

Documents of  
**THE  
FIRST  
INTERNATIONAL**

1871 \* 1872

VOLUME

V

THIS FIFTH and final volume contains the Minutes of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association (the First International) from October 1871 to August 1872, together with other documents issued in the same period. It thus completes the collection of the Documents of the First International for the whole period of its work in London. Volume 1 covers the years 1864-1866, Volume 2, 1866-1868, Volume 3, 1868-1870 and Volume 4, 1870-1871.

As with previous Volumes, all the documents are given here in their original languages, an English translation being provided where necessary in an Appendix.

**21s. net**

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

F



OR THE CENTENARY  
OF THE FOUNDING  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S  
ASSOCIATION

1864-1964



INSTITUTE OF MARXISM-LENINISM OF THE C.C., C.P.S.U.

DOCUMENTS  
OF THE FIRST  
INTERNATIONAL



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS • MOSCOW

Documents of  
**THE**  
**FIRST**  
**INTERNATIONAL**

\*

1871-1872

\*

LAWRENCE & WISHART: LONDON

INSTITUTE OF MARXISM-LENINISM OF THE C.C., C.P.S.U.

THE GENERAL  
COUNCIL  
OF THE FIRST  
INTERNATIONAL  
1871-1872

■

MINUTES

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS · MOSCOW

---

---

CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . . 9-24

**THE MINUTE BOOK OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION**

*(October 31, 1871-end of August 1872)*

1871

<i>Meeting of October 31 . . . . .</i>	27-33
<i>Meeting of November 7 . . . . .</i>	33-37
<i>Meeting of November 14 . . . . .</i>	38-41
<i>Meeting of November 21 . . . . .</i>	41-46
<i>Meeting of November 28 . . . . .</i>	46-49
<i>Meeting of December 5 . . . . .</i>	49-54
<i>Meeting of December 12 . . . . .</i>	54-58
<i>Meeting of December 19 . . . . .</i>	58-65

1872

<i>Meeting of January 2 . . . . .</i>	66-71
<i>Meeting of January 9 . . . . .</i>	71-77
<i>Meeting of January 16 . . . . .</i>	77-82
<i>Meeting of January 23 . . . . .</i>	83-89
<i>Meeting of January 30 . . . . .</i>	89-95
<i>Meeting of February 6 . . . . .</i>	95-103
<i>Meeting of February 13 . . . . .</i>	103-109
<i>Meeting of February 20 . . . . .</i>	109-116
<i>Meeting of March 5 . . . . .</i>	116-120
<i>Meeting of March 12 . . . . .</i>	120-128
<i>Meeting of March 19 . . . . .</i>	129-136
<i>Meeting of March 26 . . . . .</i>	136-139
<i>Meeting of April 2 . . . . .</i>	139-145
<i>Meeting of April 9 . . . . .</i>	145-152
<i>Meeting of April 16 . . . . .</i>	152-163
<i>Meeting of April 23 . . . . .</i>	163-169
<i>Meeting of April 30 . . . . .</i>	169-174
<i>Extraordinary Sitting of May 4 . . . . .</i>	174-180
<i>Meeting of May 7 . . . . .</i>	180-187

<i>Meeting of May 11</i> . . . . .	187-192
<i>Meeting of May 14</i> . . . . .	193-199
<i>Meeting of May 18</i> . . . . .	200
<i>Meeting of May 21</i> . . . . .	201-208
<i>Meeting of May 28</i> . . . . .	209-214
<i>Meeting of June 4</i> . . . . .	214-217
<i>Meeting of June 11</i> . . . . .	217-224
<i>Meeting of June 18</i> . . . . .	225-235
<i>Meeting of June 25</i> . . . . .	235-240
<i>Meeting of July 2</i> . . . . .	241-247
<i>Meeting of July 9</i> . . . . .	247-255
<i>Meeting of July 16</i> . . . . .	255-261
<i>Meeting of July 23</i> . . . . .	261-266
<i>Meeting of July 30</i> . . . . .	267-268
<i>Meeting of August 6</i> . . . . .	268-272
<i>Meeting of August 13</i> . . . . .	272-273
<i>Meeting of August 23</i> . . . . .	273-276
<i>Meeting of August 27</i> . . . . .	276-279
<i>Meeting of August</i> . . . . .	280-282
<i>Meeting of August</i> . . . . .	282-284

**RECORDS OF ENGELS'S REPORTS TO THE GENERAL  
COUNCIL NOT INCLUDED IN THE MINUTES**

THE SITUATION IN ITALY. Report by Engels at the General Council Meeting of November 7, 1871 . . . . .	287-290
THE POSITION OF THE DANISH INTERNATIONALISTS IN THE AGRARIAN QUESTION. Report by Engels at the General Council Meeting of December 5, 1871 . . . . .	291-292
THE SARAGOSSA CONGRESS. Report by Engels at the General Council Meeting of May 7, 1872 . . . . .	293-296
RELATIONS BETWEEN THE IRISH SECTIONS AND THE BRITISH FEDERAL COUNCIL. Engels's Record of His Report at the General Council Meeting of May 14, 1872 . . . . .	297-300

**MINUTES OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE (EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE)**

*June 28-August 28, 1872*

<i>Séance du Sous-Comité, 28 juin 1872</i> . . . . .	303-304
<i>Séance du Sous-Comité, 5 juillet 1872</i> . . . . .	304-307
<i>Séance du 19 juillet 1872</i> . . . . .	307-311

<i>Séance du 27 juillet 1872</i> . . . . .	311-314
<i>Séance du Sous-Comité le 4 août 1872</i> . . . . .	314-317
<i>Séance du 28 août 1872</i> . . . . .	317-319

**FROM THE MANUSCRIPTS OF KARL MARX**

AMERICAN SPLIT . . . . .	323-332
--------------------------	---------

**DOCUMENTS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION**

STATEMENT FROM THE GENERAL COUNCIL CONCERNING COCHRANE'S LETTER . . . . .	335-337
RESOLUTION ON THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE INTERNATIONAL'S SECTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES . . . . .	338
ON THE FRENCH SECTION OF 1871 . . . . .	339-345
STATEMENT SENT BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE EDITORS OF <i>FRANKFURTER ZEITUNG UND HANDELSBLATT</i> . . . . .	346
ALLA REDAZIONE DEL <i>PROLETARIO ITALIANO</i> . . . . .	347-348
CREDENTIALS FOR GIUSEPPE BORIANI . . . . .	349
DECLARATION SENT BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE EDITORS OF ITALIAN NEWSPAPERS CONCERNING MAZZINI'S ARTICLES ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL . . . . .	350-352
LETTER TO THE EDITORS OF <i>GAZZETTINO ROSA</i> . . . . .	353-355
FICTITIOUS SPLITS IN THE INTERNATIONAL . . . . .	356-409
RESOLUTIONS ON THE SPLIT IN THE UNITED STATES' FEDERATION PASSED BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE I.W.A. IN ITS SITTINGS OF 5TH AND 12TH MARCH, 1872 . . . . .	410-413
RESOLUTIONS OF THE MEETING HELD TO CELEBRATE THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARIS COMMUNE . . . . .	414
TO DELEGATES OF THE NATIONAL SPANISH CONGRESS ASSEMBLED AT SARAGOSSA . . . . .	415-416
TO THE SARAGOSSA CONGRESS . . . . .	417
RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL ON THE CONVOCATION AND THE AGENDA OF THE CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE . . . . .	418-419
STATUTS GÉNÉRAUX ET RÉGLEMENTS ADMINISTRATIFS DE L'ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DES TRAVAILLEURS . . . . .	420-436

THE GENERAL COUNCIL'S REPLY TO THE PROTEST OF THE JURA FEDERATION AT THE CONVENING OF A CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE . . . . .	437-438
THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION . . . . .	439-445
TO SPANISH SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION . . . . .	446-449
THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE NEW MADRID FEDERATION . . . . .	450
TO ITALIAN SECTIONS CONCERNING THE RIMINI CONFERENCE . . . . .	451-452
REPORT OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE FIFTH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION, HELD AT THE HAGUE . . . . .	453-462
RAPPORT FAIT AU CONGRÈS DE LA HAYE AU NOM DU CONSEIL GÉNÉRAL, SUR L'ALLIANCE DE LA DÉMOCRATIE SOCIALISTE . . . . .	463-476
<i>Appendix</i> . . . . .	479-518
<i>Explanatory Notes</i> . . . . .	519-586
<i>Name Index</i> . . . . .	587-619
<i>Index of Periodicals</i> . . . . .	620-21
<i>Index of Addresses and Geographical Names</i> . . . . .	622-26

### ILLUSTRATIONS

Title page of the copy of the General Rules of the International Working Men's Association signed by Marx . . . . .	35
Membership card of the Middlesbrough section of the International belonging to Thomas Whalley . . . . .	79
Leaflet issued by the General Council in honour of the first anniversary of the Paris Commune, March 18, 1872 . . . . .	125
Rules of the Ferré section (Paris) . . . . .	135
Pages of the Minute Book with Marx's proposal, seconded by Engels, to devote the next Council meeting to preparations for the Hague Congress . . . . .	231
Mandate issued to Marx by New York Section No. 1 for him to take part in the Hague Congress . . . . .	269
Mandate issued to Engels by the Breslau section for him to take part in the Hague Congress . . . . .	281
Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of June 28, 1871, recorded by Engels . . . . .	305
Page of the Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of August 4, 1872, recorded by Marx . . . . .	315
Pages of the French edition of the General Rules and Administrative Regulations with corrections by Marx . . . . .	424-425

---

## PREFACE

The Minutes of the General Council of the First International, published in the present volume for the first time in the language of the original, cover the period from October 31, 1871 to the end of August 1872; they continue the Minutes for 1864-1871 previously issued by Progress Publishers, Moscow, in four volumes (*The General Council of the First International. 1864-1866. The London Conference, 1865. Minutes; The General Council of the First International. 1866-1868. Minutes; The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870. Minutes; and The General Council of the First International. 1870-1871. Minutes*). The volume now offered completes the publication of the General Council's Minutes recorded during its sojourn in London (from October 1864 to August 1872).

The last period of the General Council's activity proceeded in the difficult international situation that set in for the International after the defeat of the Paris Commune. In some European countries (France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy and, later, Denmark) the International was banned, and its members were persecuted by the police and brought to trial as state criminals. Reactionaries the world over stopped at nothing to weaken the International's influence over the working people. For this purpose they tried to utilise the disagreements existing within the organisation. As the General Council said in its report to the Hague Congress, "all shades of ruling class opinion" carried on the war against the International (see p. 461 of the present volume).

However, the ideas of the International struck still deeper roots wherever its sections existed before the Paris Commune; moreover, they spread to Holland, Denmark, Portugal and other countries where the working class had just entered upon the path of independent struggle. It was then that sections first appeared in Australia, New Zealand and South America.

The General Council used every opportunity, however slight, to extend its propaganda (pp. 34, 91, 110), and published declarations against the persecutions of members of the International (pp. 111-12, etc.) and the slanderous attacks of the liberal and radical bourgeoisie against that body.

As in the preceding years, the General Council did much to unite the efforts of the world proletariat in the struggle against capital. Late in 1871 and in 1872 it gave aid to the striking mechanics of Roubaix, the compositors and building workers of London, the spinners of Bohemia, and others. Workers frequently called upon the General Council to intervene before they declared a strike, in order to prevent strike-breakers being brought from foreign countries, as in the case of the Glasgow copper-smiths, who won a strike thanks to the International (pp. 42-43, 55). Through its Corresponding Secretaries the Council kept European workers informed about the strike movement, sent delegates to the British trade unions and issued special appeals for aid to the strikers (pp. 51, 55, etc.).

The General Council was the organiser of international proletarian solidarity, as manifested in the day-to-day aid extended to the Paris Commune refugees and to the victims of police persecution in various countries. From September 1871 problems of direct aid to the Commune refugees were within the province of a committee made up of these Communards, but the General Council and particularly some of its members (Marx, Engels, Dupont, Jung, Stepney) continued to take an active part in this important

matter by collecting money, helping refugees to find employment, etc. (pp. 65, 67, 97-98, etc.). The Council appointed a special committee, consisting of Roach, Taylor and De Wolfers, which audited the refugee fund accounts and came to the conclusion that "the money had been most judiciously expended" (p. 119).

On the General Council's initiative, the workers began to celebrate regularly the anniversary of the heroic Paris revolution of March 18 (pp. 112-13, 119, 124, 132-34). Submitting a resolution on this, Jung said: "Hitherto the International had celebrated the insurrection of the workmen in June 1848, that being the first attempt on the part of the working classes to seize political power, but as the 18th of March was the first *success*, he thought that that should now be celebrated instead" (pp. 112-13). The anniversary meeting on March 18, 1872, adopted three resolutions, drawn up by Marx (p. 414), greeting the Paris Commune as the dawn of the great social revolution.

The major task confronting the General Council in the period under review was to embody in the International's programmatic documents the experience of the Paris Commune as formulated in the resolutions of the London Conference of 1871, which had been of a consultative nature. To make these resolutions binding and turn them into a guide to action for the international proletariat, it was necessary to have them approved by the next General Congress of the International. Therefore, Marx, Engels and their associates in the General Council centered their attention on explaining to the International's members the significance of the London Conference resolutions, especially the one on political action by the working class. Most important was to secure the approval of these resolutions by the local organisations prior to the Congress. For this purpose, Corresponding Secretaries sent to their respective countries the General Council's circular containing the London Conference resolutions and informed the Associa-

tion's members of the tasks of the Conference and its importance. Shortly thereafter the Council began to receive from the various countries letters approving these resolutions. On December 12, 1871, Jung, Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland, reported to the General Council that the meeting of thirty Geneva sections held in December 1871 had approved these resolutions and thanked the General Council "for its labours in maintaining and carrying out the principles of the International" (p. 56). The Conference resolutions were published in *La Emancipation*, the official organ of the Spanish Federal Council, and in other Spanish newspapers (pp. 64-65); they were approved by the Dutch Federal Council (p. 68), by the delegates at the congress of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party at Chemnitz (pp. 85-86), by the British Federal Council (p. 107), and by sections in France (pp. 91-92) and Italy.

Propaganda of the London Conference documents was carried on against a background of vigorous opposition by bourgeois reformers, who attempted to reduce the workers' political activity to the movement for bourgeois-democratic reforms, as well as by the Bakuninists and other leftist elements, who sought to split the International.

It will be seen from the Minutes that Marx, Engels, Lessner, Dupont, Jung and other General Council members waged a persistent struggle against the reformist trend in the British working-class movement, thus continuing to keep in contact with the British workers. Towards the close of 1871 and in the beginning of 1872, a number of new sections were set up in Britain: in Limehouse (London), Manchester, Liverpool, Middlesbrough, Nottingham, Dundee, Sunderland and elsewhere (pp. 50, 72, 74, 103). Irish, French, German, Italian and Polish workers living in Britain also formed their sections (pp. 67, 73, 77-78, 86, 381, etc.). Besides, individual trade unions continued to join the International, such as the West

End shoemakers' union, the Manchester bricklayers' union, etc. (pp. 132, 139, 141, etc.). As a result of the explanatory work carried out by the Council's delegates, a meeting of merchant seamen approved the International's principles and pledged to help implement them (pp. 50, 56). With the formation of the British Federal Council, by virtue of a London Conference resolution, the General Council was relieved of its functions as the Federal Council for England which it hitherto fulfilled. Marx and Engels supported the proposal to establish a British Federal Council in the expectation that it would help unite the revolutionary elements in the English working-class movement and form a nucleus of the future proletarian party in the country. However, from the very inception of the British Federal Council (which was originally set up as the provisional Council for London), reformist elements constituted a majority therein. John Hales, Secretary of the British Federal Council and, concurrently, of the General Council, spared no effort to sow discord between the two councils (p. 314, etc.), isolate the British Federation from the General Council and turn it into an autonomous organisation.

The position of Hales and his supporters within the British Federal Council became obvious in their attitude towards the Irish sections in England. The Irish workers had been fighting for the right to have direct ties with the General Council, independently from the British Federal Council. Irish sections had been formed in London, Bradford, Cork and Dublin (pp. 131-32, 140, 148, 176-77). These had made a substantial headway despite severe police terror and the campaign of slander waged by the bourgeois press (pp. 131, 140-41, etc.). Marx and Engels regarded the Irish sections in England as future strongpoints for the propaganda of the International's ideas in Ireland. Hales adopted a hostile attitude towards the Irish sections and on May 14, 1872, he moved a resolution alleging that the formation of Irish sections was at variance with the principles of the

Association and aggravated national antagonism (pp. 194-95). During the discussion of the question Engels made a speech in which he stressed the necessity of co-ordinating national and international tasks of the proletariat. His speech, extant as recorded by the author himself, is included in the present volume (pp. 297-300). Engels noted: "Now, for the first time, there was a chance of making English and Irish working men act together in harmony for their common emancipation" (p. 299). He said that it was necessary to consolidate this important success. Hales's jingoist resolution was unanimously rejected by the Council (p. 199). The General Council made a protest against the police terror in Ireland, emphasising that "the national antagonism between English and Irish working men... has hitherto been... one of the mainstays of class dominion in England as well as in Ireland" (p. 149). The struggle waged by the English reformist elements against the General Council's revolutionary nucleus became particularly sharp on the eve of the Hague Congress and later led to a split in the British Council. Supported by Marx and Engels, the revolutionary wing of the British Council emerged victorious.

The General Council paid serious attention to the work of the International's sections in the United States and the struggle there between the proletarian wing and the bourgeois reformers who sought to use the International for attaining their narrow political goals. As a result of a split within the North-American Federation two Federal Councils appeared, one headed by F. Adolf Sorge and the other by William West and Victoria Woodhull, both hostile to the workers' independent organisation (pp. 58, 323-32, etc.). The dissenters publicly discussed the International's inner affairs in the newspapers that were hostile to the workers (p. 326). The U.S. split was discussed repeatedly at meetings of the General Council and the Sub-Committee (pp. 120, 124, 209, 304). The discussion brought to light the

vacillation of Eccarius, Corresponding Secretary for the United States, and of Hales, the General Council Secretary, both of whom had adopted a conciliatory attitude towards the dissenters and had been guilty of violating the Council's decisions (pp. 168, 175, 181, 184-85, 188-92, 208).

Marx had to thoroughly study the documents of the two Councils in order to report to the General Council on the actual state of affairs in the U.S.A. (pp. 120, 124, 410-13). His draft report on the American split is published for the first time in the original in the present volume (pp. 323-32). On the strength of Marx's report, the General Council adopted, between March 5 and 12, 1872, a series of resolutions recommending the Councils to unite and to convene a general congress in July 1872; and recommending further that all new sections should "be composed of two-thirds wage-slaves... to prevent the Association being used for trading purposes" (p. 206). Section No. 12, which had provoked the split, was suspended till the next General Congress. On May 21, 1872, the General Council again discussed the situation in the U.S. sections and the role played by Eccarius and Hales. Eccarius misrepresented the causes of the split, laying the blame therefor entirely on German Section No. 1 headed by Sorge (pp. 206-07). Marx reviewed the Council's former resolutions on the American issue and showed that their purpose was to bar the bourgeois reformers from the International Association (pp. 205-07). Supported by the General Council, the proletarian elements in the North-American Federation were able to maintain their position and contribute to the further development of the American labour movement.

Some documents of the General Council included in the present volume (pp. 155-61, 202-04, 353-55) testify to its consistent struggle against the attempts made by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois organisations to utilize the International's authority for their own political ends. As a matter of fact,

however, the anarchists constituted the main threat at the time.

A number of documents show that after the London Conference (1871) the Bakuninists began an open fight against the General Council in order to destroy the International and replace it with the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, their own secret conspirative organisation. At their congress held in Sonvillier in November 1871 and in the ensuing circular, they challenged the Conference resolutions and the theoretical and organisational principles of the International in general. The present volume includes the General Council's private circular, *Fictitious Splits in the International*, and other documents drawn up by Marx and Engels, exposing the intrigues of the Bakuninist secret Alliance, which tried to substitute Bakunin's sectarian doctrine for the proletarian revolutionary programme of the International (pp. 119, 270, 306-07, 439-45, 446-49, 463-76, etc.).

The General Council Minutes for 1872 reveal the outstanding part Engels played as Corresponding Secretary for Italy and Spain in the struggle against the anarchist influence in these countries.

After the Paris Commune the International made substantial headway in Italy. Sections were functioning in Naples, Milan, Turin, Ferrara, Ravenna and Girgento (pp. 86, 90, 287, etc.). The end of 1871 and the beginning of 1872 witnessed the strikes and first independent political actions of the Italian workers (p. 78). The Italian Government persecuted and arrested members of the International and banned their publications (pp. 169, 173, 180, etc.). For the Italian working-class movement, only recently launched, the Bakuninists with their revolutionary phrasemongering and their policy of abstention from politics presented the greatest threat.

The General Council had its representative, one Regis, proceed to Italy and make a secret tour of several towns

to establish direct ties with the workers, by-passing "the pretended leaders—doctors, lawyers, journalists" (p. 117). Fearful of the impact that the truths propounded by Regis might make upon the workers, the leader of an Italian section, a follower of Bakunin, disclosed his identity and forced him to leave the country to avoid an arrest.

Spain, too, was the scene of a sharp struggle against the anarchistic proclivities and intrigues of the secret Alliance. After the defeat of the Commune, Spanish sections were among the strongest organisations of the International. They actively opposed government persecution of the International's members (pp. 90-91, 107, 110, etc.), and approved the London Conference resolutions (pp. 64-65, 91). But the Bakuninists, profiting by the questionable legality of the Spanish sections' status, passed off their secret organisations for genuine sections of the International, thus misleading the Spanish workers. With the help of letters from Paul Lafargue (who had been in Madrid since December 1871) and other members of the Madrid Federal Council—Mesa and Mora—Engels managed to collect material proving that a secret Bakuninist organisation existed in Madrid. The facts he reported to the General Council on May 7 and August 6, 1872 (pp. 180, 270) were instrumental in exposing the activity of the international Alliance of Socialist Democracy as a whole, and were included in his report to the Hague Congress (pp. 463-76). The support of the General Council enabled Lafargue to found the New Madrid Federation, thereby creating a strong counterpoise to the Alliancists (pp. 316, 450).

The documents published in the present volume throw light on the International's activity in Switzerland, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, Holland, Portugal (pp. 129, 306, 316), Poland (pp. 67, 73, 78), Australia (pp. 91, 225) and New Zealand (pp. 37, 126-28).

Of particular interest is information on the revival of sections in France in the aftermath of the defeat of the

Paris Commune (pp. 78, 86, 175, 225, 307-08, etc.). The French sections were forced to carry on illegally because the so-called Dufaure law adopted in March 1872 regarded affiliation with the International as a criminal offence. In the period under review sections were set up in Paris, Toulouse, Narbonne, Limoges, Avignon, Bordeaux, Corsica (pp. 72, 91-92, 117-18, 138) and Algeria (p. 107). These sections approved the London Conference resolutions (pp. 72, 91-92). Bakuninist emissaries in the south of France (Bastelica, Blanc, Richard) met with resistance from local sections (pp. 92, 201). Letters received by the General Council from France attest to the profound influence of the Paris Commune over the French proletariat. One of them stated: "The Commune had done more to develop the working class than anything that had preceded it. . . . The Commune had proved that the working classes were capable of governing themselves" (p. 72). The Minute Book contains the text of the address sent to the General Council on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Paris Commune (pp. 143-45) by the Ferré section in Paris (named so after Ferré, a Communard and follower of Blanqui, who was shot by the Versaillists).

Auguste Serraillier, Corresponding Secretary for France, had to maintain complete conspiracy in his relations with the French sections, so as to prevent *agents provocateurs* from worming their way into their midst. The General Council empowered Serraillier to give credentials to trusted people in France for forming new sections (pp. 55, 106-07, 117, 173, etc.). Besides disseminating Association documents forwarded from London, means were found to publish such documents, as well as various information on the Association, in the French newspapers (pp. 50, 146). Of great importance was the French edition of *The Civil War in France* (p. 147). The General Council's ties with the French sections were particularly close in the summer and autumn of 1872, on the eve of the Hague Congress

(p. 318), which led to their wide representation at that Congress.

In October 1871, the Danish Federal Council was founded, which united many sections in Copenhagen and the provinces. For some time the functions of Corresponding Secretary for Denmark were performed by Engels. This volume includes his report on the Danish Federal Council's work among agricultural labourers which he presented to the General Council on December 5, 1871 (pp. 291-92).

Reports from Berlin and other German towns were regularly read at the General Council meetings. Marx, in his capacity of Corresponding Secretary for Germany, used every opportunity to propagate the experience of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Eisenachers), the first independent proletarian party founded on the principles of the International. Despite the persecution of its leaders and the trials in Brunswick, in November 1871, and Leipzig, in March 1872 (pp. 47-48, 130, 143), the party openly declared itself a branch of the International Association. The Chemnitz Congress of January 1872 condemned the Bakuninists' intrigues and unanimously approved the London Conference resolutions (pp. 85-86). Of great importance was the struggle waged by Bebel, Liebknecht, Bracke and other Eisenachers against the Lassalleans, who supported the Bakuninists in their attacks against the General Council.

It will be seen from the Minutes that the General Council, headed by Marx and Engels, made thorough preparations for the next congress of the International. Much attention was devoted to the choice of the place, the principle of representation, the form of mandates and the elaboration of major documents. The reason why The Hague was chosen as the venue is explained in Marx's speech, delivered on July 27, 1872, and in the General

Council's reply to the protest from the Jura Federation (pp. 312, 437-38).

Preparations for the Hague Congress were made at a time when the European reactionaries were on the offensive against the International and the struggle within the latter had become more intense. Wherever sections of the International existed, their revolutionary-proletarian elements were opposed by a bloc of reformers and anarchists of all type. This could not but tell on the work of the Council. As the Minutes show, some of its members failed to understand the essence of the disagreements because of personal antipathies and prejudices. Hales, who was Secretary of the Council until July 16, 1872, that is, even when his departure from its line had become evident, showed bias in his records of the meetings, and these were consequently confirmed only after prolonged debates. The work of the Council was hampered by the fact that the numerous group of Commune refugees that had joined the Council knew no English, unlike the other émigrés who had become its members earlier. Marx and Engels relied mainly on the old members of the General Council, who had adopted the standpoint of scientific communism, such as Lessner, Dupont, Jung and Frankel. They were also supported by the Communards and the followers of Blanqui—Vaillant and Ranvier, the Pole Wróblewski, and the former Chartists Murray, Milner and Townshend.

On the eve of the Congress, the Sub-Committee (Standing Committee) held regular meetings. The Sub-Committee Minutes covering the period from June 28 to August 28, 1872, published in the present volume for the first time in the original, are among the few extant Minutes of this General Council executive body that appeared in October 1864. Known at this period also as the Executive Committee, the Sub-Committee carried on routine work and paid special attention to gathering material for a report on

the secret Alliance to be presented to the Hague Congress.

On June 25, 1872, the General Council initiated a discussion of proposals regarding corrections and additions to the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association. The discussion of the Rules and Regulations by articles went on the whole summer, with Marx and Engels taking an active part. Marx deemed it necessary to confirm in this major programmatic document the organisational norms and principles of leadership, obligatory for a mass proletarian party, as worked out in the course of the eight years of the International's existence. Special significance was attached, quite naturally, to the General Council, that "collective wisdom of the Association" (p. 243), as Maltman Barry called it. The General Council whose function was to co-ordinate and unify the activities of the world proletariat in its economic and political struggle against the exploiting classes was frequently called upon to arbitrate conflicts between different sections or federations.

