Will was the largest and most important revolutionary organisation of the raznochintsy (bourgeois-democratic) period in Russia's emancipation movement. Its activity was at its greatest in the early 1880s.

418 Using § 28 of the Anti-Socialist Law (see Note 289), on November 28, 1878 Bismarck introduced the so-called minor state of siege in Berlin and its environs. In the spring of 1880 the operation of the Anti-Socialist Law was extended for another five years.

419 On March 19, 1881 Johann Most's newspaper Freiheit (No. 12) carried his article "Endlich!" devoted to the assassination of Alexander II (see Note 417), and a report entitled "England" about the attempt to explode the Lord Mayor's mansion in the London City. These publications were used as a pretext for Most's arrest by the British authorities on March 30; in June he was sentenced to 16 months' imprisonment.

While criticising Most's anarchist views and his pseudo-revolutionary phraseology (see Marx's letter to Friedrich Adolph Sorge of September 19, 1879, present edition, Vol. 45), Marx and Engels still believed it necessary to rise to his defence. Most's case was used by Bismarck during the debates on socialists in the German Reichstag on March 30 and 31, 1881.

This letter was written in Engels' handwriting and signed by both Marx and Engels when it appeared in The Daily News.

420 "A Fair Day's Wages for a Fair Day's Work" is the first in the series of articles written by Engels at the request of George Shipton, Secretary of the London Trades Council and editor of The Labour Standard, the organ of British trade unions. Engels contributed to it from May to early August 1881. The articles appeared regularly, almost weekly, as unsigned editorials. All in all, eleven articles were written, with the last one, "Social Classes—Necessary and Superfluous", printed on August 6. Engels stopped contributing to the paper because of the growth of opportunistic elements in its editorial board (see Engels' letters to Marx of August 11, to George Shipton of August 10, 1881, and to Johann Philipp Becker of February 10, 1882, present edition, Vol. 46).

421 On June 21, 1824, under mass pressure, Parliament repealed the ban on the trade unions by adopting "An Act to repeal the Laws relative to the Combination of Workmen, and for other Purposes therein mentioned" (the reference is to the repeal of "An Act to prevent unlawful Combinations of Workmen 12th July 1799"). However, in 1825 it passed a Bill on workers' combinations ("An Act to repeal the Laws relating to the Combination of Workmen, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof 6th July 1825") which, while confirming the repeal of the ban on the trade unions, at the same time greatly restricted their activity. In particular, mere agitation for workers to join unions and take part in strikes was regarded as "compulsion" and "violence" and punished as a crime.

422 The Poor Law adopted in England in 1834 provided for only one form of relief for the able-bodied poor: workhouses with a prison-like regime in which
the workers were engaged in unproductive, monotonous and exhausting labour. The people called the workhouses “Bastilles for the poor”. p. 377

425 The Court of Chancery or Court of Equity—one of the high courts of England which after the judicial reform of 1873 became a division of the High Court of Justice. The jurisdiction of the court, presided over by the Lord Chancellor, covered matters concerning inheritance, contractual obligations, joint-stock companies, etc. In a number of cases, the powers of this court overlapped those of other high courts. In counterbalance to the English common law accepted in other courts, the legal proceedings at the Court of Chancery were conducted on the basis of the so-called law of equity. p. 379

426 The reference is to the Vienna Congress of European monarchs and their ministers (September 1814 to June 9, 1815), which set up a system of all-European treaties after the wars of the European powers against Napoleonic France. p. 383

426 Engels is referring to the landlords' discontent with the Land Bill passed by the Gladstone government on August 22, 1881 for the purpose of distracting the Irish peasants from the revolutionary struggle. The Bill restricted the landlords' right to evict tenants from their plots if they paid the rent in time; the rent was fixed for 15 years in advance. Despite the fact that the 1881 Law gave the landlords a chance to sell their lands to the state at a profit, and that the fixed rent remained very high indeed, the English landowners still opposed the Law trying to preserve their unlimited rule in Ireland. Despite the Law, illegal evictions from the land continued, which provoked the resistance of the Irish tenants (see notes 456, 462, 463). p. 384

427 The People's Charter, which contained the demands of the Chartists (see Note 368), was published in the form of a Parliamentary Bill on May 8, 1838. It contained six points: universal suffrage (for men of 21 and over), annual Parliaments, vote by ballot, equal electoral districts, abolition of the property qualification for MPs and payment of MPs. Petitions urging the adoption of the People's Charter were turned down by Parliament in 1839, 1842 and 1848. p. 386

428 The reference is to the second Reform Bill approved by Parliament on August 15, 1867 under pressure from the mass working-class movement and direct participation in it of the General Council of the First International. Under the new law, the property qualification for the voters was lowered, and their number doubled; suffrage was granted also to part of skilled workers. The bulk of the working population, however, was still deprived of the right to vote. p. 386

429 Starting from the late 1870s, the British working-class movement gradually freed itself from the influence of the Liberal Party.

The more advanced section of the workers took part in the activities of radical organisations and clubs, and campaigned for Irish self-determination. In 1879 the Midland Social-Democratic Association was set up in Birmingham, and in 1881 the Labour Emancipation League in London. Of great importance was the Democratic Federation founded in London in June 1881 and in 1884 transformed into the Social-Democratic Federation, which openly recognised Marxist principles. p. 387

430 The main question discussed in the House of Commons during the debate on
concluding a commercial treaty with France was the new common customs tariff adopted by the French government on May 8, 1881, which provided for some restrictions on imports in the interest of French industry. Despite the fact that the talks about the new treaty were repeatedly resumed throughout the year, the parties concerned failed to find an acceptable solution. 

p. 389

431 A. J. Balfour was elected to Parliament from Hertford, in Southeast England. 

p. 389

432 The Manchester School—a trend in economic thinking which reflected the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. Its supporters, known as Free Traders, advocated removal of protective tariffs and non-intervention by the government in economic life. The centre of the Free Traders’ agitation was Manchester, where the movement was headed by two textile manufacturers, Richard Cobden and John Bright. In the 1840s and 1850s, the Free Traders were a separate political group, which later formed the Left wing of the Liberal Party. 

p. 389

433 This refers to the protective tariff tabled in Congress by the Republican Justin Smith Morrill and passed by the Senate on March 2, 1861. It raised customs duties considerably. Later, during the American Civil War and in 1867 and 1869, the tariff was repeatedly revised, and by 1869 it had raised the average size of import duties to 47 per cent. In 1870 and 1872, these duties were lowered to 10 per cent, but this was cancelled in 1875. 

p. 390

434 The first British colony which was granted the status of a dominion (in 1867) was Canada. 

p. 390

435 After the abolition of the East India Company in August 1858 India was placed under direct administration of the British Crown. Seeking to protect the national textile industry, the authorities introduced a 5-per cent duty on the English cotton goods imported by India. However, as early as 1879 the Lancashire manufacturers managed to get these duties cancelled, and in 1882 the duties on other goods were also abolished. 

The British East India Company was founded in 1600. It enjoyed a monopoly of trade with the East Indies and played a decisive part in the establishment of the British colonial empire. 

p. 390

436 The reference is to the coalition wars of European states against the French Republic (1792-1802) and against Napoleon (1805-15). 

p. 390

437 In 1814 and 1822 the French authorities introduced high import tariffs on iron, in 1819, on grain, cattle and wool, and in 1826, doubled the tariffs on pig iron and steel. 

p. 390

438 The economic development of Germany was most adversely affected by her political fragmentation, the absence of universal commercial laws, internal customs barriers, and the multiplicity of currencies and of the weight and measure systems. On May 26, 1818 Prussia alone passed a law on the abolition of internal duties and the introduction of a universal customs tariff. 

p. 390

439 The Corn Laws, the first of which were passed as early as the 15th century, imposed high import duties on agricultural products in order to maintain high prices for these products on the domestic market. The Corn Laws served the interests of the big landowners (see Note 440). 

p. 390
The Anti-Corn Law League was founded in 1838 by the Manchester manufacturers and Free Trade leaders Richard Cobden and John Bright. By demanding complete freedom of trade, the League fought for the abolition of the Corn Laws (see Note 439). In this way, it sought to weaken the economic and political position of the landed aristocracy and lower the cost of living, thus making possible a lowering of the workers’ wages. After the repeal of the Corn Laws (June 1846), the League ceased to exist.

See Note 337.

See Note 383.

At the municipal elections of January 9, 1881, the French Workers’ Party obtained 40,000 votes and won all seats in the Town Council of Commeny.

From September 9, 1879 to June 15, 1881, the deputies to the Reichstag from the Social-Democratic faction were: August Bebel, Wilhelm Bracke, Friedrich Wilhelm Fritzsch, Wilhelm Hasselmann, Max Kayser, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Klaus Peter Reinders, Julius Vaith and Philipp Wiener. After the death of Bracke and Reinders, their seats were filled by Ignaz Auer and Wilhelm Hasenlever.

At the Wyden Congress held on August 22, 1880, Hasselmann was expelled from the party and, correspondingly, from the Parliamentary group. At the supplementary elections the deputy mandate from Hamburg was received by Georg Wilhelm Hartmann.

The Boards of Guardians—local government bodies in England elected to administer the Poor Laws in parishes or districts.

In his letter John Noble quotes Richard Cobden’s speeches in the House of Commons made on February 24, 1842 (see Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates. Third series, Vol. 60, London, 1842, p. 1045) and February 27, 1846 (ibid., Vol. 94, London, 1846, pp. 285-286), as well as the address of the Anti-Corn Law League adopted by it at the Manchester meeting on August 20, 1842 and printed by The Times, No. 18069, August 23, 1842.

Engels was living in Manchester from December 1842 to late August 1844, where he studied commerce at the cotton mill belonging to the Ermen & Engels firm.


On the People’s Charter, see Note 427.

In 1879, as a result of the merger of the Flemish and the Brabant socialist parties, the Belgian Socialist Party (Parti socialiste belge) was formed.

In 1881, the Social-Democratic groups in the Netherlands formed the Social-Democratic Union (Sociaal-Democratische Bond).

In the same year, the politically advanced and class-conscious workers and revolutionary intellectuals formed the Revolutionary-Socialist Party of Romagna (Partito Rivoluzionario di Romagna), which was the first step in the work to found an Italian workers’ party.

See Note 285.

The reference is to the second electoral reform in England introduced in 1867 (see Note 428). Under the new law, the property qualification in the counties...
was reduced to £12 of annual rent for tenant farmers; in the cities and towns suffrage was granted to all householders and lessees of houses, as well as to tenants residing in the locality for at least a year, and paying no less than £10 in rent.

452 St. Stephen's—the chapel where the House of Commons held its sessions from 1547 and until the fire of 1834.

453 The Irish Land Bill was passed on August 22, 1881 (see Note 426). p. 405

454 See Note 427.

455 See Note 289.

456 The introduction of the Land Bill (see Note 426) met with resistance on the part of the Irish tenants. Using the Coercion Act passed in March 1881, Chief Secretary for Ireland Forster applied extraordinary measures by sending troops to Ireland to evict the tenants who refused to pay the rent. p. 407

457 The reference is to the elections to the Reichstag of January 10, 1877 and July 30, 1878.

458 See Note 268.

459 Coercion Bills were passed by the British Parliament several times throughout the 19th century with a view to suppressing the revolutionary and national liberation movement in Ireland. Under them a state of siege was declared on Irish territory, and the English authorities were granted extraordinary powers.

460 On April 27, 1880 Georg Wilhelm Hartmann won the mandate at the supplementary elections to the Reichstag in the second district of Hamburg (see Note 444).

461 A minor state of siege was declared in Leipzig on June 27, 1881. Earlier, it had been introduced in Berlin (see Note 418) and on October 28, 1880, in Hamburg-Altona and the environs.

462 Using the Coercion Act, in May-October 1881 the English authorities arrested prominent Irish deputies, members of the Irish National Land League (see Note 468) headed by Charles Parnell, who opposed the introduction of the Land Bill of 1881 (see Note 426). Among the prisoners was John Dillon, an Irish political leader, member of the British Parliament, one of the League's leaders.

463 The Irish National Land League—a mass organisation founded in 1879 by the petty-bourgeois democrat Michael Davitt. The League united large sections of the Irish peasantry and the urban poor, and was supported by the progressive section of the Irish bourgeoisie. Its agrarian demands mirrored the spontaneous protest of the Irish masses against the landlords' and national oppression. However, some of the League's leaders adopted an inconsistent stand, and this was used by bourgeois nationalists (Parnell and others), who sought to reduce the activity of the League to the campaign for Home Rule, i.e. for the granting to Ireland of limited self-government within the framework of the British Empire. They did not advocate the abolition of English landlordism, a demand advanced by the revolutionary democrats. In 1881 the Land League was banned, but in actual fact it continued its activity until the late 1880s.

464 On July 20, 1881 Norris A. Clowes, the New-York Star correspondent, asked Engels to write a review of the British labour movement. Being pressed for
time. Engels referred him to his articles which The Labour Standard was at the
time publishing as editorials (see this volume, pp. 376-409, 411-18). In response
to Cloves' stated wish to enter into communication with Most, Engels advised
him to write to the Freiheit editorial board. In this letter to the Freiheit, which is
printed according to the manuscript, Engels informs the editorial board about
this. The letter is written in German and English.

This letter was first published in the original in MEGA2, Abt. 1, Bd. 25,
Berlin. 1985, S. 274.

465 Norris A. Cloves was recommended to Engels by Theodor Friedrich Cuno, a
prominent figure in the German workers' movement, in a letter of July 10,
1881. After the Hague Congress of the First International (1872), Cuno
emigrated to the USA and took part in the work of the International there.

466 An allusion to the fact that at the time Most was kept under arrest (see Note
419).

467 This refers to the activities of the Anti-Corn Law League (see Note 440).

468 In 1873-78, England entered the period of "great depression", a profound
industrial crisis aggravated by the agrarian crisis, which lasted until the
mid-1890s. The year 1874 witnessed a drop in the production of coal and iron
ore. In 1875, the output of the cotton industry also decreased.

469 See Note 422.

470 The system of internal excises—one of the main types of indirect taxes, mostly on
everyday essentials (salt, sugar, coffee, matches, etc.), as well as municipal,
transport and other widely used services. It is included in the price of goods or
service tariff, and is thus shifted onto the consumer. Excise duty is an important
source of revenue for the state budget in the capitalist countries.

In the USA each state has its own excise system, covering cigarettes, alcohol
and petrol. The first excise on whisky was introduced in the USA on March 3,
1791.

471 See Note 432.

472 This refers to the movement for Parliamentary reform in England in 1830-31.
The 1832 Reform Act in England granted the franchise to property owners
and leaseholders with no less than £10 annual income. The workers and the
petty bourgeoisie, who were the main force in the campaign for the reform,
remained unenfranchised.

473 The laws passed by the British Parliament on June 26, 1846—"An Act to
amend the laws relating to the importation of corn" and "An Act to alter
certain duties of customs"—abolished all restrictions on the import of grain
into Great Britain, which was a major victory for the industrial bourgeoisie over
the landed aristocracy (see also notes 439 and 440).

474 Engels wrote this draft in English. Its translation into French was printed in
L'Egalité, No. 1, December 11, 1881 in the section "Angleterre". The author was
named in the editorial preface.

In 1890-91, Paul Lafargue quoted Engels' speech in his article "K. Marx.
Persönliche Erinnerungen" (Die Neue Zeit, Jg. 9, Bd. 1, Stuttgart, S. 41-42).
In 1892, it was translated into Bulgarian from the text in Die Neue Zeit and
printed in the magazine Den, No. 3/4, Shumen, July-August 1892, pp. 233-34. p. 419

475 On January 19, 1843 the Prussian government decided to suppress as of April 1, 1843, the publication of the Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe, which had been appearing in Cologne since January 1, 1842 and which, under the editorship of Marx (from October 1842), had acquired a revolutionary-democratic trend. Marx’s resignation from the editorship on March 18, 1843 did not cause the government to rescind its decision, and the last issue appeared on March 31, 1843. p. 419

476 At the elections to the German Reichstag of October 27, 1881 the Social-Democrats received 912,000 votes and 12 mandates. p. 420

477 Engels wrote this obituary "Jenny Marx, Née von Westphalen" for Der Sozialdemokrat. It is based on the draft of his speech over Jenny’s grave (see this volume, pp. 419-21).

The obituary was printed in issue No. 50 on December 8, 1881. That was Engels' first contribution to Der Sozialdemokrat.

On December 18, 1881 the obituary was reprinted by the Arbeiter-Wochen-Chronik (No. 51, Budapest). p. 422

478 See Note 475. p. 422

479 See Note 476. p. 423

480 Marx and Engels wrote this Preface on January 21, 1882 at the request of Pyotr Lavrov, who was in close contact with them. On January 23, the text was sent to Lavrov (see Marx’s letter to Pyotr Lavrov of January 23, 1882, present edition, Vol. 46). It was first published, in Russian, in the magazine Narodnaya Volya of February 5, 1882. The separate edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party (in Plekhanov’s translation) with this preface appeared in Geneva in 1882 in the Russian Social-Revolutionary Library series.

In German, the Preface was first published in Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 16, April 13, 1882 (translated from the Russian text in the Narodnaya Volya magazine; see Engels’ letter to Eduard Bernstein of April 17, 1882, present edition, Vol. 46). In 1890 Engels retranslated this preface from Russian into German for the new German edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party. It was this translation by Engels that served as the basis when the Preface was translated into Bulgarian, Polish, Romanian, Dutch, Italian and Czech.

Later, the lost German manuscript of the Preface was found; its facsimile was printed in the Russian edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party that appeared in 1948.


481 The first Russian edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party (the translation is ascribed to Mikhail Bakunin or Nikolai Lyubavin) was printed at Chernetsky’s printing office in Geneva in 1869, where Herzen’s Kolokol (The Bell) was printed at that time. The translation contained a number of errors which distorted, at places, the meaning of the Manifesto. p. 425

482 After the assassination of Alexander II on March 1, 1881 (see Note 417), Alexander III was staying in Gatchina (the Russian tsars’ country residence), fearing that new terrorist acts would be staged by the Executive Committee of the People’s Will. p. 426
Engels wrote this article in the second half of April 1882 for Der Sozialdemokrat. He regarded it as his first official contribution to the newspaper as a staff member (see Engels’ letter to August Bebel, June 21, 1882, present edition, Vol. 46).

The ideas he set forth in the article were further developed in his later works, “The Book of Revelation” (1883) (present edition, Vol. 26), and “On the History of Early Christianity” (1894) (present edition, Vol. 27).

This work appeared in English for the first time in Marx and Engels, On Religion, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1966, pp. 173-82. p. 427

Aryans—members of any of the prehistoric peoples who spoke Indo-Iranian. p. 427

Under the Christian tradition, the name of the Roman Emperor Flavius Valerius Constantinus Magnus, who in 330 transferred the capital of the empire from Rome to Constantinople, is associated with the radical turn from persecution of Christianity to the protection of the new religion, although this process had begun under his predecessors. p. 428

Stoic philosophy (3rd cent. B.C.-A.D. 2nd cent.) emerged in Greece; here the reference is to the late stoic philosophy (A.D. 1st-2nd cent.), which produced Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. The stoic doctrine made a strong impact on the formation of Christianity. p. 429

Engels is referring to a character in Heine’s satirical poem Der Apollogott (from Romanska), a young blade, cantor at the Amsterdam synagogue, who imitated Apollo. p. 429

The Epicurean school of materialist philosophy was founded by Epicurus in the late 4th century B.C. and existed until the mid-4th century A.D. In their philosophical struggle against the Stoics, its members refused to recognise the gods’ interference into mundane affairs and proceeded from the assumption that matter, which has an inner source of motion, is eternal. p. 430

Engels is referring to the slave uprising of 73-71 B.C. in Rome (according to some historians, 74-71 B.C.) led by Spartacus. p. 432

An ironical allusion to Charles Darwin’s On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. p. 435

This work was written by Engels in late August-early September 1882. He had promised it to Der Sozialdemokrat on August 9 (see Engels’ letter to Eduard Bernstein of August 9, 1882, present edition, Vol. 46). It was printed in issue No. 37, with Engels’ signature, on September 7 under the title “Der Vikar von Bray. Aus dem Englischen von Friedrich Engels”. Two drafts of the translation of the song are extant.

The text of the song with a footnote quoting several lines from Engels’ conclusion in Der Sozialdemokrat, was also reprinted by the Vereins, Zurich, 1886, pp. 369-71.

Here is Engels’ translation of the English song:

Zu König Karls Zeit, da noch war
Loyalität zu finden,
Dient’ ich der Hochkirch ganz und gar,
Und so erwarb ich Pfünden.
Der König ist von Gott gesetzt—
So lehrt’ ich meine Schafe—
Und wer ihm trotzt, ihn gar verletzt,
Den trifft die Höllenstraße.
   Denn dieses gilt, und hat Bestand,
   Bis an mein End's soll's wahr sein:
   Daß wer auch König sei im Land.
   In Bray will ich Vikar sein.

Jakob nahm auf dem Throne Platz,
Das Papsttum kam zu Ehren:
Da galt's, die Katholikenhatz
Ins Gegenteil zu kehren.
Für mich auch, fand ich, paßten schon
Roms Kirch' und Priesterorden;
Kam nicht die Revolution,
Wär' ich Jesuit geworden.
   Denn dieses gilt und hat Bestand,
   Bis an mein End's soll's wahr sein:
   Daß wer auch König sei im Land.
   In Bray will ich Vikar sein.

Als König Wilhelm kam, der Held,
Und rette die Freiheit,
Hab' ich mein Segel umgestellt
Nach dieses Windes Neuheit.
Der Knechtsgehorsam vor'ger Zeit,
Der war jetzt bald erledigt:
Der Tyrannei geht Widerstreit!
So wurde nun gepredigt.
   Denn dieses gilt und hat Bestand,
   Bis an mein End's soll's wahr sein:
   Daß wer auch König sei im Land.
   In Bray will ich Vikar sein.

Als Anna wurde Königin,
Der Landeskirche Glorie,
Das hatte einen andern Sinn,
Und da ward ich ein Tory.
Für unserer Kirch' Integrität,
Da galt es jetzt zu eifern,
Und Mäßigung und Laxität
Als sündhaft zu begeifern.
   Denn dieses gilt und hat Bestand,
   Bis an mein End's soll's wahr sein:
   Daß wer auch König sei im Land.
   In Bray will ich Vikar sein.

Als König Georg bracht' ins Land
Gemäßigte Politik, mein Herr,
Hab' nochmals ich den Rock gewandt,
Und so ward ich ein Whig, mein Herr.
Das war es, was mir Pfründen gab
Und Gunst bei dem Regenten:
Auch schwor ich fast allfällig ab,
So Papst wie Prätendenten.
Denn dieses gilt und hat Bestand,
Bis an mein End' soll's wahr sein:
Daß wer auch König sei im Land,
In Bray will ich Vikar sein.

Hannovers hoher Dynastie—
Mit Ausschuß von Papisten—
Der schwör' ich Treu, so lange sie
Sich an dem Thron kann fristen.
Denn meine Treu wankt nimmermehr—
Veränderung ausgenommen—
Und Georg sei mein Fürst und Herr,
Bis andre Zeiten kommen.

Denn dieses gilt und hat Bestand,
Bis an mein End' soll's wahr sein:
Daß wer auch König sei im Land,
In Bray will ich Vikar sein.


See Note 27. p. 438

In 1877, the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV travelled to Canossa (a castle in Northern Italy) to beg forgiveness of Pope Gregory VII, with whom he had engaged in political struggle. Since that time, the phrase "to go to Canossa" has come to mean a humiliating capitulation.