Of paramount significance was the introduction into the Rules of the new Article 8, reflecting the London Conference (1871) resolution on "Political action of the working class". This article proclaimed the necessity of forming an independent proletarian party to assure the conquest of political power by the proletariat, and its introduction into the Rules by decision of the Hague Congress was to signify the triumph of Marxist principles in the programme of the international working-class movement. Marx's proposal that two-thirds of each section should consist of wage-earners was essential for ensuring the proletarian nature of the Association.

The discussion resulted in the elaboration of the draft General Rules and Administrative Regulations which were to be submitted for consideration by the Hague Congress. The draft is published in the present volume for the first time in the original (pp. 420-36).

For lack of time the Congress could not consider the whole draft and limited itself to adopting Article 8 thereof (marked as Article 7a) and elaborating articles 2 and 6 of Section II of the Administrative Regulations.

The biased manner in which Hales recorded the Minutes of the Council meetings prompted Engels to hand in his own reports in written form. Four of these reports (not included in the Minutes) are published in this volume in a special section. Three of them have been preserved in the *Eastern Post* reports of the General Council meetings, the fourth ("Relations Between the Irish Sections and the British Federal Council") is extant in full in the author's manuscript and partially in the Minute Book (pp. 197-98).

The section of the present volume entitled "From the Manuscripts of Karl Marx" presents, for the first time in the language of the original, Marx's manuscript on the split in the North-American Federation.

The section "Documents of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association" includes documents issued by the Council between the autumn of 1871 and the end of 1872. Most of them were written or edited by Marx or Engels. Many documents are here published in the original for the first time and where necessary are provided with English translations which may be found in the Appendix to the present volume. The documents earlier published in other languages in newspapers and elsewhere are given only in translation in the main section of the documents.

\* \* \*

The text of the General Council Minutes for the period between October 31, 1871 and the end of August, 1872 is published here, for the first time in the original, according to photo-copies of the Minute Books kept in the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., Moscow.

The Minutes for October 31, 1871 to May 21, 1872 are recorded on 142 foolscap pages and complete the third Minute Book; those for May 28 to the end of August 1872 are recorded in the first 77 pages of the fourth Minute Book. Until July 16, 1872, the Minutes were written down by Hales; after his removal the entries were made by secretaries appointed for each meeting (Jung, Milner and others). As a rule, the Minutes are signed. In some cases, in place of the handwritten records, newspaper clippings containing reports of the General Council meetings, and occasionally the texts of the documents, are pasted into the Minute Book.

The Sub-Committee's Minutes were recorded in French on separate sheets of paper by secretaries appointed for each meeting (Engels, Serrailier, Cournet, Frankel and Marx). They are published here in French for the first time. The English translation is given in the Appendix.

The footnotes show the condition of the published manuscripts and contain textological and other remarks by the editors.

The Appendix contains the English translation of the documents which were written in other languages and never published in the original before.

The editorial notes at the end of the present volume provide the reader with a more detailed explanation of the material published. They are based on the correspondence between Marx and Engels and their letters to others, correspondence between other members of the General Council and the International, and letters from other people—all this correspondence being kept in the Central Party Archives and the Library of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.C., C.P.S.U. Wide use has also been made of matter from the International's press, particularly of newspaper reports of the General Council meetings published in *The Eastern Post*, *The International Herald* and other journals of the International Association.

The contents of this volume correspond to the Russian edition of 1965, prepared for publication by Antonina Koroteyeva, Tatyana Vassilieva and Marina Zhelnova, under the general editorship of Irene Bach, of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

The originals for the English edition have been deciphered by Nina Nepomnyashchaya, of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, and the present volume has been prepared for publication by Lydia Belyakova, editor, Progress Publishers.

As in the first four volumes, no alterations have been made in the text, apart from corrections of obvious slips of the pen, misspellings and erroneously given names of persons and places. Most abbreviations have been written out in full, and in some places supplementary words in square brackets have been inserted to render the text clearer to the modern reader.

**THE MINUTE BOOK  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S  
ASSOCIATION**

*(October 31, 1871-end of August 1872)*

---

[1871]

MINUTES OF MEETING\*

Held October 31st, 1871

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Bradnick, Buttery, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Jung, Johannard, Lessner, Le Moussu, Martin, Mayo, McDonnell, Motterhead, Rochat, Rühl, Serrailier, Stepney, Taylor, Townshend, Wróblewski, and Barry.*

Citizens *Tibaldi* and *Sicard* were also present by permission.

POLYGLOT EDITION ABANDONED

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Engels* announced that the resolutions were in the hands of the printers.<sup>1</sup> Owing to the printers not knowing English, the revision of proofs was a difficult and wearying task. He also announced that the Rules, Regulations, and resolutions were almost ready for printing, but it would be almost impossible to print the polyglot edition, as decided upon by the Conference, owing to three being an odd number. If there were four languages

---

\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 318-22 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

to be printed, two could be printed on each page, but it would spoil the edition altogether if two were printed on one side and one on the other, and the three could not conveniently be all printed on one page. He concluded by moving the following proposition: "That the polyglot edition of the Statutes be abandoned for the present and editions in the different languages be printed separately, at such times and places as the Revising Committee may deem best."<sup>2</sup>

Citizen *Bradnick* seconded the proposition.

Citizen *Frankel* said the Conference decided to print the different languages in one edition, to guard against false translations, but that object would be equally obtained if the same Committee performed the work of translation; was in favour of the proposition.

On being put [to the vote], it was carried unanimously.

#### CONTRIBUTION. STAMP

It was then announced that the Stamp Committee had prepared the contribution stamp.<sup>3</sup> It was handed round the room, and met with general approval, and upon the proposition of Citizen *Le Moussu*, seconded by Citizen *Johannard*, it was accepted, and it was handed back to the Committee to get it engraved, and a proof printed.

#### ITALIAN ADDRESS

Citizen *Engels* announced that the Address to the Italian Working Men was not yet ready, and the Committee proposed to wait until the Conference of Working Men, which was to be held in Italy during the week, had finished its sittings, as the proceedings might give the Committee new material.<sup>4</sup>

## FEDERAL COUNCIL FOR LONDON

The *Secretary*\* reported that a Federal Council for London had been formed in accordance with the resolution of the Conference. He had communicated the resolution to the branches, and they had instructed him to summon a preliminary meeting of those who he would think would be likely to carry out the work in a harmonious manner; he had done so and the meeting was held on Saturday, October 21st. A resolution was passed by the members present accepting the instruction of the Conference and resolving themselves into a provisional Federal Council for London. A second meeting was held on October 27th and the number of Council members was increased to 25. A Secretary and Treasurer were appointed and two delegates were appointed to represent the Federal Council upon the General Council, and to make arrangements with respect to the financial question.<sup>5</sup> A false report of the first meeting appeared in *The Times* and many of the daily papers, which had been copied into the *Bee-Hive*. His attention having been called to it, he had written a reply which had been inserted in *The Times*.<sup>6</sup>

Citizen *Johannard* asked if the letter of the Secretary was considered satisfactory.

Citizens *Serraillier* and *Engels* said they had read the letter and they considered it was a very good one.

Citizen *Frankel* would propose "That the delegates be accepted, and that no more delegates from English branches be admitted to a seat on the General Council".

Citizen *Johannard* seconded.

Citizen *Jung* thought it better to see the rules of the new Council first.

Citizen *Hales* said it could not make rules until it was recognised, as it would not be a Council until that was done.

---

\* Hales.—Ed.

Citizen *Eccarius* said the [General] Council had to consider whether the Council formed by three new branches should be recognised. The Trades Unions had paid their contributions, they ought to have been apprised of the proposal to form a Federal Council; he would ask why they were not consulted.

Citizen *Mottershead* had a question to ask and that was how it was [that] the members of the General Council had not been invited to take part in the formation of the Federal [Council]. He thought the fact of their being considered fit to sit on the General Council ought to have been sufficient warrant for them to have been invited. He was afraid the Secretary had consulted personal predilections rather than the general interests of the Association.

Citizen *Hales* said he did not send invitations to those members who had opposed the formation of the Federal Council. He considered it would have been absurd to invite men to take part in a movement they did not believe in. With respect to the Trades Unions he did not consider they were branches, they were affiliated allies—nothing more.

Citizen *Eccarius* said: as an old member, he should deny the right of the new branches to say the Trades Unions were not members. Contributions could not be levied upon allies, and the Trades had to pay and did pay a contribution levied according to rule.

Citizen *Frankel*: when the Conference passed the resolution it did not wish to sow discord, but to centralise the force existing in England. He considered [that] the newly formed Council was only provisional, and that when it was organised the Trades Unions would be invited to take part in its deliberations. He would still maintain his proposition.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he opposed the proposition because there was no feeling in England. There had been no real movement since 1848, and if he had lost something of the sanguineness of youth, allowances must be made.

He must admit the Secretary had only used his discretion, but he had used his discretion very indiscreetly indeed. He would remind him that he had no right to constitute himself a judge as to men's fitness or character.

Citizen *Bultery* said the Secretary had only acted according to advice given by the representatives of the branches. He believed it was the intention of the Federal Council to invite all the Trades Societies as soon as the Council itself was organised, but it could not be done before.

Citizen *Serrailier* said the Secretary would not have been justified in summoning the Trades Societies, for the resolution of the Conference declared distinctly that the branches should proceed to form a Federal Council, and the Trades Unions were not branches.

Citizen *Engels* said it [could] not be maintained for an instant that the Trades Unions were branches; the branches had to submit their rules to the General Council for approval, while the Unions framed their own rules without any control being exercised over them; besides, they took action when they pleased without consulting the Association. Another thing, they had not paid so much per member, but had contributed in lump sums.

Citizen *Eccarius* said that arose from the fact of the societies taking a general average of members, and paying the same sum each year. The Alliance Cabinet-Makers, Cigar-Makers, London Tailors, and Day-Working Bookbinders, had all paid contributions based upon the number of their members while the General Councils of the Amalgamated Carpenters and the Bricklayers voted so much out of their contingent funds and left the Association free to appeal to the branches, and several branches had joined. The Trades Unions had found all the money for the Conference\* delegates, and he thought they ought to be con-

---

\* The London Conference of 1871.—Ed.

sulted. He would move the following amendment: "That before the newly established Council goes any further, the affiliated Trades and other societies be communicated with, and asked whether or not they will take part in the organisation of a local Council;" he proposed this because he thought they ought to be consulted, but he didn't think they would agree to assist, as the establishment of a Federal Council would double their contributions.

Citizen *Mottershead* seconded the proposition. If the Association waited until the Trades Unions held with the principles of the Association as a whole, it would have to wait a long time, but they represented the revolt against Capital.

Citizen *Engels* proposed the adjournment of the debate.

Citizen *Johannard* seconded it.

Citizen *Hales* moved and Citizen *Bradnick* seconded that the discussion be closed and the vote taken at once.

Citizen *Engels* withdrew his proposition in favour; on being put [to the vote], it was carried, with one dissentient.

The amendment was then put and lost. After which the proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* reported that an attack upon the International had appeared in *The Times* signed [by] Alexander Baillie-Cochrane. As most of the members had read it, it was not thought necessary to read it, but it needed answering. He then read a draft reply which he had prepared as the answer, and it was adopted unanimously and the Secretary was ordered to send it to *The Times* for insertion.<sup>7</sup>

The *Secretary* read a letter from the Editor of the *Graphic*\*<sup>8</sup> asking permission for their artist\*\* to attend the Council to take sketches for publication.

---

\* Camille Barrère.—*Ed.*

\*\* Geoffroy Durand.—*Ed.*

The consideration of it was adjourned for a week.  
The Council adjourned at 11.15.

H. JUNG, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

Held November 7th, 1871<sup>9</sup>

Citizen Jung in the chair.

Members present: Citizens Barry, Boon, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Jung, Keen, Johannard, Lessner, Lochner, Mayo, Pfänder, Roach, Rühl, Serraillier, Stepney, and Taylor.

The Minutes of the preceding meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen Engels announced that 800 copies of the circular\*\* in English and 800 copies in French were ready. He also announced that the Rules would be ready in a few days. Citizen Truelove desired the Council to allow him to advertise the report of the Owen Centenary on the back of the Rules.<sup>10</sup>

On the motion of Citizen Engels, seconded by Citizen Lessner, permission was accorded, and it was also resolved that the address on *The Civil War in France* should be likewise advertised on the back.

On the motion of the same citizens it was resolved that the Rules should be sold to members at 1d. per copy, to non-members at 2d. and that 1,000 copies should be sent to the Federal Committee of New York.

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 323-25 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

\*\* Containing the text of the resolutions of the London Conference of 1871.—Ed.

Citizen *Hales* announced that the letter he had sent to *The Times* had not been inserted.\*

Citizen *Engels* proposed that the Secretary be instructed to send it to the *Eastern Post* with a request for its insertion.

Citizen *Harris* proposed that the other papers should be tried, say the *Standard* and *Economist*.<sup>11</sup> The *Eastern Post* was not always impartial.

Citizen *Engels* said the *Standard* would not insert it, it would therefore be useless to send it.

Citizen *Harris* said he would propose that the letter be sent to all the papers; perhaps some of them might insert it.

Citizen *Engels* said he was opposed to anything of the kind; it would be telling the rest of the press that *The Times* had refused to insert the letter; nothing more suicidal could be done, if we ever wanted to use the press. The proposition would be quite sufficient to give publicity, as the *Eastern Post* was sent to all the Federal Councils, and its reports were reprinted in the organs of the Association.

Citizen *Hales* said the *Eastern Post* inserted everything sent by him.

Citizen *Harris* said he had seen reports of the Council meetings which were not true.

Citizen *Hales* said then he ought to have stated so, at the time he saw them.

The proposition was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

The *Secretary* said he had\*\* written to the Editor of the *Graphic* as the application made by that journal had not been decided, and had asked what kind of sketches it was desired the artist should take.\*\*\* He had received a reply stating that an exact representation was intended, and that

\* See p. 32 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Further the word "again" is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See p. 32 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

STATUTS GÉNÉRAUX  
ET  
RÈGLEMENTS ADMINISTRATIFS  
DE  
L'ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE  
DES  
TRAVAILLEURS.

ÉDITION OFFICIELLE,  
RÉVISÉE PAR LE CONSEIL GÉNÉRAL.

LONDRES,  
IMPRIMERIE DE LA SOCIÉTÉ COOPÉRATIVE  
TYPOGRAPHIQUE,  
59, GREEK STREET, SOHO, 59.



1871.  
*Citizen Matteo Pirro a été  
reçu membre de l'Internationale  
ce 9 Mars 1872. Karl Marx  
Londres, 9 Mars 72.*

Title page of the copy of the General Rules of the International Working Men's Association signed by Marx: "Citizen Matteo Pirro accepted member of the International on March 9, 1872. London, March 9, 1872. Karl Marx"

if the request was granted, one of the best artists upon the journal would be sent. He ended by proposing that the request be granted.

Citizen *Taylor* seconded it.

Citizen *Eccarius* proposed that no notice be taken of the communication.

Citizen *Harris* seconded.

Citizen *Engels* proposed and Citizen *Boon* seconded that the offer of the *Graphic* be politely declined, Citizen *Boon* remarking that he thought the Secretary had acted in an unwarrantable manner in writing to that journal without permission.

The amendment of Citizen *Engels* was carried.

Citizen *Frankel* said the engineers and ironfounders of Chemnitz in Saxony were out on strike for a reduction of hours of labour and a rise of wages. He asked that the General Secretary\* should make an appeal to the English Trades on their behalf.<sup>12</sup>

Citizen *Engels* said there was not sufficient evidence in hand except in the German papers, he would therefore propose [that] the matter should stand over a week, and that a report should be prepared for the next sitting.

Citizen *Eccarius* seconded and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* reported that he had a great deal of information from the sections in Italy, which he would hand over to the Secretary for the weekly report in the *Eastern Post*. Garibaldi's letter, in which he had finally broken with Mazzini, had exercised great influence in Italy and as [soon as] it [had] been received, would be included in the report.<sup>13</sup>

A letter had also been received from Holland which gave a favourable account of the progress of the Association in that country; a subscription was enclosed.<sup>14</sup>

---

\* Hales.—*Ed.*

News was also received from Berlin, giving a good account of work done.<sup>15</sup>

The *Secretary* reported that he had received a letter from New Zealand, giving a full account of the evils of the land laws in the state of Canterbury. Information and documents were asked for.<sup>16</sup>

Citizen *Eccarius* read a selection from a letter received from Citizen Walker of Boston, U.S., and handed over the same to the Secretary for his report.<sup>17</sup>

Citizen *Serrailier* read the report of the Committee who had had the consideration of the rules of the new French branch; it was a very lengthy document and entered into the whole subject most minutely.

On the proposition of Citizen *Serrailier*, seconded by Citizen *Rochat*, the report was adopted unanimously.<sup>18</sup>

Citizen *Lessner* reported that he had found a house which he thought would suit the\* Council, the lease was for sale, and possession could be entered upon at once. It was in Fitzroy St., Fitzroy Square.<sup>19</sup>

It was agreed that Citizens Engels and Barry\*\* should view the house and report.

Citizen *Eccarius* gave notice of motion, "That the Council discuss the relationship of Trades Societies to the Council."

The Council adjourned at 11.15.

Nov. 14th, 1871\*\*\*

JOHN HALES, Secretary  
Signed THOMAS MOTTERSHEAD, Chairman

---

\* Further the word "Association" is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\* Mottershead wrote the name "Barry" in place of the deleted name "Jung".—*Ed.*

\*\*\* There is a mistake in the Minute Book here: 1867 instead of 1871.—*Ed.*

*MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\***Held November 14th, 1871<sup>20</sup>*

Citizen *Mottershead* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Barry*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Hales*, *Harris*, *Jung*, *Lessner*, *Mottershead*, *Johannard*, *Stepney*, *Serraillier* and *Frankel*, *Longuet*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Engels* reported that he had visited the house in Fitzroy Street, Fitzroy Square, in conjunction with Citizens *Lessner* and *Barry*, and it was a very commodious house, but the rent was £110 per year. The lease had eight and a half years to run, and, thinking it suitable for the meetings of the Council, the Committee had recommended *Lessner* to take it, and he had taken it. The Council would thus have a home of its own, a thing which had long been desired.

Citizen *Mottershead* thought the locality most unsuitable, but as *Lessner* had taken [it] on the recommendation of the Committee he thought it had better be accepted.

Citizen *Jung* proposed that the report be adopted.

Citizen *Johannard* seconded the proposition, and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Eccarius* proposed that the Council accept the tenancy of the large room from *Lessner*.

Citizen *Harris* seconded the proposition.

Citizen *Hales* moved that the question be adjourned. The locality was the worst that could have been chosen; he went away from the previous meeting under the impression that no steps were to be taken in the matter, and so did all the East End members. It would be impossible for them to attend if the Council did remove as proposed. In

---

\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 326-28 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

fact it would cause a disruption in the Council. As so few members were present, he thought the matter ought to be adjourned.

Citizen *Engels* said the objections raised by Hales ought to have been raised when the Committee was appointed; he objected to deferring it because it was a small meeting. It was a duly constituted meeting.

Citizen *Jung* said he should like to know more about the matter, as to what rent was to be paid, etc.

Citizen *Engels* said it was proposed that the Council should pay £20 per year for the use of the large room two nights a week, that the Council should furnish it, and allow Lessner to let it to other people on other nights, and when the rent of the room amounted to more than £40 per year the surplus should belong to the Council. He should be very sorry to lose the East End men but the interest of the Council as a whole must be considered.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he for one did not think that the English members would attend if the room was taken, as it was proposed; the locality was not one suitable for a propagandist movement; the Council should keep as near the centre of London as possible; still under the circumstances, he didn't [know] what could be done.

Citizen *Harris* said the movement had been carried on successfully in that locality in former times.

Citizen *Hales* said the matter looked very much like a piece of jobbery; besides, he protested against the Council becoming the tenant of one of its members.

Citizen *Engels* said: as one of the Committee he threw back the charge of jobbery. Nothing had been done that could give colour to such an assertion.

Citizen *Serraillier* said the time was being wasted; the matter should have been discussed by the East End members when the proposition was first brought up.

It was then arranged that a vote should be taken upon the simple question of removing to the room and the house

spoken of, and when it was put to the vote a number [of members] voted for, none against.

The *Chairman*\* declared the proposition carried unanimously, and Citizen *Hales* at once gave notice that he should propose that the question be reconsidered at the next meeting of the Council.

Citizen *Jung* proposed and Citizen *Longuet* seconded that the previous Committee together with Citizens *Johannard* and *Townshend* be a Committee to arrange terms and details. Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* gave a full report of the Working Men's Congress which was held in Rome. The whole affair was a sham organised by *Mazzini* to revive his waning influence, and had been a complete failure.<sup>21</sup>

Citizen *Serraillier* reported that the resolutions\*\* had been printed in the French newspapers, and 200,000 copies had thus been distributed in addition\*\*\* to the publication of them in 15 local papers. He had received letters from 15 papers offering to print anything he might send, so that he hoped to get the Rules printed in French gratuitously.

Citizen *Engels* said that the resolutions had been printed in the *Qui Vive* before they were issued to the Council and the only way in which the Editor could have got them was through the printer.<sup>22</sup> In future he should object to giving the same parties any more work, after their having been guilty of such a break of faith.

Citizen *Hales* asked when the Committee were going to report over the *Scotsman* affair.<sup>23</sup>

Citizen *Eccarius* made a statement as to his having written a report for an American paper, which he thought formed the basis of the report in question but it had been distorted very much.

\* *Mottershead*.—*Ed.*

\*\* Resolutions of the London Conference of 1871.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* The words "in addition" were inserted later, when the Minutes were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Harris* said he felt certain some members of the Council had furnished the material for report in question.

It was agreed that the matter should be adjourned until the next sitting.

Citizen *Eccarius* proposed and Citizen *Harris* [seconded] the following resolution:

Considering, that at the outset of the organisation...  
The Council adjourned at 11.15.

H. JUNG, Chairman

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*\*

Held November 21st, 1871<sup>25</sup>

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Barry*, *Boon*, *Bradnick*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Harris*, *Johannard*, *Jung*, *Keen*, *Lessner*, *Le Moussu*, *Lochner*, *Longuet*, *Martin*, *Mayo*, *Mottershead*, *Rochat*, *Serraillier*, *Stepney*, *Taylor*, *Townshend* and *Vaillant*.

Citizens *Margueritte* and *Scholl* were present from the new French branch, and a deputation, consisting of Citizens *Canham*, *Elliott* and *De Walsche*, attended from the English Federal Council.

After the Minutes of the previous meeting had been read and confirmed the *Chairman* announced that a delegation from the new French branch was in attendance, with a copy of the rules.

Citizen *Engels* proposed and Citizen *Martin* seconded that the rules be referred to the Committee appointed to revise the Rules.<sup>26</sup> Carried unanimously.

\* The text of the resolution breaks off here.<sup>24</sup>—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 329-33 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Serrailier* proposed that the standing orders be suspended and that Citizens Ranvier, Cournet and Arnaud be elected members of the Council. He said [that] owing to resignations and other causes a number of the French members had left the Council, leaving vacancies which could not be filled up to the satisfaction of the whole of the Frenchmen in London better than by electing the three citizens proposed; they possessed the confidence of all sections and it would give satisfaction if their names were appended to the new edition of the Rules about to be issued in French.

Citizen *Engels* seconded the motion, and pointed out the good effect the election would have in Paris.

Citizen *Harris* said: as the candidates were unknown to the English members, he should like to hear more of their qualifications.

Citizen *Longuet* said the three were among the most popular members of the Commune—they were very popular with the working class of Paris. Ranvier was a member of the Committee of Public Safety.

Citizen *Vaillant* said they were known before the Commune. Cournet was elected a member of the [National] Assembly but he resigned at an early stage. Ranvier was Mayor of Belleville during the siege, and was deservedly popular. Arnaud was also popular.

The French were unanimously in favour of the three.

Citizen *Mottershead* [said] he didn't want to know anything about their popularity; he only wanted to know if they possessed the confidence of their colleagues; understanding from the speeches made that they did, he should vote for them.

The propositions were then put to the vote and carried unanimously.

The *Secretary*\* read a letter from Citizen Blair of Glasgow

---

\* Hales.—Ed.

stating that the copper-smiths were desirous of obtaining the good offices of the International in preventing workmen coming over from the Continent—as they were about to strike for a rise of wages—and they thought the masters would try and import some workmen if they could.

It was agreed that the Corresponding Secretaries should forward the information to the different sections, and request them to render such assistance as lay in their power.<sup>27</sup>

The *Chairman* announced that some parties in Switzerland, opposed to the General Council, had held a Congress in a little village,\* but he had not then received a report; as soon as he did he would report further upon the matter.<sup>28</sup>

Citizen *Engels* communicated a paragraph which had appeared in the *Standard* and the *Scotsman* which stated that a violent quarrel had taken place in the Council of the Association owing to the rejection of the offer of the manager of an illustrated paper to take sketches of the Council sittings\*\*—he thought members ought to be more discreet and not allow such petty affairs to get into the papers.

Citizen *Hales* differed from Citizen *Engels*; he didn't think it was a question of indiscretion, but he thought that some member supplied those and similar paragraphs, either for money, or to gratify some malicious motive.

Citizen *Mottershead* should imagine that it was one of the dissentients that supplied the information.

Citizen *Boon* moved that the Council proceed to the order of the day.

Citizen *Bradnick* thought the matter was too serious to be dismissed in that fashion.

---

\* Sonvillier.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 32, 34 and 36 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Johannard* thought the practice ought to be stopped.

Citizen *Mottershead* only knew one who took notes\* for money and that was Eccarius—it was his bread and he should be sorry to see the privilege stopped, he believed his reports had done an immense amount of good.

Citizen *Keen* said anyone could see animus in the report under discussion.

Citizen *Barry* said what was wanted was some practical suggestion to prevent the repetition.

Citizen *Mottershead* seconded the order of the day.

Citizen *Hales* proposed that no one be allowed to furnish information of the proceedings of the Council or of its business without previous permission.

Citizen *Bradnick* seconded.

Citizen *Engels* proposed and Citizen *Johannard* seconded that the matter [be] referred to the Committee appointed to report upon the article in the *Scotsman*.\*\* This was agreed to on both sides and Citizen Boon was substituted for Citizen Milner, it being understood that Milner was to attend if able to do so nevertheless.

Citizen *Barry* reported that the House Committee recommended the Council to hire the room off Lessner at £40 per year, the Council to furnish it and have the privilege of subletting.\*\*\* It had an alternative suggestion if the previous one was not accepted, namely, that the Council should hire the room for two nights a week per £15 per year.

Citizen *Barry* said that, having given in the report, he must state that he should vote against it, having been instructed to do so by the Federal Council.

The deputation which attended from the Federal Council was then heard.

---

\* The words "took notes" were inserted in place of the deleted words "supplied reports" later, at the Council meeting of November 28, 1871, when these Minutes were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 40 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See p. 39 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

The General Council was requested by the Federal Council to take offices in some central place, so that the meetings of the two Councils could be held in the same rooms on alternate nights. It would greatly assist the Federal Council.

Citizen *Johannard* asked how far the Federal Council had a right to interfere with the General Council.

Citizen *Hales* said there was no wish to interfere, but the General Council was respectfully asked to agree to the request, it was only a request.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he would propose that the report of the Committee be accepted, the members thanked for their services, but that their report be not acted upon. A greater mistake could not be made than to remove the Council so far from the centre of London; the nearer the centre of a propagandist movement was to the centre of London the better.

Citizen *Barry* seconded and explained that his action in the first instance was an action of friendship to an individual,\* that the latter was prompted by duty to principle.

Citizen *Harris* said everybody complained of the distance they had to go, and when the question of expense was considered it must be remembered that the Council would have power to sublet.

Citizen *Engels* said no suggestions had been offered as to a more suitable place and he must ask that as no better place was proposed, that the Council accept the tenancy.

On being put to the vote, the motion of Citizen *Mottershead* was carried and Citizens *Mottershead*, *Eccarius*, *Boon* and *Barry* were elected to look for a room as near the centre of London [as possible].

Citizen *Serraillier* reported that the work of organisation was proceeding very satisfactorily.

---

\* The reference is to *Lessner*.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Harris* asked if Mrs. Law was still a member of the Council.

Citizen *Engels* replied that she had been asked if she considered herself a member, and she said certainly.

The Council adjourned at 12 o'clock.

*H. JUNG*, Chairman  
*JOHN HALES*, Secretary

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

*Held November 28th, 1871*<sup>29</sup>

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud*, *Barry*, *Boon*, *Cournet*, *Delahaye*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Harris*, *Jung*, *Johannard*, *Le Moussu*, *Lessner*, *Marx*,<sup>30</sup> *Martin*, *Mayo*, *Mottershead*, *Pfänder*, *Rochat*, *Serraillier*, *Stepney*, *Taylor*, *Townshend*, and *Vaillant*.

Citizens *Bertin* and *Yarrow* were also present as visitors.

Upon the Minutes being read, Citizen *Eccarius* said there was a slight inaccuracy in the report of *Mottershead's* speech, and requested that it should be corrected; this was done.\*\*

Citizen *Marx* said it appeared from the Minutes that Citizen *Barry* had given a reason for voting a particular way, "That he had received special instructions to do so";\*\*\* he wished to point that there could be no distinctions amongst the members of the Council, there could not be any special delegations, nor any special instructions received; when a citizen was once elected, he became an ordinary member, and was responsible to nobody but the Council.

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 333-35 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 43 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See p. 44 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Hales* dissented. The Federal Council appointed delegates under the impression that it could instruct them to vote, and remove them when it pleased; besides, societies had been in the habit of withdrawing delegates and replacing them by others.

Citizen *Marx* said: if the Council had made mistakes, why should the Rules be broken? He only dealt with the Rules.

The Minutes were then confirmed, the alterations having been made as requested.

Citizen *Serraillier* read a long extract from *La Emancipation* which had been copied from the *Qui Vive*, breathing vengeance against the French Government; it was understood that *Serraillier* would translate it and forward it to the Secretary\* for his report with a repudiation, *Serraillier* observing that it was necessary [that] the character of the *Qui Vive* and of the men connected with it should be exposed.<sup>31</sup>

Citizen *Harris* said he had met some Frenchmen who met at a house near Middlesex Hospital who seemed bent upon destroying the spirit of the International. Those men ought to be met by someone who understood both French and English. Their misrepresentations ought not to remain unanswered. He hoped *Serraillier* would make a point of attending their next meeting.

Citizen *Serraillier* said the Rules had been printed in two French papers.

Citizen *Marx* announced that he had just received a telegram from Brunswick, informing him that the members of the Brunswick Committee who were arrested during the war, and sent to a Prussian fortress—for protesting against the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine—had just been tried by a Brunswick tribunal for belonging to a secret association, and had been sentenced as follows: Bracke

---

\* *Hales.—Ed.*

to 16 months imprisonment, von Bonhorst 16 months, Spier 10 months, Karl Kühn 5 months ditto. When the police were asked why they had not interfered with the Association before, the answer was given that they didn't know its tendencies until it issued the manifesto denouncing the continuance of the war.<sup>32</sup>

Citizen *Marx* also announced that a statement had appeared in the Frankfort gazette\* to the effect that the London branch of the International had elected that eminent man Sir Charles Dilke an honorary member of the International; he had written a reply stating that the International recognised no honorary members.<sup>33</sup>

Citizen *Engels* reported that the resolutions\*\* had been reprinted in Naples; he also said that Mazzini had been attacking the International again in the columns of his journal,\*\*\* quoting Bakunin as his authority; he asked powers to send an official reply.<sup>34</sup>

It was generally expressed that each Secretary possessed powers by virtue of his office to do what Engels asked.

*Engels* expressed himself satisfied with the expression of opinion.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he had received a letter from Denmark, the purport of which had been printed in the *Eastern Post*.<sup>35</sup>

Citizen *Boon* stated that the Committee, appointed to report upon the *Scotsman* report, was not quite ready to report, but that it hoped to do so at the next meeting.

Citizen *Serraillier* said a member of the Council, Citizen Chalain, had signed a document denouncing the General Council; he had been acting with the enemies of the Council, and ought not to sit any longer on the Council; he therefore proposed that he be expelled.

---

\* *Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt*.—Ed.

\*\* This word was written in place of the deleted word "Statutes".—Ed.

\*\*\* *Roma del Popolo*.—Ed.

Citizen *Johannard* seconded and it was carried unanimously.<sup>36</sup>

The Council adjourned at 11.15.

H. JUNG, Chairman

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

Held December 5th, 1871<sup>37</sup>

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Applegarth*, *Barry*, *Boon*, *Cournet*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Harris*, *Jung*, *Keen*, *Johannard*, *Le Moussu*, *Lessner*, *Marx*, *Martin*, *Mayo*, *Mottershead*, *Roach*, *Rochat*, *Rühl*, *Serrailier*, *Taylor*, *Townshend*, *Regis*, and *Arnaud*.

Citizens *Latham*, *Maujean*, and *Stainsby* were present as visitors.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Marx* asked why the report in the *Eastern Post* contained nothing relative to the Brunswick trial.

The *Secretary*\*\* explained and Citizen *Marx* continued by saying that the General Council had to furnish general reports to the Federal Councils, and he thought one of the best methods to carry out that rule would be for the Corresponding Secretaries to send the *Eastern Post* to their respective sections; he also thought that each member of the Council ought to have a copy of the official report. He therefore proposed "That each Corresponding Secretary be furnished with copies of the *Eastern Post* (not to exceed six in number) at the expense of the Council, and that each member of the Council be furnished with one copy".

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 336-40 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* Hales.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Engels* seconded the proposition; with the present pressure of business such a proposition was urgently required. Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* read the credentials of Citizen Regis who had been appointed as the delegate of the Italian section in London; he had much pleasure in proposing him to become a member of the Council.

Citizen *Marx* seconded the proposition. He believed Citizen Regis would make an excellent member, he had received good character of him from General La Cecilia and other refugees. He also had ascertained that his views were in accord with the principles of the Association.

The proposition was carried unanimously.<sup>38</sup>

The *Secretary* reported the formation of a new branch at Limehouse composed chiefly of engineers; it bid fair to become an active branch; he also reported that a strong branch had been formed in Liverpool with Citizen Gilroy as Secretary, and stated that the branch in Manchester was increasing rapidly, and promised to become the most powerful organisation in that city.

The Secretary also announced that a deputation from the mercantile seamen of the port of London had waited upon him, and requested that a deputation might be sent from the Council to explain the objects and principles of the International; he proposed that a deputation be sent—this was agreed to and Citizens Jung, Johannard, Cournet were appointed.\*

Citizen *Serrailier* reported that *La Voix du Peuple* of Marseilles had been suppressed, as being an organ of the International, but nevertheless other papers continued to print the Statutes and other information relating to the Association as if nothing had happened.

---

\* The report of this meeting published in *The Eastern Post* also mentions Hales. For the results of this visit see p. 56 of the present volume.—Ed.

He also reported that the engineers of Roubaix were on strike for a reduction of the hours of labour and a rise of wages; at present they worked 12 hours a day and demanded that they should be reduced to ten. They asked for assistance as the employers were combined against them, and unless they received assistance they could not stand. He waited upon Citizen Jung as soon as the letter was received, and they decided to send a reply to the effect that the Council would do what it could, but that circumstances were unfavourable. He would suggest that an appeal be made to the engineers.

Citizen *Hales* thought it would be useless as the engineers expected a great strike in London in January.

Citizen *Harris* thought an appeal ought to be made.

Ultimately Citizens *Eccarius*, *Mottershead*, and *Serrailier* were appointed to lay the matter before the Council of the Engineers.<sup>39</sup>

Citizen *Serrailier* said he wished to call attention to the fact that on the night preceding the shooting of *Ferré* and *Rossell*, the French Government replaced the cannon on the buttes of *Montmartre*, ready to again bombard Paris if any demonstration was attempted in favour of the condemned men.<sup>40</sup>

Citizen *Jung* said he had a mass of correspondence relating to the affairs in Switzerland, but it would take up too much time to lay it before the Council. He therefore proposed that it should be laid before a Committee,\* and that that should prepare a report to be submitted to the Council.

Citizen *Engels* said it would be the best course to pursue and it was agreed to.

Citizen *Barry* called attention to the report which had appeared in the *Standard* of a recent meeting of the

---

\* The reference is apparently to the Sub-Committee, the executive body of the General Council.—*Ed.*

Federal Council, and to several articles which had appeared in several journals; he said it must be patent to everyone that the object of those articles was to sow discord among the members, as they were asserting that there was great difference of opinion between the English and the Continental members. They made it appear that the English members had taken action to show their dissatisfaction in forming the Federal Council, and in the report he referred to the Secretary was made to appear as if endorsing those opinions. He thought [that] the time had therefore come when there should be a greater separation between the two Councils, that the seeming equality of authority should be terminated and that the Federal Council should be\* isolated [from] the General Council. And he thought that could be done by the Secretary sending an official reply to the calumnies referred to. He also thought the time had arrived when the same person should not hold the office of Secretary to the two Councils; it would prevent much misunderstanding if they were separated: the public were apt to confound the action taken by the different Councils. He had not a word to say against Citizen Hales, though he had taken a great deal upon himself in organising the Federal Council; he thought that the Council ought to thank him for the valuable work he had performed and then request him to resign the office of Secretary to the Federal Council; it was now quite able to go alone, and he was sure Citizen Hales had too much to do. The General Council would then secure the whole of his valuable services.

Citizen *Frankel*: such a proposition should come from the Federal Council.

Citizen *Marx* said the Council had proceeded somewhat informally in recognising the Federal Council before it was

---

\* Further the words "subordinated to the" are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

accepted by the affiliated societies; in fact it was not yet the Federal Council. It was only the Federal Committee for London. It had not acted up to the International standard in supporting Dilke<sup>41</sup>; he thought the two offices incompatible and ought not to [be] held by the same person. It would create confusion if they were not separated. He would propose (as he could not recognise the motion suggested by Citizen Barry) that the Council considers the two offices incompatible.

Citizen *Hales* denied the right to interfere with his action outside the Council; if he didn't do his duty the Council could dismiss him, he had not supported Dilke.

Citizen *Barry* said Citizen *Hales* proposed that the Federal Council should support Dilke in its collective capacity in opposition to a motion made by Citizen *Bradnick* that the members should support him individually.

Citizen *Hales* said the statement just made was untrue, he did not propose to support Dilke; he objected to support any individual but he did say that he would support a Republican Demonstration; he strongly opposed any demonstration in favour of an individual—he was in favour of principles being supported and not men and Citizen *Barry* knew it; he would ask him if he considered the report a truthful one.

Citizen *Barry* said he was not going to be deluded, he should decline to reply; he seconded the proposition.

Citizen *Engels* was surprised that any defence was attempted in favour of the same person holding the two offices; he must say [that] since the formation of the Federal Council Citizen *Hales* had not performed his duties satisfactorily; the Minutes were not so full, nor the reports so good as they used to be.

Citizen *Serraillier* said there would be confusion if the two were held by the same, as the reports of the two Councils would be signed by the same person—the matter would lead to endless confusion.

Citizen *Boon* thought it advisable that the two questions should be separated.

Citizen *Eccarius* protested with the continual speeches of the Secretary; it was impossible to get on with business.

Several other speeches were made amidst cries of "Vote, Vote".

The *Chairman* said he could not put it to the vote as two distinct statements had been made at variance with each other.

After some pressure he put it to the vote protesting he did not understand the question as it stood—and it was carried, a number voting for, none against.

Council adjourned at 11.45.

H. JUNG, Chairman

### MEETING OF COUNCIL\*

*Held December 12th, 1871<sup>42</sup>*

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Barry, Boon, Cour-  
net, Cohn, Eccarius,\*\* Frankel, Hales, Harris, Johannard,  
Jung, Lessner, Le Moussu, Lochner, Mayo, Martin, McDon-  
nell, Pfänder, Regis, Roach, Rochat, Rühl, Serraillier, Step-  
ney, Taylor* and *Townshend*.

A number of citizens belonging to the Cigar-Makers were also present and Citizen *Chaddock*, as visitors.

Before the Minutes were read Citizen *Cohn* stated that the Cigar-Makers were holding an International Conference, and requested permission for some of the delegates to remain during the Council sitting, which was granted.

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 341-44 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* Further the name "Engels" is crossed out.—*Ed.*

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, the *Secretary* read a letter from Citizen Blair, which stated that the Copper-smiths had been successful in their efforts to better their position.\*

Citizen *Serraillier* said that he had communicated with the engineers of Roubaix, and they had waited upon the Secretary of the Roubaix branch of the Amalgamated Engineers, and he had endorsed the action taken, and again written to him informing him of the action taken; he and Citizens Mottershead and Eccarius had waited upon Allan, and he informed them that if the Roubaix branch endorsed the action taken, it was probable the Association might render the men some assistance.\*\*

Upon the proposition of Citizen *Cohn*, seconded by Citizen *Frankel*, it was resolved to make an appeal on behalf of the men to the "Nine Hours' League" of Newcastle.<sup>43</sup>

Citizen *Serraillier* said he was receiving continual applications from French citizens asking for powers to start sections and he asked that he might be empowered to grant the necessary credentials when he deemed the applications to be genuine.

Citizen *Hales* proposed that the same powers be granted to Citizen *Serraillier* that was formerly granted to Dupont.

Citizen *Johannard* seconded.

Citizen *Eccarius* was in favour of the Council dealing with each case as it arose; if the French Secretary refused credentials the action taken might be charged to personal motives.

Citizen *Martin* was of the same opinion as Eccarius.

Citizen *Cournet* thought it was not worthwhile troubling the Council with each case, neither did he think it would be wise to leave the matter in one man's hands; he thought it would be best to appoint a commission of three.

---

\* See pp. 42-43 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 51 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

This suggestion met with general approval, and being embodied in a proposition, was carried unanimously.

The *Chairman* read an article from *L'Égalité* which stated that the thirty sections of the Association in Switzerland had just held a Conference, which passed a resolution approving of, and accepting, the resolutions of the London Conference, and also thanking the General Council for its labours in maintaining and carrying out the principles of the International.<sup>44</sup>

The *Secretary* and *Chairman* reported the result of the deputation appointed to wait upon the Mercantile Shipmasters and Seamen.\* The deputation was well received, and the following resolution was carried unanimously: "That this meeting having heard explained the principles and objects of the International heartily approves of the same, and pledges itself to help to carry out the same."

A communication from the Federal Council was then read notifying that Citizen Barry's nomination as delegate to the General Council had been withdrawn, and that Citizen Chaddock had been appointed in his place, whom the Council was respectfully asked to accept as the delegate of the Federal Council.

Citizen *Keen* then stated that he proposed that Citizen Chaddock be accepted. Citizen Barry no longer represented the opinions of the Federal Council, and it was thought he ought no longer to remain the delegate.

Citizen *Roach* seconded.

Citizen *Eccarius* proposed that the consideration of the question be postponed so that the whole question might be gone into; the motion he had on the books might affect the legal status of the Federal Council.

Citizen *Barry* seconded. He had been removed because he had accepted the ruling of Dr. Marx relative to question of delegation.

---

\* See p. 50 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Hales* asked that the question might be settled at once.

The statement of Citizen *Barry* was untrue, he was removed because he had introduced Federal Council business into the General Council, and thereby had rendered a conflict possible—the Federal Council desired to work in harmony with the General Council. The Federal Council felt that Citizen *Barry* no longer represented its views—and it asked it in conformity with its powers to accept Citizen *Chaddock*; the Council accepted Citizens *Keen* and *Barry* as delegates, as the Minutes would prove, and the proceeding was strictly in accordance with the bye-laws of the Council itself.

Citizen *Boon* hoped the question would be adjourned so that the whole question of legality might be gone into; he knew the Council had recognised the Federal Council, but if it had done wrong that was no reason why it should not retrace its steps.

On being put to the vote, the question was adjourned.

Citizen *Barry* then asked to be informed what steps the Secretary had taken to carry out the resolution carried at the previous meeting.\*

The *Secretary* declined to give any answer whatever to the question; the Council had to see whether the Secretary carried out its wishes and when it was found he did not, then to deal with him.

Citizen *Boon* stigmatised this reply as insolent on the part of a paid officer, he then put the same question through the chair, and the *Secretary* returned the same answer, making the remark that if Citizen *Boon* wished to know Federal Council business, he could write and ask for it.

---

\* The reference is to the decision prohibiting the holding of two offices by one person—that of the General Council and the British Federal Council. See pp. 53-54 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Boon* then gave in a report of their investigations of the *Scotsman's* report committee\*; it had ascertained that someone had been [paid], and handsomely too, for the report but it had not fixed the guilt upon any individual, but it hoped to do so yet.

Citizen *Hales* reported his knowledge of Ory and stated that he had been offered money but had refused it—he had never received a penny for any report in his life.

Citizen *Boon* said the Committee were convinced that Citizen *Hales* was *not* the man.

Citizen *Eccarius* reported that the Federal Committee of New York had been dissolved, but that attempts were being made to reorganise it.<sup>45</sup>

Citizen *Serraillier* reported that the refugees had refused to accept the proceeds of a lecture given by Bradlaugh; he had attacked the Commune, and the men felt it would dishonour them if they took the money.<sup>46</sup>

The Council adjourned at 11.30.

MARTIN J. BOON, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

Held December 19th, 1871<sup>47</sup>

Citizen *Boon* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Barry, Boon, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Johannard, Jung, Keen, Law, Lessner, Marx, Martin, McDonnell, Motterhead, Ranvier, Regis, Rochat, Serraillier, Stepney, Taylor, Townshend* and *Vaillant*.

\* See p. 44 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 345-51 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

Citizen Mullins attended from the Basket-Makers' Association.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Rochat* announced that he had received a letter from Belgium. He had written asking how it was that the resolutions had not been printed in Belgium, and had received a reply to the effect that they had not printed them because some of the resolutions were considered to be of a private character, and were not intended for publication, but it had been resolved to hold a Conference of delegates on the 25th when the Conference resolutions would be taken into consideration.<sup>48</sup>

Citizen *Serraillier* said a telegram had gone the round of the French papers announcing that the Association was reorganising in France. He desired to know if the Secretary had reported to that effect. He thought it bad policy to report anything of the kind relative to France, as it put the authorities on the alert, and made members fearful of police action. Since that report appeared, he had not received a single letter—whereas he used to receive on an average 20 per week.

The *Secretary* said he had reported exactly in the sense of the telegram, but he did so thinking it would do good; he should not do so in future.

Citizen *Mottershead* said that a garbled report of the meeting of the Council had appeared in *The Times*\* on the previous Wednesday and he thought the matter ought to be sifted. The report in question [was of] malice prepense, and whoever sent it was deserving of severe censure; he would ask through the Chairman if Citizen *Eccarius* had sent it.

Citizen *Eccarius* said in answer that he did not send it, and as a proof he might state that he didn't leave the company of several members of the Council until long

---

\* Apparently a slip of the pen; should be *The Standard*.—Ed.

after it was too late to go to the press on the preceding Tuesday evening.

Citizen *Mottershead* was glad to hear that reply; for his part he should imagine that if the reports in question were sent by a member of the Council, it was someone who was also a member of the Federal Council, as the business of the two Councils were dished up together.

Citizen *Marx* said he had received a letter from a person closely connected with the Home Office,\* in which intelligence was conveyed that the English Government intended to prosecute some of the refugees, upon the plea that they had been guilty of civil crimes; and it was intimated that such action was to be taken at the request of the French Government.<sup>49</sup> The information tallied with some he had received from the Continent and it was necessary the government should be interrogated upon the matter. As notice had been given of the intention of the French Government to withdraw from the Commercial Treaty,<sup>50</sup> he should not be surprised if Mr. Gladstone had offered to prosecute the refugees as an equivalent for a renewal of the treaty. If he had formed such a project it could not be carried out. The English people would never permit any minister to thus tamper with the liberties of the country. Lord Palmerston was as popular in his day as ever Mr. Gladstone had been, and his popularity was swept away at once, when he attempted to do a similar thing.<sup>51</sup>

He also reported that he had received a letter from Berlin. The organs of Bismarck had been attacking the International, and the writer remarked that Bismarck had appeared in a new character, namely, as the champion of the working men; he protested against the International interfering with the liberty of the workmen. This had done good, for the working class would be sure to rally round

---

\* Thieblin.—*Ed.*

the Association more now [that] Bismarck had denounced it.<sup>52</sup>

He had likewise received two letters from the United States, one from New York, the other from San Francisco. The first was a notification that after the Central Committee had agreed (*sine die*\*) to adjourn, a large number of delegates had immediately resolved themselves into a provisional Federal Council, and intended to thoroughly reorganise. The disputes had all been caused by the delegate of Section 12, Citizen West. Like all other sectaries, the members of this section, after causing division, tried to create scandal by publishing the whole of the affair.<sup>53</sup> The letter from San Francisco contained a report of a meeting (at which a section was formed) at which Captain Smith made a very good speech in explanation of the objects and principles of the Association. Copies of the Rules, Congress resolutions and other documents were asked for in Spanish as Captain Smith was going to Mexico and was desirous of forming a section while there.<sup>54</sup>

It was resolved to write to Madrid and ask the Spanish Federal Council to furnish the documents asked for.

Citizen *Marx* also communicated the purport of a letter which he had received from Citizen Outline, the Secretary of the Russian section in Switzerland. He stated that the Bakuninists attended the Conference which had been lately held in Switzerland and tried to get the Conference resolutions rescinded.\*\* They were an insignificant minority, and the Swiss *bona fide* workmen were so exasperated that Outline had to protect Malon, Lefrançais and Ostyn from personal violence. The workmen were incensed at their time being wasted.<sup>55</sup>

Having reported the preceding, Citizen Marx referred to the conduct of Charles Bradlaugh. He said: Mr. Bradlaugh

---

\* Without date.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 56 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

in a recent lecture, with his usual fairness, had tried to make it appear that he (Dr. Marx) was a Bonapartist, by quoting a passage (which was not given correctly), without giving the context, from *The Civil War in France*.<sup>\*</sup> He should not have noticed the matter, only there was the possibility of people being led astray by the misrepresentation. He should not have answered Bradlaugh as Bradlaugh—he had nothing in common with him. He had no ambition to become a platform spouter, and as a refugee he had no personal motive to serve which could cause him to interfere in English politics. On first reading the report, he had some doubt as to whether the misrepresentation was intentional. He thought it possible that Mr. Bradlaugh was too stupid to understand the passage, that in fact it was the result of incapacity rather than of maliciousness—for though Mr. Bradlaugh possessed a kind of reputation as a stump orator he had a very poor opinion of his scientific attainments. But on thinking over the matter he had arrived at the conclusion that the falsification was deliberate and intentional. For Bradlaugh acted in exactly the same manner in criticising the “Address”<sup>\*\*\*</sup> in the *National Reformer*—then he wilfully falsified, which action was exposed by Citizen Harris in an able letter.<sup>56</sup> Perhaps something might be due to force of habit; he understood Mr. Bradlaugh had been a clerk in some petty lawyer’s office and it was possible he had acquired a habit of falsification that became a second nature. But it was easy to understand the man’s malignity. He knew that he (Citizen Marx) represented the labour struggle and that was why he vilified him, he knew that the International was struggling for the abolition of classes, and that was what he dreaded. Some idea might be formed of a man by the company he kept. Now Bradlaugh had recently been over

---

<sup>\*</sup> See p. 58 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

<sup>\*\*</sup> *The Civil War in France*.—*Ed.*

to Paris, and while there he had associated with D troyat and Emile de Girardin of *La Libert *,<sup>57</sup> one of the most infamous men in France. While at dinner at Girardin's he boasted of his great influence, and spoke of the Hall of Science as an immense building to which half the population of London flocked. He was fully informed of Mr. Bradlaugh's doings while in Paris, and could vouch for what he said being true. With respect to Bradlaugh's letter in the *Eastern Post*, he remarked that it afforded another proof of the man's malignity, for it was a fact that he was neither at the lecture, the meeting of the refugees, nor at the meeting of the Council when the matter was discussed and Mr. Bradlaugh knew well enough that he did not lead the refugees.<sup>58</sup>

Citizen *Harris* wished to be informed whether the refugees had accepted the proceeds of Bradlaugh's lecture, after the statement that they had refused it\*; he had been told they had, and had been called a follower of Dr. Marx. He wished it to be distinctly understood that he was not led by any man, and he was no more a follower of Dr. Marx than he was of Bradlaugh, he claimed to exercise freedom of thought.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he had seen Adolph Smith who told him that the refugees did refuse the money in the first instance, but he and Le Lubez explained to them on Friday night that Bradlaugh had not insulted them, as reported at the lecture, and that the money was subscribed by the English working class, and not by Bradlaugh, and that the English working class would take it as an insult if the refusal was persisted in, whereupon the money was accepted.

Citizen *Martin* said that was hardly true. Le Lubez had the money and tried to induce the refugees to accept it. Adolph Smith and V sinier also tried, but the Committee

---

\* See p. 58 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

would not accept it, but deferred the matter until the Sunday meeting, when the arguments referred to were used, and the money was accepted, and a vote of thanks given to those who had subscribed it. He voted for that himself looking upon it as a vote of censure upon Bradlaugh.

Citizen *Regis* said the vote accepting the money was taken at the bar of the Public House, after the chairman had left the chair, and was illegal.

Citizen *Vaillant* thought the explanation quite sufficient. The men accepted the money as the gift of the working class, as they had subscribed it; they had no wish to insult any of the working class.

Citizen *Ranvier* said some of refugees had tried to create ill-will. He attended the lecture of Bradlaugh and took a friend with him who translated the salient points, and there was nothing insulting that he could see. Though there were matters upon which he differed in opinion.

Citizen *Mottershead* was sorry the refugees had acted as they had, as he felt it placed the members of the Council in a false position. They did wrong in first accepting and then refusing. It wouldn't have mattered if they had accepted the money in the first instance and said nothing about it.

Citizen *Hales* didn't agree with Citizen *Mottershead*; he thought the men had acted quite consistently: they refused it as Bradlaugh's money and accepted it as being given by the working class. The money was not accepted when the report appeared.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he was the best judge of his own honour, he felt [himself] in a false position.

The matter [was] then dropped.

Citizen *Engels* reported that the *Emancipacion*, the official organ of the Federal Council of Spain, contained declarations to the effect that the Spanish sections accepted the resolutions of the Conference, especially the one referring to the union of the political and social questions. These

had been reproduced and adhered to by the other journals of the Association in Spain.<sup>59</sup>

The news from Italy was not of a decided character.

He also reported that the Lancashire cotton masters were endeavouring to create an agitation for an amendment of the Factory Acts—to reduce the working hours to nine hours per day. The rate of production had increased at a greater ratio than the supply of cotton, hence they felt their only safety lay in a reduction of the hours of labour.

Citizen *Jung* said there was no money in hand for the refugees and it was necessary something should be done as the men were starving. He had written to Dilke, and had a long interview with him, and in the end he gave him £5. The Secretary had written suggesting that it would be a good thing if some means could be found to enable a number of them to emigrate. He thought it a very good suggestion, and would propose that a deputation be appointed to wait upon General Schenck, the American Minister, to see if he could render any assistance in carrying out that object.

Citizen *Mottershead* seconded the proposition upon the agreement to substitute Mr. Moran's name for General Schenck; he thought it better to go to him first.