On May 14, 1872, at the time of the Kulturkampf (see Note 27), Bismarck declared in the Reichstag: "We shall not go to Canossa" (see Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstages, Vol. 1, Berlin, 1872, p. 356), thus emphasising his determination to fight to the last against the Catholic clergy. However, in the late 1870s-early 1880s, in order to bring together all reactionary forces, he reconciled with the Catholic clergy and repealed nearly all the laws passed during the Kulturkampf period. p. 438

Engels wrote The Mark in mid-September—the first half of December 1882 as an appendix to the German edition of the pamphlet Socialism: Utopian and Scientific (see Note 343). The piece was highly appreciated by Marx, who read the manuscript (see Marx' letter to Engels, December 18, 1882, present edition, Vol. 46). In it Engels made use of some of the materials he had collected when researching the history of ancient Germans (see present edition, Vol. 26). In 1883 this essay was reprinted by Der Sozialdemokrat, Nos. 12-17 on March 15-April 19, and also published separately and entitled Der deutsche Bauer. Was vor die Zukunft? Was ist der Zukunft? Was könnte es sein? (see Note 510). Together with Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, it was published in German four times in Engels' lifetime. The German edition was used when translating it into Danish, Dutch and Polish.

In 1892 The Mark appeared in English, also as an appendix to Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, in Edward Aveling's translation with Engels' special introduction. Engels wrote in this introduction: "The Appendix, 'The Mark', was written with the intention of spreading among the German Socialist Party some elementary knowledge of the history and development of landed
property in Germany. This seemed all the more necessary at a time when
the assimilation by that party of the working people of the towns was in a fair way
of completion, and when the agricultural labourers and peasants had to be
taken in hand" (see present edition, Vol. 27).

In the present edition, the text is printed according to the authorised
English edition of 1892 checked against the fourth German edition of 1891,
which Engels read himself. The principal discrepancies are pointed out in
footnotes.  

The works of Georg Ludwig Maurer (12 volumes), united by a common theme,
are studies of the agrarian, urban and state systems of medieval Germany.
They are: Einleitung zur Geschichte der Mark, Hof, Dorf- und Stadt-Verfassung
und der öffentlichen Gewalt, Munich, 1854; Geschichte der Markenverfassung in
Deutschland, Erlangen, 1856; Geschichte der Fröhöfe, der Bauernhöfe und der
Hofverfassung in Deutschland, Vols. I-IV, Erlangen, 1862-63; Geschichte der
Dorferlassung in Deutschland, Vols. I-II, Erlangen, 1865-66; Geschichte der
Städtverfassung in Deutschland, Vols. I-IV, Erlangen, 1869-71. The first, second
and fourth works specially dealt with the structure of the German mark.

The Emperor's Law (Kaiserrecht)—the law promulgated by the central authority
of the medieval German Empire (see Note 94). Engels used the edition Das
Kaiserrecht nach der Handschrift von 1372 in Vergleichung mit andern Handschriften
und mit erläuternden Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Dr. H. E. Endemann, Cassel,
1846. The data cited here by Engels can be found in the section "Von Rechte
das die Waelde hatt" (p. 244).

Hereinafter when describing the farmstead communes Engels uses Hanssen's
Die Gehöferschaften (Arbgenossenschaften) im Regierungsbezirk Trier. Aus den
Berlin, 1863, p. 19, and Maurer's Einleitung zur Geschichte der Mark, Hof,
Dorf- und Stadt-Verfassung und der öffentlichen Gewalt, Munich, 1854, p. 74.

The Leges barbarorum (laws of the barbarians)—codes of law which originated
between the 5th and the 9th centuries and were, in the main, a written record
of the customary or prescriptive law of the various Germanic tribes.  

The Ripuarian Law—the law of the Ripuarian Franks, one of the
Germanic tribes, recorded in Lex Ripuaria which was written between the 6th
and the 8th centuries. Lex Ripuaria is the principal source for the study of the
social system of the Ripuarian Franks and the process of their feudalisation.
Private ownership of the arable land is dealt with in § 82 (scroll A) and § 84
(scroll B) of Lex Ripuaria. See one of the most complete publications: Lex
Ripuaria et lex Francorum Chânavorum, ed. by R. Sohm, Hanover, 1883.

Weistümcr—a record of the common law of the marks in mediaeval Germany,
Switzerland and Austria, as well as in some of the adjacent districts of
Bohemia, France and other countries, dating back, in the main, to the
13th-18th centuries. The Weistümcr mirror the economic life, the social
struggle, legal relations and the daily life of the peasantry of that period.

Engels is referring to the law on forest thefts ("Gesetz, betreffend den
Forstdiebstahl") passed on April 15, 1878, which prohibited, among other
things, the gathering of herbs, berries and mushrooms without special police
permission.  

503 The Schöffen courts were introduced in a number of German states after the
1848 revolution, and throughout Germany in 1871. At the time they consisted of
a Crown judge and two jurors (Schöffen) who, as distinct from ordinary
jurymen, not only gave their verdict of guilty or not guilty but also fixed the
penalty; their members were specially selected from among the ruling classes.

504 The Merovingian dynasty—the first royal dynasty in the Frankish state
(457-751), which derived its name from the legendary forefather Merowaeus.
The Merovingians' policy promoted the emergence of feudal relations among the
Franks.  

505 The Western Frankish Kingdom was formed as a result of the disintegration
of Charlemagne's empire, which was a short-lived and unstable military and
administrative union. In 843, under the treaty of Verdan, the empire was
divided among Charlemagne's three grandsons, children of Louis the Pious.
One of them, Charles the Bald, received the Western part of the empire, which
included the bulk of the territory of modern France and formed the Western
Frankish Kingdom. The lands to the east of the Rhine (the core of future
Germany) were given to Louis the German, and the strip lying in between,
from the North Sea to Central Italy, became the realm of Charlemagne's
eldest grandson, Lothar.  

506 The crusades were military colonialist expeditions by the big West European
feudal lords and Italian trading cities under the religious banner of recovering
Jerusalem and other "Holy Lands" from the Mohammedans. Peasants also took
part in the crusades, hoping thus to be freed from feudal oppression. History
knows eight major crusades (1096-99, 1147-49, 1189-92, 1202-04, 1217-21,
1228-29, 1248-54 and 1270). Not only Mohammedan states in Syria, Palestine,
Egypt and Tunisia but also the Christian Byzantine Empire were the objects of
the crusaders' aggressive activities. The crusaders' conquests in the Eastern
Mediterranean were not lasting, and were recovered by the Mohammedans.  

507 The Thirty Years' War (1618-48)—a European war in which the Pope, the
Spanish and the Austrian Habsburgs and the Catholic German princes, rallied
under the banner of Catholicism, fought against the Protestant countries:
Bohemia, Denmark, Sweden, the Republic of the Netherlands and a number of
Protestant German states. The rulers of Catholic France, rivals of the
Habsburgs, supported the Protestant camp. Germany was the principal battle
area and the main object of plunder and territorial claims. The Treaty of
Westphalia (1648) sealed the political dismemberment of Germany.  

508 Code civil—Napoleon's civil code issued in 1804, which he introduced in the
conquered regions of Western and South-Western Germany. It remained in
force in the Rhine Province after its incorporation into Prussia in 1815.  

509 See Note 69.  

510 The text that follows is Engels' addition to the separate edition of The Mark
published in 1883 under the title Der deutsche Bauer. Was war er? Was ist er? Was
könnte er sein. (see Note 495). This fragment was published in English for the

511 Engels wrote this Preface for the first German edition of *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (see Note 343). The first two paragraphs of the Preface were published in the article "Eine neue Propagandabroschüre" printed in *Der Sozialdemokrat*, No. 9, February 22, 1883, and the first full version appeared in: F. Engels, *Die Entwicklung des Socialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft*, Hottingen-Zurich, 1882, pp. 3-5 (the book came off the press in March 1883). It was used as the basis for four subsequent German editions (two in 1883, and in 1891 and 1894), two Dutch editions (1884 and 1885), and the Polish edition (1892).


512 The German edition of the book was prepared by Engels at the request of the *Sozialdemokrat* editorial board contained in Eduard Bernstein's letter to Engels of July 13, 1882 (see Engels' letter to Bernstein, August 9, 1882, present edition, Vol. 46). p. 457


514 Charles Longuet and Jenny Marx were married on October 10, 1872. p. 460

515 See Note 277. p. 460

516 One of the demagogic slogans of the Liberals that brought them victory at the elections was Gladstone's promise to solve the Irish question. In the summer and autumn of 1869, Ireland was the scene of a widespread campaign for an amnesty of the imprisoned Fenians. The numerous meetings (in Limerick and other cities) sent petitions to the British government demanding the release of the Irish revolutionaries. Gladstone, then head of the British government, stated his refusal to comply with these demands in his letters of October 18 and 23, 1869 to the prominent participants in the amnesty movement Henry O'Shea and Isaac Butt (see *The Times*, Nos. 26579 and 26583, October 23 and 27, 1869; for Marx's analysis of Gladstone's refusal, see present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 407-10). p. 460

517 *New Caledonia*—a group of islands in the South-Western part of the Pacific with an extremely unhealthy climate, to which the Paris Communards were exiled. p. 461

518 The words "at Argenteuil, France" were arbitrarily inserted by the editors of the *New Yorker Volkszeitung* (in actual fact, Marx died in London). This fact, as well as the editors' unauthorised use of Engels' telegram to Sorge of March 14, caused Engels' sharp protest which he expressed in his letter to the editors of the *New Yorker Volkszeitung* (see this volume, p. 472). p. 462

519 Engels wrote the "Draft of a Speech at the Graveside of Karl Marx" in English. The first publication was in the French newspaper *La Justice*, No. 27,
March 20, 1883, in Engels' translation. The text was preceded by a short account of the funeral meeting at Marx's graveside which was probably written by Charles Longuet, the widower of Marx's eldest daughter, who was present at the funeral (in 1886, he had become a member of the Justice editorial board).

The French text printed by La Justice was used for the Italian translation in La Plebe, No. 4, April 1883, p. 41.

The draft was published in English for the first time in: Karl Marx, Man, Thinker and Revolutionary, Lawrence, London, 1927, pp. 43-46. p. 463

Engels wrote this article at the request of Eduard Bernstein for Der Sozialdemokrat on about March 18, 1883, immediately after Marx's funeral. He also included in it condolences from various persons and organisations, as well as Liebknecht's speech at the funeral.

The publication in Der Sozialdemokrat was reprinted in part (the letter and the telegrams from Paris were omitted) in the Hungarian Arbeiter-Wochen-Chronik, No. 13, April 1, 1883, and in full in the New Yorker Volkszeitung, No. 82, April 5, 1883.

An incomplete publication of this obituary appeared as a supplement to Marx's biography printed by the New York Pionier. Illustrirter Volks-Kalender für 1891, pp. 44-45.

The article was published in English for the first time in Reminiscences of Marx and Engels, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow [1956], pp. 348-53.

See Note 123.

The Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (Partido Socialista Obrero de España) was founded on May 2, 1879 in Madrid by a group of former members of the Spanish Federation of the First International. Among its founders were José Mesa and Pablo Iglesias and other prominent activists of the Spanish workers' movement. The first workers' party in Spain, the Socialist Party launched an organised struggle of the Spanish proletariat for social emancipation. Up to 1881 it was illegal. In 1888, it held its first congress in Barcelona. p. 470

The Cologne Communist Trial (October 4-November 12, 1852) was organised and stage-managed by the Prussian government. The defendants were members of the Communist League arrested in the spring of 1851 on charges of "treasonable plotting". The forged documents and false evidence presented by the police authorities were not only designed to secure the conviction of the defendants but also to compromise their London comrades and the proletarian organisation as a whole. The dishonest tactics resorted to by the Prussian police state in fighting the international working-class movement were exposed by Engels in his article "The Late Trial in Cologne" and, in greater detail, by Marx in his pamphlets Revolutions Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne (see present edition, Vol. 11) and Herr Vogt (Vol. 17, pp. 64-67). p. 471

See Note 220.

The Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge—the oldest scientific society in Great Britain founded in 1660 and formalised by Royal Charter in 1662. p. 471

This article was written by Engels at the request of the editors of Der Sozialdemokrat. It appeared there in Nos. 19 and 21 on May 3 and 17, 1883.

Part I of the article was reprinted by the New Yorker Volkszeitung, No. 120,
May 19, 1888; Part II (minus the first three paragraphs) appeared in the Hungarian Arbeiter-Wochen-Chronik, No. 22, June 8, 1888.

The letter to Philipp van Patten was translated from Der Sozialdemokrat into Polish (published in Przedsiwitt, No. 18, Geneva, May 31, 1883) and into English (Bulletin of the Social Labor Movement, New York, June 1883).


The Agricultural and Forestry Academy was founded in Petrovsko-Razumovskoye near Moscow in 1865. At present it is the Moscow Timiryazev Agricultural Academy. p. 473

The St. Petersburg Practical Technological Institute of Emperor Nicholas I was founded in 1828. p. 473

This announcement was printed by Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 17, April 19, 1883. The students from Odessa asked to write the following words on the wreath: "To Karl Marx, the author of Capital and founder of the International Working Men's Association, from a group of socialists of the Odessa University, his disciples and youth." p. 473

See Note 129. p. 474

Engels is referring to Slavia, the students' association which embraced young people from Slavic countries living in Zurich. p. 474

Marx was in Karlsbad from August 19 to September 21, 1874, from August 15 to September 11, 1875, and from August 15 to September 15, 1876. p. 474

The Central Labor Union in New York—an association of trade unions of New York set up in 1882 which in the 1880s was a mass workers' organisation embracing white and coloured people, both of American and foreign extraction. The Central Labor Union was headed by socialists who recognised the need for both professional and political organisation of the workers for the purpose of more efficiently guiding the working-class struggle. p. 477

Engels' letter to Philipp van Patten of April 18, 1883 was written in English (see present edition, Vol. 47). In this volume, it is reproduced from the original checked against the German translation by Engels published in Der Sozialdemokrat. The discrepancies are indicated in the footnotes. p. 477

Engels is referring to the exposition of their views in The German Ideology (written in 1845-46) (see present edition, Vol. 5, pp. 53, 380-81). p. 477

The defeat of the Paris Commune was followed by counter-revolutionary terror and the massacre of the revolutionary French proletariat. Over 30,000 Communards (according to other data, 40,000) were tortured and shot by Versailles troops without trial. The overall number of the executed, the exiled and the imprisoned reached 70,000, and, counting those who had fled because of reprisals, 100,000. p. 478

A. Loria, La rendita fondiaria e la sua elisione naturale, Milan, Naples, Pisa, 1880. p. 479

The copy of this book sent to Marx had a dedicatory inscription: "To the most penetrating, most brilliant and most knowledgeable writer on political economy. The author. Mantua. 1879". Loria's letter was dated November 23, 1879. p. 479

See Note 281. p. 479
Bakunin's *Statehood and Anarchy* appeared anonymously in Geneva in 1873 and was received by the Bakuninists as a programme document. Marx's work on this book was closely associated with the ideological and political struggle waged by Marx and Engels and their followers against anarchism, a struggle which went on even after the Bakuninists' defeat at the Hague Congress and the expulsion of the leaders of the Alliance from the International (see notes 30 and 38).

Marx's *Notes on Bakunin's Book* form an original critical and polemical work combining the analysis of the ideas of Bakunin, the ideologist of anarchism and, at that time, the principal opponent of Marxism, and profound criticism of anarchist doctrines with the development of the basic propositions of scientific communism on the state, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the alliance of the working class with the peasantry.

This work is part of a thick notebook of Marx's manuscripts, entitled *Russische II, 1875*, which contains synopses of works by Russian authors. The manuscript of the *Notes* amounts to 24 large-size sheets. Marx wrote direct quotations from Bakunin's book in Russian or in German translation, or gave brief rendering in German of separate passages. Marx's own text consists of laconic comments and lengthier insertions.

In the present volume all passages from Bakunin's text are in small type; the words and passages translated from the Russian are placed in † †, and those from the German are in ".". Wherever Marx finds one or several equivalents to the Russian word in German or in other languages these have been translated into English. Marx's own remarks are in long primer. The italics in the quotations are Marx's unless otherwise stated in the footnotes.

Bakunin is referring to the representatives of the bourgeoisie who "came heartily to hate the present order, the political, economic and social order, who had turned their backs on the class that had produced them and had given themselves completely to the people's cause" (pp. 6-7).

The reference is to the suppression of the revolutions in the Kingdom of Naples (1820-21) and Spain (1820-23) by decision of the congresses of the Holy Alliance (see Note 145), which sent Austrian troops to Italy (Troppau and Laibach congresses, 1820-21), and French troops to Spain (Verona congress, 1822).

See Note 16.

The reference is to the Polish uprisings of 1830 and 1863 (see notes 389 and 14).

The first partition of Poland (1772) was initiated by Frederick II of Prussia. Catherine II agreed to it because of Russia's difficult position owing to the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74 and Austria's threat to enter the war on the side of Turkey (see also Note 9).

The reference is to Prussia's victories in the Austro-Prussian (1866) and the Franco-Prussian (1870-71) wars.

The Geneva Congress of the International Working Men's Association was held on September 3-8, 1866.

At the shooting festival (Schützenfest) in Vienna in August 1868, during the
discussion of Germany's unification, the South-German democrats, members of the People's Party (see Note 99), opposed Prussian hegemony in Germany. They advocated the plan for a "Great Germany" that would incorporate all German states, including Austria.

p. 492

Wilhelm Liebknecht did not want to break organisationally with the petty-bourgeois People's Party (see Note 99) which he and Bebel had helped found in 1866, but he opposed participation of class-conscious workers in democratic organisations. On the other hand, he suggested that the democrats should join the workers' party. Marx and Engels always disapproved of Liebknecht's inconsistent and conciliatory policy (see, for instance, Marx's letter to Kugelmann of June 24, 1868, and Engels' letter to Kugelmann of July 10, 1869, present edition, Vol. 43).

p. 492

The reference is to the Fifth Nuremberg Congress of the Union of German Workers' Associations led by August Bebel which was held on September 5-7, 1868. The congress signified the break of the Union's majority from the liberal bourgeoisie and its firm adherence to class proletarian stand. By 69 votes against 44 the delegates accepted the International's platform, which was put concisely in the new programme of the Union proposed to the congress. This programme declared the abolition of the capitalist system to be the goal, and the proletarian class struggle the means of attaining it. The congress stated that the workers would be able to emancipate themselves only by seizing political power and acting "jointly with the workers of all countries".

p. 492

The reference is to the French National Assembly, the elections to which were held on February 8, 1871. The majority of the deputies were monarchists. After the uprising of March 18, 1871, the Assembly fled to Versailles, from where it fought against the Commune.

p. 492

The Vendôme Column was erected in Paris between 1806 and 1810 as a tribute to the military victories of Napoleon I. On May 16, 1871, by the order of the Paris Commune, the Vendôme Column was destroyed as a symbol of militarism.

p. 492

In the spring of 1873 the last units of the Prussian occupation troops were withdrawn from French territory. They were stationed there under the terms of the Frankfurt Peace of 1871, which concluded the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71.

p. 493

Marx is referring to the activities of the Comité de propagande révolutionnaire socialiste de la France méridionale. It was founded by the former Paris Commune refugees living in Barcelona Charles Alberti and Paul Brousse and the member of the International's Lyons section Camille Camet in the spring of 1873 for spreading anarchist ideas in France and among the Commune refugees.

p. 493

The reference is to Alsace and the north-eastern part of Lorraine captured by Germany in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, to Russia's refusal to observe the article of the Paris Treaty of 1856 (see Note 578) which forbade it to maintain its navy in the Black Sea, and to the campaign undertaken by the Russian government in the spring of 1873 against the Khiva Khanate.

p. 493

The reference is to the Spanish Revolution of 1808-14 (see K. Marx, "Revolutionary Spain", present edition, Vol. 13).
In 1809 Tirol was the scene of a popular uprising, headed by Andreas Hofer, against the Franco-Bavarian occupation. The uprising was a failure. p. 494

The Carlists—a reactionary clerical-absolutist group in Spain consisting of adherents of the pretender to the Spanish throne Don Carlos, the brother of Ferdinand VII. Relying on the military and the Catholic clergy, and making use of the support of the backward peasants in some regions of Spain, the Carlists launched a civil war in 1833, which in fact turned into a struggle between the feudal-Catholic and liberal-bourgeois elements and led to the third bourgeois revolution (1834-43). After Don Carlos' death in 1855 the Carlists supported his grandson Don Carlos Jr. In 1872, in the situation of political crisis and sharper class conflicts, the Carlists stepped up their activity, which took on the scope of a new civil war that ended only in 1876. p. 494

Fueros here means the charters which, in medieval Spain, established the rights, privileges and duties of townpeople and members of village communities in matters of local government, jurisdiction, taxation, military service, etc. p. 494

A reference to the activity of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see Note 30) during the fifth bourgeois revolution in Spain (see Note 62). p. 494

The programme of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy was drawn up by Bakunin and published as a leaflet in Geneva in 1888 in French and German. It proclaimed atheism, equality of classes and the abolition of the state, and rejected the need for political action on the part of the working class (for Marx's remarks and criticism of this programme, see present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 207-11). p. 495

According to the Austro-Hungarian compromise of 1867 the Habsburg Empire was transformed into a dual constitutional monarchy, Austria-Hungary. The Czech territories were incorporated into Cisleithania—part of the empire with Austria as its centre, and Slovakia, into Transleithania with Hungary as its centre. p. 495

The Great Moravian Kingdom (the Great Moravian Principality) was the early-feudal state of the Western Slav in the 9th-early 10th centuries. At the time of its flourishing, it embraced the territories of Moravia, Slovakia, Bohemia, Lužica, Pannonia, and probably Małopolska and part of the Slovenian lands. p. 497

An ironical allusion to the following passage from Bakunin's book: "Against these people-suppressing trends ... an entirely new trend has finally developed leading directly to the abolition of all exploitation and all political or legal, as well as governmental-administrative oppression, i.e. to the abolition of all classes by means of making all estates economically equal, and to the abolition of their last stronghold, the State" (p. 74). p. 499

Bakunin is referring to Article 7a, "On the Political Action of the Working Class", which was included into the "General Rules of the International Working Men's Association" by the majority vote at the Hague Congress (see Note 38). p. 500

St. Wenceslas's crown—a symbol of the Czech people's historical right to state independence. In the 1860s-early 1870s, the campaign of the Czechs for state
sovereignty and national equality proceeded under the banner of the restoration of the rights of St. Wenceslas's crown. p. 500

567 Under the direct influence of anarchists, Serbian and Bulgarian students in Zurich organised a small group, Slavenski Savez, within the Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see Note 30). After several attempts in the spring of 1872 to constitute itself as a section of the International and the General Council's refusal to recognise it, the group affiliated to the Jura Federation (see Note 298) in June-July 1872. The group's programme was drawn up by Bakunin and published as "Supplement 'B'" to his Statehood and Anarchy. The Slavenski Savez ceased to exist in the summer of 1873. p. 501

568 Slavophiles (A. Khomyakov, the brothers Aksakov, I. Kireevsky, Yu. Samarin and others)—representatives of a trend in the 19th-century Russian social and philosophical thought. In the late 1830s-1850s they advanced a theory of Russia's unique path of historical development which, in their opinion, differed from that of Western Europe. Among the characteristic features of their theory were monarchism, a negative attitude to revolution and a leaning towards religious-philosophical conceptions. The Slavophiles met mostly at the literary salons of Moscow. p. 502

569 The reference is to the liberation of Moscow on October 22-26, 1612 by the people's militia under Minin and Pozharsky, who united the country's patriotic forces at the final stage of the struggle against the Polish-Lithuanian and Swedish invaders in the early 17th century. p. 502

570 Bogdan Khmelintsy led the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people in 1648-54 against the rule of the Polish szlachta and for the re-union with Russia. As a result, the Ukraine was re-united with Russia in a single state (1654). p. 502

571 Bakunin is referring to the bloody suppression of the Polish uprising of 1863-64 (see Note 14) by Mikhail Muravyov, the Governor-General of Lithuania and Byelorussia, who was nicknamed "the hangman" for this. p. 503

572 This remark relates to the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, the beginning of which Marx described as follows: "On the German side the war is a war of defence, but who put Germany to the necessity of defending herself? Who enabled Louis Bonaparte to wage war upon her? Prussia! It was Bismarck who conspired with that very same Louis Bonaparte for the purpose of crushing popular opposition at home, and annexing Germany to the Hohenzollern dynasty" (see present edition, Vol. 22, p. 5). p. 504

573 See Note 84. p. 505

574 The three parties are:

The National-Liberal Party—the party of German and, above all, Prussian bourgeoisie formed in the autumn of 1866 after a split in the Party of Progress. The policies of the National Liberals mirrored the capitulation of a significant part of the liberal bourgeoisie to Bismarck's Junker government after Prussia's victory in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 and the establishment of its supremacy in Germany.

The Party of Progress was founded in June 1861. It advocated the unification of Germany under Prussian aegis, the convocation of an all-German Parliament, and the establishment of a strong liberal Ministry responsible to the Chamber of Deputies. Its opposition to the Bismarck government was just so many words.
By the Social-Democratic Party Bakunin means the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (the so-called Eisenachers) and the General Association of German Workers uniting Lassalle's followers (see Note 554).

As a result of victory in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866, Prussia substantially expanded its territory by incorporating small German states. Besides, Austria had to renounce its rights to Schleswig and Holstein (see Note 577).

The digging of the Kiel Canal, the project of which was first mentioned in the press in the 1870s, began in 1887. The opening took place on June 20, 1895.

After the defeat in the Austro-Danish Prussian war of 1864 (see Note 70), Denmark lost Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenburg, which were declared the joint possession of Austria and Prussia. Contrary to the opinion of Gorchakov, who considered unification of Germany under Prussia's supremacy damaging to Russian interests, Emperor Alexander II did not try to hamper Prussia's policy towards Denmark as a sign of gratitude for the "service" rendered by Prussia in the suppression of the Polish uprising of 1863 (see Note 14). This is what Marx means by his remark.

The Paris Treaty—the peace treaty that concluded the Crimean war (1853-56) (see Note 19). It was signed by Austria, Britain, France, Prussia, Sardinia and Turkey, on the one hand, and Russia on the other, at the Congress of Paris on March 30, 1856. Under the treaty, Russia ceded the mouth of the Danube and part of Bessarabia, renounced its protectorate over the Danubian Principalities and its protection of Christians in Turkey, agreed to the neutralisation of the Black Sea (involving the closure of the Straits to foreign warships and a ban on Russia and Turkey maintaining navies and naval arsenals on the Black Sea), and returned the fortress of Kars to Turkey in exchange for Sevastopol and other Russian towns held by the Allies.

A reference to the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (see Note 94).

The reference is to the events of the Anglo-French-Chinese war of 1856-60 (Second Opium War). In August 1860 Anglo-French troops captured Tiensin and in October 1860 Peking. The Chinese government was forced to sign new, very damaging treaties with Britain and France in 1860. The war was an important step towards turning China into a semi-colony.

Preparing for a war with Austria (see Note 5), in the autumn of 1865 in Biarritz Bismarck managed to extract a promise of French neutrality in the war from Napoleon III in exchange for raising no objections to the incorporation of Luxembourg into the French Empire. Bismarck did not keep his promise.

The reference is to the treaties of Tilsit—peace treaties signed on July 7 and 9, 1807 by Napoleon, France, and Russia and Prussia, members of the fourth anti-French coalition. In an attempt to split 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 an advanced post in the event of war with Russia.

583 J. G. Fichte, Reden an die deutsche Nation (Berlin, 1808)—a course of lectures delivered by Fichte at Berlin University in the winter of 1807, when after the signing of the Peace of Tilsit Germany was in a state of extreme national humiliation. They developed the idea of the nation as a collective personality having its own, special vocation. Fichte called on his compatriots to unite; he believed that political independence can be attained through stronger moral principles and an education reform. According to him, a nation should foster an awareness of its vocation and duty.

584 Nicholas I was married in 1817 to the Prussian Princess Charlotte (Alexandra Fyodorovna), daughter of Frederick William III.

585 Ligue du Midi—a revolutionary-democratic organisation embracing 15 departments. It was set up on September 18, 1870 in Marseilles on the initiative of the more active section of the middle commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, and assumed responsibility for providing local defence in view of the weakness of the central authority. The League's programme included the basic democratic demands set forth by the French sections of the International. By late 1870 it had been declared illegal and disbanded.

586 In the notes for his L'Empire knouto-germanique, Bakunin wrote: "It is clear that urged by the same logic Mr. Engels could say in a letter written this year to a friend of ours, without the slightest irony but, on the contrary, quite seriously, that Mr. Bismarck, like King Victor Emmanuel, has rendered immense services to the revolution by creating great political centralisation in their respective countries" (Archives Bakounine, par A. Lehning, Vol. II, Leiden, 1965, p. 195).

It is probably this letter by Engels that is interpreted so freely by Bakunin in this work. Marx and Engels advocated a revolutionary way of uniting Germany and were sharply opposed to both the home and foreign policy pursued by Bismarck. In the works included in this volume (see pp. 251-52, 578), they emphasised that Bismarck's reactionary domestic policy was turning the German proletariat towards revolutionary struggle.

587 The reference is to the so-called Doctors' Club, a Berlin group of Young Hegelians in which Marx had a prominent place. The Young Hegelians drew radical atheistic conclusions from Hegel's philosophy, but at the same time removed philosophy from reality, turning it into a self-contained, determining force. In fact, the Young Hegelians were withdrawing more and more from practical revolutionary action.

Here and below, Bakunin made many inaccuracies when citing the facts of Marx's biography.

588 This refers to "The Free" (Die Freien)—a Berlin group of Left Hegelians which was formed in the first half of the 1840s and included Edgar Bauer, Max Stirner and others. Marx gave a highly negative assessment of the actions of "The Free" and of their empty abstract criticism.

589 See Note 378.

590 A reference to the Communist League—the first German and international communist organisation of the proletariat formed under the leadership of Marx and Engels in London early in June 1847 as a result of the reorganisation of the League of the Just (see Note 220). The League's members took an active
part in the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany in 1848-19. In 1849
and 1850, after the defeat of the revolution, it was reorganised and continued
its activities. In the summer of 1850 disagreements arose between the
supporters of Marx and Engels and the sectarian Willich-Schapper group,
which ended in a split within the League. Owing to police persecutions and
arrests of League members in May 1851, the activities of the Communist
League as an organisation practically ceased in Germany. On November 17,
1852, on a motion by Marx, the London District announced the dissolution of
the League. The Communist League played an important historical role as the
first proletarian party based on the principles of scientific communism, as a
school of proletarian revolutionaries, and as the historical forerunner of the
International Working Men's Association.

591 Marx moved to Brussels on February 3, 1845, after the French government
had expelled him from Paris by the decree of January 16, 1845. At that time,
Engels was in Barmen and joined Marx in Brussels on April 5, 1845.

592 See Note 18.

593 See Note 102.

594 In the note to the Preface to the first German edition of Volume One of
Capital Marx wrote: "This is the more necessary, as even the section of
Ferdinand Lassalle's work against Schulze-Delitzsch, in which he professes to
give 'the intellectual quintessence' of my explanations on these subjects,
contains important mistakes. If Ferdinand Lassalle has borrowed almost literally
from my writings, and without any acknowledgement, all the general
theoretical propositions in his economic works, e.g., those on the historical
character of capital, on the connexion between the conditions of production
and the mode of production, &c. &c. even to the terminology created by me, this
may perhaps be due to purposes of propaganda. I am here, of course, not
speaking of his detailed working out and application of these propositions, with
which I have nothing to do" (see present edition, Vol. 39).

595 The Geneva Congress of the International Working Men's Association adopted
the principal ideas set forth in Marx's "Instructions for the Delegates of the
Provisional General Council. The Different Questions" (present edition,
Vol. 26, pp. 183-94) as its programme.

596 The Nuremberg Congress (see Note 549) sent a delegation to the conference of
the People's Party (see Note 99), which took place on September 19-20, 1868 in
Stuttgart and declared the Party's support for the Nuremberg programme.

597 The second congress of the League of Peace and Freedom was held on
September 21-25, 1868 in Berne.

598 The reference is to the resolution on the League of Peace and Freedom
adopted by the Brussels Congress of the International on September 12, 1868
in connection with the League's invitation to attend its congress in Berne in
September 1868. The invitation was sent to the International on the initiative
of Bakunin who, being a member of the League's Central Committee, sought to
establish his authority over the International Working Men's Association (see
The General Council of the First International, 1868-1870. Minutes, Progress
In 1876 Prosper Olivier Lissagaray, a French republican journalist and member of the Paris Commune, published a book in Brussels entitled *Histoire de la Commune de 1871*. The author, who drew on extensive factual material, exposed the anti-national policies of the French ruling circles and showed the part played by the people in the history of the Paris Commune. In a letter to Wilhelm Bracke written on September 23, 1876, Marx said that this book was "the first authentic history of the Commune" (see present edition, Vol. 45). Believing this work important for the proletarian party, Marx did a great deal to have a German translation of it published (*Geschichte der Commune von 1871. Autorisirte deutsche Ausgabe nach dem vom Verfasser vervollständigten französischen Original*, Brunswick, 1877).

Engels' "Note on Page 29 of the *Histoire de la Commune*" provides, as it were, comments on the events that unfolded in France after the capitulation of Bazaine's army in Metz on October 27 and until the complete encirclement of Paris in mid-November 1870. Engels, who had earlier written a series of articles ("Notes on the War") for *The Pall Mall Gazette* (London), which appeared between July 1870 and June 1871 (see present edition, Vol. 22), had a good knowledge of the course of events and their underlying causes. He sent a copy of his comments to Lissagaray who on February 9, 1877 thanked the author for "a brilliant commentary" on the military events. Lissagaray included Engels' text in the second French edition of his book, part changed and part verbatim.

Engels' "Note" was first published, in Russian, in 1933. It now appears in English for the first time.

The reference is to the beginning of the talks on a truce held in Versailles on October 30 between Thiers, representative of the Government of National Defence, and Bismarck. The news about the encirclement of Metz that followed prompted the revolutionary action of Paris workers on October 31. Bismarck used the inaction of the French command during the talks, which allowed him to play for time, and on November 6 he broke off the talks.

Engels comments on the following passage from Lissagaray: "The men of September 4 believed themselves to be saved having obtained their aim. They put on the same level armistice and capitulation, 'good and bad news', convinced that Paris, despairing of victory, will open its arms to peace."

"The men of September 4"—a group of bourgeois politicians, monarchists and clericals, who comprised the so-called Government of National Defence set up after the revolution of September 4, 1870 in Paris.

Franco-tireurs—volunteers organised into small guerrilla units who took part in the defence of France against the invaders. The first units were formed during the wars against the anti-French coalitions in the late 18th-early 19th century. In 1867 francs-tireurs' societies began to spring up in France. When the Franco-Prussian war broke out and Prussian troops invaded French territory, members of these societies were called to arms by a special decree. When the regular French troops were defeated and blockaded in fortresses the number of francs-tireurs' units increased sharply. They mainly attacked transports, weaker detachments, railway trains and food depots, and did substantial damage to the enemy.

The reference is to the siege of Mantua (June 1796-February 2, 1797) by French troops during Napoleon’s Italian campaign of 1796-97.
The book which prompted Marx's notes was the second edition of Adolph Wagner's *Allgemeine oder theoretische Volkswirtschaftslehre*, erster Theil: *Grundlegung*, published in Leipzig and Heidelberg in 1870 as the first volume of *Lehrbuch der politischen Oekonomie* by Adolph Wagner and Erwin Nasse. It has been possible to date these notes by Marx's mention in his manuscript (see this volume, p. 530) of Rudolph Meyer's *Briefe und Socialpolitische Aufsätze von Dr. Rodbertus-Jagetzow* which appeared in Berlin after January 1881.


The note mentioned by Marx is to be found in his *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (see present edition. Vol. 29, p. 270). p. 545

*Vegetable ivory* (Phytelephas)—species of an anomalous genus of palms from tropical South America. The seed or nuts, as they are usually called when fully ripe and hard, are used by the American Indians for making small ornamental articles and toys. They are imported into Britain in considerable quantities, frequently under the name of corozo nuts. p. 555

The reference is to the change in the social and economic position of Germany as a result of the 5,000 million francs it received from France after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 (see Note 144). p. 557

*St. Peter's Money* (*St. Peter's Penny* or *Pence*)—annual contributions from Catholics to the Papacy (originally, a silver penny from each family on the feast day of St. Peter). It continues to be an important source of revenue for the Pope's curia. p. 559

Getting ready to travel to Karlsbad for medical treatment in August 1874, Marx applied to become naturalised in Britain. This was a precaution against possible reprisals by the Austrian authorities. Marx left for Karlsbad on August 15, having failed to receive a reply to his application.

This document is an official blank on which information about Marx (in italics in the text) has been entered in a clerk's hand. Only the signature is Marx's. The special report by W. Reimers and J. Williams was written on a separate blank.

Appended to the application are the statements made by Marx's referees written on special blanks, as well as the letter of Morris R. Willis, Marx's lawyer, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department of August 29, 1874, requesting to know the reasons for the refusal to grant a Certificate of Naturalisation. p. 563

Apart from Marx and Engels, former Communards and other participants in the meeting spoke at the celebration held by the German Workers' Educational Society in London (see Note 129). Friedrich Lessner, a veteran of the German and international workers' movement, sent a greeting.
An account of the meeting was featured by the Neue Social-Demokrat of Berlin, No. 20, February 18, 1876. The report published in this volume was drawn up on February 12 by Carl Scharr and printed by Der Volksstaat, No. 24, February 27, 1876, in the section “Aus England”. Besides his own speech, Engels translated into German Walery Wróblewski’s speech, indicating the milestones of his career. Wróblewski’s speech was also included by the editorial board into the report on Engels’ speech. Serious factual errors were made in the account of Marx’s and Engels’ speeches.

A report of the meeting was also carried by the Russian periodical Nabat published in Geneva, No. 4, 1876. It differed substantially from the text in Der Volksstaat, and also contained a great number of factual errors.  

612 See Note 378. p. 565

613 The reference is to the second congress of the Communist League held on November 29-December 8, 1847 (see Note 220). A number of its members also belonged to the German Workers’ Educational Society in London. p. 565

614 As is clear from the correspondence of the members of the London District of the Communist League with the League’s Central Authority (see letters of March 15 and June 18, 1848 in Der Bund der Kommunisten, Dokumente und Materialien, Vol. I, Berlin, 1970, pp. 726-28 and 804-07), in early March 1848 the owner of the pub where the members of the Educational Society used to assemble cancelled the lease, and the meetings could no longer be held there. The author of the letter of March 15 stressed that in future the Society’s meetings would be held only, under police surveillance, and that the British government had established strict supervision over the connections between foreign revolutionaries and the Chartists (see Note 368). p. 565

615 An inaccuracy in the text: the reference is to the dissolution of the Communist League in November 1852. p. 566

616 See Note 14. p. 566

617 See Note 26. p. 566

618 Marx’s interview with the correspondent of The Chicago Tribune took place in the first half of December 1878. Despite the several inaccuracies of the correspondent, this document has some biographical interest.

The German translation of the text of the interview was published, slightly abridged, in the New York Volkszeitung, No. 10, January 10, 1879 and reprinted by Der Vorbote, No. 2, January 11, 1879. The Socialist of Chicago (No. 18, January 11) reprinted the last part of the interview. The publication in Der Vorbote was used for the Danish translation, which appeared in the Social-Demokrater, Copenhagen, Nos. 84 and 85, April 9 and 10, 1879. p. 568

619 Marx left for Paris late in October 1843. p. 568

620 The reference is to the report of the American Ambassador to Berlin J. Ch. Bancroft Davis dispatched to the US Secretary of State Hamilton Fish on February 10, 1877. The part of the report referring to the socialist movement in Germany was printed in the official publication: United States, State Department, Papers Relating to Foreign Relations of the United States, Washington, 1877, pp. 175-80. p. 571

621 This refers to the programme of the Socialist Workers’ Party of Germany adopted by the unity congress in Gotha in May 1875. p. 571
The first national trade union in the USA—the National Typographical Union—was founded in 1850. By the 1860s the country had a whole network of local trade union organisations. In August 1866 the National Labor Union was formed in Baltimore, and in December 1869 the Noble Order of Knights of Labor in Philadelphia, which on January 1, 1878 became a legal body. Both organisations, while experiencing a strong petty-bourgeois influence, nevertheless advocated social reforms, including the eight-hour working day, women's rights, and higher wages. The economic crisis of 1873 and the prolonged slump which followed were the causes for vigorous strike action of American workers, with its peak being the miners' strike in Pennsylvania (the Long Strike) of 1874-75 and the national railway strike of 1877.

See Note 96.

See Note 110.

See Note 268.

The reference is to the Anti-Socialist Law promulgated on October 19, 1878 (see Note 289) and the introduction of a minor state of siege in Berlin (see Note 418).

On July 12, 1870 the Paris members of the International published in the "Revue" an anti-war manifesto addressed to the workers of all nations, which was reprinted by Der Volksstaat, No. 57, July 17, 1870. A number of similar addresses were issued in France at that time. On July 16 a workers' meeting in Brunswick convened by the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party issued an address in protest against the war preparations made by the ruling classes, and for solidarity with the manifesto of the International's Paris members. Workers' meetings in Chemnitz and Munich also adopted similar manifestos and resolutions.

On September 5, 1870, after the defeat of the French army at Sedan, the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party with its headquarters in Brunswick issued a manifesto ("Manifest des Ausschusses der social-demokratischen Arbeiterpartei. An Alle deutschen Arbeiter!") urging German workers to organise mass meetings of protest against the expansionist plans of the Prussian government. The Manifesto included parts of Marx's and Engels' "Letter to the Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party" of August 22 and 30, 1870 (see present edition, Vol. 22, pp. 260-62). On September 9, members of the Brunswick Committee, Bracke, Bornhorst, Spier, Kühn and Gralle, as well as a printer, Sievers, were arrested for publishing the Manifesto and in November 1871 brought to trial on the fabricated charge of disturbing public order.

On November 26, 1870, when the German Reichstag discussed the question of credits for the war against France, Bebel and Liebknecht demanded that credits be refused and peace with the French Republic promptly concluded without annexations. The entire Social-Democratic group in the Reichstag together with Bebel and Liebknecht voted against the granting of credits on November 28. After the Reichstag session closed on December 17, Bebel, Liebknecht and Hepner were arrested and charged with high treason.
On November 28, 1878 a minor state of siege was declared in Berlin (see Note 418). The next day 67 members of the Social-Democratic Party, including their leaders Auer and Friztsche, received deportation orders. p. 578

In this letter, addressed to Victoria Adelaide Mary Louisa, the eldest daughter of Queen Victoria and wife of the Prussian Crown Prince, the future German Emperor Frederick III, the British politician Mountstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff gives an account of his talk with Marx, which took place on January 31, 1879 at the Devonshire Club. The author first published excerpts from the letter in his Notes from a Diary, 1873-1881, London, 1898, pp. 103-06. Grant Duff took pains not to disclose the name of his addressee.

Despite the fact that the author did not always faithfully reproduce Marx’s ideas, the letter is undoubtedly of interest as additional material throwing light on Marx’s views of the revolutionary future of Russia and Germany, and also as evidence of the fear provoked in ruling quarters by the growth of the working-class movement and the prestige of its leader, Karl Marx. The letter was published in full for the first time in an article by Andrew Rothstein “A Meeting with Karl Marx” (The Times Literary Supplement, July 15, 1949, p. 464). p. 580

See Note 90. p. 581

The protracted economic crisis began in 1873 after the period known in history as Gründerzeit (see Note 84). p. 581

The reference is to the Glorious Revolution of 1688 (the overthrow of the Stuart dynasty and the enthronement of William III of Orange in 1689), after which constitutional monarchy was consolidated in England on the basis of a compromise between the landed aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. p. 581

Marx’s interview with John Swinton, at that time editor of the progressive New York newspaper The Sun, took place in August 1880. Following the publication of an account of the interview Marx wrote to Swinton on November 4, 1880: “I have at the same time to thank you for your friendly article in The Sun” (see present edition, Vol. 46). After the interview, Marx kept in touch with Swinton for some time and sent him, at the latter’s request, the French translation of Capital.

Marx’s interview with Swinton was reprinted in the collection: John Swinton, Current Views and Notes of Forty Days in France and England, New York, 1880, pp. 41-45.