This was agreed to and the following citizens were appointed as a deputation: Mottershead, Ranvier, Engels and Vaillant.

Citizen *Serraillier* asked if Citizen Richard was a delegate to the Federal Council from any section, and upon receiving a reply, gave notice that he should introduce the question as to how far the Federal Council was acting in accordance with the Rules, at the next meeting.

Citizen *Eccarius* proposed and Citizen *Lessner* seconded that the Council adjourn for a fortnight. Carried unanimously.

The Council adjourned at 11.45.

H. JUNG, Chairman

---

[1872]

MINUTES OF MEETING\*

Held January 2nd, 1872<sup>60</sup>

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Boon*, *Arnaud*, *Cournet*, *Ecarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Harris*, *Jung*, *Johannard*, *Keen*, *Lessner*, *Le Moussu*, *Lochner*, *Marx*, *Martin*, *Mayo*, *McDonnell*, *Milner*, *Mottershead*, *Pfänder*, *Rochat*, *Rühl*, *Regis*, *Ranvier*, *Serraillier*, *Stepney*, *Townshend*, *Vaillant* and *Barry*.

Citizens *Burke*, *O'Connor*, *Coleman* and *Mitchell* were also present as visitors.

The Minutes of the preceding meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Boon* asked what action had been taken by the deputation appointed to wait upon Mr. Moran.

Citizen *Jung* said he had seen *Mottershead* who told him that he had been to the Embassy where he learnt that Moran was out of town. The person in charge though promised to forward any written communication he might leave, and he was waiting for an answer.

The *Secretary* read correspondence from Manchester, Taunton and Paris.

Citizen *Serraillier* asked if the Secretary had written

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 352-57 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

as instructed to the Nine Hours' League of Newcastle on behalf of the Roubaix engineers.\*

The *Secretary* said he wrote the next day, but he had not received any reply.

Citizen *Jung* announced that a letter from Geneva had been received asking for 2,000 copies of the revised Rules.

Citizen *Marx* announced that Dupont had sent a list of persons to whom an appeal might be made for the refugees. Mrs. Law had sent £2, the proceeds of a lecture given by her for the refugees. He also announced that the Belgian Congress had voted against the Congress resolutions,\*\* not directly, but indirectly, and that in opposition to the votes of their own delegates. It must be remembered that Belgium had 7 delegates upon the Conference, a large number for so small a country. The action taken was the more strange as the Belgian Federal Council had only the previous week voted in quite a contrary spirit.<sup>61</sup> With reference to the Geneva letter, he proposed that it [be] referred to the Sub-Committee.

This was seconded and carried unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* brought up the rules of the new Polish section, and suggested that they be referred to the Rules Revising Committee.<sup>62</sup>

Citizen *Hales* proposed that that Committee be made a standing Committee for revising rules, and that all rules be submitted to it that were brought up for approval.

Citizen *Johannard* seconded, and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* said General Wróblewski had received news from Cracow, announcing that the Socialist-Democrats had declared themselves enthusiastically in favour of the International. This had provoked a counter-demonstration from

---

\* See p. 55 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* A slip of the pen: the reference is to the resolutions of the London Conference of 1871.—*Ed.*

the aristocracy, but their effort was a complete failure and the only effect had been to give a new impulse to the movement.

Citizen *Frankel* reported that a demonstration had taken place in Vienna in favour of the principles.\* There were some persons there who claimed to be more radical than the Association for the purpose of sowing dissention. He wished the Council to issue a manifesto declaring that persons could belong to the International without using the name, and he should like the same notified in the *Eastern Post*.

Citizen *Serraillier* proposed that the question be referred to the Sub-Committee—he was opposed to any notification until the matter was decided upon.

The proposition was seconded and carried unanimously.

Citizen *Eccarius* reported that he had received a letter from Harney informing him that he had sent 30s. through his bookseller: £1 for two years' contribution and 10s. for the refugees. He warned the Council to be careful in admitting the Irish into the Association as the Council would have Gladstone down upon it if he thought it was going too far. Reports and telegrams had appeared in the Boston papers that Marx's house was beset with secret police, and that Gladstone was contemplating his expulsion from the country.

Citizen *Rochat* announced that he had received a letter from Holland which informed him that the Dutch Federal Council gave in its adherence to the Conference resolutions.<sup>63</sup>

Citizen *Serraillier* read an article from *Le Soir* written in defence of Bradlaugh. It said he had honoured the journal by contributing to it and was a safe governmental man, and had nothing to do with demagogical intrigues; having read it, Citizen *Serraillier* said Bradlaugh had repre-

---

\* Of the International Association.—*Ed.*

sented that he said Bradlaugh was sold to the Tories. He never said so, he should consider such a remark insulting to the Tories. Bradlaugh belonged to the party of Bradlaugh and that was the party of the police, he meant the French police.

Citizen *Mottershead* read a letter which he had received from Denmark. It announced that the Association was progressing rapidly, and that in spite of the most strenuous efforts on the part of both the Government and the police. Information was asked as to the mode of conducting strikes. It also stated that the movement was making progress in Sweden—a Federal Council having been formed in that country.

Citizen *Eccarius* stated that he and Citizen *Mottershead* were going to Nottingham to the Trades Union Congress and he asked that they might be furnished with copies of the Rules and the addresses on the *Civil War in France* to distribute among the delegates.

After a short discussion it was voted that 100 copies of the Rules and 200 copies of the *Civil War in France* be placed at their disposal for the purpose asked.

The next business upon the order of the day was the consideration of the request of the Federal Committee\* that Citizen *Chaddock* be accepted as a delegate in place of Citizen *Barry* who had been removed.

Citizen *Boon* proposed that Citizen *Chaddock* be not accepted.

Citizen *Hales* said the nomination of Citizen *Chaddock* was withdrawn, he having resigned. The Federal Council now asked that the General Council accept another delegate in place of Citizen *Barry*, leaving the question as to the individual to be settled afterwards; it was thought that would simplify the matter.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he objected to the matter being

---

\* The Federal Council for England.—*Ed.*

got rid of in that fashion, he should therefore propose his resolution which was to reinstate the Trades Societies as members—at least to reverse the decision of the Council when it passed the resolution accepting the Federal Council. The Trades Societies were branches of the Association, and their members were entitled to all the privileges of members—they ought to have been consulted in any attempt to organise a Federal Council.

Citizen *Hales* objected to the discussion of *Eccarius's* motion as it would not affect the question at issue, namely, was the Federal Council a legal body and had its acts been legal. The wish of the Federal Council was to have the question fully discussed and settled as things had come to a deadlock.

Citizen *Marx* agreed with *Hales* that the motion of *Eccarius* did not meet the matter. The matter ought to be discussed fully and settled—but it was useless to go back to the beginning as the Council had recognised the provisional Federal Committee (there was no Federal Council) up to a certain time—and what they had to do was to see how far the Federal Committee had acted since in accordance with the Rules; he would therefore move that the Secretary write to the Federal Committee, asking for a list of its members, specifying who was on it at the time it was recognised and who had been added since, stating who had qualifications as delegates—and who had not—and also as to what branches and affiliated Trades Societies had been written to for their adhesion.

Citizen *Boon* seconded the proposition.

Citizen *Mottershead* didn't object to any amount of propaganda, but he did object to the laws being broken. They had been deliberately broken by the Secretary. Now if anything ought to be sacred it should be the Rules of the Association; it was by its laws that the Association had become what it was—the greatest power in Europe, and he must enter his solemn protest against the flagrant exam-

ple set by the Secretary—in violation of all the interests of the Association.

Citizen *Eccarius* read his resolution<sup>64</sup> and maintained that it was pertinent to the question at issue. The Trades Societies had been deprived of their rights as members—and that would affect the constitution of the Federal Committee.

Citizen *Marx* read the Conference resolution and pointed out that the affiliated societies were to be consulted after the formation.

Citizen *Engels* supported the resolution; it was intolerable that the whole time of the Council should be wasted in discussing this one question.

Citizen *Keen* said he regretted that the time of the Council should be thus taken up, but it was through a disaffected minority.

Citizen *Mottershead* protested; he was not going to come to the Council night after night to be humbugged.

Citizen *Boon* gave notice that at the next meeting he should move that Citizen *Hales* be no longer considered fit to hold the office of General Secretary.

The Council adjourned at 11.45.

A. SERRAILLIER  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

### COUNCIL MEETING\*

*Held on January 9th, 1872<sup>65</sup>*

Citizen *Serraillier* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Barry, Boon, Bradnick, Cournet, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Jung, Johannard, Lessner, Lochner, Le Moussu,*

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 357-62 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

*Longuet, Marx, Martin, Mayo, McDonnell,\* Pfänder, Rochat, Rühl, Serraillier, Taylor, Townshend, and Ranvier.*

Citizens Mitchell, Burke, and Yarrow were also present as visitors.

The *Secretary* read the Minutes of the previous meeting, which were confirmed unanimously. He then announced that the Liverpool branch had issued a short address, a copy of which he laid upon the table; he also stated that Citizen Sanders of the Sailors' Association had informed him that he could find officers who would undertake to convey anything the Council might wish to send to Marseilles, or Bordeaux.

Citizen *Serraillier* reported that he had received a letter from Bordeaux saying the sections in that city approved of the Conference resolutions, and that a notification to that effect would be sent in a few days, endorsed by all the six sections. He had also received a letter from Corsica. Another letter stated that the Commune had done more to develop the working class than anything that had preceded it. Even in the rural districts the people began to look upon those who fell for the Commune as Martyrs. The Commune had proved that the working classes were capable of governing themselves. The facts relative to the terrible atrocities, perpetrated by the Versaillists upon entering Paris, were only just becoming known in the provinces. The writer asked if it was true that a dozen women were violated and then shot in the Place de Vendôme, and buried in the street where they fell; they had also heard that the wounded and dead were shovelled into pits together in the Cemetery of Père-la-Chaise.

The *Secretary* stated that Mr. Truelove had requested him to ask the Council for some money on account of printing.

---

\* Further the name "Milner" is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Engels* asked if an account properly drawn up had been sent in by Mr. Truelove.

The *Secretary* answered that it had not.

Citizen *Engels* then proposed that Mr. Truelove be requested to furnish a properly detailed account, and that no money be paid until such was done.

Citizen *Bradnick* seconded the proposition and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Serraillier* asked if the Committee appointed to find a suitable room had found one.\* Papers and letters were continually being lost, he expected a letter several days ago, but no such letter had come.

Citizen *Engels* said he had lost Spanish papers.

Citizen *Barry* had searched but could not find a suitable room, the principal difficulty was the rent. Could not find a room at all suitable under £20 or 25 pounds per year.

Citizen *Bradnick* proposed and Citizen *Taylor* seconded that the Committee be enlarged.

This was carried unanimously, and Citizens Taylor, Jung, and McDonnell were appointed.

Citizen *Marx* then brought up the report upon the rules of the new Polish section\*\*; they were in accordance with the General Statutes with the exception of one paragraph which proposed to make the General Council a court of appeal in cases of personal quarrels, and another relative to printing under assumed names, which was ambiguous and required explanation.

With the exception of those paragraphs the Committee proposed the adoption of the rules.

The proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* then brought up the report of the Committee upon the rules of the London Federal Council. There

---

\* See p. 45 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 67 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

was nothing antagonistic to the General Statutes though there were several points which wanted stating more explicitly and there were several errors of redaction. These he pointed out.

The *Secretary* read a letter from the Federal Council giving a list of the members of the Federal Committee—at the time it was recognised by the General Council, and stating also the names of those who had been added to since. It appeared that three citizens had been added who had no delegation, viz., Cowell Stepney, Blandford, and Richard. It was also stated that all the branches but one had given in their adhesion—that being the Nottingham one—from that no reply had been received. A list of Trades Societies was also given who had been invited to give in their support.<sup>66</sup>

Citizen *Engels* asked Citizen Keen in what way the Manchester adhesion had been given; he had a letter from Dupont which stated the matter was not settled.<sup>67</sup>

Citizen Keen replied that as Citizen Hales knew the [London] branches and the provincial branches better than himself, he had carried on the correspondence.

Citizen *Boon* then said: I want to know from Citizen Keen—through the chair—if while he was nominally Secretary Citizen Hales was the actual Secretary.

Citizen *Bradnick* said an arrangement had been come to, which was perfectly satisfactory to the Federal Council—by that the correspondence was left in the hands of Citizen Hales—and the result proved the arrangement was a good one.

Citizen *Hales* said the matter was very simple: he had undertaken to carry on the correspondence of the Federal Council in answer to a request that he should do so.

Citizen *Yarrow* asked if he was still a member of the Council.

The *Secretary* did not consider he was a member, he was a delegate of the Cabinet-Makers, and had left London

prior to the Congress of Basle—and another delegate had been sent in his place.<sup>68</sup> It was understood that when a member left town for an indefinite time that he ceased to be a member. Lochner left town, and upon his return was proposed again in the ordinary way and underwent a fresh election. Citizen W. Hales too was away from London only 10 months and he went through a re-election.

Citizen *Yarrow* said no other delegate was appointed since he represented the Cabinet-Makers.

Citizen *Eccarius* said Smith came once or twice to pay some money and to a summoned meeting on the Belgian affair.<sup>69</sup>

The matter was ended by Citizen *Boon* proposing that Citizen *Yarrow* become a member of the Council, which was seconded by Citizen *Lessner*.

Citizen *Marx* then proposed and Citizen *Jung* seconded that during the term of probation Citizen *Yarrow* be allowed to take part in the proceedings of the Council, but without power to vote.

The proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* said there were two members of the Federal Council\* who were also officers of the Universal Republican League<sup>70</sup>; that was a rival association, and two of its officers were continually attacking the [International] Association through the press in Germany and Poland; therefore it was impossible for the same persons to be officers in both associations. They would have to make a choice between the two. There had also been persons added to who were not delegates, and that was contrary to the Statutes. So their election could not be recognised.

Citizen *Yarrow* said the Cabinet-Makers had not heard of the movement to form a Federal Council. He thought different steps ought to have been taken at the start. The

---

\* Chaddock and Canham.—*Ed.*

affiliated societies ought to have been consulted—so that the trades might be properly represented.

Citizen *Hales* said he first proposed that the Council should proceed to form a Federal Council—he had proposed it time after time but could not carry it. The action taken was upon the Conference resolution.

Citizen *Bradnick* said he regretted that those who had been working had met with nothing but factious opposition from certain English members who thought more of other movements than they did of the Association or its principles.

Citizen *Engels* said it was time the question was settled. The question as it affected Citizens Chaddock and Canham had really been decided when they decided the question of the Alliance: members of the Association could not belong to an International Committee within the International<sup>71</sup>—he was glad the rules of the Federal Council were not in opposition to the Statutes. Dupont had sent him a letter saying the Federal Council wished to have the power of adding to its own number<sup>72</sup>—he was glad to find that was [a] mistake.

Citizen *Hales* said it was not a mistake—it was correct.

Citizen *Engels* said then he would propose that the question be adjourned and that the originals be produced. It appeared that they didn't know what they were voting upon.

Citizen *Eccarius* said it would be better if Bradnick considered before he made rash statements. The fact was that when Hales brought forward his motion, only two supported it on Sub-Committee and Hales reserved the right to bring it on in the Council. The result was that the question was relegated to the Conference and there it was carried by the votes of the Continentals who had been trying for years to separate English from General business. Events had proved the statement to be correct when it was said there was not brains enough outside the Council to con-

duct the movement, and some of them had a reputation to lose.

Citizen *Serraillier* here declared the matter adjourned, the time having expired.

Citizen *Boon* complained that he had not a chance to bring on his motion—he meant to press it next week; he should move that it take precedence of other business.

The Council adjourned at 11.30.

*H. JUNG*, Chairman  
*JOHN HALES*, Secretary

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

*Held January 16th, 1872<sup>3</sup>*

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Boon*, *Bradnick*, *Cournet*, *Engels*, *Eccarius*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Harris*, *Jung*, *Keen*, *Lessner*, *Lochner*, *Le Moussu*, *Marx*, *Mayo*, *McDonnell*, *Milner*, *Mottershead*, *Pfänder*, *Rochat*, *Rühl*, *Serraillier*, *Regis*, and *Townshend*. Citizen *Yarrow* was also present.

The Minutes of the preceding meeting having been read and confirmed, the *Secretary* read letters from Liverpool, Manchester, and Middlesbrough, the latter one announcing that work could be found for the refugees. A letter was also read from Hugh Williams, enclosing a cheque for the refugees and urging upon the Council the necessity of establishing an organ and offering to assist in carrying out the same.

The *Chairman* announced that a communication had been received from the new French-speaking branch, notifying that Citizens De Wolfers and Margueritte had been

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 362-66 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

appointed as the delegates of the section and asking the General Council to accept them.

It was proposed [and] seconded that they become members of the Council.

The proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Serraillier* stated that he had received several letters from France. The movement was progressing, especially in the South where a Federation of Sections was trying to establish a paper which they desired should become an official organ.

Citizen *Engels* announced that three strikes had taken place in Rome. Namely, those of the cabmen, tanners, and blacksmiths. They were the first strikes that had taken place in Rome.

Citizen *Marx* reported that the new Polish section had accepted the alterations made in their rules, and had given a satisfactory explanation of the paragraph relative to the use of false names.\* It had reference only to the publication of documents, etc., and was only to be used for purposes of propaganda in Poland and Galicia.

He also reported that the sub-committee\*\* had carefully gone through a complete copy of the rules of the Federal Council, and they had found that, with the slight alterations suggested the previous week, they would be in accordance [with] the General Statutes—with the exception of the rule which proposed to give the Federal Council power to add to its number.\*\*\* That the Committee had struck out, and it was proposed that the rules should be accepted and the Federal Council recognised upon conditions, 1st, That the alterations made by the Committee be accepted, 2nd, That those members of the Federal Com-

---

\* See p. 73 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Appointed to examine the rules.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See p. 76 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

"THE RIGHT TO LIVE BY LABOUR."

International Working Men's Association.

Middlesbrough Section. *No 5*

OBJECTS :

To unite in one Fraternal Bond the Workers of all Countries, and to secure to them the full results of their Labours.

The abolition of all Class rule, and of all Class privileges.

This is to Certify that *Citizen Tho Whalley*  
was enrolled a member of this section *Sept 20<sup>th</sup> 1871*

*Michael McGilky* Secretary.

JOHN HALES, General Secretary.

MEETING NIGHTS EVERY EVENING.

"EQUAL RIGHTS AND EQUAL DUTIES."

J. GOULD, PRINTER.

Membership card of the Middlesbrough section of the International belonging to Thomas Whalley

mittee who were upon the Council of the Universal Republican League should be invited by the Federal [Committee] to choose as to which Council they would belong to, 3rd, That the members who had been added since the recognition of the Provisional Federal Committee—who had no powers of delegation—should be struck off the Council.

The first was necessary to make the rules accord with the General Statutes. The second was necessary as the Universal Republican League was a rival association, and some of its members were continually attacking the [International] Association; it would therefore be necessary to prevent the names of a possibly antagonistic association appearing as names of office-bearers in the International. The third was necessary because the action taken in electing those who had no delegation was illegal.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he should like to know to what the proposition amounted.

Citizen *Marx* said two questions had to be decided. The legality of the rules, and the composition of the Council.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he rose to higher ground than mere personality. He objected to the original formation of the so-called Federal Council. He should be glad to shake hands with the men who had been working to make it a success, but he could not recognise anything that had been done illegally. The disputes and contentions that had taken place would never have occurred if the Secretary had done his duty like a man. He could not be a party to making Citizen Chaddock a scapegoat, he had nothing to say against him.

Citizen *Boon* would propose that no recognition be given to anybody calling themselves either the British Federal Council or London Federal Committee until the resolutions of the Conference\* had been complied with. He thought

---

\* The London Conference of 1871.—*Ed.*

nothing could be done with the rules until the composition of the body forming the rules had been dealt with—perhaps different men would make different rules. The Secretary himself had admitted he had only consulted his own friends in forming the so-called Council.

Citizen *Harris* seconded; he did not belong to any clique, but he did complain of the Secretary's illegality. The National Reform League,<sup>74</sup> which was a branch of the International and represented on the General Council by Citizen Milner, was not even informed of the intention to form a Federal Council, and he claimed as a right that every member of the Council ought to have been informed of any movement for that purpose.

Citizen *Engels* read the Conference resolution and pointed out that the Conference charged the branches to proceed to the formation of a Federal Council upon the invitations of the General Council. No doubt some irregularities had been committed in the first instance, but they had been overlooked when the Council first gave its recognition. It must be remembered that no other attempt had been made to extend the organisation in Britain. It was useless quarrelling over what had been done; besides, a number of the largest branches had given in their adhesion.

Citizen *Eccarius* suggested as a way out of the difficulty that the present Federal Committee be considered as a provisional body and that it should summon all the branches and affiliated societies to send delegates who should form the Federal Council.

Citizen *Serraillier* said the Council had twice decided to recognise the Federal Council—first when it accepted the delegates—secondly when it referred the rules to the Sub-Committee.\* If there were only three branches when the resolution was carried by the Conference, then it lay with three to carry out the resolution.

---

\* See pp. 32 and 73-74 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Mottershead* said it was a question of good faith; the Secretary only invited the friends when he proposed to form the Federal Council.

Citizen *Jung* said he believed the Secretary had acted quite legally, but he did not say anything about the discretion he had exercised.

Citizen *Bradnick* said the men who had worked hard to do something for the Association had been continually thwarted by those who cared more for some other movement than they did for the International.

Citizen *Cournet* said as no new arguments had been adduced he hoped the vote would be taken.

Citizen *Boon* said it was admitted that the Secretary had acted illegally and they were asked to condone that illegality. They who opposed would never consent to do so, if beaten they should take the matter outside.

Citizen *Boon's* amendment was then put to the vote when there were 7 for it, 11 against; the proposition was then put and carried by 11 to 2.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he wished publicly to withdraw every word he had uttered in disparagement in times past of Citizen *Applegarth*. At the Mayor's\* banquet in Nottingham *Applegarth* spoke out nobly in defence of the Association when it required some moral courage to do so.<sup>75</sup> He recanted everything he had said against him—he did so because it would be necessary for some of the citizens to reconsider their position after the vote just passed and it was probable he should not attend again.

A. SERRAILLIER, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

---

\* Ward's.—Ed.

**MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\***

*Held January 23, 1872<sup>76</sup>*

Citizen *Serraillier* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Bradnick, Boon, Cournet, Ecarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Jung, Law, Lessner, Le Moussu, Longuet, Marx, Martin, Margueritte, Mayo, Mottershead, Pfänder, Ranvier, Roach, Regis, Rochat, Wolfers, Yarrow, Applegarth, Townshend* and *Barry*.

After the reading of the Minutes had been finished by the *Secretary*\*\* and before a proposition was made to confirm them, Citizen *Mottershead* rose to make a statement; he said that he hoped that with the vote of the previous week, fighting would have ceased; he knew that it must end some time, and he thought it ought to have ended then, but the Secretary had made a charge against his private character, he had called him a forger. He demanded that the Secretary should at once retract what he said, or prove his words, it was impossible to rest under such a charge.

Citizen *Hales* said: to save the time of the Council he would propose "That a Committee be appointed to investigate the charges made by *Mottershead* against *Hales*, and by *Hales* against *Mottershead*"; he desired that the whole question should be gone into.

Citizen *Mottershead* had no objection to a Committee being appointed to settle questions of political morality, but he would not consent to a Committee interfering in matters affecting his private character.

Citizen *Cournet* said that the dispute referred to by *Mottershead* occurred after the Council sitting, and he thought

---

\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 366-71 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* *Hales*.—*Ed.*

the Council had nothing to do with it, but if it must be dealt with, he should vote for the proposition of Hales.

Citizen *Hales* said it was either Council business, or it was not; if it was, the Council could best deal with [it] by appointing a Committee, if it was not Council business, it ought not to have been brought before it.

Citizen *Mottershead*: it was impossible for him to allow the Committee to deal with a charge affecting his private character; he proposed that the Secretary be called upon to prove or retract what he had said, his honour was at stake.

Citizen *Marx* said Citizen Mottershead was not consistent; for if it was not business that could be dealt with by a Sub-Committee of the Council, it could not be dealt with by the Council. It was not logical to appeal to the Council and then object to the Council deciding to deal with it in its own way. It could not be dealt with there and then, as it required investigation to come to a decision. Further discussion would only hinder business—there was no question of honour in the matter, it was a question of fact.

Citizen *Boon* believed Mottershead's honour was at stake, and that of every other member of the Council; it was monstrous that a man should be denounced as a forger simply because he thought fit to differ from the Secretary—perhaps he might be attacked next and denounced; it was a question that affected the honour of every member—nobody knew who might be attacked next. He seconded the proposition of Mottershead.

Citizen *Roach* seconded the proposition of Hales, as he thought the Council had a right to proceed in its own way, the subject having been brought before it.

Citizen *Engels* said that Boon's demand to have the question settled at once was asking that the Council should proceed by Drumhead Court Martial instead of by ordinary tribunal; it was a matter that required evidence before it

could be decided upon, and could be done better in [a] Sub-Committee.

Citizen *Bradnick* did not see that any question of honour was involved; according to every code, a man was presumed to be innocent until he was proved to be guilty.

Citizen *Ranvier* was of the same opinion as *Bradnick*; nobody was held to be guilty until proved to be so. He asked how Continentals could express an opinion upon a matter when they had not heard the evidence.

Citizen *Mottershead* said the matter affected his personal honour, and he held that every man was the best judge of his own honour, he was of his. He would demand that the Secretary should either retract or affirm what he had said.

Citizen *Boon* said it was impossible [that] the rest of the members could sit at the same board with both *Mottershead* and *Hales*, one certainly did not deserve a seat on the Council.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he should press his question, he would demand that the Secretary should prove or retract, or he should take measures elsewhere—he demanded a public apology.

Citizen *Hales* said he should refuse to answer any questions relative to private business that did not occur during the Council sittings. He believed what he had said about *Mottershead* was true. If the Sub-Committee decided that he had libelled *Mottershead* he would apologise publicly, but not without.

Citizen *Applegarth* said he believed that *Mottershead* was the victim of a slanderer, who did not sit on that Council.

The question was then put to the vote and the proposition of Citizen *Hales* to refer the matter to a Committee was carried by a large majority. Citizens *Longuet*, *Yarrow* and *Milner* were the citizens appointed.

Citizen *Marx* announced that a Congress had been held

at Chemnitz in Saxony at which 120 delegates were present representing 60 towns. It had in its secret sittings passed a resolution unanimously in favour of the principles of the Association, and approving of the Congress resolutions.<sup>77</sup>

Citizen *Engels* reported that he had received a letter from Turin enclosing 20 francs, being a contribution for part of the members of the section; it was hoped to soon send the contribution for those members who were not present. He also reported that the Italian papers were printing *canards* relative to the Association and its doings; two he read as samples.<sup>78</sup>

Citizen *Jung* reported that he had received the rules of a section in Zurich—and he should hand them over to the Sub-Committee.

Citizen *Marx* reported that he had received a translation of the General Rules from the Secretary of the section at Amsterdam\* and a copy of the rules of the Dutch Federal Council.<sup>79</sup>

Citizen *Serrailier* reported that he had received letters from France. The movement was progressing, especially in the South, where the trades were sending delegates to form Federal Councils; he had the names of one section or Council, which he read, with a statement of the societies and a number of men the different delegates represented.

Citizen *Hales* reported that the Liverpool branch was progressing favourably, and that several new branches were being organised. He had also received letters from each of the Federal Committees of America.<sup>80</sup>

Citizen *Eccarius* reported that he had received news of the death of Citizen Gregory, one of the most active members of the Association in the United States. Several of the sections in New York had held a Conference to

---

\* Gerhard.—Ed.

discuss several propositions of a Communistic nature which it was proposed to make the basis of an agitation.<sup>81</sup>

The *Secretary* read a letter purporting to be from the German Working Men's Society,\* which stated that Citizen Rühl had been removed from the office of delegate.