Swinton used this interview in his speech at the meeting organised by New York workers on March 19, 1883 on the occasion of Marx’s death. See Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 15, April 5, 1883, and Truth (San Francisco), April 7, 1883. p. 583

Marx and his family took a rest at Ramsgate between early August and September 13, 1880. p. 583

Marx probably referred to Karl Daniel Adolph Douai’s proposal to have Capital translated into English. As is clear from Sorge’s letter to Marx of July 19, 1878, this plan had not been carried through. The English translation of Volume One of Capital appeared after Marx’s death, in 1887. It was prepared by Engels, Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. p. 584

Originally, while working on his economic manuscripts, Marx had planned to write six books: on capital, on landed property, on wage labour, on the state, on international trade and on the world market (see Marx’s letters to Lassalle}
of February 22, 1858, to Engels of April 2, 1858, and to Weydemeyer of February 1, 1859, present edition, Vol. 40). The plan was not realised. Questions of ground rent and credit were dealt with, at some length, in Volume Three of Capital.  

p. 584

The reference is to the authorised French translation of Volume One of Capital (see Note 108). Marx made substantial changes and additions in the manuscript of the translation. He believed that the French edition had an independent scientific value. On its basis, changes were introduced into the subsequent editions of Volume One in German, Russian and other languages.  

p. 584

This statement, written before February 26, 1883 probably by a staff member of L'Égalité (perhaps by Paul Lafargue) in view of the closure of the newspaper of the French Workers' Party, was sent by Engels to the Sozialdemokrat editorial board. It was enclosed with the letter of February 27-March 1, 1883 to the editor, Eduard Bernstein. "L'Égalité has gone phut again," wrote Engels, "and I would ask you to publish the following facts (see enclosed slip of paper) in the Sozialdemokrat" (see present edition, Vol. 46). The translation of this statement into German was probably made by Engels. The facts cited relate to the fourth and fifth series of L'Égalité, whose publication was terminated and resumed several times since its foundation in 1877. The fourth series appeared from October 24, 1882 and throughout 1883. The fifth series was published between February 15 and 26, 1883. The statement appeared in Der Sozialdemokrat, No. 11, March 8, 1883, and was prefaced by the editorial note: "After a brief existence L'Égalité was unfortunately forced to close. The following has been written to us in this connection."

p. 586
NAME INDEX

A

Albert (1828-1902)—King of Saxony (1873-1902).—172

Alexander I (1777-1825)—Emperor of Russia (1801-25).—488, 511-12

Alexander II (1818-1881)—Emperor of Russia (1855-81), assassinated by members of the Narodnaya Volya (People's Will) group in March 1881.—5-6, 8-9, 31, 103-04, 226, 228, 239, 357, 374, 496, 511

Alexander III (1845-1894)—Emperor of Russia (1881-94).—426

Anaxagoras (c. 500-428 B.C.)—Greek materialist philosopher from Clazomenae (Asia Minor).—285

Anne (1665-1714)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1702-14).—437

Applegarth, Robert (1833-1925)—cabinet-maker, a trade union leader; General Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (1862-71); member of the London Trades Council; member of the General Council of the First International (1865, 1868-72); delegate to the Basic Congress of the International (1869); one of the Reform League leaders; subsequently left the working-class movement.—571

Arakcheyev, Alexei Andreyevich (1769-1834)—Russian statesman; favourite of Paul I and Alexander 1.—512

Arch, Joseph (1826-1919)—British politician, founder of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union in 1872 and its president, Liberal M.P. (1885-86, 1892-1900).—179, 181-82

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—298, 535

Arims—family of margraves in Prussia, first mentioned in 1204.—144

Atia—mother of Roman Emperor Augustus.—429

Auer, Ignaz (1846-1907)—one of the leaders of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany, reformist; saddler; for many years deputy to the Reichstag.—77, 209, 578

Augustus, Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus (63 B.C.-A.D. 14)—Roman Emperor (27 B.C.-A.D. 14).—429

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).—528-30

B

Babeuf, François Noël (Gracchus) (1760-1797)—French revolutionary, advo-
cate of utopian egalitarian communism, organiser of the "conspiracy of equals".—287

Bacon, Francis, Baron Verulam, Viscount St. Albans (1561-1626)—English philosopher, naturalist, historian and statesman.—299, 569

Badinguet—see Napoleon III

Bakunin, Mikhail Alexandrovich (1814-1876)—Russian democrat, journalist; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; an ideologist of Narodism (populism) and anarchism in later years; opposed Marxism in the First International, was expelled from it at the Hague Congress (1872) for his splitting activities.—23, 26-28, 34, 37, 45, 72, 77, 174-77, 205, 213-14, 236, 425, 478, 487-526, 584

Balfour, Arthur James Balfour, 1st Earl of (1848-1930)—British statesman and philosopher, M.P. from 1874.—589

Batbie, Anselme-Polycarpe (1828-1887)—French politician, Orleanist, deputy to the National Assembly (1871); Senator (1876-79).—204

Bauer, Bruno (1809-1882)—German idealist philosopher, Young Hegelian; author of works on the history of Christianity; radical; National Liberal after 1866.—427-28, 430, 431, 514

Bauer, Edgar (1820-1886)—German philosopher and journalist, Young Hegelian; emigrated to England after the 1848-49 revolution; editor of the London Neue Zeit (1859); Prussian official after the 1861 amnesty; Bruno Bauer's brother and associate.—514

Baumann, August—German Social Democrat; composer; took part in socialist publications; at the time of the Anti-Socialist Law was deported from Germany; emigrated to the USA.—578

Beaconsfield—see Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield

Bebel, August (1840-1913)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; turner; member of the First International; deputy to the North German (1867-70) and the German Reichstag (1871-81 and from 1883); a founder and leader of German Social Democracy; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—67, 71-73, 77, 214, 240-42, 244, 249, 253-54, 258, 408-09, 500, 528, 525

Becker, Bernhard (1826-1891)—German journalist and historian; follower of Lassalle; President of the General Association of German Workers (1864-65); subsequently joined the Eisenachers; delegate to the Hague Congress of the First International (1872).—78

Becker, Hermann Heinrich ("Red Becker") (1820-1885)—German lawyer and journalist; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; member of the Communist League from 1850; one of the accused in the Cologne Communist trial (1852), sentenced to five years' imprisonment; member of the Party of Progress in the 1860s; later National Liberal.—138

Becker, Johann Philipp (1809-1886)—prominent figure in the international working-class movement; brushmaker; took part in the German and Swiss democratic movement in the 1830s and 1840s and in the 1848-49 revolution; prominent figure in the First International in the 1860s, delegate to all its congresses; editor of Der Vorbot (1866-71); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—251

Becker, Oskar (1839-1868)—student of Leipzig University; in 1861 made an attempt on William I's life; sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment; amnestied in 1866.—244

Becks, Pierre Jean (1795-1887)—Belgian clergyman; head of the Order of Jesuits (1853-84).—575

Benoiston de Châteauneuf, Louis François (1776-1856)—French economist and
statistician; member of the editorial board of the *Journal des Économistes*.—326

Berenson, Antoni (1847-1916)—Polish revolutionary, took part in the 1863-64 uprising; emigrated after its suppression; in 1867 made an attempt on Alexander II’s life in Paris; sentenced to 20 years of hard labour by a French court.—5

Bernstein, Eduard (1850-1932)—German Social-Democrat from 1872; editor of *Der Sozialdemokrat* (1881-90); after Engels’ death came out with the revision of Marxism.—254, 257-66, 269

Berull, Vasilij Vasiljevich (pseudonym N. Flersovsky) (1829-1918)—Russian economist and sociologist; enlightener and democrat; author of *The Condition of the Working Class in Russia*.—44

Bessemer, Sir Henry (1813-1898)—British inventor of a new economical way of converting pig-iron into steel.—276, 556

Bignami, Enrico (1844-1921)—Italian journalist; took part in the national liberation struggle in Italy headed by Garibaldi; member of the First International; founder and editor of *La Plebe* (1868-83).—172-73


Blanc, Jean Joseph Charles Louis (1811-1882)—French petty-bourgeois socialist, historian; member of the Provisional Government and President of the Luxembourg Commission in 1848; pursued a policy of conciliation with the bourgeoisie; emigrated to England in August 1848; a leader of petty-bourgeois refugees in London; deputy to the National Assembly of 1871; opposed the Paris Commune.—514

Blanqui, Jérôme Adolphe (1798-1874)—French political economist; brother of Louis Auguste Blanqui.—326

Blanqui, Louis Auguste (1805-1881)—French revolutionary, utopian communist; organised several secret societies and plots; active participant in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848; leader of the proletarian movement in France; sentenced to imprisonment several times: in 1871, was elected member of the Paris Commune in his absence while in prison.—13-14, 58, 336

Bleichröder, Gerson von (1822-1893)—German financier; head of a big banking house in Berlin; Bismarck’s private banker and unofficial adviser on financial questions.—274, 277

Blind, Karl (1826-1907)—German democratic journalist; active participant in the revolutionary movement in Baden in 1848-49; a leader of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in London in the 1850s; National Liberal in the 1860s.—244, 270-71

Bloé, Wilhelm (1849-1927)—German journalist and politician; member of the Social-Democratic Party (from 1872); deputy to the Reichstag (1877-1918, with short intervals); Minister-President of the Württemberg government (1918-20).—209

Bluma, Karl Wilhelm Hermann von (1835-1919)—Prussian general and military writer; took part in the
Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71.—550

Böckh, Philipp August (1785-1867)—German philologist and historian of antiquity; professor and for a number of years rector of Berlin University.—556

Bonaparte, Louis—see Napoleon III

Bonaparte, Napoleon Eugène Louis Jean Joseph (1805-1879)—son of Napoleon III; got the title of Imperial Prince at his birth.—222

Bonaparte, Prince Napoleon Joseph Charles Paul (1822-1891)—son of Jérôme Bonaparte, cousin of Napoleon III; known under the nicknames of Plon-Plon and Red Prince.—189, 270

Boon, Martin James—British mechanic; prominent figure in the British working-class movement; follower of the social-reformist views of the Chartist James Bronterre O'Brien; member of the General Council of the First International (1869-72); Secretary of the Land and Labour League; member of the British Federal Council (1872).—571

Borchardt, Louis (1820-1888)—German physician, liberal; sentenced to imprisonment for his participation in the 1848-49 revolution; being released he emigrated to Bradford, then to Manchester; private doctor of Wilhelm Wolff; Engels acquaintance.—170-71

Bornstedt, Adalbert von (1808-1851)—German journalist; founder and editor of the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung (1847-48); member of the Communist League, expelled from it in March 1848, as it turned out later he had contacts with the Prussian police.—336

Bourbons—royal dynasty in France (1589-1792, 1814-15, 1815-30); in Spain (1700-1808, 1814-68, 1874-1931 and since 1975) and in a number of Italian states.—488, 512

Bracke, Wilhelm (1842-1880)—German Social-Democrat; publisher of socialist literature in Brunswick; a founder (1869) and leader of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Eisenachers); member of the Social-Democratic group in the Reichstag (1877-79).—20, 69, 75, 77-78, 174, 209, 253, 269

Bradnick, Frederick—member of the General Council of the First International (1870-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871); following the Hague Congress (1872) joined the reformist wing of the British Federal Council; expelled from the International by the General Council's decision of May 30, 1873.—571

Brandenburg, Friedrich Wilhelm, Count von (1792-1850)—Prussian general and statesman, head of the counter-revolutionary ministry (from November 1848 to November 1850).—161

Bright, John (1811-1889)—British manufacturer and politician, one of the Free Trade leaders and founders of the Anti-Corn Law League; M.P. (from 1843); leader of the Left wing of the Liberal Party from the early 1860s; held several ministerial posts.—179, 403, 412

Brutus (Marcus Junius Brutus) (c. 85-42 B.C.)—Roman politician, republican: an initiator of the conspiracy against Julius Caesar.—14-15

Bucher, Lothar (1817-1892)—Prussian official and journalist; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Left Centre) in 1848 and then a refugee in London; subsequently National Liberal and supporter of Bismarck.—230-33

Bucher, Philippe Joseph Benjamin (1796-1865)—French politician, historian, Christian Socialist.—69, 93

Büchner, Georg (1813-1837)—German dramatist and writer; revolutionary democrat; in 1834, an organiser of the secret revolutionary Gesellschaft der Menschenrechte (Society of
Human Rights) in Hesse; author of the address to the Hessian peasants bearing the motto: "Peace to the cabin; war to the palace."—513

Buttler, Johann (1777-1803)—German robber, nicknamed Schinderhannes (Hans the skin-flint).—49

Billow-Cummerow, Ernst Gottfried Georg von (1775-1851)—German journalist and politician; expressed the interests of big landowners.——144

Burns, Lydia (Lizzie, Lizzie) (1827-1878)—Irish working woman; Frederick Engels' second wife.——567

Busch, Meritz (1821-1899)—German publicist.——580

Buss, Franz Joseph von (1803-1878)—German lawyer and politician; main representative of political Catholicism; deputy to the National Assembly in Frankfurt am Main (extreme Right wing) and in 1874-76 deputy to the German Reichstag (Centre).——166

Buttery, G. H.—member of the General Council of the First International (1871-72).——571

C

Caesar (Gaius Julius Caesar) (c. 100-44 B.C.)—Roman general, statesman and writer, author of Commentarii de bello Gallico—350, 365, 429, 442-43

Camphausen, Ludolf (1803-1890)—banker in Cologne; a leader of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Prime Minister of Prussia (March-June 1848).——107, 183

Carlyle, Thomas (1795-1881)—British writer, historian and philosopher; supported the Tories; preached views bordering on feudal socialism up to 1848; later a relentless opponent of the working-class movement.—288, 412

Castelar y Ripoll, Emilio (1832-1899)—Spanish politician, historian and writer; leader of the Right-wing Republican party; President of the Republic (September 1873-January 1874); deputy to the Cortes after the restoration of monarchy in 1874.—513, 523

Catherine II (1729-1796)—Empress of Russia (1762-96).——49, 360, 488

Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de (1547-1616)—Spanish writer.——458

Chambord, Henri Charles Ferdinand Marie D'Eulon, comte de (1820-1889)—last representative of the elder line of the Bourbons, grandson of Charles X, pretender to the French throne under the name of Henry V.—292

Charlemagne (Charles the Great) (c. 742-814)—King of the Franks (768-800) and Roman Emperor (800-14).——448, 450

Charles II (1630-1685)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1660-85).——496

Chernyshevsky, Nikolai Gavrilovich (1828-1889)—Russian revolutionary democrat, materialist philosopher, writer and literary critic.—23, 199

Cherval, Juliet (real name Joseph Cramer)—Prussian police spy who had gained entry into the Communist League and led one of the Paris communities belonging to the sectarian Willich-Schapper group; accused of complicity in the so-called Franco-German plot in Paris in February 1852; escaped from prison with the connivance of the police; agent provocateur in Switzerland under the name of Nugent (1853-54).——51

Cloves, Norris A.—American journalist; in the early 1880s, the New-York Star correspondent in Ireland; acquaintance of Theodor Friedrich Guno.—410

Chauvel, Gustave Paul (1823-1909)—French politician, general; joined Garibaldi's volunteers in Italy (1860); fought in the US Civil War; member of the First International; Bakuninist; the General Council's correspondent
in the USA in the spring of 1870; took part in revolutionary uprisings in Lyons and Marseilles (1870); member of the Paris Commune (1871); emigrated after its defeat.—237

Cobbett, William (c. 1762-1835)—British politician and journalist; from 1802 published Cobbett's Weekly Political Register.—32

Cobden, Richard (1804-1865)—British manufacturer and politician; one of the Free Trade leaders and founders of the Anti-Corn Law League; M.P. (1841-65).—400-03, 412

Cohen, Ferdinand (c. 1842-1866)—German student, Karl Blind's stepson; made an unsuccessful attempt on Bismarck's life on May 7, 1866.—244

Constantine I (called "The Great") (c. 285-337)—Roman Emperor (306-37).—428

Cook, Flavius Josephus (Joseph) (1838-1901)—American theologian and preacher; his Boston Monday lectures enjoyed great popularity in the 1870s.—576

Correggio (Antonio Allegri) (c. 1489-1534)—Italian painter.—119

Count of Paris—see Louis Philippe Albert d'Orleans, Count of

Cournot, Antoine Augustin (1801-1877)—French mathematician, philosopher and economist; forerunner of the mathematical school of political economy; in his Recherches sur les principes mathématiques de la théorie des richesses tried to study economic phenomena with the help of mathematical methods.—559

Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658)—leader of the English Revolution, Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland from 1653.—578

Cross, Richard Assheton, first Viscount Cross (1823-1914)—British statesman, Conservative, Home Secretary (1874-80 and 1885-86).—563

Cuff, Christ. R.—English court official.—563

D

Dante, Alighieri (1265-1321)—Italian poet.—183

Darwin, Charles Robert (1809-1882)—English naturalist, founder of the theory of natural selection of species.—301, 313, 435, 458, 462, 467

Davis, John Chandler Bancroft (1822-1907)—American lawyer and diplomat; the London Times correspondent (1854-61); Under-Secretary of State (1869, 1871 and 1873-74); Ambassador to Germany (1874-77).—571-72

Delachaye, Victor Alfred (1838-1897)—French mechanic; Proudhonist; member of the First International from 1865; took part in the Paris Commune (1871); emigrated to England after the suppression of the Commune; member of the General Council of the International and the British Federal Council (1871-72), delegate to the London Conference (1871); returned to France in 1879.—571

Delbrück, Martin Friedrich Rudolf von (1817-1903)—Prussian and German statesman; supporter of Free Trade; one of Bismarck's close advisers up to 1876; deputy to the Reichstag (1878-81).—122, 124

Demmler, Georg Adolf (1804-1886)—German Social-Democrat, deputy to the Reichstag (1877-78).—209

Demosthenes (c. 384-322 B.C.)—Greek orator and politician; champion of democracy in slave-owning society.—548

Demuth, Helene (1820-1890)—housemaid and friend of the Marx family.—476, 568

Deprez, Marcel (1843-1918)—French
physicist and electrician; worked on
the problem of electric energy trans-
mission.—468

Descartes, René (in Latin: Renatus Cart-
tesius) (1596-1650)—French philos-
opher, mathematician and natu-
ralist.—298

Deville, Gabriel Pierre (1854-1940)—
French socialist, active member of the
French Workers' Party, journalist;
staff member of L'Égalité; author of
a popular exposition of Marx’s Cap-
tal; left the working-class movement
at the beginning of the 20th cen-
tury.—586

Dickens, Charles John Huffman (1812-
1870)—English novelist.—569

Didier, Denis (1713-1784)—French
philosopher of the Enlightenment,
atheist, leader of the Encyclopædi-
asts.—298

Dilke, Sir Charles Wentworth, Baronet
(1843-1911)—British politician and
writer; a leader of the Radical wing
of the Liberal Party; Under-Secretary
for Foreign Affairs (1880-82) and
President of the local government
board (1882-85).—389

Dillon, John (1851-1927)—Irish politi-
cian; a leader of the Irish National
Land League; M.P. in 1880; in the
1880s was arrested several times and
imprisoned.—408

Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield
(1804-1881)—British statesman and
author, a Tory leader; Chancellor of
the Exchequer (1852, 1858-59 and
1866-68) and Prime Minister (1868
and 1874-80).—180, 386

Dobrolyubov, Nikolai Alexandrovich
(1836-1861)—Russian revolutionary
democrat; literary critic and journal-
ist; materialist philosopher; one of
the predecessors of Russian Social-
Democracy.—23

Dolleschall, Laurens (b. 1790)—police
official at Cologne (1819-47), censor
of the Rheinische Zeitung.—183

Don Francisco de Asís de Borbón—
husband of Isabella II from
1846.—21

Donkin, Horatio Bryan—English physi-
cian, doctor of Marx and his family
in 1881-85.—476

Dörenberg, E.—German journalist, So-
cial-Democrat; staff member of the
Berliner Freie Presse, Berlin corrspon-
dent of La Pèdre (1877).—172

Douillet, Gustave—French physician in
Argenteuil, doctor of Marx and his
family in 1881-82.—475

Du Barry, Marie Jeanne Béru, comtesse
(1743-1793)—favourite of Louis XV,
King of France.—21

Duchâtel, Charles Marie Tannequin, comte
de (1803-1867)—French statesman,
Orleanist, Minister of Trade (1854-
36), Minister of the Interior (1839,
1840-February 1848); staff member
of the Journal des Économistes; fol-
lower of Malthus.—326

Ducrot, Auguste Alexandre (1817-
1882)—French general; deputy to
the National Assembly from 1871; as
Commander of the 8th Corps (1872-
78) took part in monarchist plots
against the Republic.—204

Dühring, Eugen Karl (1833-1921)—
German eclectic philosopher and
economist, petty-bourgeois socialist;
lecturer at Berlin University (1863-
77).—119, 339, 457

Dumiénil, Edelisteand Pontus (1801-
1871)—French philologist and palaeographer; staff member of the
Journal des Économistes.—326

Duncker, Franz Gustav (1822-1888)—
German politician and publisher,
prominent figure in the Party of
Progress; in 1868, together with Max
Hirsch, founded reformist trade
unions, known as Hirsch-Duncker
unions, which existed until 1933.—
189

Dunoyer, Barthélemy Charles Pierre Joseph
(1766-1862)—French economist and
politician.—326
Danté, Virgilio (c. 1260-1321)—Italian poet and statesman; one of the greatest literary figures in the history of Western literature; his works, including the *Divina Commedia*, are considered masterpieces of the Italian language.

Daudet, Alphonse (1840-1897)—French author and journalist; best known for his humorous and satirical works, including *Tartarin de Tarascon*.

Doisneau, Robert (1912-1994)—French photographer; known for his humanistic and poetic images of everyday life in France.

Duclos, Alphonse (1745-1810)—French writer and politician; known for his contributions to the *Encyclopédie*.

Dumas, Alexandre (1802-1870)—French writer; known for his historical novels, including *The Three Musketeers*.

Dumas, Alexandre (1824-1895)—French writer; known for his historical novels, including *The Three Musketeers*.

Dupont, Eugène (c. 1837-1881)—prominent figure in the French and international working-class movement; musical instrument maker; took part in the June 1848 uprising in Paris; from 1862 on, lived in London; member of the General Council of the First International (November 1864 to 1872); Corresponding Secretary for France (1865-71); participant in all the congresses (except for the Basle Congress of 1869) and conferences of the International; member of the British Federal Council of the International in 1872; associate of Marx and Engels; moved to the USA in 1874.—371

E

Eccarius, Johann Georg (1818-1889)—German tailor and journalist; prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; member of the League of the Just and later of the Communist League; a leader of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the General Council of the First International (1864-72); the Council's General Secretary (1867-71); Corresponding Secretary for America (1870-72); delegate to all the International's congresses and conferences; associate of Marx up to 1871, subsequently joined the leaders of the British trade unions.—371

Eichhorn, Johann Albrecht Friedrich (1779-1856)—Prussian statesman, Minister of Religious Worship, Education and Medicine (1840-48).—151

Engel, Ernst (1821-1896)—German statistician, head of the Royal Prussian Statistical Bureau in Berlin (1860-82).—413


Epicurus (341-270 B.C.)—Greek atomistic philosopher.—430, 434

Erlach, Franz von (1819-1889)—Swiss army officer and military writer; during the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71 was an observer at the German General Headquarters.—529

Eulenburg, Botho, Count of (1831-1912)—Prussian statesman, Minister of the Interior (1878-81 and 1892-94); Prime Minister (1892-94); took part in the working out of the Anti-Socialist Law and in the persecution of Social-Democrats.—242-49

Eulenburg, Friedrich Albrecht, Count of (1815-1881)—Prussian statesman and diplomat; Minister of the Interior (1862-78).—566

Ewald, Georg Heinrich August von (1803-1875)—German orientalist; researcher and critic of the Bible.—480

Eynern, Ernst von (1838-1906)—German politician and businessman; from 1879 member of the Prussian Chamber of Deputies; National Liberal; opposed Social-Democracy.—458

F

Fallmerayer, Jakob Philipp (1790-1861)—German historian and traveller.—432

Feuchter, Léonard (Léon) Joseph (1803-1854)—French writer and politician, Malthusian economist, Orleanist; staff member of the *Journal des Économistes*; Minister of the Interior (December 1848-May 1849, 1851); later Bonapartist.—326

Fautre, Jules Claude Gabriel (1809-1880)—French lawyer and politician; a leader of the bourgeois republican opposition from the late 1830s;
Foreign Minister (1870-71), together with Thiers headed the struggle against the Paris Commune; among others, inspired the struggle against the First International; Senator from 1876.—237, 527

Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas (1804-1872)—German materialist philosopher.—513

Feugier—French physician in Enghien. Marx's doctor from June to August 1882.—475

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb (1762-1814)—German philosopher.—459, 511

Florovsky, N.—see Berri, Vasily Vasilievich

Flocon, Ferdinand (1800-1866)—French politician, journalist, democrat, an editor of La Réforme (1845); member of the Provisional Government (1848).—187

Fleurbaux, Gustave Paul (1838-1871)—French naturalist and revolutionary, follower of Blanqui; contributed to La Marseillaise; one of the leaders of the Paris uprising 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.—461

Forchenbeck, Maximilian (Max) Franz August von (1821-1892)—German politician, a founder of the Party of Progress (1861) and National-Liberal Party (1867); Chairman of the Reichstag (1874-79).—240

Forster, William Edward (1818-1886)—British manufacturer and statesman, Liberal M.P.; Chief Secretary for Ireland (1880-82); pursued a policy of brutal suppression of the national liberation movement.—407, 409

Fourier, François Marie Charles (1772-1837)—French utopian socialist.—287, 289, 292-93, 313, 316, 459, 508

Francis II (1768-1835)—Holy Roman Emperor (1792-1806); Emperor of Austria as Francis I (1804-35).—9

Francis Joseph I (1830-1916)—Emperor of Austria (1848-1916).—9, 259

Frankel, Leo (1844-1896)—prominent figure in the Hungarian and the international working-class movement; jeweller; member of the Paris Commune; Corresponding Secretary of the General Council of the First International for Austria and Hungary (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; a founder of the General Workers' Party of Hungary; associate of Marx and Engels.—105, 571

Frederick II (the Great) (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86).—488

Frederick William (1831-1888)—Prussian Crown Prince; married Victoria Adelaide Mary Louisa in 1858; German Emperor and King of Prussia under the name of Frederick III (March-June 1888).—582

Frederick William II (1744-1797)—King of Prussia (1786-97).—8

Frederick William III (1770-1840)—King of Prussia (1797-1840).—183, 313, 343, 511

Frederick William IV (1795-1861)—King of Prussia (1840-61).—9, 107, 143, 151, 188, 515

Fribourg, Ernest Edouard—prominent figure in the French working-class movement; engraver, later businessman; Proudhonist; participant in the inaugural meeting of the First International held on September 25, 1864 at St. Martin's Hall; a leader of the Paris section of the International; delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866) of the International; in 1871
published a book, L'Association internationale des travailleurs, hostile to the International and the Paris Commune.—295

Fritzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm (1825-1905)—a reformist leader of the German Social-Democratic and trade union movement; tobacco-worker; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; one of the founders (1863) and leaders of the General Association of German Workers; follower of Lasalle; joined the Eisenachers in 1869; deputy to the North German and the German Reichstag (1868-71 and 1877-81).—209, 578

G

Gambetta, Léon (1838-1882)—French statesman, bourgeois republican; member of the Government of National Defence (1870-71); Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1881-82).—493, 513, 523, 528-30

Gartman, Lev Nikolayevich (1850-1908)—Russian revolutionary, Narodnik (populist); in 1879 took part in an act of terrorism of the People's Will group against Alexander II, following which emigrated to France; representative of the People's Will group abroad; left London for the USA at the end of 1881.—372

Geib, August (1842-1879)—German bookseller in Hamburg; Social-Democrat; member of the General Association of German Workers; participant in the Eisenach Congress (1869); treasurer of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (1872-78); deputy to the Reichstag (1874-77).—77, 214

Goleff, Paul Johansen (1842-1928)—participant in the Danish socialist and working-class movement; a founder of the Danish section of the First International (1871); one of the founders (1876) and leaders of the Social-Democratic Party of Denmark; emigrated to the USA in 1877.—219

George I (1660-1727)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1714-27).—437

Gerlach, Carl Johann Heinrich Eduard von (1792-1863)—Prussian politician; chief of the police in Berlin up to 1839; Regierungspräsident in Cologne (1839-45).—184

Giffen, Sir Robert (1837-1910)—English economist and statistician; head of the Statistics Department in the Board of Trade (1876-97); author of works on economics and statistics.—323

Gladstone, Robert (c. 1806-1875)—British trader; a founder (1848) and for a long time President of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association, brother of William Ewart Gladstone.—96

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory, later Peelite; leader of the Liberal Party in the latter half of the nineteenth century; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55 and 1859-66), Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886, 1892-94).—96, 124, 389, 409, 460

Goegg, Amand (1820-1897)—German journalist, democrat; member of the Baden Provisional Government in 1849; emigrated after the revolution; member of the League of Peace and Freedom, and its Vice-President in 1870; member of the Central Committee of the German Workers' Educational Society in Switzerland; member of the German-language section of the First International (1865); delegate to the Basle Congress (1869) of the International; member of the Central Committee of the People's Party; member of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany.—70, 524

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1749—
Goltz, Theodor Alexander Georg Ludwig, Freiherr von der (1836-1905)—German scientist, agronomist; author of works on agriculture.—121

Gorchakov (Gorchakov), Alexander Mikhailovich, Prince (1798-1883)—Russian statesman and diplomat; envoy to Vienna (1854-56); Foreign Minister (1856-82).—507, 508, 511

Grant Duff, Sir Mountstuart Elphinstone (1829-1906)—British liberal politician and author, M.P. (1857-81); Under-Secretary of State for India (1868-74); Governor of Madras (1881-86).—580-81

Greiff (Greif), Friedrich Wilhelm (born c. 1819)—one of the chiefs of the Prussian secret service in London in the early 1850s.—51

Grillenberger, Karl (Carl) (1848-1897)—German publisher and editor of Social-Democratic newspapers; member of the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party (from 1869); deputy to the German Reichstag (1881-97).—259

Guillaume, James (1844-1916)—Swiss teacher, anarchist; follower of Bakunin; an organiser of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; member of the Swiss organisations of the First International from 1868; expelled from it at the Hague Congress (1872) for his splitting activities.—176, 177

Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume (1787-1874)—French historian and statesman, Orleanist; Foreign Minister (1840-48), Prime Minister (1847-48); virtually determined the home and foreign policy of France from 1840 to the February 1848 revolution; expressed the interests of the big financial bourgeoisie.—184

Hackenberger, Rudolph—an editor of the Freie Volksstimme in Saarbrücken, Social-Democrat.—210

Hales, William—member of the General Council of the First International (1867, 1869-72).—571

Hales, W. K.—publisher of the London Daily News (1878-81).—239-31, 374

Hanussen, Karl August Bernhard Hermann von (1810-1886)—Prussian officer and military writer.—528

Hansemann, David Justus Ludwig (1790-1864)—German capitalist, a leader of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Prussian Finance Minister (March-September 1848).—183, 274

Harcourt, Sir William George Granville VENABLES VERNON (1827-1904)—British statesman, Liberal M.P. (1868-80); Home Secretary (1880-85); leader of the Liberal Party (1894-98).—375

Harris, George—active in the British working-class movement; follower of the social-reformist views of the Chartist James Bronterre O’Brien; member of the National Reform League; member of the General Council of the First International (1869-72); Financial Secretary of the Council (1870-71).—571

Hartmann, Georg Wilhelm—German worker; member of the General Association of German Workers; from 1875, one of the two Chairmen of the Executive Committee of the Socialist Workers’ Party of Germany; deputy to the Reichstag (1878-81).—408

Hasenclever, Wilhelm (1837-1889)—German Social-Democrat, follower of Lassalle; leather-dresser, journalist; Secretary (from 1866) and President (1871-75) of the General Association of German Workers; one of the two Chairmen of the Executive Committee of the Socialist Workers’ Party of
Germany (1875-76); member of its leadership (from 1878); deputy to the North German and the German Reichstag (1869-71, 1874-78, 1879-88).—209, 214, 408

Hasselmann, Wilhelm (1844-1916)—one of the leaders of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers; editor of Der Social-Demokrat (1867-71) and Neuer Social-Demokrat (1871-76); member of the Socialist Workers’ Party of Germany from 1875; deputy to the German Reichstag (1874-76 and 1878-80); expelled from the party as an anarchist in 1880.—67, 72, 214, 578

Haxthausen, August Franz Ludwig Maria, Freiherr von (1792-1866)—Prussian official and writer; author of works on the agrarian system and the peasant commune in Russia.—45, 196

Hébert, Jacques René (1757-1794)—prominent figure in the French Revolution; leader of the Left wing of the Jacobins, publisher of Le Père Duchesne (1790-94).—14

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1770-1831)—German philosopher.—285-86, 293, 298, 302-04, 427, 458-59, 514, 583

Heine, Heinrich (1797-1856)—German revolutionary poet.—14, 33, 175, 249, 429

Heßdörff-Bedde, Otto Heinrich von (1833-1908)—German politician, member of the Reichstag (1871-74, 1877-81 and 1884-93); a leader of the German Conservative Party.—250

Henry IV (1553-1610)—King of France (1589-1610).—237

Heracleitus (c. 540-c. 480 B.C.)—Greek philosopher; one of the founders of dialectics.—299

Herman, Alfred—active in the Belgian working-class movement; sculptor; a founder of sections of the First International in Belgium; 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.—571

Herodotus (c. 484-c. 424 B.C.)—Greek historian.—548

Hessen, Alexander Ivanovich (1812-1870)—Russian revolutionary democrat; materialist philosopher and writer; left Russia in 1847, from 1852 lived in England where he established the Free Russian Press and published the periodical Polzavniya Zvezda (Polar Star) (1855-62, 1869) and the newspaper Kolokol (The Bell) (1857-67).—43, 45, 196

Hessekiel, Georg Ludwig (1819-1874)—German journalist and man of letters.—550

Hess, Moses (1812-1875)—German radical writer; a "true socialist" in the mid-1840s; member of the Communist League; sided with the separatist Willich-Schapper group; Lassallean in the 1860s; delegate to the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the First International.—51, 514

Hinckeldey, Karl Ludwig Friedrich von (1805-1856)—Prussian official; Chief Commissioner of Berlin police from 1848, President of the Police Department in the Ministry of the Interior from 1853.—51-53

Hirsch, Carl (Kari) (1841-1900)—German Social-Democrat, journalist, editor of a number of Social-Democratic newspapers; while in Paris in the summer of 1879 he propagated ideas of scientific socialism.—255-54, 257-61

Hirsch, Wilhelm—Hamburg shop assistant, Prussian police agent in London in the early 1850s.—51

Hüschberg, Karl (pseudonym Dr. Ludwig Richter) (1853-1885)—German social-reformer; son of a rich merchant; in
1876 joined the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany; organised and
financed a number of newspapers and journals.—253-54, 257-60, 262-
67, 269

Hödel (Hoedel), Emil Heinrich Max
(1857-1878)—dinner from Leipzig: on
May 11, 1878 made an attempt on the life of William I.—231, 237, 243,
245-46, 575

Hohenzollern—dynasty of Brandenburg
Electors (1415-1701), Prussian Kings
(1701-1918) and German Emperors
(1871-1918).—9

Homer—semi-legendary epic poet of
Ancient Greece, author of the Iliad
and the Odyssey.—24, 34

Howell, George (1833-1910)—reformist
leader of the British trade unions;
mason; former Chartist; Secretary of
the London Trades Council (1861-
62); participant in the inaugural
meeting of the First International
held on September 28, 1864 at St.
Martin's Hall, London; member of the
General Council of the Interna-
tional (October 1864 to 1869); par-
ticipate in the London Conference of
the International (1865); Secretary of
the Reform League (1864-67) and
the Parliamentary Committee of the
British Congress of Trade Unions
(1871-75); opposed revolutionary tac-
tics; Liberal M.P. (1885-95).—234-39

Hubbard, Nicolas Gustave (1828-1888)—
French economist and writer.—291

Hugo, Victor Marie (1802-1885)—
French writer and statesman.—585

Humboldt, Alexander (Friedrich Heinrich
Alexander), Baron von (1769-1859)—
German naturalist, traveller and
statesman; between 1830 and 1848
he was frequently sent on diplomatic
missions to the court of Louis Phi-
lippe.—184, 419, 422

Hurtigrman—member of the General
Council of the First International
(1871-72); delegate from the Swiss
Society in London.—571

Illegworth, A.—M.P. in 1881.—389

Isabella II (1830-1904)—Queen of
Spain (1833-68).—21-22

Jacob, Johann (1805-1877)—German
radical writer and politician; a leader
of the Left wing in the Prussian
National Assembly (1848); in the
1870s, was close to the Social-
Democratic Workers' Party of Ger-
many.—492, 525

James II (1683-1701)—King of Great
Britain and Ireland (1685-88).—
436

Jhering, Rudolf von (1818-1892)—
German jurist; taught Roman law at
several universities; headed the
"positive" and "practically-dogmatic"
trend of the bourgeois school of
law.—554, 556

Johannard, Jules Paul (1843-1892)—
prominent figure in the French
working-class movement; lithogra-
pher; member of the General
Council of the First International
(1868-69, 1871-72) and Correspon-
ding Secretary for Italy (1868-69);
member of the Paris Commune
(1871); was close to the Blanquis;
emigrated to London after the sup-
pression of the Commune; delegate to
the Hague Congress (1872) of the
International.—571

Johann Nepomuk Maria Joseph (pen-
name Phileletus) (1801-1873)—
Prince of Saxon, King of Saxony
(1854-73), translator of Dante.—183

John (Johann) (1782-1859)—Archduke
of Austria, field marshal, fought
against Napoleon; Imperial Regent
from June 1848 to December 1849.—
138, 167-68, 188

Jottrand, Lucien Léopold (1804-1877)—
Belgian lawyer and writer, democrat,
President of the Democratic Association in Brussels (1847).—136-37

Jung, Hermann (1830-1901)—prominent figure in the international and Swiss working-class movement; watchmaker; member of the General Council of the First International and Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland (November 1864 to 1872); participant in the London Conference (1865), Chairman of the Geneva (1866), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses and of the London Conference (1871) of the International; member of the British Federal Council; supported Marx before the Hague Congress of 1872; later joined the reformist leaders of the British trade unions; left the working-class movement in the late 1870s.—571
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Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804)—German philosopher.—295, 301-02, 488-59

Kapell, August (b. 1844)—a founder of the General Association of German Carpenters; deputy to the German Reichstag (1877).—209

Kardorff, Wilhelm von (1828-1907)—German politician, deputy to the Reichstag (1868-1906); a founder of the party of "free Conservatives" ("Imperial party"); protectionist; supported Bismarck's foreign and home policy.—111, 119-20, 122, 124-25

Kaulitz, Harry—an editor of the Freie Völksstimme in Saarbrücken; Social-Democrat.—210

Kayser, Max (1853-1888)—German journalist; member of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany; member of the Reichstag (1878-87), belonged to the right wing of the Social-Democratic group.—258-61

Kéraly, Émilie, comte de (1832-1905)—French reactionary politician; Prefect of the Paris police (September-October 1879); 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.—461, 529

Khmelnytsky, Bogdan (Zinovy) (c. 1395-1657)—Ukrainian statesman and general, Heiman of the Ukraine; headed the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people against Polish domination (1648-54); initiator of the union of the Ukraine with Russia and advocate of her political autonomy (1654).—502

Kościuszko, Tadeusz Andrzej Bonawentura (1746-1817)—prominent figure in the Polish national liberation movement in the 1790s; took part in the struggle for the independence of the North American colonies (1775-83); leader of the Polish uprising of 1794.—7, 343

Krengel—mayor of the village of Nessin (Eastern Prussia) in the 1840s.—148

Krüger, Daniel Christian Friedrich (1819-1896)—German lawyer and diplomat; represented Lübeck (from 1868) and Hamburg and Bremen (from 1873) in the Federal Council.—122-23

Kruppi, Alfred (1812-1887)—big German steel and ordnance manufacturer, supplying many European states with guns and other weapons.—275-76

Kryński (Krymski), Jan (1811-1890)—Polish revolutionary; participant in the Polish uprising of 1863-64; refugee in London; member of the General Council (1865-67); Secretary of the society called "The Polish People".—5

Kußmann, Eduard (1833-1892)—German cooper, member of a Catholic trade union; on July 13, 1874 made an attempt on Bismarck's life in protest against his policy of restricting the rights of the Catholic Church in
Germany (Kulturkampf); died in prison.---244
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Ladenberg, Adalbert von (1798-1855)—Prussian official; Minister of Religious Worship, Education and Medicine (November 1848-December 1850).---151

Lafargue, Charles Étienne (1868-1872)—son of Laura and Paul Lafargue.---460-61

Lafargue, Laura (1845-1911)—Karl Marx's second daughter; prominent figure in the French working-class movement; translated many works of Marx and Engels into French; married Paul Lafargue in 1868.---460-61, 585

Lafargue, Paul (1842-1911)—prominent figure in the French and international working-class movement; member of the General Council of the First International (from 1866); Corresponding Secretary for Spain (1866-69); helped to organise the First International's sections in France (1869-70), Spain and Portugal (1871-72); delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); a founder of the French Workers' Party; follower and associate of Marx and Engels; husband of Laura, Karl Marx's daughter, from 1868.---23, 26-27, 335-36, 345, 457, 460-61, 471, 585

Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis de (1790-1869)—French poet, historian and politician; one of the leaders of the moderate republicans in the 1840s; Minister of Foreign Affairs and virtual head of the Provisional Government in 1848.---107, 187, 480

Lange, Friedrich Albert (1828-1875)—German philosopher and economist; from 1870 professor in Zurich and, from 1872, in Marburg; Neo-Kantian.---91, 531

Lankester, Sir Edwin Ray (1847-1929)—English scientist, professor of biology (from 1874).---471

Laplace, Pierre Simon, marquis de (1749-1827)—French astronomer, mathematician and physicist; independently of Kant, worked out and mathematically substantiated the hypothesis that the solar system developed from gaseous nebula.---302, 458

Lassalle, Ferdinand (1825-1864)—German writer and lawyer; participant in the democratic movement in the Rhine Province (1848-49); founder of the General Association of German Workers (1863); an initiator of an opportunist trend within the German working-class movement.---69-70, 72, 78, 83-84, 88-93, 230, 263, 273, 326, 457, 492, 515-16, 522-23, 572, 574, 584

Lavrov, Pyotr (Peter) Lavrovich (1823-1900)—Russian philosopher, sociologist and journalist; an ideologist of revolutionary Narodism (populism); emigrated in 1870; member of the First International; took part in the Paris Commune; editor of the journal Vperyod (Forward!) (1873-76); adherent to the subjective method in sociology.---19-29, 32-34, 36, 469, 473, 477

Law, Harriet (1832-1897)—a leading figure in the atheist movement in England; member of the General Council (June 1867-72) and the Manchester Section of the First International (1872); publisher of The Secular Chronicle (1876-79).---571

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, where he headed the Montagne party; emigrated to England after the demonstration of June 13, 1849, and lived there until 1870;
deputy to the National Assembly (1871).—270

Lelewel, Joachim (1786-1861)—Polish historian and revolutionary; participant in the Polish insurrection of 1830-31; a leader of the democratic wing of the Polish refugees in France and, from 1832, in Brussels.—844

Lemke, Gottilieh (c. 1844-1885)—member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London.—467

Le Mousse, Benjamin Constant (b. 1846)—prominent figure in the French working-class movement; engraver; took part in the Paris Commune; emigrated to London after the suppression of the Commune; member of the General Council of the First International and Corresponding Secretary for the French-language sections in the USA (1871-72) and, from May 1872, for all sections of the International there; delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); supported Marx and Engels in their struggle against the Bakuninists.—571

Leonhardt, Gerhard Adolf Wilhelm (1815-1880)—German lawyer and statesman; Minister of Justice in Hanover (1865-66) and Prussia (1867-79).—448

Leopold I (1790-1865)—King of Belgium (1831-65).—136-37

Lépine, Jules—Secretary of the Paris branch of the French Workers' Party.—470

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim (1729-1781)—German dramatist, critic and philosopher of the Enlightenment.—23

Lessner, Friedrich (1825-1910)—member of the Communist League; tailor; participant in the 1848-49 revolution; defendant at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); refugee in London from 1856; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the Gener-
classification systems for plants and animals.——503

Lissagaray, Prosper Olivier (1858-1901)—French journalist; took part in the Paris Commune, emigrated to Great Britain after its defeat; author of *Histoire de la Commune de 1871* (1876); on returning to France (1880), published the newspaper *La Bataille* (1882-83, 1888-93), which opposed the leaders of the French Workers' Party. Jules Guesde and Paul Lafargue.——527

Lochner, Georg (born c. 1824)—active member of the working-class movement; joiner; member of the Communist League and of the German Workers' Educational Society in London; member of the General Council of the First International (November 1864-67 and 1871-72); delegate to the London conferences of the International (1865 and 1871); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.——471, 571

Locke, John (1632-1704)—English dualist philosopher and economist.——299

Longuet, Charles (1839-1903)—prominent figure in the French working-class movement; journalist; Proudhonist; member of the General Council of the First International (1866-67, 1871-72), Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (1866); delegate to the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and the Hague (1872) congresses and the London Conference (1871); member of the Paris Commune (1871); later joined the Possibilists; in the 1880s-90s was elected to the Paris Municipal Council; in 1872 married Karl Marx's daughter Jenny.——330, 460, 469, 571, 585

Longuet, Edgar (1879-1950)—Marx's grandson, son of Jenny and Charles Longuet.——585

Longuet, Henri (1878-1888)—Marx's grandson, son of Jenny and Charles Longuet.——585

Longuet, Jean, Frédéric, Laurent (1876-1958)—Marx's grandson, son of Jenny and Charles Longuet.——585

Longuet, Jenny (1844-1883)—Marx's eldest daughter; prominent figure in the international working-class movement; wife of Charles Longuet (from 1872).——460-61, 475, 585

Loria, Achille (1857-1943)—Italian sociologist and economist.——479-80

Louis XIV (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715).——539

Louis XV (1710-1774)—King of France (1715-74).——21

Louis Bonaparte——see Napoleon III

Louis Napoleon——see Napoleon III

Louis Philippe I (1773-1850)—Duke of Orleans, King of the French (1830-48).——19, 93, 96, 419, 488

Louis Philippe Albert d'Orléans, Count of Paris (1838-1894)—Louis Philippe's grandson; pretender to the French throne.——222

Lucraft, Benjamin (1809-1897)—one of the reformist leaders of the British trade unions; furniture-maker; member of the General Council of the First International (1864-71); in 1871 refused to sign the General Council's address *The Civil War in France* and left the General Council.——237

Luther, Martin (1483-1546)—German theologian and writer, a leader of the Reformation, founder of Protestantism (Lutheranism) in Germany, ideologist of the German burghers.——247

M

Mabry, Gabriel Bonnot de (1709-1783)—French sociologist, proponent of utopian egalitarian communism.——287

McDonnell (MacDonnell), Joseph Patrick (1847-1906)—active member of
the Irish working-class movement; member of the General Council of the First 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 took part in the American working-class movement.—571

MacIver, D.—British M.P. from Birkenhead (1881).—389

MacMahon, Marie Edmé Patrice Maurice, comte de, duc de Magenta (1808-1893)—French military figure and politician, marshal, Bonapartist; an organiser of the suppression of the Paris Commune (1871), President of the Third Republic (1873-79).—577

Maine, Sir Henry James Sumner (1822-1888)—English comparative jurist and historian; as a member of the Governor General's Council for India (1862-69) took an active part in working out local English laws and in the colonial oppression of India.—359, 366

Malon, Benoît (1841-1893)—French socialist, member of the First International; took part in the formation of the Bakuninist Alliance of Socialist Democracy (1868); delegate to the Geneva Congress of the International (1866); deputy to the National Assembly (1871); member of the Paris Commune; after its suppression emigrated to Italy and then to Switzerland; later, a leader and ideologist of the Possibilists.—12

Malthus, Thomas Robert (1766-1834)—English clergyman and economist, author of a theory of population.—69, 91

Manteuffel, Edwin Hans Karl, Baron von (1809-1888)—German general, general field-marshall from 1873; 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).—539

Manteuffel, Otto Theodore, Baron von (1805-1882)—Prussian statesman, Minister of the Interior (November 1848-November 1850); Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (1850-58).—140-41, 161, 516

Manteuffels—aristocratic family from Pomerania, first mentioned in documents in 1287; in the 14th century settled in Saxony, Sweden and the Baltic area. —144

Marat, Jean Paul (1743-1793)—leading figure in the French Revolution, prominent Jacobin.—582

Maria Alexandrovna, the Grand Duchess (1855-1920)—Alexander II's daughter; wife of Alfred Ernest Albert, Duke of Edinburgh, from January 1874.—5

Martin, Bon Louis Henri (1810-1883)—French historian, Republican; deputy to the National Assembly (1871); Senator (from 1876).—235

Martin, Constant (1899-1906)—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 First International (1871-72); Secretary of the London Conference (1871); after the amnesty in 1880 returned to France.—571

Marx, Edgar (Musch) (1847-1855)—Karl Marx's son.—420, 423

Marx, Eleanor (Tussy) (1855-1898)—Karl Marx's youngest daughter, prominent figure in the British and international working-class movement; married Edward Aveling in 1884.—460-61, 473, 475

Marx, Franziska (1851-1852)—Karl Marx's daughter.—420, 423
Marx, Heinrich Guido (1849-1850)—Karl Marx's son.—420, 423

Marx, Jenny (née von Westphalen) (1814-1881)—Karl Marx's wife from June 1843.—184, 419-24, 463, 467, 474, 583, 585


Massard, Nicolas Émile (1857-1932)—French socialist, journalist; member of the French Workers' Party; staff member of L'Égalité in the early 1860s.—586

Mauver, Georg Ludwig (1790-1872)—German historian, studied the social system of ancient and medieval Germany.—46, 350, 366