Citizen Rühl asked the Secretary if the communication bore the stamp of the Association.

The *Secretary* replying no; it was proposed and seconded that the Council proceed to the order of the day.

Citizen *Frankel* said the parties who had sent the letter had proposed that the society in question should no longer belong to the Association, but were defeated; since then they had done everything to sow discord.<sup>82</sup>

Citizen *Jung* said: during the late war\*\* the parties in question wanted the German Society to declare in favour of Germany.<sup>83</sup>

Citizen *Eccarius* said: before the French Revolution\*\*\* they had accumulated 600 volumes of books in the German Society and went along very comfortable until the new element entered which did nothing but created discord. Unable to bear it any longer, the majority removed the Society and the property to another place, where the dissentients could not interfere with them—hence the present action.

The proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Bradnick* asked if the Press Committee was ready to report.<sup>84</sup>

Citizen *Boon* replied that the Committee could not report as the person who knew about the affair had left England; he had seen the person in question who told him he had paid money, but wouldn't say who—he shielded himself by saying he had given his word of honour not to tell.

---

\* The German Workers' Educational Association in London.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Franco-Prussian war.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* The Paris Commune.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Serraillier* asked if there was any report from the House Committee.\*

It appeared there was not.

Citizen *Harris* asked if the Association had made Sir Charles Dilke an honorary member; he saw the report in *Reynolds's [News]paper*; if it was not true, it ought to be contradicted.

The *Secretary* said it was not true, but it had been contradicted a fortnight ago—when the report first appeared\*\*; he didn't see the use of continually answering *canards*.

Citizen *Bradnick* asked when Boon was going to bring on his motion relative to the Secretary.

Citizen *Boon* replied as soon as he got a chance; he was quite ready and intended to proceed with it on the first opportunity.

Citizen *Engels* proposed that the matter stand over until the Committee which had just been appointed gave in its report.

Citizen *Marx* said: if no special circumstances had arisen, those who were opposed to the Secretary and his manner of performing his duties could oppose his. . .\*\*\*

Citizen *Hales* said he should like the matter to be definitely settled, as it was very unpleasant to have a motion hanging over from week to week.

Citizen *Lessner* seconded the proposition of Citizen *Engels*.

Citizen *Cournet* said that [at] every sitting two or three hours were lost in personal quarrels—he thought it would be a good thing if a permanent Committee could be appointed to take cognizance of all such differences.

---

\* See p. 45 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 48 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* The Minutes break off here.—*Ed.*

The proposition was carried unanimously.<sup>85</sup>

The Council adjourned at 11.15.

A. SERRAILLIER, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

### COUNCIL MEETING\*

*Held January 30th, 1872<sup>86</sup>*

Citizen *Serraillier* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Boon, Barry, Cournet, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Jung, Keen, Le Moussu, Lessner, Longuet, Lochner, Marx, Martin, Mayo, Margueritte, Milner, Mottershead, Pfänder, Ranvier, Rochat, Regis, Rühl, Serraillier, Taylor, Townshend, Wolfers* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Marx* reported that the Rules Committee had examined the rules of the Dutch Federal Council and of the Zurich section, and it found both of them in accordance with the General Statutes. He therefore proposed that they be accepted.\*\*

The proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* also reported that an international combination of manufacturers had been projected [in] Berlin. In its articles it declared that "one of its functions shall be to spy into the action and working of the International Working Men's Association and give reports thereon to the Government, to act upon hints given by the Government relative to the Association, and to execute such measures against it as the Government may officially demand". The

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 372-77 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 86 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

organ of the *Bourse* in Berlin\* in commenting upon this proposal said the success of the movement is impossible, as no Association which thus declares itself a police agency will ever obtain the confidence of the working class.

Citizen *Engels* reported that he had received the rules of the Milan section and had found them in accordance with the General Statutes. He proposed that they be adopted.<sup>87</sup>

Citizen *Regis* seconded and it was carried unanimously.

He [Engels] also reported that the remainder of the Turin contribution had not yet come to hand.\*\* He also reported news from Spain, a new section had been formed in Barcelona composed of commercial clerks. They desired to open up communications with all other sections of commercial clerks with a view to organising a movement to improve their condition.<sup>88</sup> With respect to general matters the whole attention of the members of the Association in Spain was occupied with the Government measures to put down the International. Segnor Sagasta, the Prime Minister, had sent a circular to the Governors of the Provinces informing them that while the rights of public meeting and of free speech were to be maintained inviolate in general cases, they were not to be allowed in the case of the International, as it was an Association antagonistic to all law and order. The members of the Association had a perfect right to hold the opinions they did but not to express them. For them to do so would be equivalent to the commencement of a revolution. The first action of the sections in Madrid was at once to summon a public meeting to decide upon the course to be pursued in the matter. He did not [know] whether it had been held as yet. Though there could be no mistake as to the intention of the Government, in the matter, no action had been taken as

---

\* *Berliner Börsen-Courier*.—Ed.

\*\* See p. 86 of the present volume.—Ed.

yet. That, though, might be owing to the dissolution of the *Cortes*, that dissolution was considered by the radicals a *coup d'état*; and the general impression prevailed that the people would not proceed to the election, but that blows would ensue. The International was considering what action it should take under the circumstances; for though it has made a practice to abstain from politics hitherto, it finds itself compelled to act politically as well as socially—in fact it thoroughly recognises the principle laid down in the Conference resolutions that the political and social questions are indissoluble.<sup>89</sup>

Citizen *Frankel* announced that the last number of the *Volkswille*<sup>90</sup> had been seized on account of an article in it from the pen of Louise Michel. The Editor Neumayer had been arrested upon a charge of high treason and owing to the persecutions he had received he had become insane.

Citizen *Hales* announced that he had received a letter from Australia asking for information relative to the Association.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he had received a letter from Sorge asking him to send 1,000 stamps, 2,000 copies of the Rules in German and 200 in French; he also complained of a secretary being appointed for a distinct nationality—when all nationalities were represented on the Federal Council of States; the Federal Council also objected to the General Council corresponding direct with American sections, instead of through the Federal Council.<sup>91</sup>

Citizen *Serrailier* reported that a meeting of republicans had been held at Limoges to establish a branch of the Association; a letter which he had written was read, and the Conference resolutions,\* after which it was unanimously voted that the branch should be established and that it adhered to the Conference resolutions in their integrity;

---

\* The resolutions of the London Conference of 1871.—*Ed.*

a section in the South of France, the delegates of which represented over 400 members, had declared its approval of paragraph 16 of the Conference resolutions.<sup>92</sup> This showed that the assertion of the Swiss dissentients that they had the South of France with them was not true. Everywhere in the South of France the most cordial approval was given to the programme of the Council.

Citizen *Engels* said that the party had just been to the door who brought the note on the previous meeting-night which purported to come from the German Society; he told him there was no answer.

Citizen *Barry* reported as one of the House Committee he had found a room which he thought would be suitable for the Council—the rent would be 10 pounds per year for one night; it was connected with a school and was at the back of the National Gallery—near to Trafalgar Square.

Citizen *Martin* said he had some rooms in Rathbone Place which he thought would suit the Council.

It was proposed, seconded and carried that Citizens Jung and Taylor should go and visit the rooms mentioned and report at the next meeting.

Citizen *Eccarius* pointed out that a month's notice must be given before the Council could leave its present rooms, and as the month was just out he proposed that a month's notice be given at once.

Citizen *Lessner* seconded and it was carried.

Citizen *Boon* reported on behalf of the Press Committee: the Committee had not been able to get any further with its inquiries owing to the fact that Ory, who was the man supposed to know about the matter, had left England.\* The Committee had ascertained that a member of the Council had furnished a report to an American paper\*\*

---

\* See p. 87 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* *The World*.—*Ed.*

which was a truthful one, and he thought the member he alluded to, Citizen Eccarius, would be able to give a satisfactory explanation with regard to it.

Citizen *Jung*, as a member of the Press Committee, thought there ought to have been another meeting to adopt a report before one was brought up; he differed from the report given in. He had grave doubts as to how far any member was at liberty to furnish a report even to an American journal—but there could not be any doubt that Eccarius had acted very wrong in so sending a report that it could get transcribed as it had been into the *Scotsman*, for it was a fact that the *Scotsman* report was based upon the American one.\*

Citizen *Marx* said Eccarius had admitted to having sent the American report, which was a blunder which ought not to have been committed.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he had furnished nothing that was to be kept secret, and he only furnished it upon condition that nothing relative to it should appear in the English press. He thought it would not appear until the matter had been published. He might mention that the sum he received was exactly the same as what he received from the same paper for his other articles, and the one referred to was an article and not a report.

Citizen *Le Moussu* said he considered that furnishing a report of the character as that under discussion was selling the secrets of the Council.

Citizen *Keen* said there were other reports that ought to be dealt with; he would ask if any member present wrote the letter to the *Eastern Post* signed "a Contributor".<sup>93</sup>

Citizen *Mottershead* said the writing of that letter was a dirty trick, and the fellow who wrote [it] would certainly not own to it.

---

\* See p. 40 of the present volume.—Ed.

Citizen *Harris* said the report might have been furnished by others than *Eccarius*; he understood that there were other reports.

Citizen *Eccarius* said Gerard said that three other reports were to follow Ory's, so it was a clear proof others were to follow.

Citizen *Boon* said Ory told him he had paid a larger sum than £2 for a report, but not to either Hales or *Eccarius*.

Citizen *Keen* would ask through the chair if Citizen *Barry* wrote the letter he referred to in the *Eastern Post*.

Citizen *Barry* said he should decline to answer any question put [by] an individual member, but he would supply any information the Council might ask for.

Citizen *Engels* said he could not permit the question to pass without any expression of opinion; though *Eccarius* was an old friend of his, he proposed that the Council disapprove of the action of *Eccarius* in having furnished a report to the American press of the proceedings of the Conference.

Citizen *Mottershead* said that he thought it would not be fair to condemn an old servant and valuable worker over a matter like that; he thought publicity in the press was the best thing for the progress of the Association. He proposed as an amendment: That the Committee having failed to find out who received the £10 from Ory—the Council proceed to the order of the day. He had seen three other reports which Ory had shown to him, neither of which were written by *Eccarius*.

Citizen *Yarrow* seconded.

Citizens *Milner*, *Martin*, *Le Moussu* and\* spoke in favour of the original resolution and Citizens *Boon*, *Harris*, *Mottershead* and *Barry* in favour of the amendment.

---

\* Further the name "Barry" is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

On being put to the vote, 8 voted for the amendment, 16 against; on the original resolution 20 voted for, 7 against.

A letter was read from Ogilvy, after which the Council adjourned at 11.30.

A. SERRAILLIER, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

*Held February 5th,\*\* 1872<sup>94</sup>*

Citizen *Serraillier* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Boon, Bradnick, Eccarius, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Jung, Keen, Lessner, Le Moussu, Lochner, Marx, Martin, Mayo, Murray, Milner, Pfänder, Roach, Rühl, Serraillier, Taylor, Townshend, Wróblewski, Yarrow, Longuet, and Barry.*

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Marx* proposed and Citizen *Bradnick* seconded that the regulation relating to the non-admission of strangers be made absolute in all cases.

It was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* said he had received a letter from an old Chartist who was in America, in which he asked for information relative to a certain English Republican, who was thought to be very intimate with Prince Napoleon; a cutting was enclosed from the *New York World* in which the reporter described an interview he had with the Prince, and stated that he was accompanied by one of the leading Republicans.<sup>95</sup> The context which followed after clearly showed that Bradlaugh was the person referred to.

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 377-84 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* Should be "6th".—*Ed.*

Citizen *Marx* also called attention to the fact that Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc had become Bonapartist agents and had recently published a pamphlet in furtherance of their designs. The title was *L'Empire et la France Nouvelle*<sup>96</sup>; in it they stated that they no longer belonged to the International as they were convinced that not that but Imperialism was the only thing that could save France, and they appealed to the workmen of France to assist them in trying to restore the Empire. These men had belonged to the party in the International who preached abstention from politics, and that abstention had borne its fruits in making them imperialists. The same doctrine had influenced others, too, for the Bonapartist reaction was rapidly extending, and unless the workmen roused themselves from their present lethargy, they would find themselves again under the rule of the author of the *coup d'état*.\* He should have proposed the expulsion of the two men mentioned; only as they declared that they no longer belonged to the International, he considered it was unnecessary. They had visited London for the purpose of seeing Bastelica.

The rules of a newly formed French section were sent in to the Council for ratification, and were referred to the Rules Committee.<sup>97</sup>

A deputation from the French refugees here entered the room for the purpose of soliciting the Council to render further help to the men.

Citizen *Naze* stated the object of the deputation; he said that the French Government was landing men on the English shores every day with scarcely any clothes to wear and absolutely penniless, and the refugees here in London were in despair. They had no funds, and did not know what to do. The Council had collected money for them

---

\* Napoleon III.—*Ed.*

and had given them from 5 to 10 pounds per week until a week ago and now that had fallen off. He urgently entreated the Council to make fresh efforts, and see if it could not do something more for them. There were 75 men needing assistance, the women and children making the number up to 102, and the number was likely to be doubled by the action of the French Government.

The Federal Council of Switzerland had remonstrated with the French Government for sending men into their territory.<sup>98</sup> Perhaps something might be done here, in the same direction.

Citizen *Jung* said: of late the Council had done nothing for the refugees. What had been done had been done by a few gentlemen like Stepney and Allsop, who had been soliciting aid from their friends; but the Council had done much previously and he was desirous that the refugee account should be audited so that those who said the Council had done nothing might see what really had been done; personally he had done everything he could, principally in trying to find work for the men, but they did not always look after it so promptly as they ought to have done, they ought immediately to seize every opportunity that presented itself and they ought, besides, to put themselves in communication with him when they got work. He had sent 11 men to Middlesbrough to work found by our Secretary there, and he was confident the men were well treated. Yet not one of them had written, and the consequence was the most absurd stories were afloat respecting them. On seeing the action taken by the Swiss Government he had immediately written to Dilke and Harrison asking them if Thiers had a right to send men over here to fill English prisons, for the men could not starve and would be compelled to steal if they could not get work.

Citizen *Marx* said something must be done immediately to push on the Government, but he thought it ought to

be done outside the Council, for, while the Council had been doing all that it possibly could, it had received nothing but calumnies in return. He thought the accounts ought to be audited and then it could be seen what the Council had done; he thought the Council had done its share, and now somebody outside the Council should take the matter up and see what further could be done. Of course, members of the Council individually must continue to do all they could.

Citizen *Martin* said he thought the Council ought not to form a Committee, but at the same time it ought to give as much publicity as possible and get in as much money as possible.

Citizen *Frankel* agreed with Citizen Marx. He thought that each Secretary might appeal to his own section and the English members might organise a Conference to take the matter into consideration.

Citizen *Wolfers* thought what money came in should be distributed by the Council as the refugees often changed their officers.

Citizen *Barry* said: as the Council had acquired some influence, it might be a question as to how far it would be advantageous to give that influence up.

Citizen *Jung* thought it would not be of any use sending appeals to all the sections. A fresh appeal might be made to America.<sup>99</sup>

Citizen *Hales* proposed that a Sub-Committee be appointed to take the matter into consideration.

Citizen *Jung* should like the accounts audited, he thought auditors should be appointed in the first instance.

It was proposed, seconded, and carried that auditors be appointed and Citizens Roach, Taylor, and Wolfers were appointed.

Citizen *Jung* then said it [was] necessary something should be voted to the refugees.

Citizen *Hales* proposed and Citizen *Lessner* seconded

that 5 pounds be voted for the refugees. Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Jung* said: in reference to the question of future action there were two ways of acting on the Government—one was by getting some member to interrogate the Government in the House, the other was to appoint a deputation to wait upon the Foreign Secretary.\*

Citizen *Harris* was in favour of a deputation.

Citizen *Hales* repeated his proposition for a Sub-Committee, he thought that the best way of dealing with the question.

Citizen *Taylor* seconded; carried unanimously.

Citizen *Jung* thought it should consist of all the English members and such Continentals as liked to attend.

This was agreed to and a meeting was fixed for the next evening at Citizen Martin's, 38, Rathbone Place, Oxford Street.

Citizen *Longuet* said the Committee appointed to report upon the charges of Mottershead against Hales and Hales against Mottershead\*\* had arrived at conclusions. The report had been drawn up by Citizen Yarrow and he and Citizen Milner agree to it. As it was late, he proposed that it should be read, and then adjourned.

Citizen *Yarrow* read the report, which expressed no opinion upon the questions at issue.

Citizen *Harris* proposed the report be received.

Citizen *Barry* seconded.

Citizen *Hales* objected upon the ground that there was a mistake in the report as to fact.

Citizen *Taylor* proposed and Citizen *Bradnick* seconded that the question be adjourned until the next meeting.

Citizen *Harris* said: as the facts were disputed he would consent to the adjournment and withdrew his motion.

---

\* Granville.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 85 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Eccarius* then read the following protest which he desired to be inserted in the Minutes.\*

#### PROTEST

I protest against the vote of condemnation passed upon me by the majority of the members of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, present at the sitting of the Council on January 30, 1872, for the following reasons:

1. Because the vote was urged on before the Committee of Inquiry had delivered its joint report.

2. Because no notice has been taken of the printed report, which was in the hands of Citizen Jung for three months, and which contains incontrovertible evidence that, notwithstanding the injunction that the Conference must be kept secret as publicity might endanger the safe return of the Continental delegates, Secretary Hales betrayed the secret to an unknown man and introduced him into the house where the Conference held its sittings to interview the delegates, the result of which [was] that reports of the holding and purport of the Conference appeared in the English papers before any of the delegates had departed.

3. Because it is in the highest degree inconsistent, unjust and partial, on the one hand, to condemn the man who—after all the delegates had safely reached home—published a faithful and favourable summary of the proceedings of the Conference, who by a deliberate and unanimous vote had decided that the bulk of its resolutions should be published; and, on the other hand, never so much as to question the man's doings who betrayed the Conference while in session and introducing a stranger

---

\* Further the text of the protest written in *Eccarius's* hand is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

who came with the avowed purpose of immediately communicating to the public press whatever he might learn and who made scandal out of it.

J. GEORGE ECCARIUS

February 6th, 1872

Citizen *Hales* gave notice of motion that the Council take into consideration the conduct of the person who had sat at the Board for the purpose of taking notes, with which to supply press reports for money.

Citizen *Harris* asked Citizen Keen if he knew anything of the reasons which excluded a certain letter from the *Eastern Post* which had been sent to that journal and which he understood fully exposed the conduct of a certain official of the Council.

Citizen *Keen* said he was not the Editor, but the Manager, and he knew nothing of the letter in question. Many letters came to the office which he did not see, and he supposed that was one.

Citizen *Barry* said he wished to make a statement in reference to the question put by Citizen Keen at the previous meeting\*; he should have answered the question at the time, but he thought it would be impolitic as there was another question before the meeting which might have been prejudiced by his statement, and in this he had acted under the advice of some influential members of the Council. In fact he had acted upon the advice of those influential members throughout the affair to which he was going to refer, namely, about sending reports to the press. He had sent one report to the press for which he had been paid, and only one—that was the one announcing the refusal of the proceeds of Bradlaugh's lecture, and he sent that one for three reasons—first because he wished

---

\* See p. 94 of the present volume.—Ed.

to raise the opinion of the public with respect to the Council. Secondly, to raise the Council itself, and, thirdly, to deal a blow at Bradlaugh. He had made no profit out of the matter, for he had handed over the proceeds for the benefit of the refugees. Throughout the matter he had acted upon the advice and recommendation of the influential members to whom he had referred; they were privy to the affair from beginning to end; there was no secret in the matter, and in what he had done, he had only tried to serve the cause.

Citizen *Jung* said Citizen Barry said that he had sent the reports by the advice of the influential members; he wished that to be taken down as he had a different impression upon the matter.

Citizen *Barry* said he did not say that he had sent the report by the advice of those members, but that he had withheld the knowledge of the fact from the rest of the Council by their advice.

Citizen *Jung* desired that to be taken down though he understood differently—even upon that question.

Citizen *Hales* said [that] after the statement made he should alter his notice of motion. He would give notice that he should move that Citizen Barry be expelled from the Council, as having been guilty of the conduct of a spy.

The Council adjourned at 11.40.\*

Citizen *Harris* questioned the accuracy of the report.

Citizen *Barry* also stated that the Minutes were inaccurate so far as his speech was concerned; he did not say that he had sent the report under advice—but withheld from Keen the reply because of his proximity to a certain individual; he acted on his own responsibility in sending report.

The *Chairman* thought Barry spoke as reported. He also

---

\* Below is an addition inserted in the Minutes when they were being confirmed at the next Council meeting.—*Ed.*

wished to state in reference to Eccarius's protest that he did not withhold the printed matter from the Committee.

*Harris* said he had seen it and he had told *Boon* that he could have it at the next meeting of the Committee or before if he would call for it, but he did not call for it, and the Committee had not held another meeting; it was not true that the printed matter was withheld.

H. JUNG, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF MEETING\*

*Held February 13th, 1872*<sup>100</sup>

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Boon, Bradnick, Cournot, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Jung, Lessner, Le Moussu, Marx, Martin, Mayo, Margueritte, Murray, Milner, Pfänder, Rochat, Ranvier, Serraillier, Taylor, Townshend, Wolfers, Yarrow* and *Barry*.

The *Secretary*\*\* having read the Minutes of the previous meeting, Citizens *Harris* and *Barry* said the Minutes were not correct, Citizen *Barry* saying that the misrepresentation in his case was not unintentional.

The Minutes were confirmed after the explanations were entered.

The *Secretary* reported that a branch had been formed at *Dundee*, and one at *Hinckley* in *Leicestershire*—branches were also in process of formation in *Sunderland* and *Woolwich*.<sup>101</sup>

He also communicated a letter from a gentleman named *Riley*, stating that a journal was to be started on the first

\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 385-90 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* *Hales.—Ed.*

of March to be called the *International*,\* and the offer was made to the Council of one column to one page to be used as it might deem fit, the Council in return being asked to push the circulation.

It was decided that Citizen Engels should visit the writer, and ascertain further particulars before the Council decided upon the matter.<sup>102</sup>

A letter from the National Sunday League was read announcing that the month's notice had been received and accepted.

Citizen *Marx* reported that he had received a letter from Berlin announcing the receipt of the General Statutes (German edition). The Federal Council had already appointed a Committee of Statistics. It also expressed its readiness to pay its contributions by the date fixed in the Conference resolution, viz., March 1st.<sup>103</sup> He thought it would be necessary to extend the time for payment of contributions, otherwise the object in passing that resolution would be defeated. Through some cause or another the stamps had been 4 months in hand, and many sections had not yet received them. It would therefore be impossible to take a census of the members in time. He would propose that the time for paying the general contributions be extended to the 1st of July this year.

Citizen *Serraillier* seconded.

Citizen *Engels* supported; the Spanish members had not yet received their stamps.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* also communicated the following which he had received from Geneva.\*\*

The news from Switzerland was of a peculiarly interesting character. The house of Citizen Outline, member of the International

---

\* *The International Herald*.—Ed.

\*\* Here a clipping from *The Eastern Post* is pasted into the Minute Book.—Ed.

and late Editor of the *Egalité* of Geneva, has been searched on the demand of the Russian police. The Russian Government, being aware that Russian notes were forged in several places of Western Europe, sent out a Councillor of State, Mr. Kamensky, to trace the forgers. True to the customs of his Country, Kamensky, instead of prosecuting the forgers, made common cause with them, and is now himself "wanted" by the magistrates of Iverdun, in Switzerland. Having induced the Swiss authorities to undertake the prosecution of Kamensky, the Russian Government thought it might as well avail itself of the opportunity to get a little political information. Consequently, the Russian Chancellery of St. Petersburg wrote direct to the magistrates of Iverdun, saying that they had reasons to believe that Citizen Outine was implicated in those forgeries, and that if his premises were searched proofs would be forthcoming. Now, though this demand, to be legal, would have to be communicated by the Russian Embassy to the Federal Government, and from them to their own magistrates, accompanied by such instructions as might be necessary, the magistrate of Iverdun took it upon himself to carry out this utterly illegal demand. He went to Geneva, obtained the aid of the authorities there, and the Republican magistrates proceeded to seize all Outine's papers. The search took three full days, all letters in Russian, German and English were examined by a Russian translator, who, it was supposed, was an agent of the Russian Government, for even his name was withheld. After this lengthy and arduous enquiry, the authorities had to withdraw, crest-fallen, and acknowledge that there was not the slightest particle of truth in the allegations that had been made. Nevertheless, Citizen Outine's whole correspondence and papers had been scrutinised, not only by the Republican tools of the Russian Government, but also by the mysterious Russian translator, whose name could not be given, why, it is easy to imagine, it would not do to publish the names of spies. The whole affair from the beginning to end was too transparent. The Russian Government had an obvious interest in finding out Outine's correspondents in Russia, hence the false, frivolous and absurd charge of forgery. The Swiss magistrates, one of whom is a French nobleman, may, on the other hand, be well excused for a little curiosity as to the alleged secret doings of the International, and they thought Outine's papers would prove a mine in that respect. Thus two birds could be killed with one stone. Unfortunately the whole affair from beginning to end was a failure. The Russian correspondence proved to consist of nothing but family letters, and the International papers only consisted of matters with which the public were well acquainted through its organs. So the matter ended in a sad disappointment for the curious, in a deep

stain upon the Republican escutcheon of Switzerland, and in an humble apology to Citizen Outine.\*

He also stated that the Editor-in-Chief of the Socialist organ in Denmark\*\* had been on a visit to Geneva where he had made great complaints of the neglect of the Danish Secretary in not corresponding regularly. He knew nothing as to the truth of the complaint, he only reported it.

Citizen *Harris* said he believed Mottershead had acted up [to] his duty, he complained that he could not get replies when he wrote.

Citizen *Marx* proposed the following instructions to the Belgian Secretary\*\*\*:

[First]. That he ask the Belgian Federal Council to acknowledge the receipt of 200 copies of the General Rules in French.

Second. That he ask the Federal Council how many stamps would be required for the section, and point out to it that the Belgians were more strongly represented on the London Conference than any other section, and that it could not therefore escape its liability with respect to the Conference and its resolutions.

Third. To ask if the *Liberté*<sup>104</sup> is considered to be the official organ of the Belgian Federal Council.

The latter was necessary inasmuch as the matters relating to the General Council were not fairly noted in that journal, while prominence was given to every little affair concerning the Swiss dissentients.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Citizen *Serraillier* reported that the movement was progressing satisfactorily in Paris, the sections were reorganising; he had received a letter from an old member of

---

\* The newspaper clipping ends here. For the text of the General Council's declaration see pp. 111-12 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Louis Pio, the editor of *Socialisten*.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Evidently to Rochat, Secretary *pro tem*.—*Ed.*

the old Federal Council; of course, great care had to be exercised.

He had also received a letter from a person who stated that he had been delegated by some Paris workmen to make himself acquainted with the General Council; he made an appointment to meet him, but the appointment was not kept; he then went to the address he gave—which he found to be the house of a member of the old French branch,<sup>105</sup> and as he was not in, he left his card but still he had not heard from him. He believed his message had been withheld.

In Avignon the movement was steadily progressing; a working man had been elected to the municipality.

The Federal Council of Bordeaux had declared its adherence to the\* General Council.

He had also received a letter from an old correspondent at Brest, giving some interesting details concerning the prisoners confined there.

He had received from Algeria no less than three letters; the old section was composed of police agents and bourgeoisie, so it had been necessary to dissolve it—that was done and it was now reconstituted.