Mayo, Henry—participant in the British working-class movement, member of the General Council of the First International (1871-72) and the British Federal Council (1872); in the latter he joined the reformist wing; opposed the decisions of the Hague Congress of the International; expelled from the International by the General Council's decision of May 30, 1873.—571

Mazzini, Giuseppe (1808-1872)—leader of the national liberation movement in Italy; headed the Provisional Government of the Roman Republic (1849); an organiser of the Central Committee of European Democracy in London (1850); when the International was founded in 1864 he tried to bring it under his influence; in 1871 opposed the Paris Commune and the International; hindered the development of the independent working-class movement in Italy.—217, 583

Merovingians—the first dynasty of Frankish kings that ruled from 457 to 751.—450

Mesa y Leoparto, José (1840-1904)—participant in the Spanish working-class and socialist movement; printer; an organiser of the First International's sections in Spain, member of the Spanish Federal Council (1871-72) and the New Madrid Federation (1872-73); fought anarchism; one of the first propagandists of Marxism in Spain and a founder of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (1879); translated works by Marx and Engels into Spanish.—105, 470

Metternich-Winneburg, Clemens Wenzel Lothar, Prince von (1773-1859)—Austrian statesman and diplomat; Minister of Foreign Affairs (1809-21) and Chancellor (1821-48); an organiser of the Holy Alliance.—488, 512

Meyer, Rudolph Hermann (1839-1899)—German bourgeois economist and journalist, conservative.—550

Menzelov, Nikolai Vladimirovitch (1827-1878)—Russian statesman; from 1864, chief of staff of the political police corps; in 1876-78, chief of the political police.—245

Mickiewicz, Adam (1798-1855)—Polish poet and leader of the national liberation movement; emigrated in 1829; studied literature, culture and history of the Slav peoples.—497

Mieroslawski, Ludwik (1814-1878)—leader of the Polish national liberation movement, took part in the 1830-31 uprising; helped to organise the uprising in Posen in 1846, was arrested: headed the 1848 uprising in Posen; in 1849, commanded the Baden-Palatinate revolutionary army.—58

Mikhalowsky, Nikolai Konstantinovich (1842-1904)—Russian sociologist, journalist and literary critic; an ideologist of Narodism (populism):
an editor of Otechestvennie Zapiski (Fatherland's Notes) (1868-84) and Russkoye Bogatstvo (Russian Wealth) (1892-1904).—196, 199-200

Mill, John Stuart (1806-1873)—British economist and positivist philosopher.—181

Milner, George—participant in the British working-class movement; Irish by birth; tailor; follower of the socialist-reformist views of the Chartist James Bronterre O'Brien; member of the National Reform League, the Land and Labour League, the First International's General Council (1868-72), and the British Federal Council (autumn 1872 to 1873); in the latter opposed the reformist wing; delegate to the London Conference (1871) of the International.—571

Miquel, Johannes (1828-1901)—German lawyer, politician and banker; member of the Communist League up to 1852, later a National Liberal; deputy to the North German and the German Reichstag (1867-77 and 1887-90), Finance Minister (1890-1901).—266

Mîres, Jules Isaac (1809-1871)—French banker, owner of several newspapers.—277

Molière (real name Jean Baptiste Poquelin) (1622-1673)—French dramatist.—569

Moll, Joseph (1812-1849)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; watchmaker: a leader of the League of the Just; member of the Central Authority of the Communist League, President of the Cologne Workers' Association (from July to September 1848), member of the Rhenish District Committee of Democrats; took part in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849, was killed in the battle of the Murg.—138, 566

Moltke, Helmuth Karl Bernhard, Count von (1800-1891)—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.—528-30

Monk, Charles (b. 1824)—British statesman, Liberal Unionist M.P. (1859, 1865-85).—389

Montaigne, Michel de (1533-1592)—French skeptical philosopher.—569

Moore, Samuel (1838-1911)—English lawyer, member of the First International; translated into English Volume One of Marx's Capital (in collaboration with Edward Aveling) and the Manifesto of the Communist Party, friend of Marx and Engels.—480

Moreno González, Tomás—Bakuninist, delegate to the Ghent Congress of Socialists (September 1877).—216

Morelly (18th cent.)—French advocate of utopian egalitarian communism.—287

Morgan, Lewis Henry (1818-1881)—American ethnographer, archaeologist and historian of primitive society.—350

Most, Johann Joseph (1846-1906)—German anarchist, joined the working-class movement in the 1860s; deputy to the German Reichstag (1874-78); after the promulgation of the Anti-Socialist Law (1878) emigrated to England; founder (1879) and editor of the Freiheit; expelled from the German Socialist Workers' Party as an anarchist (in 1880); in 1882 emigrated to the USA and continued anarchist propaganda.—210, 214, 374, 410, 478-79

Motteler, Julius (1838-1907)—German Social-Democrat, a founder of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (1869), deputy to the Reichstag (1874-78, 1903-07).—209, 214

Mottershead, Thomas G. (c. 1826-1884)—
English weaver, a Chartist; member of the General Council of the First International (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 International by decision of the General Council of May 50, 1873.—571

Müller, Wilhelm (1820-1892)—historian, professor in Tübingen.—511

Münzer, Thomas (c. 1490-1525)—leader of the urban plebeians and poor peasants during the Reformation and the Peasant War in Germany (1525); advocated egalitarian utopian communism.—287

Muravyov-Apostol, Sergei Ivanovich (1796-1826)—one of the leaders of the Decembrist movement in Russia, republican and opponent of serfdom; executed by Nicholas I together with the other four leaders of the Decembrist uprising of 1825.—501

Muravyov, Mikhail Nikolayevich (1796-1866)—Russian statesman, Minister of State Property (1857-63), opposed the Peasant Reform, Governor General of the North-Western Territory (1865-65); for the brutal suppression of the Polish uprising (1863-64) he was called "hangman".—503

Murray, Charles Joseph—active participant in the British workers' movement; shoemaker; follower of the social-reformist views of the Chartist James Bronterre O'Brien, member of the National Reform League and the Land and Labour League; member of the General Council of the First International (1870-72) and of the British Federal Council (1872-79); follower of Marx and Engels; an active member of the Social-Democratic Federation in the 1880s.—571
Niebelschütz, Edwin von—German official, editor of the Neue Preußische Zeitung in 1876-81.—241

Nobiling, Karl Eduard (1848-1878)—German anarchist; on May 11, 1878 made an attempt on William I's life.—231, 238, 241-46

Noble, John (1827-1892)—British politician, Free Trader, advocate of the Anti-Corn Law League; author of works on finances.—400-03

O

Odger, George (1820-1877)—one of the leaders 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 First International (1864-71), 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.—257

O'Donovan Rossa, Jeremiah (1831-1915)—a leader of the Fenian movement; publisher of The Irish People (1863-65); in 1865 was arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment; amnestied in 1870, emigrated to the USA where he headed the Fenian organisation; retired from political life in the 1880s.—460

Orleans—a branch of the royal dynasty in France (1830-48).—586

Orsini. Felice (1819-1858)—Italian democrat, republican; prominent figure in the struggle for Italy's national liberation and unification, executed for his attempt on the life of Napoleon III.—577

Owen, Robert (1771-1858)—British utopian socialist.—287, 289, 294-96, 335, 459

P

Paine, Thomas (1737-1809)—English-born American author, Republican, participant in the American War of Independence (1775-83) and the French Revolution (1789-94).—569

Palmerston, Henry John Temple, 3rd Viscount (1784-1865)—British statesman, Tory at the beginning of his career, Whig from 1850 onwards; Foreign Secretary (1830-41, 1846-51), Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58, 1859-65).—56, 138, 189

Pavia y Albuquerque, Manuel (1827-1895)—Spanish general and politician; in 1873 commanded the Republic's troops against the Carlists and suppressed the cantonalist uprising in Andalusia; Captain-General of New Castle (1873-74); carried out a monarchist coup d'état (January 2-3, 1874) which brought Serrano to power; Senator from 1880.—49

Pèreire, Isaac (1806-1880)—French banker, Bonapartist, deputy to the Corps législatif; in 1852, together with his brother Émile Pèreire, founded the joint-stock bank Crédit mobilier, which went bankrupt in 1867 and was liquidated in 1871; author of works on credit.—274, 277

Pèreire, Jacob Émile (1800-1875)—French banker, adhered to the Saint-Simonists (1825-31); later a Bonapartist; a founder (1852) and director of the Crédit mobilier.—274, 277
Persius (Aulus Persius Flaccus) (A.D. 34-62)—Roman satirist, follower of Stoic philosophy.—433

Pestel, Pavel Ivanovich (1793-1826)—a leader of the Decembrist movement in Russia, founder and leader of the Southern Society.—501

Peter I (the Great) (1672-1725)—Tsar of Russia (1682-1721); Emperor of Russia (1721-25).—8, 42, 488, 508

Peter III (1728-1762)—Emperor of Russia (1761-62).—49

Petronius (Gaius Petronius Arbiter) (d. A.D. 66)—Roman satirist, the reputed author of Satyricon showing moral degradation of Roman society during Nero's reign.—451

Pfänder (Pfländer), Karl (Carl) (c. 1818-1876)—participant in the German and international working-class movement, painter; 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 Communist League's Central Authority and of the General Council of the First International (1864-67 and 1870-72); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—571

Pfuel, Ernst Heinrich Adolf von (1779-1866)—Prussian general; Prime Minister and War Minister (September-October 1848).—188

Philalethes—see Johann Nepomuk Maria Joseph

Phtio (Philo Judaeus) (21 or 28 B.C.—A.D. 41 or 49)—main representative of the Judaic religious philosophy of Alexandria; greatly influenced the formation of Christian theology.—428-30

Pinder, Julius Hermann (b. 1805)—Prussian official, moderate liberal; Oberpräsident of Silesia; deputy to the Prussian National Assembly (Right wing) in 1848.—148

Pio, Louis Albert François (1841-1894)—publisher of the workers' weekly Socialisten; actual founder of the International's sections in Denmark (1871); a founder of the Danish Social-Democratic Party (1876); fled to the USA in 1877.—219

Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti) (1792-1878)—Pope (1846-78).—10, 238

Pizarro Margall, Francisco (1824-1901)—Spanish politician, leader of the Left Republicans, utopian socialist; lawyer and writer; took part in the revolutions (1854-56 and 1868-74); Minister of the Interior (February 18-June 11, 1873); President pro tempore of the republican government (June 11-July 18, 1873).—513

Plato (428 or 427-348 or 347 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—548

Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus) (A.D. 23 or 24-79)—Roman scholar, author of Natural History in 37 volumes.—548

Pogodin, Mikhail Petrovich (1800-1875)—Russian historian, writer and journalist.—6-7

Pompadour, Jeanne Antoinette Poisson le Normant d'Étioles, marquise de (1721-1764)—mistress of Louis XV of France.—21

Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865)—French writer, petty-bourgeois socialist, economist and sociologist; a founder of anarchism.—71, 184, 296, 326-27, 479, 514, 520-21

Puchta, Georg Friedrich (1798-1846)—German lawyer; representative of the historical school of law.—534

Pugachov, Yemelyan Ivanovich (c. 1742-1775)—leader of an anti-feudal peasant and Cossack uprising in Russia (1773-75).—49

Racine, Jean (1639-1699)—French dramatist.—569
Rackow, Heinrich—German Social-Democrat; from 1879 a refugee in London; owner of a tobacco shop; member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London.—578

Rau, Karl Heinrich (1792-1870)—German political economist.—532, 537, 540, 543

Reh, Theodor (1801-1868)—German lawyer; in 1848-49, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left Centre), its last President (1849).—167

Reichenbacher, August (1808-1895)—Prussian politician and writer on art; deputy to the Second Chamber (1830-63) and to the North German and German Reichstag (1867-92); a leader of the Roman Catholic (Centre) Party.—250

Reimer, O.—follower of Lassalle; deputy to the Reichstag (1874).—214

Reimers, W.—sergeant of the English police (1874).—564

Renan, Ernest (1823-1892)—French historian of religion, Semitist, idealist philosopher.—238, 427

Renard, Andreas, Count (1795-1847)—Silesian landowner; deputy to the Second Chamber (Right wing) in 1849.—151

Reuleaux, Franz (1829-1905)—German scientist, founder of the German school of machine theory; member of the juries of the world exhibitions in Paris (1867), Vienna (1873) and Philadelphia (1876).—275

Reuss (Reuß), Heinrich XXII, Prince von (1846-1902).—172

Reuter, Heinrich Ludwig Christian Fritz (1810-1874)—German humorist writer; for participation in the student movement was sentenced to death (1833) which was commuted to thirty years' imprisonment; amnestied in 1840; began his literary activity in 1852.—183

Ricardo, David (1772-1823)—English economist.—69, 382, 534, 551

Richter, Ludwig—see Höchberg, Karl

Rittinghausen, Moritz (1814-1890)—prominent figure in the German working-class movement; staff member of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung in 1848-49; deputy to the German Reichstag (1877-78 and 1881-84).—209

Rouch, Thomas John—member of the General Council of the First International (1871-72), delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); Corresponding Secretary for the British Federal Council, belonged to its reformist wing (1872); expelled from the International by the General Council's decision of May 30, 1873.—571

Robespierre, Maximilien François Marie Isidore de (1758-1794)—leader of the Jacobins in the French Revolution; head of the revolutionary government (1793-94).—15, 176, 514

Rochat, Charles Michel (b. 1844)—member of the Paris Federal Council, took part in the Paris Commune; Corresponding Secretary of the International's General Council for Holland (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871); in 1872 emigrated to Belgium.—571

Rochefort, Henri, marquis de Rochefort-Lugay (c. 1851-1915)—French journalist and politician, Left-wing republican; publisher of the journal La Lanterne (1868-69) and the newspaper La Marseillaise (1869-70); after the revolution of September 4, 1870 until October 31, member of the Government of National Defence; after the suppression of the Paris Commune was exiled to New Caledonia; monarchist from the end of the 1880s.—460, 584

Rodbertus (Rodbertus-Jagezow), Johann Karl (1805-1875)—German economist; leader of the Left Centre in the
Prussian National Assembly in 1848; subsequently theoretician of "state socialism".--531, 544-47, 549-51

Rost. Valentina Christian Friedrich (1790-1862)—German philologist.—548

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-1778)—French philosopher and writer of the Enlightenment.—82, 286, 288, 298

Rubichon, Maurice (1766-1849)—French economist, royalist, contributed to the Journal des Economistes.—326

Ruge, Arnold (1802-1880)—German radical journalist and philosopher, Young Hegelian; published, jointly with Marx, the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher; Marx's ideological opponent after 1844; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848; leader of the German petty-bourgeois refugees in England in the 1850s; National Liberal after 1866.—184, 335

Rühl, J.—German worker, member of the German Workers' Educational Society in London and of the General Council of the First International (1870-72).—571

Rutenberg, Adolf (1808-1869)—German journalist, Young Hegelian; member of the editorial board of the Rheinische Zeitung (1843); National Liberal after 1866.—233

Sadler, Michael Thomas—participant in the British working-class movement; member of the General Council of the First International (1871-72).—571

Saint-Simon, Claude Henri de Rouvroy, comte de (1760-1825)—French utopian socialist.—287, 299-92, 302, 459, 514, 521

Salsky (Salsky-Shchedrin), Mikhail Yevgrafovich (pseudonym N. Shched-}

rin) (1826-1889)—Russian satirical writer; in the 1840s took a great interest in the ideas of Saint-Simon and Fourier and was exiled to Vyatka "for harmful thoughts" (1848); Vice-Governor of Ryazan, then of Tver (1858-62); member of the editorial board of Sovremennik (1862-64); co-editor and shareholder of Otechestvennye Zapiski (1868-84). Thanks to him these journals became the main triune of the Russian democrats.—196

Schäffle, Albert Eberhard Friedrich (1831-1905)—German economist and sociologist; propagated abstention from the class struggle.—531, 533, 536-37, 547, 553

Schapper, Karl (c. 1812-1870)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; a leader of the League of the Just, member of the Communist League's Central Authority; took part in the 1848-49 revolution; a leader of the separatist group that split away from the Communist League (1850); again drew close to Marx in 1856; member of the General Council of the First International (1865), participant in the London Conference of 1865.—52, 336, 366

Scheele, Alfred—head of the imperial railway office (1873-74).—278

Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von (1759-1805)—German poet, dramatist, historian and philosopher.—14, 18, 127

Schinderhannes—see Bückler, Johann

Schmider, Adam—German carpenter, took part in an attempt on the life of Prince William (subsequently William I) on June 12, 1849.—244

Schollemmer, Carl (1834-1892)—German organic chemist; dialectical materialist, professor in Manchester; member of the First International and of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party; member of scien-
tific societies in Great Britain, USA and Germany; friend of Marx and Engels.—471

Schouvaloff—see Shuvalov, Pyotr Andreyevich

Schramm, Carl (Karl) August (1830-1905)—German Social-Democrat; reformist; an editor of the Jahrbuch für Socialistische Bildung und Socialpolitik; criticised Marxism in the second half of the 1870s; withdrew from the working-class movement in the 1880s.—257-59, 262-67, 269

Schultze, Ernst—German philologist, author of the Gothisches Glossar.—548

Schwarzenberg, Felix, Prince zu (1800-1852)—Austrian conservative statesman and diplomat; after the suppression of the Vienna uprising in October 1848 Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs (November 1848-52).—516

Schweitzer, Johann Baptist von (1833-1875)—German journalist, follower of Lassalle, 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; fought against the Social-Democratic Workers' Party; was expelled from the General Association for his contacts with the Prussian authorities (1872).—263

Sefeloge, Maximilian Joseph (1820-1859)—Prussian retired non-commissioned officer; made an attempt on the life of Frederick William IV on May 22, 1850; died in a lunatic asylum.—244

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus (c. 4 B.C.-A.D. 65)—Roman stoic philosopher, writer and statesman.—429-33

Serralquier, Auguste (1840-1878)—prominent figure in the French and international working-class movement; shoemaker; member of the First International (from 1864) and of its General Council (1869-72); Corresponding Secretary for Belgium, Holland and Spain (1870) and France (1871-72); member of the Paris Commune; delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress of the International (1872); member of the International's British Federal Council (1873-74); supporter of Marx and Engels.—571

Serrano y Domínguez, Francisco, conde de San Antonio, duque de la Torre (1810-1885)—Spanish general and statesman, War Minister (1843); took part in the coup d'état of 1855; Foreign Minister (1862-63), head of the Provisional Government (1868-69), Regent of the Kingdom (1869-71), Prime Minister (1871 and 1872), President (1874), Ambassador to France (1883-84).—22

Seton—English house-owners.—564

Shakespeare, William (1564-1616)—English poet and dramatist.—72, 237, 569

Shuvalov (Schouvaloff), Pyotr Andreyevich, Count (1827-1889)—Russian general and diplomat; chief of gendarmeries and head of the Third Department of the Imperial Office (1866-74); Ambassador to Great Britain (1874-79).—239

Sieler, Nikolai Ivanovich (1844-1888)—Russian economist, one of the first popularisers and supporters of Marx's economic theories in Russia.—534

Singer, Paul (1844-1911)—prominent leader of the German working-class movement and the Social-Democratic group of the Reichstag, member of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party (from 1869), deputy to the Reichstag (1884-1911).—254, 257

Skaldin—see Yelezov, Fyodor Pavlovich

Stillig, J.—member of the British Parliament from Manchester (1881).—389
Smith, Adam (1723-1790)—Scottish economist.—534

Socrates (c. 470-399 B.C.)—Greek philosopher.—585

Sorge, Friedrich Adolph (Adolf) (1828-1906)—German teacher, took part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; emigrated to the USA (1852), organised the First International’s sections there; Secretary of the General Council, delegate to the Hague Congress (1872), General Secretary of the General Council in New York (1872-74); took part in organising the Socialist Workers’ Party of North America (1876-77); friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—472, 478

Soriano, Trinidad—Bakuninist, delegate to the Ghent Congress of the Socialists (September 1877).—216

Spartacus (d. 71 B.C.)—leader of the greatest slave revolt in Ancient Rome (73-71 B.C.).—492

Speyer, Karl (b. 1845)—Secretary of the German Workers’ Educational Society in London in the 1860s; carpenter; member of the General Council of the First International in London from 1870 and then in New York.—105

Spinoza, Baruch (or Benedictus) de (1632-1677)—Dutch philosopher.—298

Stenzel, Gustav Adolf Harald (1792-1854)—German historian; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing, later Right Centre) in 1848.—164

Stephen Dushan (c. 1308-1355)—King of Serbia (from 1331), Tsar (from 1346): after long wars with Byzantium, annexed Macedonia (1345), Albania, Epir and Fessalia (1348) to Serbia and created a vast Greco-Serbian kingdom.—497, 500

Stepney, Cowell William Frederick (1820-1872)—participant in the British working-class movement, member of the Reform League, member of the General Council of the First International (1866-72) and its Treasurer (1868-70); delegate to the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses and the London Conference (1871) of the First International; member of the British Federal Council (1872).—571

Stieber, Wilhelm (1818-1882)—chief of the Prussian political police (1850-60); an organiser of and chief witness for the prosecution at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); together with Wermuth wrote the book Die Kommunisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.—51, 53, 135

Stirner, Max (real name Schmidt, Johann Caspar) (1806-1856)—German Young Hegelian philosopher, an ideologist of individualism and anarchism.—514, 521

Stolberg-Wernigerode, Otto, Graf zu (from 1890 Fürst zu) (1837-1896)—German statesman and politician, deputy to the Reichstag (1871-78), Vice-Chancellor of the German Empire (1878-81); Conservative.—240, 250

Storch, Albrecht von (1818-1896)—German general; during the Franco-Prussian war, Chief of the Commissariat of the German armies and later Chief of Staff of German occupational troops in France (1871); Navy Minister (1872-83).—242

Strauss, David Friedrich (1808-1874)—German Young Hegelian philosopher and writer; author of Das Leben Jesu; National Liberal after 1866.—428

Straussberg, Bethel Henry (real name Baruch Hirsch Straussberg) (1823-1884)—British railway industrialist, German by birth; went bankrupt in 1875.—265

Swinton, John (1830-1901)—Scottish-
born American journalist, editor of several influential New York newspapers, The Sun (1875-83) included; founder and editor of John Swinton's Paper (1883-87).—383-85

Sykel, Heinrich von (1817-1895)—German historian and politician, representative of the "Prussian school" of German historians; member of the North German Reichstag (1867); National Liberal; director of the Prussian State Archives (1875-95).—458

T

Tacitus, Cornelius (c. 55-120)—Roman historian, orator and politician.—350, 365, 432, 443-44

Tamerlane (or Timur) (1386-1405)—Central Asian soldier and conqueror, Emir (1370-1405), founder of a vast state in Asia with its capital in Samarkand.—510

Taylor, Alfred—British worker; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72) and the British Federal Council (1872-73).—571

Tessendorff, Hermann Ernst Christian (1831-1895)—Prussian public prosecutor, member of the Berlin Municipal Court (1873-79); from 1885 President of the Criminal Senate of the Supreme Court in Berlin; organised persecutions of Social-Democrats.—173, 566

Thackeray, William Makepeace (1811-1863)—English writer.—569

Thadden-Triegloff, Adolf von (1796-1882)—Prussian landowner in Pomerania, reactionary; member of the first United Diet (1847).—144

Thaler, Karl von (b. 1836)—Austrian writer and journalist; opposed the First International; editor of and contributor to the Neue Freie Presse (1865-70 and 1873).—20-21, 26

Thiers, Louis Adolph (1797-1877)—French historian and statesman, Prime Minister (1836 and 1840); head of the Orleanists after 1848; Chairman of the Council of Ministers (1871); suppressed the Paris Commune (1871); President of the Republic (1871-73).—222, 224, 492-93, 527

Thompson, Thomas Perronet (1783-1869)—British politician and economist, Free Trader.—403

Tiberius (Tiberius Claudius Nero Caesar) (42 B.C.—A.D. 37)—Roman Emperor (14-37).—432

Tkachov (Tkatschoff), Pyotr (Peter) Nikitich (1844-1886)—Russian revolutionary, journalist, ideologist of the Blanquist trend in the Narodnik movement; in the 1860s was several times arrested for participation in student unrest and revolutionary propaganda among students; fled abroad from exile (1873); contributed to Lavrov's journal Vperyod! in Zurich; after break with him (1874) worked in the Blanquist newspaper Ni Dieu, ni Maître (1880).—21-43, 45-49, 100

Tolain, Henri Louis (1828-1897)—prominent figure in the French working-class movement; engraver; Proudhonist; member of the First Paris Bureau and Paris section of the First International, delegate to all congresses and conferences of the International in 1865-69; deputy to the National Assembly (1871); during the Paris Commune went over to the side of the Versaillists and was expelled from the International (1871); Senator during the Third Republic.—235

Tooke, Thomas (1774-1858)—English economist, adherent of the classical school in political economy, criticised Ricardo's theory of money.—556

Townshend, William—British worker; member of the General Council of the First International (1869-72),
took part in the socialist movement in the 1880s.—571

Troitschke, Heinrich von (1834-1896)—German historian and journalist, editor of the Preußische Jahrbücher (1866-69); deputy to the German Reichstag (1871-88) where he first joined the Right wing of the National Liberals and from the late 1870s supported conservatives.—54, 458

Trochu, Louis Jules (1815-1896)—French general and politician, Orleanist; took part in the conquest of Algeria (1830s-40s); head of the Government of National Defence; Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces of Paris (September 1870-January 1871); sabotaged the city's defence; deputy to the National Assembly (1871).—527, 550

Tschech, Heinrich Ludwig (1789-1844)—Prussian official, democrat, burgomaster of Storkow in 1832-41, executed for an attempt on the life of Frederick William IV.—244

Tussy—see Marx, Eleanor (Tussy)

U

Uhland, Johann Ludwig (1787-1862)—German romantic poet; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left Centre) in 1848-49.—168

Urquhart, David (1805-1877)—British diplomat, writer and politician, Turcophile, went on diplomatic missions to Turkey in the 1830s; Tory M. P. (1847-52), exposed the foreign policy of Palmerston and the Whigs; founder and editor of The Free Press (1855-77), which appeared under the heading Diplomatic Review from 1866.—290

V

Vahlteich, Carl Julius (1839-1915)—German shoemaker and editor; a founder of the General Association of German Workers (1863), set up the Dresden section of the First International (1867), one of the founders of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party (1869); deputy to the German Reichstag (1874-76 and 1878-81); emigrated to the USA (1881).—214

Vaillant, Marie Édouard (1840-1915)—French engineer, naturalist and physician, Blanquist; delegate to the Lausanne Congress (1867) and the London Conference (1871) of the First International; member of the Paris Commune, of the National Guard's Central Committee and of the General Council of the International (1871-72); after the Hague Congress (1872) withdrew from the International.—18, 571

Van Patten, Philipp—American bourgeois, joined the socialist movement; National Secretary of the Labor Party of the USA (from 1876) and of the Socialist Labor Party of the USA (from 1877 to 1883); later became a government official.—477

Vermersch, Eugène Marie Joseph (1845-1878)—French petty-bourgeois journalist, participant in the republican movement; during the Paris Commune (1871) published the newspaper Le Père Duchêne; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England where he published Vermersch-Journal and Qui Vive attacking the International and the General Council.—14-15

Victor Emmanuel (Vittorio Emanuele) II (1820-1878)—King of Piedmont (1849-61), King of Italy (1861-78).—271

Victoria (1819-1901)—Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901).—296, 568

Victoria Adelaide Mary Louisa (1840-1901)—Queen Victoria's older
daughter; from 1858 wife of the Prussian Crown Prince Frederick William.—580-82

Viénot, Louis (1851-1921)—German publisher and journalist; during the Anti-Socialist Law a leader of the Right wing of the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany; member of the Reichstag (1884-87); discharged from all responsible party posts by decision of the St. Gallen Congress (1887); in 1896 emigrated to the USA and withdrew from the socialist movement.—254, 257, 260-62

Viñas, José García—Bakuninist, delegate to the Ghent Congress of the Socialists (September 1877).—216

Vogt, Auguste—Karl Vogt's younger sister.—168

Vogt, Karl (1817-1895)—German naturalist, petty-bourgeois democrat; deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (Left wing) in 1848-49; one of the five Imperial regents (June 1849); emigrated to Switzerland in 1849; received subsidies from Napoleon III in the 1850s and 1860s, slandered proletarian revolutionaries; exposed by Marx in his pamphlet Herr Vogt.—167-68, 189

Vogts-Rhetz, Julius von (1822-1904)—Prussian general, participant in the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71), major general and Director of the General War Department (1873); later General Inspector of Artillery.—64

Voltaire (François Marie Arnaud) (1694-1778)—French philosopher, writer and historian of the Enlightenment.—433, 569

W

Wagner, Adolph (1835-1917)—German bourgeois economist and politician, professor of political economy and finance; a founder of the socio-legal school in political economy; academic (Katheder) socialist.—531-59

Washington, George (1732-1799)—American statesman, Commander-in-Chief of the North American Army in the War of Independence (1775-83), First President of the USA (1789-97).—345

Weizsäcker, Wilhelm (1808-1871)—one of the early leaders of the working-class movement in Germany; tailor; member of the League of the Just; a theoretician of utopian egalitarian communism; emigrated to the USA in 1849.—297, 565

Wenceslas IV (1361-1419)—King of Bohemia (1378-1419), Holy Roman Emperor (1378-1400).—500

Weinruth, Carl Georg Ludwig (c. 1803-1867)—chief of police in Hanover, an organiser of and witness for the prosecution at the Cologne Communist trial (1852); together with Steiber wrote the book Die Communisten-Verschwörungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.—135

Weston, John—prominent figure in the British working-class movement; carpenter, follower of Owen; member of the General Council of the First International (1864-72), delegate to the London Conference (1865); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League; a leader of the Land and Labour League; member of the British Federal Council.—571

Westphalen, Johann Ludwig von (1770-1842)—Jenny Marx's father, Privy Councillor in Trier.—419, 422

Wilke, Christian Gottlob (1786-1854)—German theologian, first Protestant, then Catholic; engaged in the philological-historical studies of the Bible.—428

William I (1797-1888)—Prince of Prussia, King of Prussia (1861-88),
Emperor of Germany (1871-88).—172, 212, 239, 241, 372, 408-09, 577

William III (1650-1702)—Prince of Orange, Stadtholder of the Netherlands (1672-1702), King of Great Britain and Ireland (1689-1702).—436

William IV (1765-1837)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1830-37).—563

Williams, J.—sergeant of the British police (1874).—564

Willrich, Johann August Ernst (1810-1878)—Prussian officer; retired from the army on account of his political views; member of the Communist League, participant in the Baden-Palatinate uprising of 1849; a leader of the separatist group that split away from the Communist League in 1850; emigrated to the USA in 1853, took part in the US Civil War on the side of the Northerners.—52, 336

Wolff, Bernhard (1811-1879)—German journalist, owner of the Berlin newspaper National-Zeitung from 1848, founder of the first telegraphic agency in Germany (1849).—241

Wolff, Johanna Christine (d. 1846)—younger sister of Wilhelm Wolff.—132

Wolff, Johann Friedrich (d. 1835)—Wilhelm Wolff’s father.—132

Wolff, Marie Rosine—Wilhelm Wolff’s mother.—132

Wolff, Wilhelm (Lupus) (1809-1864)—German teacher, proletarian revolutionary; the son of a Silesian serf peasant; participant in the student movement; was imprisoned in Prussia (1834-39); from 1846 member of the Brussels Communist Correspondence Committee; from March 1848 member of the Central Authority of the Communist League; took an active part in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; an editor of the Neue Rheinische Zeitung; in 1849 deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (extreme Left wing); emigrated to Switzerland in summer 1849 and to England in 1851; friend and associate of Marx and Engels.—129-71

Woodhull, Victoria Claflin (1838-1927)—U.S. feminist, headed Section No. 12 which included bourgeois and petty-bourgeois members; was expelled from the International (1872).—575

Wrangel, Friedrich Heinrich Ernst, Count von (1784-1877)—Prussian general; took part in the counter-revolutionary coup d’état in Berlin and in dispersing the Prussian National Assembly in November 1848; from 1856, field marshal-general.—138

Wróblewski, Walery (1836-1908)—Polish revolutionary democrat, a leader of the Polish liberation uprising of 1863-64; general of the Paris Commune, after its defeat emigrated to London; sentenced to death in his absence; member of the General Council of the First International and Corresponding Secretary for Poland (1871-72); delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); fought Bakunists; headed the Polish People revolutionary society in London (1872); propagated the idea of a Russian-Polish revolutionary alliance; after amnesty returned to France; maintained contacts with Marx and Engels.—5, 571

Wühr, Carl Otto (1803-1884)—lawyer, petty-bourgeois democrat, deputy to the Frankfurt National Assembly (extreme Left wing).—168

Y

Yelenev, Fyodor Pavlovich (pseudonym Skaldin) (1827-1902)—Russian writ-
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Falstaff, Sir John—a fat, merry, ribald and boastful knight in Shakespeare's The Merry Wives of Windsor and King Henry IV.—2374
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Zasulich, Vera Ivanovna (1849-1919)—participant in the Narodnik (from 1868) and later in the Social-Democratic movement in Russia; a founder (1883) and active member of the Emancipation of Labour group.—245, 346, 361, 364, 370-71

Zev, Maurice—member of the General Council of the First International (1866-72). Corresponding Secretary for Hungary (1870-71); tailor.—571

Zhukovsky, Yuly Galaktionovich (1833-1907)—Russian economist, journalist, sociologist, eclectic; manager of the State Bank, senator; author of the article "Karl Marx and His Book on Capital", which slandered Marxism.—196
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Peter, the Apostle (Bib.)—559
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Vulcan—the Roman god of fire, the deity of smiths.—915
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Kreisordnung für die Provinzen Preußen, Brandenburg, Pommern, Posen, Schlesien und Sachsen. Vom 13. Dezember 1872 (Nr. 8080). In: Gesetz-Sammlung für die Königlichen Preußischen Staaten, Nr. 41, Berlin, 1872.—121, 156, 162
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Manifest Towarzystwa Demokratycznego Polskiego. Poitiers, d. 4 grudnia 1836 r. [Paris, 1836].—7-8


Общее положение о крестьянах, вынужденных изъ крепостной зависимости. In: Санктпетербургские Ведомости, № 53, 54, 7 и 8 марта 1861.—41


The Premier and Factory Operatives. In: The Times, No. 28883, March 7, 1877.—180

Programm der deutschen Arbeiterpartei. In: Der Volksstaat, Nr. 27, 7. März 1875.—67-100
Programm der sozialistischen Arbeiterpartei Deutschlands. In: Der Volksstaat, Nr. 59, 28. Mai 1875.—77-100, 260, 266, 571-72

Programme électoral des travailleurs socialistes. In: L'Égalité, No. 24, 30 juin 1880, 2nd série.—340


Protokoll des Vereinigungs-Congresses der Sozialdemokraten Deutschlands abgehalten zu Gotha, vom 22. bis 27. Mai 1875, Leipzig, 1875.—571

Reichs-Militärgesetz. Vom 2. Mai 1874 (Nr. 1002). In: Reichs-Gesetzblatt, Nr. 15, Berlin, 1874.—60, 63, 66

[Resolution of the Congress of the Jura Federation...]. In: L'Avant-Garde. Organe Collectiviste et Anarchiste, No. 23, 26 août, 1878.—246


Сборники материалов об активных в России. Издание С. Петербургского отделения Комитета о сельских, судообразительных и промышленных товариществах. Выпуск I, С.-Петербург, 1873.—48

Tracts of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association. Liverpool, 1851.—96

Traité de paix entre Sa Majesté l’Impératrice de Hongrie et de Bohême, et Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, conclu et signé à Teschen le treizié mai 1779, avec un article séparé et les conventions, garanties et actes annexés.—8
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Berliner Freie Presse, Nr. 195, 23. August 1878: Das Henkerbeil.—246

Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne de l'Association internationale des travailleurs, No. 51, 17 décembre 1876: Nouvelles de l'extérieur. Italie.—177

The Daily News, No. 10906, March 31, 1881: Prosecution of the "Freiheit" Journal.—374

—No. 10981, June 27, 1881: News from Berlin.—407
—No. 10988, June 29, 1881: Socialism in Saxony. In the section Latest Telegrams—407
—No. 10994, July 12, 1881: The Social Democrats in Germany. In the section Latest Telegrams—407
—No. 10997, July 15, 1881: News from Berlin. In the section Latest Telegrams—407

—Nr. 89, 8. Februar 1876: Vermischte Nachrichten—123

Die Laterne, Nr. 23, 8. Juni 1879: Aus Breslau schreibt man der "Laterne".—258, 260-61
—Nr. 21, 25. Mai 1879: Die Zolldebatte.—258, 260-61
—Nr. 23, 8. Juni 1879: Zur Kaiser'schen Rede und Abstimmung.—258, 260-61

Neue Preußische Zeitung, Nr. 126, 4. Juni 1878: Die Frevelhat vom 2. Juni.—241, 243-44

Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, Nr. 12, 15. Januar 1875: Aus Paris wird heute gemeldet.... In the section Politischer Tagesbericht.—65-66
—Nr. 67, 20. März 1875: Politischer Tagesbericht.—90
—Nr. 229, 30. September; Nr. 234, 5. Oktober; Nr. 251, 24. Oktober; Nr. 259, 2. November 1877: Politischer Tagesbericht.—575

La Pèse, No. 3, 21 gennai o 1877: Quattro piccole righe....—177
—No. 7, 26 febraro 1877: Abbiamo ricevuto....—177

Der Sozialdemokrat, Nr. 17, 19. April 1883: Aus Odessa (Südrußland)....—473

The Times, No. 29279, June 12, 1878: We have received the following telegrams through Reuter's Agency:—Eastern Affairs. Berlin, June 11. In the section Latest Intelligence.—230
—No. 30145, March 18, 1881: Nihilists in London. In the section Parliamentary Intelligence. House of Commons, Thursday, March 17.—375
—No. 30217, June 10, 1881: The French Commercial Tariff. In the section Parliamentary Intelligence. House of Commons, Thursday, June 9.—389

Der Vorbote, Nr. 9, September 1867; Nr. 10, Oktober 1871: Empfangsbescheinigungen der für die Zentralkasse von Außen eingegangenen Beträge.—230

Vorwärts, Nr. 57, 17. Mai 1878: Das Attentat—245

[Vperyod!] Вперьод! Неперіодичне обозріння. Том II. ОТДАВЛ. 2. ЦЮРИХ, 1874: Ізд. Ні́цкіча. В разділі: Чим діється на Родині?—23
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L’Atelier, organe spécial de la classe laborieuse, rédigé par des ouvriers exclusivement—a monthly of the French artisans and workers who were influenced by the ideas of Christian socialism, published in Paris from 1840 to 1850.—93

Belletristisches Journal und New-Yorker Criminal-Zeitung—a weekly published by German petty-bourgeois refugees in New York from 1852 to 1911. In 1853 the paper printed articles libelling Marx and other proletarian revolutionaries associated with him.—51

Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne de l'Association internationale des travailleurs—organ of the Swiss anarchists, published in French under the editorship of James Guillaume in 1872-78, at first twice a month, and from July 1873, weekly.—176

The Chicago Tribune—a newspaper founded in 1847, a Republican organ in 1855-99.—563

The Commonwealth—a weekly of the General Council of the International published in London from February 1866 to July 1867 as the successor of The Workman’s Advocate; Eccarius was its editor in February and March 1866; Marx was on the Board of Directors till June 1866; because of the growing influence of the trade unionists on the board, from June 1866 the newspaper virtually became an organ of bourgeois radicals.—236

The Daily News—a liberal daily of the British industrial bourgeoisie published in London from 1846 to 1930.—230-33, 237, 374, 407, 479

Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung—a newspaper founded by the German refugees in Brussels and published from January 1847 to February 1848 twice a week. From September 1847 Marx and Engels regularly contributed to the newspaper and under their influence it became an organ of revolutionary communist propaganda.—136, 187, 336, 469

Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher—a German-language yearly published in Paris under the editorship of Karl Marx and Arnold Ruge; only the first issue, a double one, appeared in February 1844. It carried a number of works by Marx and Engels.—184, 335
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L'Égalité—a French socialist paper founded in 1877 by Jules Cuesde; from 1880 to 1883 it was published in Paris as the organ of the French Workers' Party. It appeared in six series. The first three series were published weekly (113 issues), the fourth and fifth—daily (56 issues). Of the sixth series only one issue appeared, in 1886. The series differed by subtitles.—326, 340, 586

Le Figaro—a French conservative newspaper published in Paris since 1854; from 1866 it appeared daily; was connected with the government of the Second Empire.—577

Forward—see Breifs!

Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt—a German democratic daily published in Frankfurt am Main from 1856 (under this title from 1866) to 1943.—68

Freie Presse—see Neue Freie Presse

Freiheit—a German weekly, organ of the anarchist group of Johann Most and Wilhelm Hasselmann; published in London (1879-82) and in New York (1882-1908).—258, 374, 410, 478

Jahrbuch für Socialwissenschaft und Socialpolitik—a German-language journal of the social-reformist trend, published in Zurich from 1879 to 1881 by Karl Höchberg (pseudonym Dr. Ludwig Richter); three volumes appeared.—253, 262-66, 269

Journal des Économistes. Revue mensuelle de l'économie politique et des questions agricoles, manufacturières et commerciales—a liberal monthly published in Paris from December 1841 to 1943.—326

La Justice—a French daily, organ of the Radical Party published in Paris from 1880 to 1930. In 1880-96, under the leadership of its founder Georges Clémenceau, the paper was the organ of the Left-wing radicals, advocating a programme of democratic and social reforms and expressing the interests of the petty and middle bourgeoisie. In 1880 Charles Longuet entered the editorial board of the paper.—460, 484

Kölnische Zeitung—a German daily, organ of the liberal bourgeoisie, published in Cologne from 1802 to 1945.—65, 111, 123, 183

Kokovtza (The Bell)—a revolutionary-democratic newspaper; it was published by Alexander Herzen and Nikolai Ogaryov from 1857 to 1867 in Russian and in 1868-69 in French under the title Kolokol (La Cloche) with supplements in Russian; until 1865, it was published in London, then in Geneva.—425

Königlich-Preußischer Staats-Anzeiger—a daily newspaper of the Prussian government published in Berlin under this title from 1851 to 1871.—142, 230, 232, 233

Kreuz-Zeitung—see Neue Preußische Zeitung

The Labour Standard. An Organ of Industry—a weekly organ of the trade unions published in London from 1881 to 1885. In 1881 Frederick Engels contributed to it.—378, 382, 394, 400, 418

Die Laterne—a Social-Democratic satirical weekly; published in Brussels from December 1878 to June 1879 under the editorship of Carl Hirsch.—254, 259, 262
La Marseillaise—a daily newspaper, organ of the Left republicans, published in Paris from December 1869 to September 1870; the paper carried material on the activity of the International and the working-class movement.—460

Hapodna nosa (People's Will)—a democratic paper published in Smederevo (Serbia) from December 1875 to June 1876.—219

National-Zeitung—a German daily published in Berlin from 1848 to 1915; it voiced liberal views in the 1850s.—230

Neue Freie Presse—a liberal daily which appeared in Vienna from 1864 to 1939.—20-21, 26, 578

Die Neue Gesellschaft, Monatsschrift für Socialwissenschaft—a reformist newspaper published in Zurich from October 1877 to March 1880.—268

Neue Preußische Zeitung—a conservative daily published in Berlin from June 1848 to 1939; organ of the Prussian Junkers and Court circles; it was also known as the Kreuz-Zeitung because the heading contained a cross bearing the slogan "Forward with God for King and Fatherland!"—188, 241

Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Organ der Demokratie—a daily published in Cologne under the editorship of Marx from June 1, 1848 to May 19, 1849 (with an interval between September 27 and October 12, 1848); organ of the revolutionary-proletarian wing of the democrats during the 1848-49 revolution in Germany. Engels was among its editors.—103, 107, 137, 139-64, 168, 187-88, 336, 468

Neue Rheinische Zeitung, Politisch-ökonomische Revue—a journal published by Marx and Engels from December 1849 to November 1850, theoretical organ of the Communist League.—336

The New Moral World—see The New Moral World: and Gazette of the Rational Society

The New Moral World; and Gazette of the Rational Society—English weekly founded by Robert Owen, published from 1834 to 1846, first in Leeds, then in London; Engels contributed to it from November 1843 to May 1845.—335

New-York Daily Tribune—a newspaper founded by Horace Greeley in 1841 and published until 1924; organ of the Left wing of the American Whigs until the mid-1850s and later of the Republican Party. It voiced progressive views and opposed Negro slavery in the 1840s and 1850s. Marx and Engels contributed to it from August 1851 to March 1862.—189, 468, 583

New-Yorker Volkszeitung, Den Interessen des arbeitenden Volkes gewidmet—a German-language socialist daily published from 1878 to 1932.—462, 472

The New-York Star.—410

The Nineteenth Century, A Monthly Review—an English liberal review published under this title in London from 1877 to 1900.—234-39

Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung—a conservative daily published in Berlin from 1861 to 1918, an official organ of the Bismarck government in the 1860s-80s.—65-66, 90, 232, 245

Norddeutsche Zeitung—see Zeitung für Norddeutschland

The Northern Star—an English weekly, central organ of the Chartists, published from 1837 to 1852, first in Leeds, from November 1844 in London. Its founder and editor was Feargus O'Connor, George Harney being one of its co-editors. Engels contributed to the paper from 1843 to 1850.—935
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Nuova Antologia di scienze, lettere ed arti—an Italian liberal magazine; published in Florence from 1866 to 1878 once a month, and in Rome from 1878 to 1943 twice monthly.—479

Otechestvenye Zapiski (Fatherland’s Notes)—a literary and socio-political monthly published in St. Petersburg from 1868 to 1884 under the editorship of N. A. Nekrasov (till 1877), M. Y. Saltykov-Shchedrin, G. Z. Yeliseyev and N. K. Mikhailovsky (after 1877). It was the literary mouthpiece of the Russian democrats and, in essence, an illegal organ of the underground revolutionaries; it was closed down by the government in 1884.—196

Le Père Duchêne—a French daily published in Paris by Eugène Vermersch from March 6 to May 22, 1871; was close in its trend to the Blanquist press.—14

Le Père Duchesne—a newspaper published in Paris from 1790 to 1794 by Jacques Hébert; it expressed the views of the urban semi-proletarian masses during the French Revolution.—14

La Plebe—an Italian monthly published under the editorship of Enrico Bignami in 1868-75 now in Lod; now in Milan; from 1875 to 1883—irregularly, only in Milan; up to the early 1870s it was a bourgeois-democratic organ, then an organ of the socialist working-class movement. Engels contributed to it from late 1871. In 1872-74, as an organ of the Italian section of the International Working Men’s Association, La Plebe pursued the line of the General Council, published articles by Marx and Engels, and the documents of the International.—106, 176-78

O Protesto—a Portuguese socialist weekly published in Lisbon from 1875 to January 1878.—217

La Révue socialiste—a French monthly founded by Benoît Malon as a republican-socialist organ, then it became a syndicalist and co-operative organ; it was published from 1850 in Lyons and Paris, from 1885 to 1914 in Paris. In the 1880s Marx and Engels contributed to the magazine.—335, 457