Citizen *Bradnick* reported that the Federal Council had unanimously voted its adherence to the [London] Conference resolutions.

Citizen *Engels* reported that things in the Spanish sections remained unaltered, no action had been taken upon Sagasta's circular.\*\* Nevertheless the section of Madrid had issued a manifesto announcing its determination to maintain its rights by force of arms if it was not allowed to meet peaceably; from Italy there was nothing new.

Citizen *Frankel* announced that the Society of Freedom\*\*\* had been dissolved in Vienna upon the plea that

---

\* Further the words "Rules of the" are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 90 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* *Freiheit*.—*Ed.*

it was in correspondence with the Socialists of other parts of Europe. The *Volkswille* was not allowed to enter Hungary, and the workmen were being tyrannised over by the inspector of police named Thaisz.

Citizen *Harris* asked that the Refugees' [Committee] might make a report.

The *Chairman* stated that the matter had passed out of the hands of the Council; it would be insulting to those outside the Council, if it were again to take the matter out of their hands.

It was asked if the House Committee had a report.

No report was given.

Citizen *Serrailier* asked urgency for a motion of order. He proposed that a Judicial Committee be appointed, to which all personal questions and matters relating thereto should be referred. That it should have full powers to decide upon all questions brought before it and pass judgement and that there should not be any appeal from its decisions except in cases of expulsion. It was necessary to pass such a motion if the Minutes were not to consist exclusively of quarrels upon personal matters; for the last four months there had been nothing done, and the French members were tired of not being allowed to do any business.

Citizen *Murray* seconded.

Citizen *Boon* was in favour of the principle but he thought it should not be applied to pending questions.

Citizen *Cournet* said: those were just the questions it was proposed to deal with, so as to save time.

Citizen *Engels* said the question of appointing a Committee should be discussed before the questions to be referred to it were.

Citizen *Milner* was glad the proposition was made; he regretted that members should have so far forgotten their responsibilities as to make such a motion necessary.

Citizen *Yarrow* was in favour of the principle but didn't

see the use of taking matters before it that had been before a Committee already.

Citizens *Marx, Hales, Murray, Bradnick* and *Ranvier* spoke in favour of the proposition.

Citizen *Boon* moved an amendment that the matter be adjourned.

Citizen *Yarrow* seconded it and Citizens *Eccarius* [and] *Harris* spoke for it.

The resolution was carried by a large majority and the following citizens were proposed as the members of the Committee: *Arnaud, Ranvier, Bradnick, Milner, Pfänder, Jung, Wróblewski* and *Boon*; the first seven were elected.

The Council adjourned at 11.45.

JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF MEETING\*

*Held February 20th, 1872<sup>106</sup>*

Citizen *Longuet* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Boon, Cournet, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Jung, Keen, Lessner, Longuet, Martin, Mayo, McDonnell, Milner, Margueritte, Pfänder, Rochat, Rühl, Serrailier, Taylor, Townshend, Wróblewski, Barry* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, the *Secretary*\*\* announced that he had received two letters from the two Federal Committees of North America—one asking for copies of the Rules in German, French, Italian, Spanish and English, the other containing the rules of the Federal Council—which sent

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 390-95 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* Hales.—*Ed.*

them together with a monthly report.<sup>107</sup> He proposed that the letters be referred to the Sub-Committee.<sup>108</sup>

Citizen *Eccarius* said as *Sorge* had announced to him that he was going to resign, he had sent the Rules to *Gregory*, who soon after died, and then he heard that the Rules had got into the wrong hands—there were now 41 sections in the States, 32 of whom were in communication with one Federal Council.

Citizen *Engels* proposed that the whole matter be referred to the Sub-Committee.

Citizen *Jung* seconded it, at the same time proposing that in future the documents sent be sent through the agency of the mercantile seamen with whom the Council was in connection.\*

The motion was carried unanimously.

The *Secretary* reported that two citizens who had taken an active part in the Nine Hours' Struggle in Newcastle were going to try to form a branch in Newcastle. They were also going to start a magazine to be called *The Workman's Monthly Magazine*.

Citizen *Engels* reported that things had not changed much in Spain. The cloud had not broken, the Government was in the throes of dissolution, and consequently the circular of *Sagasta*, depriving the members of the International of the rights of citizenship, remained a dead letter.

He also reported that in accordance with the instructions of the Council he had called upon Citizen *Riley*, but at present he could not give anything as to the tendencies of the paper, which it appeared was to be called the *International Herald*,\*\* but he was informed that circulars giving that information were upon the table. Citizen *Riley* was willing to give a whole page to be headed "The International", and which was to be cut off clearly and dis-

---

\* See p. 56 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 103-04 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

tinctly from the rest of the paper in which he would insert official reports from the General Secretary and the Corresponding Secretaries; he also invited articles from the members of the Council. He would [publish] those together with letters from individual members, but not in the official column. This was necessary to prevent the semblance of clashing. Of course with [regard] to those offers he retained the right of editorial supervision, so as to secure himself against the insertion of libellous matter. The journal was to be published on Thursdays once a fortnight.

He proposed that the Secretary be instructed to send an exact copy of the report [sent] to the *Eastern Post* to the *International Herald* each week.

The resolution was seconded and carried unanimously.

Citizen *Jung* called the attention of the Council to the outrage committed upon Citizen *Outine*,\* and proposed the adoption of the following declaration upon the subject.

Citizen *Engels* seconded it and it was carried unanimously.\*\*

DECLARATION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

The Swiss authorities have thought proper, upon a simple reclamation of the Russian Foreign Office, sent in violation of the Federal Constitution direct to a magistrate at Iverdun, to search the house of Citizen *Outine* at Geneva, under the infamous pretext that he might be implicated in the forgery of Russian paper money—a scandalous affair, in which, wonderful to say, the Russian State Councillor, *Kamensky*, charged to prosecute the forgers,

---

\* See pp. 104-06 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Here a clipping from *The Eastern Post* is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

figures at the same time as their ringleader. They seized the papers of Outine, and exposed all his Russian, German, and English correspondence to the scrutiny of a Russian translator, whose very name they refused to give. Citizen Outine, up to December 1871, was editor of the International organ. *L'Égalité*, and consequently his correspondence was for the greater part that of the International, and provided with the stamps of its different committees. Had it not been for the interference of his legal adviser, Citizen Ambery, to whom the Council tenders its best thanks, Outine's papers and himself would have been handed over to the Russian Government, with which Switzerland has not even a treaty of extradition.

The Russian Government, met at home by a daily growing opposition, has taken advantage of the sham conspiracies of men like Netchayeff, who did not belong to the International, to prosecute opponents at home under the pretext of being Internationals. Now it takes another step in advance. Supported by its faithful vassal, Prussia, it commences an intervention in the internal concerns of Western nations by calling upon their magistrates to hunt down in its service the International. It opens its campaign in a Republic, and the Republican authorities hastened to make themselves the humble servants of Russia. The General Council considers it sufficient to denounce the designs of the Russian Cabinet, and the subserving of its Western helpmates, to the workmen of all nations.\*

Citizen *Barry* said that the same thing had been tried on with the English Government, but without success. He stated that in confidence, and did not want it published.

Citizen *Jung* proposed "That measures be taken to celebrate the anniversary of the 18th of March". Hitherto the International had celebrated the insurrection of the

---

\* The newspaper clipping ends here.—*Ed.*

workmen in June 1848, that being the first attempt on the part of the working classes to seize political power, but as the 18th of March was the first *success*, he thought that that should now be celebrated instead.

Citizen *Cournet* seconded the proposition.

Citizen *Boon* supported it and suggested that a Committee be appointed to make arrangements.

The resolution was carried unanimously and Citizens Jung, Boon, Taylor, Milner and McDonnell were appointed as a Committee to carry out the arrangements, it being understood that they should have power to add to their number.

Citizen *Harris* asked what position the Council stood in in relation to the Secretary's salary; when his salary was fixed, it was for three months, and that had long since expired. He should have thought that the Secretary himself would have called attention to the matter, but as he had not done so, he thought he would do it.

Citizen *Hales* said that Citizen Boon's motion, with respect to the unfitness of the Secretary, was next on the order of the day, and he thought that it ought to be discussed next. It would be useless to discuss the question raised by Citizen Harris first. It would be better to settle the question of fitness and then the pay.

Citizen *Engels* thought that Harris's question was a question for the Council to deal with, but he thought Boon's motion was one of those matters which ought to be referred to the Judicial Committee; he would therefore propose that it should be referred to the Judicial Committee.

Citizen *Hales* objected to it being referred to the Committee; if he understood the question aright it was not a personal question but a question of capacity.

Citizen *Boon* endorsed what Hales had said, the matter was not personal at all, but a question of fitness for office; besides, there was an understanding when the Judi-

cial Committee was appointed that this particular question was not to be brought before it, but that it should be dealt with by the Council.\*

Citizen *Engels* denied that any such understanding existed or was inferred, the question was decided upon principle. This was exactly one of the cases it was intended to meet—the question as to a man's intellectual or moral qualification was a personal one. It was not a matter of interest to the working classes.

Citizen *Boon* said it was a question that affected the interests of the working classes, as the welfare of the Association depended in a great degree upon the selection of proper officers. He proposed that his motion be discussed.\*\*

Citizen *Cournet* said the question was a personal one, at least it appeared so to him, and therefore ought to be submitted to the Judicial Committee. That Committee was appointed in order that the time of the Council might be saved.

Citizen *Hales* seconded *Boon's* motion, because if Citizen *Engels's* motion was carried it would become a precedent and would virtually place the appointment of officers in the hands of the Judicial Committee; besides, it would be almost impossible for any member to hold office, when he might be taunted with not holding office by the will of the majority.

Citizen *Engels* said there was no analogy; this was not a motion for the appointment of an officer, but was a question of one member impeaching an officer.

Citizen *Boon* said it was a question whether an officer appointed by the whole Council was not responsible to the whole Council. The motion with respect to Citizen *Barry*

---

\* See pp. 108-09 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* This sentence was inserted when the Minutes were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

was a personal one, but this was altogether a different matter—it didn't touch the question as to any one's fitness to be on the Council—only the fitness for office was involved.

Citizen *Margueritte* said if Boon's motion was carried officers might be impeached every week—for the purpose of personal quibbling.

Citizen *Harris* said his question was distinct from Boon's, and ought to be dealt with—in fact it ought to have been brought on before. The motion of Boon had been postponed time after time and it had given rise to great unpleasantness amongst the English members—in fact there was not sufficient confidence between the English members and the Continentals. He was told by a good authority that the remarks made by English members were not fairly translated—and that consequently the Continentals were often led to vote upon matters which they did not understand.

Citizen *Mayo* said he was in a fix—he approved of the spirit of Citizen *Engels's* motion but still he thought the Council was the body to decide. He understood there would be no appeal from the decision of the Committee except in cases of expulsion.

Citizen *Serraillier* said this was a case in which it was proposed to expel a member from office, and consequently there would be the right of appeal if the Committee convicted. It would be a loss of time unless it was referred to the Committee.

Citizen *Milner* suggested that it be referred to the Committee with instructions to report at the next sitting.

This suggestion was agreed to by Citizen *Engels* and the question was put to the vote, when the original proposition to refer the matter to the Judicial Committee was carried by a large majority.

Citizen *Boon* then said that he had not confidence in the Judicial Committee, and did not think the question a

matter for its decision; he therefore announced that he should not submit the motion to it.

Citizen *Jung* protested as a member of the Committee against the remarks of Boon. He had always acted in an impartial manner upon any subject brought before him.

Citizen *Boon* said he had not faith in the ability of the Committee to decide upon the question, that was all.

Citizen *Serraillier* called attention to the fact the Council would shortly have to leave its present address and it was necessary that some address should be given for letters to be directed to some place—he would propose 33, Rathbone Place.<sup>109</sup>

Citizen *Jung* suggested that each Secretary should have his letters directed to his residence.

Citizen *Eccarius* said all that was necessary was for the change to be notified to the postal authorities.

Citizen *Engels* said that would not do in those cases where the documents were not directed to any particular person.

The suggestion was agreed to.

The Council adjourned at 11.30.

CH. LONGUET  
JOHN HALES

### MINUTES OF MEETING\*

*Held March 5th, 1872*<sup>110</sup>

Members present: Citizens *Bradnick, Cournet, Delahaye, Engels, Eccarius, Frankel, Hales, Harris, Jung, Lessner, Le Moussu, Lochner, Longuet, Marx, Martin, Margueritte, Mayo, Milner, Pfänder, Rochat, Rühl, Serraillier, Taylor, Townshend, Barry, Wolfers* and *Yarrow*.

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 395-98 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

Citizen *Longuet* in the chair.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, the *Chairman* announced that a letter had been received from the members of a so-called branch of the International, calling itself the Section de Retraite, denouncing the Council for not replying to a communication it had previously sent.<sup>111</sup>

A letter was also read from the French-speaking section, urging upon the Council the duty of obtaining assistance for the refugees.

Citizen *Jung* said that the new Committee which had been formed had funds coming in, and he thought the matter should be referred to them.

This suggestion was agreed to.

Citizen *Engels* announced that he had just received a letter from Italy which he had not time to translate, but from what he could see of it it was of a very favourable character indeed; it proved that the teachings of the pretended leaders—doctors, lawyers, journalists, etc.—had not any influence upon the real working class; the doctrine that they ought to abstain from politics found no favour with them.<sup>112</sup>

Citizen *Serraillier* said he had received letters from Paris, one of which was from the delegate he was to have met a short time ago in London but from whom his address was withheld.\* He desired powers to form sections, and said that in three months the Association would be completely reorganised in Paris—he had received a letter from the Secretary of a section in the South of France, speaking of the action of the Versaillists; it said the action the Mamelukes of Versailles were taking against the International would only make the people more determined to rally to it. The writer also said he had seen an account of the action taken by Bastelica, Blanc and Richard.\*\* So it

\* See pp. 106-07 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 96 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

appeared Bastelica's name was mentioned in connection with the affair.

He had also received a letter from Corsica where a section had been started.

He had also received communications from Avignon where the organisation was progressing, and from a railway guard who offered his services in carrying documents, etc., from one town to another.

In concluding he stated that all the stamps he had sent had arrived safely—and he asked that another citizen be appointed in place of Citizen Johannard to act on the Committee for granting credentials.

Citizen *Jung* proposed that Citizen Ranvier be appointed.

Citizen *Margueritte* seconded and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* reported that a man named Rüder, who was director of police in Leipzig, had forbidden the sale of the publications of the International in that city, and he had written to a man who announced that he sold them, ordering him to come to him, and bring proofs that he was authorised by Dr. Marx to sell them. It showed the absurd action taken by the German police, though for that matter it was only on a par with that of the English police; here the publicans were continually threatened with the loss of their licences if they permitted branches to be held, or meetings of the Association to take place in their houses.

With reference to English politics, it might be remembered that he had announced that the English Government, upon the request of the French Government, were preparing to expel the refugees upon the plea of their being guilty of civil crimes.\* That was quite true, but the English Government had asked the French Government not to press the matter just now as the time was not op-

---

\* See p. 60 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

portune. It was intended, though, to [remodel] the old "Correspondence Act" which was passed against the Jacobin Clubs, and which was applied against Feargus O'Connor,<sup>113</sup> and apply it against the whole International.

Citizen *Taylor* reported that he in conjunction with Citizen *Wolfers* had audited the refugee fund account and found everything quite correct. The money had been most judiciously expended, and the balance showed that £1 16s. 8d. was due to the Treasurer, Citizen *Jung*, he having distributed that amount more than he had received.

The report was unanimously adopted.

Citizen *Jung* reported that the Committee appointed to organise the commemorative meeting of the 18th of March had met and was arranging for a meeting to be held in St. George's Hall. The Committee was short of funds though and a guarantee fund had been started, which it was hoped the Council would aid. Several sums had already been guaranteed. Several members handed in their names for various amounts.<sup>114</sup>

Citizen *Harris* said that he was at a meeting on Sunday night at the Sir Robert Peel—when Mr. Lord announced that he attended the meeting on Saturday night and that up to ten o'clock no Secretary was present—he would ask how that was—he might announce that the Sir Robert Peel branch had collected 18s. for the refugees which had been handed over.

Citizen *Jung* said *Theisz* was Treasurer and the fact was he did not come, and another Secretary was appointed for the evening.

Citizen *Marx* brought up the manifesto which had been drawn up relative to the Swiss disputes. It was in French but he gave an explanation of the salient points and stated that the great value of the document consisted in the historical development of the principles and policy of the Association, which was traced most distinctly<sup>115</sup>; he asked that the Committee be empowered to print it.<sup>116</sup>

Citizen *Barry* asked for an explanation with reference to the disputes which necessitated the manifesto.

Citizen *Engels* entered into a lengthy explanation.

Citizen *Barry* hoped the Council would excuse him, but as the document was in French and [he] had not a thorough knowledge of it he wished to withhold his name—he did not wish his name to be appended to anything he did not understand.

The resolution approving of the manifesto and authorising the Committee to get it printed was then put to the vote and carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* then brought up the report upon the American disputes. He said that he had many of the facts in his possession bearing upon the subject, and the rest had been forwarded by Citizens *Eccarius* and *Hales* to him, so he thought he might as well bring it forward and save time. It was embodied in a series of propositions which he read and which were discussed seriatim.<sup>117</sup> The three first paragraphs were carried when the arrival of midnight put a stop to further discussion.\*

The subject was adjourned till the next meeting.

The Council adjourned at 12.

*H. JUNG*, Chairman  
*JOHN HALES*, Secretary

### MEETING OF COUNCIL\*\*

*Held March 12th, 1872<sup>118</sup>*

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Bradnick*, *Cournet*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Harris*, *Jung*, *Keen*, *Lessner*, *Le*

\* The words "first paragraphs were carried" were inserted by Marx later, when the Minutes were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 399-403 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

*Moussu, Marx, Martin, Margueritte, Mayo, McDonnell, Arnaud, Barry, Lochner, Ranvier, Roach, Rühl, Taylor, Townshend, Milner, and Wolfers.*

Citizens *Longuet* and *Serrailier* were excused.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read, and after a rectification pointed out by Citizen *Marx* had been made they were confirmed.

Citizen *Margueritte* said he wished to make an observation upon the Minutes of the last meeting but one. Citizen *Boon* had repudiated the Judicial Committee; he wished to point out that Citizen *Boon* was a candidate for that Committee and he didn't see how he could repudiate [it] after accepting a candidature.

Citizen *Barry* said it must be remembered that Citizen *Boon* was opposed to the subject under discussion being relegated to the Committee even before the election took place.

Citizen *Engels* said that there was a question arising out of the Minutes which the Council would have to consider. Citizen *Barry* was reported to have said that he should decline to have his name appended to one of the documents of the Council. It was an old rule of the Council that the names of all the members should be appended to all the documents and if Citizen *Barry* persisted the Council would have to consider whether a member could withhold his name.

Citizen *Barry* said that he had had some friendly conversation with Citizen *Engels* upon the subject and after the explanation he had heard he was willing that his name should appear, but he must say as a justification that as a rule it was desirable that everyone should know the substance of every document to which he gave his adhesion.

Citizen *Engels* said the report of what he said was altogether wrong and he handed in a written correction which he desired to appear in the *Eastern Post* exactly as

he sent it; he must complain that on many previous occasions when he had, in accordance with instruction from the Council, sent things to Hales for the weekly report they had been manipulated, and adorned with flowers of rhetoric of the kind that appeared in the columns of *Reynolds's Paper*; he could not tolerate such conduct; if he sent matter for publication, he must have it printed exactly as he sent it; he always wrote on one side of the paper so that there was no need to rewrite it.

Citizen *Hales* said it must be remembered that he was not only responsible to the Council for the reports but also to the public, and though Citizen Engels might be a better writer than him yet his style was different and there were times when the reports would be absurd if the communications of Citizen Engels were inserted without explanation or alteration; he would ask either that he be allowed to print Citizen Engels's productions as his or that he should have the right to revise them himself.

Citizen *Eccarius* said there was a resolution on the Books, which he believed was proposed by Hales, to the effect that the Secretary should publish nothing except [what] he was instructed to publish, and though he didn't agree with it, it was carried; the difficulty was in the name of the Secretary appearing to the reports. There was no necessity for that to appear and if the signature did not appear there could not be any responsibility.

Citizen *Engels* said the position assumed by Hales was a most ridiculous one; how could he be responsible for the Council? The business of the Secretary was not to put in his own language but to report what was said and, surely, if he took the trouble to write out his report, he was only giving what he should have given verbally, and a man certainly was the best judge of what he would say. There was no necessity for Hales's name to be appended to the report.

Citizen *Marx* said the misunderstanding all arose from

the Secretary signing his name; there was no reason why he should do so; but there was important matters to be discussed, therefore he proposed that further discussion upon the subject be adjourned.

This suggestion was agreed to\* and it was understood that Citizen Engels's report together with the following one from Denmark<sup>119</sup> should be printed as written.\*\*

Citizen *Engels* stated that the published report of last week's meeting gave a completely erroneous account of what he had said respecting Italy.\*\*\* In correcting that report he took the opportunity, at the same time, to complete his statements as to the situation of the International in Italy. Hitherto, all accounts received from the country, both by the correspondence of the Council and the newspapers of the Italian International, had represented the latter as unanimous in upholding the doctrine of complete abstention from political action, and in repelling the Conference resolution upon that subject. But it was not to be forgotten that both the correspondence and the newspapers, so far, had been in the hands, not of working men themselves, but of men of middle-class origin, lawyers, doctors, newspaper writers, etc. In fact, the great difficulty for the Council had been to open direct communications with the Italian working men themselves. This had now been done in one or two places, and now it was found that these working men, far from being enthusiastic for political abstention, were, on the contrary, very much pleased to hear that the General Council of the great mass of the International did not at all adhere to that doctrine. Thus it might be hoped that upon that question too the Italian working men would soon be found in harmony with

---

\* Further the words "together with a proposition" are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\* Here a clipping from *The Eastern Post* is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See p. 117 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

those of the rest of Europe and the United States. In Spain the International was still in the same position. The Government denied them the right of public meeting, but otherwise did not interfere with them. On the other hand the middle-class Republicans made them the most pressing advances to join in a rising against the Government and the new dynasty. But the Internationals were determined to fight for their own platform, if they were to fight at all.\*

Citizen *Taylor* announced that the arrangements were proceeding satisfactorily for the commemoration of the 18th of March. St. George's Hall had been engaged and the bills were ready for distribution. There were not sufficient funds in hand to meet the liabilities and he asked if there were any more members prepared to guarantee towards the expenses.

In answer to the appeal several members gave in their names for various amounts.

Citizen *Marx* then brought up again the American report and read the 2nd article of Section Two which recommended that no new sections should be admitted by the Federal Council, unless two-thirds of the members were wage-paid workers.\*\* The object being to prevent the International being used by the middle classes for election purposes.

Citizen *Eccarius* was opposed to the clause. There was no fear of swamping as the International was going to attend a congress in conjunction with other labour organisations. The principle might be applied to the General Council\*\*\*: the Rules said that it should be composed of working men belonging to different nationalities.<sup>120</sup>

---

\* The newspaper clipping ends here.—*Ed.*

\*\* The reference is to Article 2, Section III. See p. 412 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* The rest of the sentence is written between the lines of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

**ANNIVERSARY** of the **SOCIAL REVOLUTION**  
*OF THE 18th OF MARCH, 1871*

**PUBLIC MEETING**

WILL BE HELD IN

**ST. GEORGE'S HALL,**

LANGHAM PLACE, REGENT STREET,

*UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE*

Members of the International, the Democrats of London  
and the Refugees of the Commune,

**ON MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1872.**

AT FIVE P. M., TO COMMEMORATE THE

**SOCIAL REVOLUTION OF PARIS.**

President - **CITIZEN JUNG.**  
Vice-Presidents {     "     **RANVIER.**  
                          "     **HALES.**

**FRENCH SPEAKERS**

RANVIER, Member of the Commune

LISSACARAY, National Guard

LONGUET, Member of the Commune

VAILLANT

THEISZ

LEO FRANKEL

SERRAILLIER

ANDRIEUX

ARNAUD

DELAHAYE, Member of the Labour  
Committee

COURNET, Member of the Commune

CAMELINAT, Director of the Mint

EUDES, Member of the Commune

JOFFRIN, Delegate from the 18th  
Arrondissement

Members  
of the  
Commune

LE MOUSSU, Commissary of Public  
Safety

BOURSIER, Member of the Central  
Committee

**ENGLISH SPEAKERS**

DR. KARL MARX

HALES

MILNER

WESTON

McDONNELL

JOHNSON

BOON

MITCHELL

BRADNICK

**ADMISSION FREE.**

Leaflet issued by the General Council in honour of the first  
anniversary of the Paris Commune, March 18, 1872

Citizen *Barry* likewise disagreed with the clause: he thought it would be true political economy to gradually absorb such of the middle class that was favourably disposed to our principles.

Citizen *Bradnick* thought no class ought to be prevented from joining.

Citizen *Milner* said that the working classes always had looked for leaders outside their own class, and had always been led astray. The working classes ought to look for leaders amongst their own class.

Citizen *Martin* thought all the difficulties that might arise would be met by the regulation requiring all branches to send up their rules for approval.

Citizen *Margueritte* said it must not be forgotten that anyone could join by simply declaring themselves in favour of the principles of the Association; he thought the clause necessary.

Citizen *Hales* was opposed to the doctrine advocated by Barry; they had reason to fear the middle class absorbing the best blood of the working class, they had always tried to buy the leaders and always would. [He] should vote for the resolution.

It was then put to the vote and carried by 16 to 3.

The rest of the resolutions were carried with very little discussion, the votes being unanimous. The one suspending Section 12 until after the meeting of the Congress\* being carried without a division.

Citizen *Marx* then read the following letter which had been received from New Zealand.\*\*

Dear Sir,—We received yours dated June [1871], and were truly glad the International so kindly received our communications in reference to New Zealand.<sup>121</sup>

---

\* See pp. 411-12 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Here a clipping from *The Eastern Post* is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

It is impossible for me to give you a just description of this country. It is a long, narrow, mountainous one, with occasional patches of good agricultural [soil] on the flats. But that is very scarce, in fact I do not think a person could buy 100 acres from the Crown at £2 per acre. The remainder is perpendicular, mountainous, and without soil. Canterbury is the only part which has got any flat worthy of the name, and fully 7-10ths is shingle deposits, with about three inches of a sandy soil.

As for governments, we have to maintain ten; the general which has its headquarters in Wellington, in the North Island, the chief of which is the governor, on £4,000 per annum, and found a premier with all the officers of a House of Commons. Then comes the provincial ditto who have superintendents that act as kings in miniature, with their advisers in the shape of speakers, treasurers, auditors, solicitors, secretaries, and all the executive functionaries of a first-rate state. In all, New Zealand has to maintain 1,600 officials, not including the police. For instance, the police of this province consists of a superintendent whose office costs over £1,000 a year, he has two inspectors, three sergeants, and about 20 constables.

The population of all New Zealand, (*vidē* census returns 1871), was 250,000 souls. The debt per head is £40, in England it is £25. In regard to employment there is none to be had except at harvest time, a farmer can, perhaps, keep one man as ploughman, who has, on the whole, good wages if he can find constant employment. The same holds good with sheep farmers, who can employ one man as shepherd, but want eight or ten at shearing time.

As for trades, one single member of any one trade would cause the discharge of one already here; the surplus, of which there are many, have to travel from hut to hut and station to station in search of that which is impossible to be had, *viz.*: work; and beg for food and shelter. In general they will give one a pannikin full of flour, which he can mix with water and cook the best he can. On one station, when shearing began this year, one night there were 300 men looking for work; that was Glenmark station. As for a place to shelter in, a man may turn in with the dogs or pigs or sleep out in the open air. The government encourages the system as they are enabled to perpetuate a system which enslaves the mass of the people.

Doubtless by this time you are in possession of positive proof with regard to government immigration. The governing class are clerks of English houses and sheep farmers, who make all laws to suit themselves. In 1862 gold was found in quantities, which brought a large influx of population and prosperity, as diggers pay ten times more in the shape of taxes than any other class of the community, now both is falling off, and to stem the tide of popular discontent, an adventurer

appears and proposes another South-Sea Bubble,<sup>122</sup> by means of borrowing millions to pour in a constant stream of immigrants, so that those who may have an occasional day's work to be done may have it done for nothing.

The Canterbury Working Men's Mutual Protection Society, which I started a year ago, will become a branch of the International.

When yours last reached here I was in the back country and the poisonous reports which the organs of those who are opposed to the welfare of the working man [spread] had such an effect, at the time, that it was deemed advisable to defer writing until they saw more about it. People are very ignorant of what is taking place in the old world.

I intend, after I have saved a few pounds, to preach a crusade in favour of every working man becoming a member of your Society. I will give open air lectures in all the towns in this island, and likewise in Melbourne, and if you could give publicity to your determination to take steps to prevent such deception as is being practised, it would bring thousands to our standards. The agent-general for inveigling immigrants, as he is called, is in Norway or Denmark, and then goes to Germany; if you could manage to send information it would have a tremendous effect, not only in New Zealand, but all through Australia.

It will be about five months before I will be able to proceed on my mission, therefore, if you have any statutes which will be of any use in the furtherance of the cause, I would thankfully do my best. I can inform you that I am not a skilled workman, but a farm labourer, of which there are 1,000 idle at present.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Yours, &c.,

JAMES M'PHERSON.

Christchurch, Canterbury, New Zealand  
November 23, 1871\*

It was then announced that a circular had been received from Blanc and Richard. The discussion upon it was postponed.<sup>123</sup>

The Council then proceeded to nominate speakers for the meeting at St. George's Hall.\*\*

The Council adjourned at 12 o'clock.

A. SERRAILLIER

JOHN HALES, Secretary

\* The newspaper clipping ends here.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 124 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

## MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

*Held March 19th, 1872<sup>124</sup>*

Citizen *Serraillier* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Boon, Cournet, Ecarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Jung, Lessner, Marx, Martin, Mayo, Milner, Ranvier, RoCHAT, Rühl, Serraillier, Townshend, Vaillant, Wolfers, Barry* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Citizen *Engels* announced that he had received a letter from Spain. It stated that *Lorenzo*, who was the delegate to the Conference,\*\* had been on a tour through the provinces to organise the sections; in a future letter an account would be forwarded of his mission, with a full account of the labour performed by the Association and a statement of its position at the present time. The number of stamps required would also be forwarded at the same time.<sup>125</sup>

He had also received a letter from *Lisbon*, from the Secretary of the section\*\*\* which had been formed in that city. The section numbered 400 members and three trades societies had affiliated themselves to it, the members of which were close upon 1,000. It gave in its adhesion to the principles of the Association and was fully determined to do all it could to propagate them. It had started a journal which represented the objects and principles of the Association and which was intended to be an organ of the section. *O Pensamento Social* was the title, copies were forwarded for the use of the Council. The letter stated that the section was very poor and as it had great dif-

---

\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 400-07a of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* Held in *London* in 1871.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* *Nobre-Franca*.—*Ed.*

facilities to contend with, the members would be glad if the Council could lend them a little money to help to make the journal successful.<sup>126</sup>

He had written back an answer stating that the Council was not in a position to lend the required assistance, but had it been able, there was no section that it would more cheerfully assist than that of Lisbon. 500 stamps was asked for.<sup>127</sup>

Citizen Engels also announced that he had received a letter from Ferrara which stated that the section of Ferrara gave it its adhesion, except so far that it retained its own autonomy; he didn't quite understand what was meant, so he had written asking for an explanation, informing them that there could not be any exception to [the] Rules.<sup>128</sup>

Citizen *Marx* said he had a report to make upon the trial of Bebel and Liebknecht but he should postpone it for a week as the trial was still in progress.

He had received a letter from Breslau in Silesia. The section there had appointed a Committee for Statistical Inquiries composed of 90\* members. The Committee was found to be very useful for propagandist purposes. There was one difficulty, though, the members had to contend with, and that was they could not find meeting-places. The police were intimidating the publicans, so that no meetings were allowed in their houses.<sup>129</sup> The same system exactly was pursued under Bismarck as was followed by Gladstone.

Citizen\*\* read a letter which he had received from Belgium in answer to the one he sent by the instruction of the Council.\*\*\* 1st. The receipt of 200 copies of the Rules in French was acknowledged. 2nd. It was considered that

---

\* Apparently a slip of the pen.—*Ed.*

\*\* No name is given; the reference seems to be made to Rochat.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See p. 106 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

[the Rules] would be unfitted for Belgium, but this answer was not to be taken as involving any intention on the part of the section not to pay the contributions. The section intended to meet its liabilities honourably. 3rd. The *Liberté* was not, nor had ever been, an organ of the Belgian Federal Council; a proposition to make it one had lately been made to adopt it as such, but it was rejected by a large majority as its views were not in accordance with those of the Council.

Citizen *Eccarius* read a letter from the new Federal Council of America, in which a complaint was made that no answers had been sent to its previous communications; the £11 sent for the refugees had not been acknowledged. It stated that it would be humiliating to again ask for recognition, the General Council was therefore asked to decide at once. It also said that those who charged the Federal Council with using the name of the Association to propagate extraneous doctrines such as free love, etc., were guilty of misrepresentation.

He had received a letter from the old Federal Council, acknowledging the receipt [of] 1,056 [copies].\*

Citizen *Hales* said that he had sent a receipt for the money to Citizen *Nicholson*, but he had not answered the other two letters he had received, as they did not belong to his department, but they were laid before the Council when received.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he had not received any correspondence until lately—since the split.

Citizen *McDonnell* sent up a note which stated that the International was progressing favourably in Ireland, though it had also raised great opposition. On the previous Sunday the brother of the Member for Cork had denounced the Association from the altar.\*\* The coach-makers of Cork

\* This sentence was inserted when the Minutes were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

\*\* This refers to Canon Maguire.—*Ed.*

had joined the International and were on strike for a reduction of the hours of labour from 60 to 54 per week.

Citizen *Engels* said it was necessary that the Council should communicate the fact to the English Trades Unions and the British Federal Council. He proposed that the Secretary be instructed to do so; the proposition was seconded and carried unanimously.<sup>130</sup>

The *Secretary* announced that the West End boot-closers had sent in their contribution. The Alliance Cabinet-Makers had done the same a few weeks previously.

Citizen *Serrailier* reported that he had received a number of letters from Paris, all very favourable. Since the passage of the law against the International<sup>131</sup> a new section had been formed which called itself Section Ferré<sup>132</sup> and it had sent a fraternal greeting which was to have been read at the St. George's Hall meeting on the previous night.\*

Citizen *Barry* reported that he had been to Captain Maxse's lecture, who spoke favourably of the Association.

Citizen *Jung* reported the proceedings of the committee at Francis St., Tottenham Court Road, on the previous evening and laid the resolutions upon the table which it had passed.\*\*

Citizen *Hales* reported the action taken by the committee appointed to organise the meeting to commemorate the Social Revolution at St. George's Hall. The Hall was taken, and a deposit paid, and for which a receipt was received, and all the arrangements were proceeding satisfactorily until Friday night,\*\*\* when a letter was received from the lessee of the Hall, Mr. Wilkinson, returning a cheque for the deposit, and curtly informing the engager of the Hall that he could not permit the Hall to be used

---

\* See pp. 143-45 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 414 of the present volume. Further a clipping from *The Eastern Post* is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* March 15.—*Ed.*

for the purpose intended. A meeting of the committee was immediately convened, and a deputation was appointed to wait upon Mr. Wilkinson to try and get him to alter his decision. It waited upon him on Saturday evening and asked him his reasons. He said he thought the meeting was to celebrate the downfall of the empire. He was reminded that the 18th of March was not the anniversary of the 4th of September, and the committee naturally expected that his historical knowledge would extend back a year. He admitted that he was told that the Hall was to be used for a meeting to celebrate the Social Revolution of the 18th March, 1871, which took place in Paris. He then said he would consult his friend upon the matter, and left the committee for some time; upon his return he said that the meeting might have taken place if the refugees had not been announced to take part in the proceedings, but, that as it had been so announced it was impossible for it to take place, "for Communist meetings were not allowed to take place in England". The committee said there was not any law preventing them, but he said he did not know anything about that, he only knew that he should be held responsible if he allowed it, so he must refuse. The committee thereupon handed the cheque back, and informed him that action would be taken in the Law Courts. It was afterwards resolved to allow all the arrangements to proceed, so as to test the matter legally, the lessee's statement clearly proving that there was underhand influences at work.

The meeting did not take place at St. George's Hall, but the committee was in attendance, and explained the matter to the people who came. There was a few who came with the intention of making a disturbance, a German named Weber suggesting that the doors should be broken in with an axe, but the attention of the police was called, and the would-be disturbers went off. The committee and some friends afterwards adjourned to "Cercle d'Études

Sociales", 31, Francis Street, Tottenham Court Road,<sup>133</sup> where a meeting was held, and the resolutions were passed, which were to have been submitted to the meeting at St. George's Hall.<sup>134</sup>

It was afterwards determined that the proprietor or lessee of St. George's Hall should be sued for damages.\*

It was then proposed and seconded that Citizen Taylor be instructed to bring an action against the lessee; it was carried unanimously and Citizens Hales and Milner were appointed.

Citizen *Barry* said he had received information that was quite sufficient to prove to him that Mr. Gladstone had nothing to do with the closing of the Hall on the previous night.

Citizen *Jung* asked if Citizen Barry would state through the chair where he got his information from.

Citizen *Barry* said he received his information from a confidential source and he could not state it, he only wished to prevent the Council falling into a mistake, by charging the Premier.

Citizen *Engels* asked through the chair if Citizen Barry was in correspondence with Gladstone.

Citizen *Barry* declined to answer.

Citizen *Hales* said Citizen Barry had either said too much or too little: he either ought not [to] say anything or he ought to give his authority, he was not infallible like the Pope.

Citizen *Boon* asked how it was that no meetings of the Finance Committee had been held.

Citizen *Hales* said it was the business of the Committee to call its own meetings; he called the first meeting, and Citizen Engels was the only one present; Citizen Boon apologised for not attending.

Citizen *Boon* said he never heard of the meeting.

---

\* The newspaper clipping ends here.—Ed.

# Reglement Interieur de la Section Ferré

## Article 1<sup>st</sup>

Une section de l'Internationale des travailleurs est constitué sous le nom de Section Ferré.

Elle ne pourra être composée de plus de vingt membres.

## Article 2<sup>ème</sup>

Nul ne pourra être admis que sur la présentation de deux membres

Une commission de trois membres renouvelée a chaque demande d'admis-

Citizen *Hales* said he told him himself and he apologised for not attending.

The Council adjourned at 11.45.\*

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*\*

*Held March 26th, 1872*<sup>135</sup>

Citizen *Engels* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Boon, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Keen, Lessner, Le Moussu, Lochner, Martin, Mayo, Milner, Murray, Roach, Rochat, Rühl, Serraillier, Taylor, Townshend, Vaillant, Barry, Yarrow.*

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read, Citizen *Eccarius* pointed out an omission which was added; they were then confirmed.\*\*\*

Citizen *Engels* read a communication stating that the Spanish Federal Council, on the eve of the expiration of its term of office, had sent in a full report to the General Council on the progress and present condition of the International in Spain. The Association, introduced into that country in 1869, organised itself in June,\*\*\*\* 1870, at a Congress held at Barcelona. It was then still weak; but the revolution of the Paris Commune, and the beginning of Government prosecutions, soon increased its strength and at the conference of Valencia, held in September, 1870,\*\*\*\*\* there were already represented thirteen local federations, and now, at the eve of the Spanish International Congress, to be held on April 7th at Saragossa, the Association counts

\* Unsigned.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 407a-10 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Here a clipping from *The Eastern Post* is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\*\*\* A misprint in the newspaper; should be "July".—*Ed.*

\*\*\*\*\* A misprint in the newspaper; should be "1871".—*Ed.*

above seventy organised local federations, while in more than a hundred localities there are one or more branches still occupied in completing their local organisation. There are eight trades possessing Trades' Unions spread all over Spain and within the International, and there are at present negotiations going on for the entrance into our Association of the great union of the factory workers, which counts from 40,000 to 50,000 members. The propaganda is very active, the manifestos of the Federal Council are read all over the country; since the discussion on the International in the Spanish Parliament, the middle-class press reprints every document issued by the society, and this powerfully aids the seven or eight Spanish papers which belong to, and defend principles of, the International. This is what the Spanish Government has attained with all the persecutions to which it had subjected the members of our Association, and now, when persecution and obstruction has become the rule, the Spanish Internationals, in defiance of the Government, are about to hold their second public Congress at Saragossa.\*

They hardly knew how many stamps would be required, as their subscriptions were paid monthly. They were afraid it would be difficult to use them; it would have suited them had monthly stamps been issued.

The Federal Council also enclosed an address to the different Federal Councils and desired that they, and the General Council, should send them telegrams on the opening of their Congress, as a token of that solidarity which the Association inculcated.<sup>136</sup>

It was proposed by Citizen *Lessner*, seconded by Citizen *Roach*, that Citizen Engels be empowered to send a telegram congratulating the section.\*\*

\* The newspaper clipping ends here.—*Ed.*

\*\* A slip of the pen; the telegram was sent to the Congress of Spanish sections held at Saragossa. See p. 417 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

The resolution was carried unanimously.<sup>137</sup>

Citizen *Serrailier* reported that he had received a letter from Avignon, where arrangements had been made to defeat the new law,\* so that if they detected one man they could find out nothing. He had also received a letter from Toulouse. The section there had adopted a somewhat similar system. They had appointed a committee of seven to manage the business. They intended to send delegates to the next Congress. He had received a letter from the South of France—the numbers were augmenting, and sections were being organised among the peasantry. Section *Ferré* desired that the manifesto, which was to have been read at the St. George's Hall meeting, should be published.

It was unanimously resolved that it should be translated and sent for publication.\*\*

Citizen *Serrailier*\*\*\* also pointed out that the workmen of Paris were agitating for a law which the Commune passed during its term of power, viz., "That for abolishing night work in bakeries". So that the Commune had taught the working classes.

From Algeria he learnt that the section was thoroughly disorganised, but new efforts were going to be made to start another.

He also called attention to a report in the French newspaper, the *Emancipation*, which gave a grossly perverted account of the meeting that was held on the 18th of March. He said it was written by a professional liar, Vésinier, who was an employee of M. Kératry, the prefect of police under the Government of National Defence.

Citizen *Hales* said the affair in Cavendish Square was ludicrous; there certainly was not half a dozen present

---

\* The Dufaure law.—*Ed.*

\*\* For the manifesto see pp. 143-45 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* The report of this meeting in *The Eastern Post* refers here to Frankel, "late Minister of Labour under the Commune", instead of *Serrailier*.—*Ed.*

who held cards of membership of the International, dated within these last two or three years.<sup>138</sup>

Citizen *Murray* said he represented the West End boot-closers and that [they] certainly recognised the General Council—they voted the annual subscription almost unan- imously. If any of the dissentients represented bona fide organisations, let them show it.

Citizen *Roach* proposed and Citizen *Mayo* seconded that Citizen George Sexton become a member of the Council.

Citizen *Eccarius* proposed and Citizen *Barry* seconded that Citizen Mark Tapley become a member of the Council.

Citizen *Taylor* reported on behalf of the Committee ap- pointed to prosecute.\*

Citizen *Hales* also said a few words. It appeared that no action had been taken owing to the absence of Citizen Crompton who had been written to.

A proposition was made by Citizen *Boon*, seconded by Citizen *Murray*, that the Committee be instructed to pro- ceed at once against the lessee in the County court by suing him for damages.

After a long and animated discussion the motion was lost, it being understood that the Committee should take immediate action.

The Council adjourned at 11.30.

JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*\*

*Held April 2nd, 1872*<sup>139</sup>

Citizen *Dupont* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Cournet*, *Dupont*, *Eccarius*, *Frankel*, *Jung*, *Keen*, *Barry*, *Lessner*, *Margueritte*, *Martin*,

\* See p. 134 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 411-15 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

*Marx, Mayo, McDonnell, Milner, Ranvier, Roach, Serrailier, Taylor, Townshend, Vaillant, Wróblewski and Yarrow.*

Citizen *Hales* being in the provinces, the Minutes of the previous meeting were read by Citizen *Keen*, and were confirmed.

Citizen *Jung* read a letter from Citizen *De Walsche*, asking the Council to use its influence on behalf of the London compositors, who were on strike for the nine hours. He proposed that the secretaries of the different nationalities should be directed to communicate the facts to the respective sections.

Citizen *Serrailier* said he had already communicated the facts to his correspondents who would do what they could in the matter; but the French newspapers would not insert anything in the name of the International.

Citizen *Keen* seconded the proposition of Citizen *Jung* and said that the majority of the employers had given in. The Association did much good for the engineers, and would render a service to the compositors.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Citizen *McDonnell* reported that flourishing Irish sections had been formed in Bradford, Chelsea, Cork, Cootehill, Dublin, Middlesbrough, Marylebone\* and Soho. In Cork the sections were very strong. Two trade societies, the coach-makers and carpenters, had already affiliated themselves to the Association, and a deputation had waited upon thirteen other trade societies, nine of whom had promised to take the matter into consideration and votes of thanks were given to the deputations who attended on behalf of the Association. The sections in Dublin were large and were rapidly increasing in spite of the Dublin newspapers who were denouncing the International as an association opposed to all morality and all religion. The Painters, numbering about 900, were about to make over-

---

\* The word is written in the margins.—*Ed.*

tures to the International. He had received a letter from an active agent, who stated that he was subject to the gross-est police espionage, his house being watched night and day by the police. The result of such a course would be to ruin a man in his business. He had received a letter from De Morgan of Cork. There, great opposition had been offered to the movement. The press with the exception of the *Irishman*<sup>140</sup> was doing its utmost to malign the Association. A public meeting had been called by employers and others adverse to the International for the purpose of denouncing it, but the tables were completely turned upon them; Canon Maguire and other priests had been hurling their anathemas against the Association; the first named even incited to assassination. De Morgan himself was subjected to the most odious persecution for his participation in the movement; his pupils had been taken from him, until very few remained, and a lady had called upon him offering to guarantee him 10 pupils at £3 per quarter if he would renounce his connection with the International.

In reference to the lock-out of the coach-makers,\* a compromise had been effected. The men had agreed to go in at 57 hours [a week] for three months, at the expiration of which they were to work 54. Subscriptions however were still needed.

The Drapers' Association, numbering about 400 members, were discussing the advisability of joining the Association.

Efforts were being made to form sections in Bristol, Bolton, Belfast, Wellington and other places.

Citizen *McDonnell* then stated that he had asked Citizen Hales for some copies of the Rules, and he had refused to give them to him. He was placed at a great inconvenience in consequence of that refusal.

---

\* See pp. 131-32 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Jung* said Hales had informed him that he had already supplied McDonnell with 350 copies, and he had no power to give the Rules without a vote, or an order from the Council. The Rules Eccarius sent to America were asked for by him and were voted by the Council.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he neither asked for, nor wrote for, the Rules; they were voted by the Council without [his request], it was a lame excuse on the part of Hales.

Citizen *McDonnell* then read a letter he had received from Hales, in answer to one sent by him. It stated that there were other strikes of equal importance with that of the coach-makers of Cork, that of the agriculturalists being even greater. It also deprecated the formation of Irish branches in England, on the ground that it would tend to perpetuate national prejudices and was moreover opposed to the principles of the Association.<sup>141</sup> He, Citizen McDonnell, did not see the force of these objections. The coach-makers of Cork were affiliated to the Association while the others were not.

Citizen *Marx* said it was apparent that Citizen Hales had not executed the orders of the Council.\* He had no right to express an opinion, but simply to obey the orders of the Council. Neither had he a right to criticise the Irish branches. He thought Citizen Hales was deserving of a vote of censure, but he should not propose it in Citizen Hales's absence.<sup>142</sup>

Citizen *Roach* explained that he had borrowed the book containing the addresses of the affiliated societies from Hales, who had written to him asking him to forward a list of the societies and their addresses to McDonnell, and he had done so.

Citizen *McDonnell* said it had not yet reached him.

On the motion of Citizen *Marx*, seconded by Citizen *Townshend*, a Commission was appointed (consisting of Citizens

---

\* See p. 131 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Marx, Milner and McDonnell) to draw up a manifesto against the proceedings of the police in Ireland.\*

Citizen *Marx* communicated a number of facts relating to the trial of Bebel and Liebknecht.<sup>43</sup>

Citizen *Jung* called the attention of the Council to the regulations of an employer residing near Zurich in Switzerland. They showed that the form of government made no difference to the workers. A printed form was submitted to the men for signature binding them to inhabit the cottages of the employer, which contract was to remain in force so long as the family worked at the factory, but the families could be ejected by the employer whether they were employed at the factory or not. When the men left the employment of the millowner, the families had to leave the cottages; at ten every night the inhabitants were compelled to go to bed, all lights and fires to be extinguished before retiring. There was to be no exemptions from work without the production of a doctor's certificate and a number of other clauses equally oppressive.

Citizen *Eccarius* read a communication from San Francisco submitting a resolution for the consideration of the Council.

Citizen *Serraillier* brought up the following translation of the address of Section *Ferré* which was to have been read at the St. George's Hall meeting.\*\*

CITIZENS.—A year ago the Parisian working men turned out the imposters who, after having sold their country to Prussia, were already concocting, with the Orleans, Bonaparte, or Chambord, the sale of the Republic, ready to hand her over to the highest bidder.

Their Machiavellistic plans failed, their criminal designs were frustrated by the working class. The 18th of March sounded the death knell of the adventurers who had rushed eagerly to power on the 4th of September. The 18th of March saw the last of these treacherous boasters; Thiers, the modern saviour of society; Jules

\* See pp. 149-50 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 138 of the present volume. Further a clipping from *The Eastern Post* is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

Favre, the great orator and greater forger; Vinoy, that daring capitular; and their accomplices, had fled to Versailles in order to escape the just chastisement which befell, that very day, Clément Thomas, the murderer of June, and Lecomte, the Bonapartist general.

These cowardly runaways are still terror-struck at the very name of the International Working Men's Association, defeated as it is, but not subdued, even after the overcrowding of the pontoons, the banishment *en masse*, the deportation to the "Guillotine sèche" of New Caledonia, and the monstrous slaughtering of May, 1871.

The time had not yet come to unveil the bleeding corpses of our brothers, and we have spoken of them only to take the oath of revenge.

The threats and terrors of our enemies prove the hour of triumph to be close at hand; no measure seems too vast, no precaution safe enough. Soldiers and mitrailleuses, gendarmes and spies, are encumbering that palace, witness of their perjury and of their foul deeds. But in vain they cling to their bloody victory, in vain they heap injustice on injustice, reactionary law on exceptional law, they will fail in the attempt to enchain, to burke the Association.

Aghast they look at justice advancing upon them, they know the conquered of today will be the conquerors of tomorrow, and the prosecutors of today will be the culprits tomorrow.

When the red flag of the working class shall float again victorious we shall remember the real meaning of these deceiving words, "Conciliation, reconciliation". They have cost us too much to forget it. For a century the working class has been used as a tool by the bourgeois in its pursuit of state power. Repeatedly has the working class on the day of victory forgotten its past sufferings, and forgiven its bitterest enemy, the bourgeoisie. History shows by what treacheries this confidence has been repaid. The hideous hecatombs of June, 1848, and May, 1871, will form, for ever, an abyss between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

No more high-sounding phrases, no more useless speeches, but acts and nothing but acts, in acts alone rests our salvation.

Citizens, the proletarian army, scattered by late events, must rally and reorganise itself. No time is to be lost for this perilous work. At the same time inaction would weaken our ranks and strengthen those of our enemies, who aim at this end by intimidation. To their threats there is but one answer—contempt. Convinced of our rights and duties we shall go ahead in spite of obstacles and dangers thrown in our way.

Among the soldiers of our cause, escaped from the pontoons and the bullets of the Versailles murderers, some have to live in a free but melancholy land of exile, while others remain still in their own

country but enslaved and stained with floods of her own children's blood. You have the exile and its sufferings, we have the slavery and its humiliation—the parts are equal.

In spite of reactionary measures the International Working Men's Association is revived in Paris, and in paying a tribute to the hero and martyr, who fell at Satory, cowardly murdered, the first section reorganised takes the significant name of SECTION FERRÉ!

Slow but sure is its progress, and every day brings nearer and nearer the end it aims at.

Our cause, Citizens, can not die. As the sun it may have its temporary eclipses, but as the sun also it reappears each time brighter. Your exile will have an end which all our efforts will tend to shorten. Take advantage of the liberty of exile to work for the Social Revolution, and we, by substituting our energy to the liberty taken from us, shall do our duty, and even under the fire of the enemy we will lay the foundation of the new social edifice.

And until the victory of justice shall change our mutual misery into rejoicing, we join our voices to yours in the common cry of defiance to old society.

Vive la république démocratique, sociale, universelle!

SECTION FERRÉ

Paris, 17th March, 1872\*

On the motion of Citizen *Eccarius*, seconded by Citizen *Jung*, it was unanimously decided that the sittings of the Council should commence at 8 o'clock precisely if ten members were present or as soon after, as ten were present.

The Council adjourned at 10 o'clock. .

JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*\*

Held April 9th, 1872<sup>146</sup>

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Bradnick*, *Cournet*, *Delahaye*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Jung*, *Lessner*, *Lochner*,

\* The newspaper clipping ends here.—Ed.

\*\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 415-19 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

*Martin, Margueritte, Mayo, McDonnell, Milner, Pfänder, Rühl, Rozwadowski, Serraillier, Taylor, Barry, Vaillant, and Yarrow.*

Citizen *Marx* was excused being ill.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Engels* reported that he had received a letter from Denmark.<sup>145</sup> The Danish section had had to suspend the publication of its organ *Socialisten* for one number, owing to the printers having refused to do any work for the Association. The last they had done they had to take to Hamburg. They were however organising a co-operative printing office, and hoped to bring out the journal themselves. Another item of news was that there was an election taking place in North Schleswig, which was taken from Denmark by Prussia. It was stipulated in the Treaty of Prague<sup>146</sup> that it should be returned, but it had not been carried out. The consequence was that Danish Nationalist members had been returned to the German Parliament. Now the candidates were a Danish middle-class farmer and a German working man.\* The working men in the district wrote to Copenhagen asking for advice as to how they should vote. The answer was: vote for the working man whether he be German or Danish.

Citizen *Engels* also announced that Citizen *Marx* had received a letter from Citizen *Liebknrecht*, which was in English and it would be forwarded to the *Eastern Post* for publication.<sup>147</sup>

Citizen *Serraillier* reported that the *Emancipation* of Toulouse had printed the information about the strike of the London compositors, it had also published a report of the sittings of the Council. This had led to its being seized and a prosecution was instituted against it, for making propaganda for the International.

He had written a reply to *Vésinier* which the *Emancipa-*

---

\* Hasenclever.—*Ed.*

tion had not published, but it had published the following repudiation.<sup>148</sup>

Citizen *Frankel* said: so far from the new law intimidating the members in France it had made them more determined. Some members in Paris had sent him £2 10s. to be used for the purposes of propaganda. He would suggest that the best method would be to translate the address on the *Civil War* and circulate it [in] France.