Reynolds’s Newspaper. A Weekly Journal of Politics, History, Literature and General Intelligence—a radical weekly published by George Reynolds in London from 1850; it was connected with the labour movement; in 1871 it came out in defence of the Paris Commune.—5

Rheinische Zeitung—see Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe

Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe—a German daily founded on January 1, 1842, as an organ of the Rhenish bourgeois opposition, and published in Cologne till March 31, 1843. When edited by Marx (from October 15, 1842 to March 17, 1843), the paper became a mouthpiece of revolutionary-democratic ideas, which led to its suppression. Engels was one of its contributors.—183-84, 419, 422, 468

Le Siècle—a daily published in Paris from 1836 to 1939. In the 1840s it was an oppositional organ which demanded electoral and other reforms, moderate republican in the 1850s.—295

Der Social-Demokrat. Organ des Allgemeinen Deutschen Arbeitervereins—a German Lassallean newspaper published under this title in Berlin from December 15, 1864 to 1871 (in 1864 weekly and from 1865 three times a week). Johann Baptist Schweitzer was its editor in 1864-67. Under the title Neuer Social-

49-1317
Demokrat it was published from 1871 to 1876. Marx and Engels contributed to the paper for a short time but ceased to do so in February 1865, since they disagreed with the political line of the editors.—327

Der Sozialdemokrat. Organ der Sozialdemokratie deutscher Zunge—a German weekly, central organ of the Socialist Workers’ Party of Germany; published in Zurich from September 1879 to September 1888 and in London from October 1888 to September 27, 1890. In 1879-80 the paper was edited by Georg von Vollmar, and from 1881 to 1890 by Eduard Bernstein; Marx and Engels contributed to it.—457, 467, 473-74, 481

Staats-Anzeiger—see Königlich-Preußischer Staats-Anzeiger

The Sun—an American progressive bourgeois-democratic paper published in New York from 1833 to 1950.—583

Die Tagebuche—a German-language Social-Democratic paper published in Zurich from 1869 to 1880; in 1869-73, an organ of the German sections of the International in Switzerland, later, of the Swiss Workers’ Union and of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland.—29

The Times—a daily founded in London in 1785 under the title of Daily Universal Register; appears as The Times since 1788.—577

Voice of the People—a weekly of the Socialist Workers’ Party of North America published in New York from early 1883.—479

Das Volk—a German-language weekly published in London from May 7 to August 20, 1859; it was founded as the official organ of the German Workers’ Educational Society in London; Marx took part in its publications beginning with issue No. 2, and in early July he virtually became its editor and manager.—189

Der Volksstaat—central organ of the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party published in Leipzig from October 2, 1869 to September 29, 1876 first twice a week and from July 1873, three times a week.—29-32, 68, 78, 100, 336, 524-25, 565

Der Vorbote. Organ der Internationalen Arbeiterausschüsse—a monthly of the German sections of the International in Switzerland published in Geneva from 1866 to 1871 under the editorship of Johann Philipp Becker; on the whole, it upheld the line pursued by Marx and the General Council of the International by regularly publishing documents of the International and information about its activity in various countries.—290-31

Vorwärts. Central-Organ der Sozialdemokratie Deutschlands—a newspaper published in Leipzig from October 1876 to October 1878. It appeared as a result of the merger of Neuer Sozialdemokrat and the Volksstaat. Marx and Engels constantly helped its editorial board. The publication was stopped, when the Anti-Socialist Law was issued.—241, 245, 261, 336, 339

Vorwärts! Pariser Deutsche Zeitung—a German-language newspaper published in Paris twice a week from January to December 1844; at first it was the organ of the moderate section of German emigrants and from May 1844 of their radical and democratic section. Marx and Engels, who collaborated in the production of this paper, strengthened its revolutionary tendencies. When Marx and several other contributors were expelled from France by the Guizot Government the paper ceased publication.—468
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Вперёд! Непериодическое обозрение (Vперёд—Forward)—a Russian magazine published from 1873 to 1877 first in Zurich, then in London; only five issues appeared; from 1873 to 1876 its publisher was Pyotr Lavrov. It published a lot of material concerning the working-class movement in the West and the activities of the International.—19-29, 32-84, 36, 100

Zeitschrift für die gesammte Staatswissenschaft—a liberal politico-economic review published, with intervals, in Tübingen in 1844-48.—544, 549

Zeitung für Norddeutschland—a liberal newspaper published in Hanover from 1848 to 1872.—575

Die Zukunft. Socialistische Revue—a socio-reformist magazine published in Berlin from October 1877 to November 1878.—268
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See also Aristocracy—British; Bourgeoisie—British; Peasantry—English; Working-class and socialist movement—in Great Britain; Working class—British; Trade unions, trade union movement—in Great Britain
Enlightenment, Enlighteners—285-86, 292, 294, 427
Exchange—36-36, 192, 306, 308, 311-12, 316, 319, 324, 325, 353-36, 553-54, 557
Exploitation—17, 44, 156, 161, 193, 195, 305, 318-22
Expropriation—181, 182, 199-201, 346, 354, 359-61, 364, 370

F

Feudalism—88, 132, 141, 162-63, 192, 195, 199, 286-88, 293, 307-13, 321, 324, 415, 446, 448-54
First International—see International Working Men's Association
France—18, 221-25, 292
— history—16, 48, 188, 189, 224, 288-91, 344, 441, 527, 530, 577
— economy—118, 224, 273, 274, 279, 289, 291, 390-92
— social and political system—6, 203-04, 221-25, 289-90, 292
— foreign policy—58, 103, 118, 189, 343, 454-55, 488
See also Aristocracy—French; Army—French; Bourgeoisie—French; Peasantry—French; Revolution of 1848-49 in Europe—in France; Working-class and socialist movement—in France; Working class—French
Franco-Prussian war, 1870-71—6, 9, 62, 68-69, 125, 271, 273, 279-80, 304, 527-30, 578
Frankish state—441-46, 448-50
French Revolution of the 18th century—7, 18, 55, 57-58, 141, 192, 224, 248, 285, 288-92, 343, 454, 576
French Workers' Party—340, 405

G

German People's Party (1865)—68, 77, 95
Germans (ancient)—48, 46, 350-51, 441-52
German Workers' Educational Society in London (1840-1919)—105, 135, 467, 565-66
German Workers' Society in Brussels (from 1847)—136, 184, 395-86
German Social Democrats—21, 69, 184-87, 211-12, 214, 239, 247, 574
— Social-Democratic Workers' Party, Eisenachers (1869-75)—10, 13-16, 21, 27-28, 53, 55, 58, 67-72, 77-78, 87-89, 94, 95, 103, 211, 239, 572, 578
— Gotha Congress (1875), criticism of the Gotha programme by Marx and Engels—67-73, 77-99, 106, 175, 219, 260, 572
— Socialist Workers' Party—172-73, 202, 209-14, 218, 239, 251, 253-69, 404-05, 407-09, 477, 478, 574
— participation in the electoral struggle and parliamentary activities—172-73, 175-76, 209-14, 250, 251, 260-61, 264, 396, 404-05, 407-09, 428, 574
Germany, German Empire (after 1871)
— 9, 31, 56, 90, 95-96, 121, 252, 279, 441, 455, 574
— history—153, 247, 452-54, 458, 578
— survivals of feudalism and the process of their elimination—96, 121, 127, 162-63, 172, 454-55
— economic development—163, 275, 453, 458
— industry—161, 162, 164, 272-77, 390-92, 414, 508
— agriculture, agrarian relations—46, 162-63, 275, 441-44, 447, 453-57
— commerce—90, 117, 119, 124, 272-75, 390-92
— economic crises—204, 274, 277, 323
— social development—141, 268-69, 448-49
— political development, political system—9, 95-98, 141, 251, 458, 578
— liberal and democratic movements—53, 68, 72-73, 97-98, 107, 183, 188, 211-12, 232, 267, 423
— prospects of revolution—54, 66, 251-52
— foreign policy—9-11, 56, 103-04, 112, 125, 229
See also Anti-Socialist Law; Bourgeoisie—German; Nobility, aristocracy in Germany; Peasantry—German; Prussia; Revolution of 1848-49 in Europe—in Germany; Working-class and socialist movement—in Germany; Working class—German
Grundtum—59, 266

H

Hegel, Hegelianism—293, 298, 301-04, 427, 458-59

Historical materialism, materialist conception of history—191-93, 195, 303-06, 458-59, 463, 467-68

History
— as a class struggle—191-93, 269, 303-05
— as people’s activities—323-24
— historical development—9-10, 16-17, 94, 198, 199, 301-02, 304-05, 426, 468

History (as a science)—21-22, 52, 191-93, 304-05, 428-29, 441, 467-68

Holy Alliance—125, 348-44, 488

Humane—191-93, 286-87, 297, 298, 301-03, 313, 428, 463, 467

Hungary—219
See also Revolution of 1848-49 in Europe—in Hungary; Working-class and socialist movement—in Hungary

I

Idealism—184, 302-04, 326-27, 431

India—349, 351, 359, 368

Industrial reserve army—314, 316, 319, 325, 377, 383-84

Industrial revolution—273, 293, 307, 324, 390

International Alliance of Socialist Democracy—12, 22, 37, 105, 106, 174-76, 236, 496, 506-07, 524-25

Internationalism, proletarian—57, 68-69, 89-90, 187, 190, 215, 239, 266, 344, 464, 570

International Working Men’s Association (First International)—90, 190-91, 220, 269, 420, 464, 468, 569-72, 575
— foundation of—190-91, 234, 269, 344, 464
— congresses and conferences—20, 215, 234-36, 478
— role of Marx and Engels in the foundation and activities of—103-06, 190-91, 234, 269, 339, 420, 464, 468, 478, 564
— in Belgium—105, 213
— in Denmark—106
— in France—106, 237, 239, 470
— in Germany—68-69, 106, 239
— in Great Britain—106, 236
— in Italy—103-06, 213
— in Spain—106, 213, 216, 238
— in Switzerland—213-15, 230-31
— in the USA—576
— cessation of activities, reasons for it—90, 215, 220, 372, 464, 576
Inventions—192, 390, 392
Ireland—57, 159, 162-63, 391, 405, 407, 408
Islam—494
Italy—175, 178, 189, 217, 271, 480, 577
See also Bourgeoisie—Italian; Peasantry—Italian; Working-class and socialist movement—in Italy; Working class—Italian

J
Jacobin dictatorship, Jacobins—18, 288, 289, 291
Jews—126, 429-31, 484
Joint-stock companies—273-79, 317-19, 325, 353, 416-17
Judaism—450, 484, 485
June 1848 insurrection of the Paris proletariat—9, 138, 141, 221, 344

K
Kant, Kantianism—293, 301-02, 458-59
Katheder socialism—see Academic, armchair (Katheder) socialism

L
See also Division of labour
Language—10, 27, 46, 219, 430, 538-39, 547-49
Lassalleanism, Lassaleans—67-70, 72, 83-91, 93-97, 105, 263-64, 273, 325, 500, 516-17, 520, 572, 574-75
Law, right
— as superstructure—84, 86-87, 304, 467-68, 553
Law-courts, judicial system—42, 52, 97, 156-57, 322, 447-48
League of Peace and Freedom (1867)—68-69, 90, 95
League of the just—184-87, 336, 565
Legislation—95, 217, 219, 386, 409, 444
Levellers—287
Liberal Party (Great Britain)—386-87, 404
Lyons insurrection of workers, 1831—304

M
Machinery (machine production)—293-94, 313-15, 324-25, 349, 353, 362, 377-81, 383, 390, 392
Man
— and animal—82, 301, 313, 329, 538
— and nature—81, 301, 319-20, 323-25, 538, 550-53
— development of—87-200, 292-95, 301, 313, 323-24, 351, 366-67
Manchester School—389-90, 392, 414
Manufacture—192, 293, 307-09, 313, 318, 324
Marxism (general points)—189-95, 285, 298-307, 325, 326, 335-39, 420, 423, 458-59, 463-68
Marxist philosophy—298-305, 458-59
Marxist political economy—189-90, 194-95, 305, 463-68
Metaphysics—298-301, 305-06
Middle Ages, medieval society—191, 307-09, 312, 324, 366, 441, 449-51
Mode of production—39-40, 84, 87-88, 194, 201, 269, 294, 305-10, 312-13, 315-17, 319-22, 325, 468, 535, 556
See also Productive forces; Relations of production
Money—316, 546, 553-54
Monopolies—276-79, 317-19, 325
N

Napoleonic wars—9, 288, 390, 454-55
Narodnik (populist) movement, Narodniki in Russia—252, 372, 426
—criticism of their views—19-50
Natural science—293, 299-303, 305, 458-59, 468, 470
Nature—298-309, 319-20, 323-24, 463, 467
Netherlands, the—392, 499
See also Working-class and socialist movement—in the Netherlands
Nobility—192, 286-87, 290, 449-50
Nobility, aristocracy in Germany—449-50, 452-55
Nobility, landowners in Russia—40-41, 47, 49, 104, 126, 204, 205, 226-27
North American War of Independence, 1775-83—55, 57

P

Panslavism—6, 9
Paris Commune, 1871—10, 12, 17-18, 58, 68, 71, 90, 190, 222-23, 266-67, 344, 372-73, 461, 478, 577
Party, proletarian
—itits character, tasks and vanguard role—178, 340, 386, 405-06
—programme, aims of its struggle—71-72, 78, 81, 94, 215, 340, 378, 399, 456
—struggle against reformism and opportunism—67-73, 251, 262-69
Peasantry
—in ancient Rome—200, 354, 432
—in feudal society—192, 308, 312, 449-54
—in bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic revolutions—50, 141, 454-55
—expropriation of—199-201, 346, 354, 360-61, 364, 370
—and the working-class, the working-class movement—89, 224-25, 456, 517-19

—Austrian—162
—English—179-82, 346, 360, 364, 517
—French—148, 204, 224-25, 288
—Italian—175
—Polish—8, 10, 41, 58
Peasant war in Germany, 1524-25—287, 451, 452
Philosophy—24, 183, 193, 200-01, 286, 293, 298-306, 427-35, 468-50
—English—298, 299
—French—285-89, 298, 302, 305
—German—184, 268, 298, 301-03, 428-81, 458-59
—in ancient Rome—429-34
See also Marxist philosophy
Poland
—history—6-11, 55-58, 103, 107, 343-44
—economy—46, 117
—social relations—10, 56, 58, 103
—nationalities question, national movement—7, 10, 55-58, 103-04, 344
—insurrection of 1863-64—7, 10, 55-58, 103, 190, 228, 344
—policies of European powers in relation to Poland—6-11, 41, 55-57, 102-03, 107-08, 227
See also Peasantry—Polish; Working-class and socialist movement—in Polish lands
Political economy—194, 376, 544-45
See also Marxist political economy
Production
—and nature—538, 552-53
Reformation—247, 287, 291, 453, 499


Religion—15-16, 70, 97, 192-93, 285, 304, 427-90, 433-55, 467-68, 571, 576

See also Christianity, Church, Clergy, Islam

Revolution, bourgeois, bourgeois-democratic—50, 56, 103, 141, 221, 289, 291, 454-55


—in Austria—107-08, 138

—in France—58, 107-08, 118, 136, 141, 165, 187-88, 221, 224, 270-71, 455

—in Germany—58, 107-08, 121, 137-48, 158-59, 161, 162, 164-69, 188, 251, 265, 270, 272-73, 356, 344, 455, 566, 575

—in Hungary—107-08, 164-65, 344

See also June 1848 Insurrection of the Paris proletariat

Revolution, proletarian, socialist

—essence, tasks, and goals of—39-40, 43, 325, 340, 478

—historical necessity of—92-95, 193, 265, 289, 346, 426

—prerequisites for—39-40, 83, 180, 193, 200, 289, 304-08, 311, 313, 316-25, 361-62

—as the highest form of the proletarian class struggle against the bourgeoisie—96, 265, 269

—peaceful and violent ways of its accomplishment—95-96, 248-50, 405, 406, 576

Russia—40-50, 103-04, 204-05, 226

—history—40-48, 47, 49, 50, 100, 104


—social and political system—11, 24-26, 29-33, 36-37, 42-43, 46, 50, 56-57, 227-28
—science, literature, culture—24, 27-28, 46, 227, 229
—contacts of Marx and Engels with Russian revolutionaries—19-28, 361, 370-71, 469
—foreign and colonial policies—6-11, 41-42, 56-57, 103-04, 107-08, 125, 158, 227-29, 252, 488, 508-09, 515-16
See also Army—Russian; Bourgeoisie—Russian; Commune, community in Russia; Neronik (populist) movement, Neroniks in Russia; Nobility, landowners in Russia; Peasantry—Russian; Working class—Russian
Russian-Turkish war, 1877-78—204, 228-29

S

—scientific cognition—191-95, 303-05, 463, 467-68, 536
—historical development of—70, 91, 97, 193-34, 183, 191, 299, 322, 325, 335, 449, 463-71
Scotland—163, 415
Serfdom—132, 141, 152-53, 320-21, 367, 415, 450-55
Slavery—320, 354, 367, 415, 535
Socialism (first stage of communist society)—83-88
Socialism (theories and trends)—71-72, 89, 99, 194, 281, 285, 297, 304-05, 335, 451, 457
Socialism, utopian—281, 287-96, 297, 304-05, 326, 520, 574
Social relations—46, 193, 286, 511, 321, 323, 325, 351, 366
Société des saisons (Paris, 1837)—12-18, 336
Society
—basis of—304, 306
—laws of—200, 218, 376, 378, 379, 463, 467-68
—and nature—319, 319-20, 323-24, 325
—and the State—40, 53, 68, 71, 82, 93-96, 318-22, 477-78
—emergence of—289, 293, 307, 324
—bourgeois social system—267, 290, 292, 298, 296, 307, 395-96
—and classes, social strata—285, 385-86, 415, 463
—and the State—17, 68, 94-96, 318-19
Society, feudal—192, 287, 307-13, 324, 367, 386
Society, slave-owning—358-59, 367, 431-32
Spain—21-22, 118-19, 216, 350
State, the
—as superstructure—40, 46-47, 94, 321, 467-68
—and society—40, 53-54, 68, 71, 82, 94-96, 317-22, 477-78
—as an economic power—126, 349, 354-55, 363
—and law—431-32, 467-68
—and religion—97, 429
—and classes, the class struggle—96, 320-22, 477
—and revolution—71, 141, 320
—withering away of under communism—70-71, 292, 320-21, 325, 477-78, 519-22
Subject Index

263, 321, 477-78, 499
See also Dictatorship of the proletariat
State, bourgeoisie—17, 68, 94-96, 141, 150, 317-21, 323, 475, 546
State, feudal—320-21
State, slave-owning—320-21, 429-31
Surplus value—92, 194-95, 305, 324, 463, 535, 557-58
Sweden—442
Switzerland—44, 70, 94-97, 141, 169, 215-19
See also Working-class and socialist movement—in Switzerland

T
Taxes, taxation—41-42, 96, 431, 572
Theology—236, 429-30
Theory and practice—19, 34, 86, 268, 288-87, 290, 304, 325, 428, 463-64, 468, 538
Thinking—233, 239, 285-86, 290, 297-303, 307
Thirty Years' War, 1618-48—453-54
Trade unions, trade union movement—70, 210-11, 379-88, 403
—in Germany—70, 210-11
—in Great Britain—296, 376, 379-82, 384-88, 403
Tribe(s)—441-42
Tribal system—350, 365, 366, 441-43
"True" socialism—268, 458

U
United States of America, the
—in history—248, 577
—in economy—97, 390, 392, 397-99, 413-14, 425-26, 456
—in social and political system—95-97, 248
—in immigration, its role—398, 425
See also Working class—US; Working-class and socialist movement—in the USA;
Usury—41-42, 44, 47, 50, 364, 392, 431, 455

V
Value—85-86, 194-95, 533-49, 550-52
—exchange value—538, 536, 544-45, 549, 550, 551
—use value—81, 82, 533-34, 544-49, 554
—law of value—537, 558
See also Surplus value

W
Wage labour—70, 91-92, 194, 305, 309-11, 346, 365, 379-80, 415
Wages—69, 92, 181, 314, 376-85, 402-03
War(s)—69, 228-29, 313, 450
—influence on socio-economic development—9, 103-04, 450, 451, 557
—and revolution, revolutionary movement—9, 50, 103, 228-29
Wars of the First French Republic (late 18th-early 19th centuries)—390, 528
—in origin and formation of—89, 273, 289, 293, 313-14, 320-21, 324
—as a revolutionary class—13, 88-89, 193, 320-21, 325, 340, 519, 569-70
—in development of its class consciousness—211, 215, 468
—and the peasantry—89, 224-25, 456, 517-18
—in British—180, 248, 384-88, 392-93, 396, 404-06, 517, 573
—in French—93, 141, 221-25, 289-90, 573
—in German—89, 93, 98, 114-16, 120-21, 141, 163, 172, 211-12, 221, 263, 273, 441, 458, 573
—in Italian—174-76, 178, 217, 221
—in Portuguese—216-17
—in Russian—36, 43-45, 226
—in US—248, 405, 573
—in Austria—203, 218, 219
—in Belgium—176-77, 214, 216-18, 299, 405
Subject Index

—in Denmark—218, 219, 239
—in Great Britain—175, 179-82, 297, 304, 335, 344, 376, 385-88, 404-06, 572
—in France—13, 16-18, 70, 87, 93, 203-04, 222, 237, 297, 304, 340, 344
—in Germany—10, 18, 31, 52-53, 68-69, 175, 184, 210-12, 251, 267-69, 273, 408, 423, 458-59, 572; see also Anti-Socialist Law
—in Hungary—203, 218, 219
—in Italy—174-78, 182, 214, 217, 218, 239, 405
—in the Netherlands—239, 405
—in Polish lands—239, 344-45
—in Portugal—216-18, 239
—in Russia—20, 23-24, 36-37, 226, 229, 425, 572
—in Spain—216, 572
—in Switzerland—176-77, 203, 214, 216, 218-19, 239
—in the USA—203, 239, 405, 572-76
# Glossary of Geographical Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Name</th>
<th>Modern Name</th>
<th>Alternative Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barmen-Elberfeld</td>
<td>Wuppertal</td>
<td>Nessin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breslau</td>
<td>Wrocław</td>
<td>Nimwegen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinople</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>Olmütz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crakau</td>
<td>Kraków</td>
<td>Peloponnes, Peloponnesos, Peloponnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danzig</td>
<td>Gdańsk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
<td>Dybbel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dürkheim</td>
<td>Bad Dürkheim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elberfeld</td>
<td>Wuppertal</td>
<td>Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elberfeld-Barmen</td>
<td>Wuppertal</td>
<td>Posen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankenstein</td>
<td>Ząbkowice</td>
<td>Reval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Śląskie</td>
<td>Tallinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlsbad</td>
<td>Karlovy Vary</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolberg</td>
<td>Kolobrzeg</td>
<td>Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Kolobrzeg)</td>
<td>Schweidnitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Königsberg</td>
<td>Kaliningrad</td>
<td>Sielberberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Świdnica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labühütte</td>
<td>Laura Huta</td>
<td>Srebrna Góra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Silesia</td>
<td>Dolny Śląsk</td>
<td>Suettin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravia</td>
<td>Morawa</td>
<td>Szczecin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Moravskoslezská</td>
<td>Upper Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>země)</td>
<td>Górny Śląsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maina</td>
<td>Mani</td>
<td>Tarnau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*This glossary includes geographical names occurring in Marx's and Engels' works in the form customary in the press of the time but differing from the national names or from those given on modern maps. The left column gives geographical names as used in the original (when they differ from the national names of the time, the latter are given in brackets); the right column gives corresponding names as used on modern maps and in modern literature.—Ed.*