This suggestion was adopted, and it was proposed by Citizen *Serrailier*, seconded by Citizen *Frankel*, and carried unanimously that the address on *The Civil War in France* should be translated and published in French.<sup>149</sup>

Citizen *Rozwadowski* presented credentials appointing him as the delegate of the Polish section in London to the Council.\*

After a short discussion it was proposed by Citizen *Engels*, seconded by Citizen *Lessner*, and carried unanimously that Citizen *Rozwadowski* be accepted as a member of the Council.

Citizen *Yarrow* handed in a credential from the Alliance Cabinet-Makers appointing Citizen *Ritchie* as a delegate to the General Council.

On reference to the Minutes of the meeting of the 31st of October, it was found that the Council had decided not to admit any more delegates from English societies.

The matter was therefore ended by the reading of the General Rules which preclude the recognition of separate branches by the General Council until after the local Federal Council had been consulted<sup>150</sup>; in accordance with which the application was referred to the British Federal Council.

Citizen *Hales* stated that Citizen *Broderick* of Ryde, Isle of Wight, had challenged *Baillie-Cochrane* to discuss the International in the Town Hall of Ryde, and said that if it was

---

\* See p. 67 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

accepted, that the Council would be asked to take charge of the matter.

A short discussion took place after which Citizen *Mayo* proposed that the Secretary\* be instructed to furnish Citizen Broderick with all the information required.

Citizen *Taylor* seconded the proposition, and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *McDonnell* reported that an Irish branch was being formed in Liverpool. In Cork the state of terrorism inaugurated against the Association was fearful.

The coach-makers had repudiated all connection with the International and had refused the money collected on their behalf. Nevertheless he had De Morgan's authority for asserting that the coach-makers did join the Association. There was little doubt that their action was due to priestly intimidation. De Morgan himself had been completely ruined; previous to his connection with the International he had a good connection as a teacher of elocution, but every one of his pupils had been taken from him, and he had been discharged from a situation he held in an Academy where he had given the greatest satisfaction—solely because of the action he had taken. The police were watching his house day and night, and were warning people not to have anything to do with him. The evident intention was to drive him out of Cork.

He, Citizen *McDonnell*, believed that intention would be defeated, for he believed that the members of the Irish branches in England had spirit and determination enough to raise such a sum weekly as would maintain De Morgan in Cork until the machinations of the priests and employers were overcome.<sup>151</sup>

He then brought up the following declaration on behalf of the Committee\*\* appointed at the previous meeting.\*\*\*

\* Hales.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 142-43 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Here a copy of the leaflet is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

DECLARATION BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

POLICE TERRORISM IN IRELAND

The national antagonism between English and Irish working men, in England, has hitherto been one of the main impediments in the way of every attempted movement for the emancipation of the working class, and therefore one of the mainstays of class dominion in England as well as in Ireland. The spread of the International in Ireland, and the formation of Irish branches in England, threatened to put an end to this state of things. It was quite natural then that the British Government should attempt to nip in the bud the establishment of the International in Ireland by putting into practice all that police chicanery which the exceptional legislation and the practically permanent state of siege there enable it to exercise. How Ireland is governed in a truly Prussian way, under what is called the Free British Constitution, will appear from the following facts.

In Dublin, at the meeting of the International, a sergeant and private of the police, in full uniform, were stationed at the door of the place of meeting, the owner of which asked them whether they were sent officially, and the sergeant said he was, the International having a dreaded name.

In Cork the same trick is practised. Two constables of the "Royal Irish Constabulary" are placed opposite the house door of the secretary of the local section, during the day, and four after dark, and the name of every one is noted down who calls upon him. A sub-inspector has recently called upon several persons by whom members of the Cork section were employed, and demanded the addresses of the latter, and many persons have been warned by the "Constabulary" that if they are seen speaking to the secretary their names will be sent to "The Castle"—a name of horror to the working class of Ireland.<sup>152</sup>

In the same city, according to a letter received,

"The magistrates have held several special meetings, extra police have been drafted in, and on Easter Sunday the constables were all under arms, with ten rounds of ball cartridge each. They expected we were going to have a meeting in the park; the magistrates are trying all they can to provoke a riot."

If the British Government continues in this way they may be sure that the last shreds of the mask of liberalism will be torn from their faces. In the International papers all over the world, the name of Mr. Gladstone will be coupled week after week with those of Sagasta, Lanza, Bismarck, and Thiers.

By order of the General Council,

*R. APPEGARTH, M. BARRY, M. J. BOON, F. BRADNICK, G. H. BUTTERY, E. DELAHAYE, EUGÈNE DUPONT, W. HALES, G. HARRIS, HURLIMAN, JULES JOHANNARD, C. KEEN, HARRIETT LAW, F. LESSNER, LOCHNER, C. LONGUET, C. MARTIN, ZÉVY MAURICE, H. MAYO, G. MILNER, CH. MURRAY, PFÄNDER, J. ROACH, RÜHL, SADLER, COWELL STEPNEY, A. TAYLOR, W. TOWNSHEND, E. VAILLANT, J. WESTON, YARROW*

Corresponding Secretaries:

*LEO FRANKEL*, for Austria and Hungary; *A. HERMAN*, Belgium; *T. MOTTERSHEAD*, Denmark; *A. SERRAILLIER*, France; *KARL MARX*, Germany and Russia; *C. ROCHAT*, Holland; *J. P. McDONNELL*, Ireland; *F. ENGELS*, Italy and Spain; *WALERY WRÓBLEWSKI*, Poland; *HERMANN JUNG*, Switzerland; *J. G. EC-CARIUS*, United States; *LE MOUSSU*, for French branches of United States; *J. HALES*, General Secretary\*

---

\* The insert ends here.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Barry* thought it better to charge the action taken to class hatred rather than to the Government.

Citizen *Vaillant* thought it was not sharp enough against the Government.

Citizen *Milner* thought the Government should be held responsible, when their professions with respect to Ireland were considered.

Citizen *Mayo* thought the declaration ought to have been stronger.

Citizen *Hales* thought it childish to issue an address at all—the very existence of the Association was a declaration of war against existing society—and the members must not complain if the governing classes used the means at their disposal to crush that which threatened to destroy them. It was war to the death and the privileged classes knew it. He thought the matter had been a little coloured by the natural enthusiasm found in the Irish character.

Citizen *Engels* said the declaration was against *police* interference. The subject was nothing to do with class hatred—it was simply the question of the Government using its force to interfere with meetings perfectly legal.

Citizen *Cournet* thought the address was weak compared with other utterances on the Irish question which the Council had issued on other occasions.<sup>153</sup>

Citizen *Engels* was convinced that when *Cournet* saw the declaration in print, he would be satisfied.

It was then put to the vote and carried unanimously.

On the motion of Citizen *Engels*, seconded by Citizen *Taylor*, it was decided that 1,000 copies should be struck off in the shape of a handbill to be distributed in Ireland.<sup>154</sup>

Citizen *Jung* read a letter from Geneva announcing the formation of a new section, and suggesting that it would be advisable to unite the different sections in one Federal Council—so that the power concentrated could be used to better advantage.

Citizen *Hales* said he thought it was clear there had been some mistake relative to the affiliation of the coach-makers of Cork. He therefore proposed "That no Trades Society be announced as affiliated to the Association until the legal authorisation or form of affiliation had been duly signed by the officers of such societies and the same was in the possession of some Council or branch of the Association".

The proposition was seconded by Citizen *Mayo* and carried unanimously.

Citizen *Hales* gave notice of motion: he should call the attention of the Council to the formation of Irish branches in England, and move a resolution with respect to the continuation of that policy.

The Council adjourned at 11 o'clock.\*

### MINUTES OF MEETING\*\*

*Held April 16th, 1872*<sup>155</sup>

Citizen *Longuet* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Boon, Bradnick, Arnaud, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Barry, Hales, Jung, Keen, Lessner, Frankel, Lochner, Le Moussu, Longuet, Martin, Marx, Mayo, Margueritte, McDonnell, Murray, Milner, Ranvier, Roach, Rühl Rozwadowski, Serrailier, Taylor, Townshend, Vaillant, and Yarrow.*

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, the *Chairman* read a communication from Citizen *Harris* tendering his resignation as a member, and asking that the same might be notified in the weekly report.

On the motion of Citizen *Barry*, seconded by Citizen *Yarrow*, it was decided to adjourn the acceptance of the re-

---

\* Unsigned.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 419-22 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

signation, and that Citizen Harris be requested to give his reasons for tendering it.

The *Chairman* then announced that he had a communication from the German Working Men's Society\* which stated that Citizen Caulincourt had been appointed the delegate of the Society in the place of Citizen Rühl who had been removed.

Citizen *Frankel* said great misconception existed as to the right of delegation belonging to the branches. He proposed that no more delegates be admitted from any society.

Citizen *Engels* seconded the proposition. There had been nothing but difficulties with regard to the assumed right to send delegates, and the best thing would be to end the matter altogether. The mistake arose from the idea that the General Council was composed of representatives. The Council was empowered to add to its numbers—and everyone so added became an integral part of the Council and even though they might have been presented by some branch or society. The General Council was not a Trades Council.

Citizen *Keen* thought Citizen *Engels's* speech was opposed to the principle of delegation, which was the spirit of democracy. He thought societies had the right to withdraw their delegates, when they thought them no longer fit to represent them.

The *Secretary*\*\* here read a letter from the Alliance Cabinet-Makers asking for the reason why the delegate they had sent on the previous night had not been accepted.\*\*\*

Citizen *Yarrow* said: the rule, quoted at the previous meeting as a reason for not accepting the delegate, did not apply, as it only applied to the admission of *new* branches, while the Cabinet-Makers were old members.

---

\* The London German Workers' Educational Association.—*Ed.*

\*\* Hales.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See p. 147 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Eccarius* said this was one of the difficulties arising out of the manner in which the Federal Council was formed, and would not have occurred had the Trades Unions been properly communicated with. The society to which he belonged had not been communicated with since he was Secretary. With respect to the question of delegation, the acceptance of delegates was an act of courtesy which could not be claimed as a right. The British Federal Council had no more right to have delegates on the General Council than any other Federal Council.

Citizen *Hales* proposed the adjournment of the question upon the ground that there was important business to transact.

The motion was not seconded, but the vote was taken upon the proposition of Citizen *Frankel* when it was carried.

Citizen *Hales* then proposed that a deputation be appointed to wait upon the Cabinet-Makers to explain matters to them.

Citizen *Jung* seconded and it was carried, Citizens *Jung*, *Eccarius*, *Bradnick*, and *Hales* being selected.

Citizen *Roach* said that the election of Citizen *Sexton* stood next on the order of the day,\* and he asked that it might be taken.

Citizen *Marx* proposed that it be adjourned as there was likely to be some discussion upon the subject, and there was a great deal to do.

Citizen *Hales* did not think there would be any discussion, he thought that all the opposition could be disposed of in a few minutes.

Citizen *Roach* consented to the adjournment.

Citizen *Hales* postponed his notice of motion in reference to the formation of Irish branches in England.\*\*

---

\* See p. 139 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 152 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Marx* said two declarations had been drawn up to be issued to the public if the Council approved of them; the first had reference to the debate in the House of Commons upon Baillie-Cochrane motion,<sup>156</sup> the second to the so-called split in the International. He then proceeded to read the first which was as follows\*:

The performances of the Versailles Rural Assembly, and of the Spanish Cortes, with intent to extinguish the International, very properly aroused a noble spirit of emulation in the breasts of the representatives of the Upper Ten Thousand in the British House of Commons. Accordingly, on the 12th April, 1872, Mr. B. Cochrane, one of the most representative men, as far as upper class intellect is concerned, called the attention of the House to the sayings and doings of that formidable society. Being a man not much given to reading, he had qualified himself for his task by a journey of inspection to a few of the Continental headquarters of the International, undertaken last autumn, and had, on his return, hastened to secure, by a letter to the *Times*, a kind of provisional protection for his right of priority to this subject.\*\* His speech in Parliament betrays what in any other man would be considered a wilful and premeditated ignorance of what he is talking about. With one exception the many official publications of the International are unknown to him; in their stead, he quotes a jumble of passages from petty publications by private individuals in Switzerland, for which the International, as a body, is as much responsible as the British Cabinet is for the speech of Mr. Cochrane. According to that speech,

“the great majority of those who joined the society in England, and their number was 180,000, was totally ignorant of the principles it was intended to carry out, which were carefully concealed from them while they were giving their subscriptions”.

---

\* Here a clipping from *The Eastern Post* is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 32, 335-37 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Now, the principles intended to be carried out by the International, are laid down in the preamble to the General Rules, and Mr. Cochrane is in happy ignorance of the fact that no one can enter the Association without giving his express adhesion to them. Again,

“the society, as originally constituted, was founded upon the principles of the Trades’ Unions, and no political element was then introduced into it”.

Not only does the preamble to the original General Rules contain a strong political element, but the political tendencies of the Association are very fully developed in the Inaugural Address, published in 1864, contemporaneously with these Rules.<sup>157</sup> Another wonderful discovery is this, that Bakunin was “charged” to reply, in the name of the International, to the attacks of Mazzini, which is simply an untruth. After giving a quotation from Bakunin’s pamphlet,<sup>158</sup> he continues:

“We might smile at such bombastic nonsense, but when these papers emanated from London” (from which they did *not* emanate) “was it surprising that Foreign Governments should take alarm?”

And is it surprising that Mr. Cochrane should become their spokesman in England? Another charge is that the International had just started “a newspaper” in London, which is another untruth. However, let Mr. Cochrane console himself, the International has plenty of organs of its own in Europe and America, and in almost all civilised languages.

But the gist of the whole speech is contained in the following:

“He should be *able to show* that the Commune and the International Association were, in reality, one, and that the International Society located” (?) “in London, had given orders to the Commune to burn Paris, and to murder the Archbishop of that City.”

And now for the proofs. Eugène Dupont, as chairman of the Brussels Congress of September, 1868, truly stated that

the International aimed at a social revolution. And what is the secret link between this statement of Eugène Dupont in 1868 and the deeds of the Commune in 1872?\*

That "only last week Eugène Dupont was arrested in Paris, to which he had gone secretly from the country. Now, this M. Eugène Dupont was a member of the Commune and also a member of the International Society".

Unfortunately for this very conclusive mode of reasoning, A. Dupont, the member of the Commune, who has been arrested in Paris, was not a member of the International, and E. Dupont, the member of the International, was not a member of the Commune. The second proof is:

"Bakunin said, at Geneva, July, 1869, when the Congress met under his presidency:—"The International proclaims itself Atheist."

Now, there never took place an International Congress at Geneva, in July, 1869; Bakunin never presided at any International Congress, and was never charged to make declarations in its name. Third proof:—The *Volksstimme*, the International organ at Vienna, wrote:

"For as the red flag is the symbol of universal love, let our enemies beware, lest they turn it into the symbol of universal terror."

The same paper, moreover, stated in so many words that the General Council in London was, in fact, the General Council of the International, that is to say, its central administrative delegation. Fourth proof:—In one of the French trials of the International, Tolain ridiculed the assertion of the public prosecutor, that

"it was sufficient for the president of the International" (who does not exist) "to raise his finger to command obedience over the whole surface of the globe".

The muddling brain of Mr. Cochrane turns Tolain's denial into a confirmation. Fifth proof:—The manifesto of the

---

\* A misprint; should be "1871".—Ed.

General Council on the Civil War in France, from which Mr. Cochrane quotes the defence of the reprisals against the hostages, and of the use of fire, as measures of warfare, necessary under the circumstances. Now, as Mr. Cochrane approves of the massacres committed by the Versaillese, are we to infer that he had *ordered* them, although he is surely innocent of the murder of anything but game? Sixth proof:

“There was a meeting held between the leaders of the International and the Commune before the burning of Paris.”

This is exactly as true as the report which a short time ago went the round of the Italian press to the effect that the General Council of the International had sent, on a tour of inspection to the Continent, its truly and well-beloved Alexander Baillie-Cochrane, who reported most satisfactorily on the flourishing state of the organisation, and stated that it counted seventeen millions of members. Final proof:

“In the decree of the Commune which commanded the destruction of the Column of the Place Vendôme, the approval of the International is signified.”

Nothing of the kind is stated in that decree, although the Commune was, no doubt, fully aware that the whole International all over the world would applaud this resolution.

Such then is the, according to the *Times* newspaper, irrefutable evidence for Cochrane's statement that the Archbishop of Paris was killed and Paris burnt by the direct order of the General Council of the International in London. Compare his incoherent rant to the report of M. Sacase, on the law against the International in Versailles, and you will be able to realise the distance still existing between a French Rural and a British Dogberry.\*

---

\* *Dogberry*—a character from Shakespeare's comedy *Much Ado About Nothing*, personification of complacency, ignorance and stupidity.—Ed.

Of Mr. Cochrane's *fidus Achates*,\* Mr. Eastwick, we should say with Dante: "Look at him and pass on," were it not for his absurd assertion that the International is responsible for the *Père Duchêne*<sup>159</sup> of Vermersch, whom the learned Mr. Cochrane calls Vermuth.

If it is an unmixed pleasure to have an opponent like Mr. Cochrane, it is a grievous calamity to have to undergo the patronage, as far as it goes, of Mr. Fawcett. If he is bold enough to defend the International against forcible measures, which the British Government neither dare nor care to take, he has at the same time that sense of duty and high moral courage which compel him to pass upon it his supreme professoral condemnation. Unfortunately the pretended doctrines of the International, which he attacks, are but concoctions of his own poor brain.

"The State," he says, "was to do this and that, and find money to carry out all their projects. The first article of the programme was that the State should buy up all the land, and all the instruments of production, and let them out at a fair and reasonable price to the people."<sup>160</sup>

As to the buying up of the land by the State under certain circumstances and the letting of it out to the people at a fair and reasonable price, let Mr. Fawcett settle that with his theoretical teacher Mr. John Stuart Mill, and with his political Chief Mr. John Bright. The second article

"proposes that the State should regulate the hours of labour".

The historical learning of our Professor shines out brilliantly when he makes the International the author of the British Factory and Workshops' Acts, and his economical proficiency comes out to equal advantage in his appreciation of those acts. Third article—

"That the State should provide gratuitous education."

---

\* Devoted follower, henchman.—*Ed.*

Such broad facts as the existence of gratuitous education in the United States and Switzerland, and their beneficial results, what are they compared to the gloomy vaticinations of Professor Fawcett? Fourth article—

“That the State should lend capital to co-operative societies.”

There is here a slight mistake; Mr. Fawcett mixes up the demands put forth by Lassalle, who died before the foundation of the International, with the principles of the International. By the by, Lassalle invoked the precedent of the State loans, which, under the pretext of agricultural improvements, and by the instrumentality of Parliament, the British landed proprietors had so generously granted to themselves. Fifth article—

“as the coping-stone, it was proposed that the whole revenue of the country should be raised by a graduated tax upon property”.

This is really too bad; to make the demands of Mr. Robert Gladstone and his Liverpool middle-class Financial Reformers the “coping-stone” of the International!

This great political economist, Mr. Fawcett, whose claim to scientific fame rests entirely upon a vulgarisation, for the use of schoolboys, of Mr. John Stuart Mill’s compendium of political economy, confesses that “the confident predictions” (for the free-traders) “of five and twenty years ago had been falsified by facts”. At the same time he is confident of his ability to allay the giant proletarian movement of our days by repeating over and over again, in a still more diluted form, the very same stale phrases by which those false predictions of twenty-five years ago were propped up. His sham defence of the International, which is, in reality, an humble apology for his former pretended sympathies with the working classes, will, it is to be hoped, open the eyes of such English working men as are still taken in by the sentimentalism, under which Mr. Fawcett hitherto tried to hide his scientific nullity.

Now if Mr. B. Cochrane represents the political intellect, and Mr. Fawcett the economical science of the British House of Commons, how does this "pleasantest of all London Clubs" compare with the American House of Representatives, which, on the 13th December, 1871, passed an act for the establishment of a Labour Statistics Office,<sup>161</sup> and declared that this act was passed at the express desire of the International Working Men's Association, which the House recognised as one of the most important facts of the present age?

The General Council:

*R. APPEGARTH, A. ARNAUD, M. BARRY, M. J. BOON, F. BRADNICK, G. H. BUTTERY, F. COURNET, E. DELAHAYE, EUGÈNE DUPONT, W. HALES, HURLIMAN, JULES JOHANNARD, C. KEEN, HARRIETT LAW, F. LESSNER, LOCHNER, C. LONGUET, MARGUERITTE, C. MARTIN, ZÉVY MAURICE, H. MAYO, G. MILNER, CH. MURRAY, PFÄNDER, J. ROZWADOWSKI, V. REGIS, J. ROACH, RÜHL, G. RANVIER, SADLER, COWELL STEPNEY, A. TAYLOR, W. TOWNSHEND, E. VAILLANT, J. WESTON, DE WOLFERS, F. J. YARROW*

Corresponding Secretaries:

*LEO FRANKEL*, for Austria and Hungary; *A. HERMAN*, Belgium; *T. MOTTERSHEAD*, Denmark; *A. SERRAILLIER*, France; *KARL MARX*, Germany and Russia; *C. ROCHAT*, Holland; *J. P. McDONNELL*, Ireland; *F. ENGELS*, Italy and Spain; *WALERY WRÓBLEWSKI*, Poland; *HERMANN JUNG*, Switzerland; *J. G. ECCARIUS*, United States; *LE MOUSSU*, for French Branches of United States; *J. HALES* General

Secretary

London, 17th April, 1872

The Secretary of Spain\* communicated the following two documents from the Congress of Spanish Internationals sitting at Saragossa.

"Citizens of the General Council,

"Today, 8th of April, the Second Congress of the International Working Men's Association in Spain has been opened. There were present forty-five delegates. The Congress has been dissolved by force, but the effect produced by this act was immense. Although it was on a Monday, all the workshops of Saragossa were closed, the workmen having resolved to assist at the Congress. The authorities conducted themselves with a reserve almost amounting to humility before our calm and energetic attitude. We are going to continue holding our Congress, but without giving it a public character. With best thanks to the Council, we send our fraternal salute to it, as well as to all our brothers in England.

"Saragossa, 8th April, 1872,

"F. MORA"

"To the General Council.

"The Congress of Saragossa sends a vote of thanks to the defenders of the Commune of Paris, who suffer on the hulks or in exile for their love for the cause of the emancipation of the working class, and mourningly recalls the memory of the victims murdered by the barbarians of Versailles.

"Congress of Saragossa, 10th April, 1872.

"The chairman of the meeting, *M. PINO*, engineer.

"The secretaries, *SANTIAGO GOMEZ*, engineer, *JOSE PAMIAS*, shoemaker."

The Congress was closed on the 11th April, but the resolutions taken by it have not yet come to hand.<sup>162</sup>

Citizen Harris resigned his membership of the Council.\*\*

The declaration was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* read the second declaration which dealt with the promoters of the disturbances which were charged upon the International and proved their utter unreliability.<sup>163</sup>

\* Engles.—*Ed.*

\*\* The newspaper clipping ends here.—*Ed.*

A long discussion took place upon it, many of the members thinking that some of the statements could not be maintained though they might be morally true. While there was a few who deprecated the issuing of a declaration upon the matter at all as tending to give the persons referred to an unnecessary importance; in the end Citizen *Bradnick* proposed that the question be adjourned.

Citizen *Milner* seconded it and on being put to the vote, it was carried.

The Council adjourned at 11.15.

J. ROACH, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF MEETING\*

*Held April 23rd, 1872*<sup>164</sup>

Citizen *Roach* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Bradnick, Barry, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Jung, Keen, Lessner, Le Moussu, Lochner, Marx, Martin, Margueritte, Mayo, McDonnell, Milner, Murray, Roach, Rühl, Serrailier, Taylor, Townshend, Vailant* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, the *Chairman* said the election of Citizen *Sexton* stood first on the order of the day. He had known him for many years and could vouch that if elected, he would make a very useful member of the Council; he had always entertained opinions similar to those advocated by the Association, and he was a most able lecturer; he would be able to go into the provinces and do much good for the Association if elected.

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 423-27 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

As Citizen Mayo was not present, Citizen *Taylor* seconded; he had always found Citizen Sexton a consistent and valuable advocate of democratic ideas.

Citizen *Serraillier* said he had seen a book in which Citizen Sexton was charged with having been connected with a museum of anatomy at which the practice was somewhat questionable and he was further charged with having threatened to expose the malpractices but suppressed the information in consideration of a certain sum annually. He thought that was a matter which required clearing up; until that was done he could not vote for Citizen Sexton.

Citizen *Engels* thought the matter alluded to by Citizen *Serraillier* ought to be disproved.

Citizen *Jung* said he could [see] no reason to object to Citizen Sexton because he had lectured at Kahn's; as he believed, the lectures given were upon scientific subjects—more valuable than otherwise, but he agreed with *Serraillier* and *Engels* that the charge of suppressing information for money ought to be met and disproved.

Citizen *Marx* said: in view of the resolution of the Conference\* he should not have voted for the addition of any more Englishman being made to the Council,<sup>165</sup> but as *Harris* had resigned, his place could be filled up. Nevertheless, he thought, as the character of Sexton had been challenged, the same course should be pursued as was followed in the case of *McDonnell*.<sup>166</sup>

Citizen *Barry* said the fact that Dr. Sexton had been a lecturer [at] a place like Kahn's, which it was known was used as a cloak for the worst practices, was quite a sufficient reason why he should not be accepted. The fact that he had used the degree of M.D. without stating that it was not obtained in England showed an amount of moral delinquency, which rendered him unfitted to sit on the Council.

Citizen *Hales* said he was authorised by Citizen Sexton

---

\* Held in London in 1871.—Ed.

to assure the Council that the statement referred to by Citizen Serrailier was absolutely untrue; so far from Citizen Sexton being ashamed of his connection with the museum alluded to, he advertised the fact himself in the medical directory. The lectures he there gave were of a scientific and educational character, and he challenged anyone to say to the contrary who had ever attended them. Citizen Sexton had always been consistent in his political and social professions and had been a friend of Ernest Jones and Robert Owen; he called the first meeting which was held against the Conspiracy to Murder Bill of Lord Palmerston,<sup>167</sup> when he and Ernest Jones spoke on the same platform. The man who attacked him was a quack and he was persecuted by certain sections of the Medical Profession because he was considered an interloper; he was a M. D. of Göttingen University, a member of the Royal Geographical Society, a member of the Royal Zoological Society, a member of the Anthropological Society and a member of the Society of Arts—to the last he had been admitted since the date of the alleged suppression. All these societies required guarantees of the honour and honesty of their members and he thought the fact that he had been admitted a member of the societies mentioned ought to be sufficient for the Council.

Citizen *Barry* said Citizen Hales had pleaded the cause of Dr. Sexton as well as if he had been paid to do it, but he must inform him that the man who wrote the book in question was not a quack—he was on the register while Sexton was not.

Citizen *Jung* asked if all men who were not on the medical register were quacks.

Citizen *Barry* said he did not mean to say they were.

Citizen *Jung* asked if all the men on the register were free from quackery.

Citizen *Barry* said, Oh, no!

Citizen *Hales* said Citizen Sexton was registered, he had

seen the proofs himself; with respect to his advocacy, he might say that he was not paid; he only hoped that Citizen Barry was not paid for services which he rendered and information which he supplied.\*

Citizen *Yarrow* said he did not know anything about Dr. Sexton except that he was not a legitimate practitioner.

Citizen *Bradnick* didn't object to an investigation of Citizen Sexton's character; he only regretted that the same policy had not been pursued with others on previous occasions.

Citizen *Martin* thought the Council should be careful in making additions to its numbers when the candidates did not belong to the working class.

Citizen *Marqueritte* proposed [that] the question be adjourned, so as to allow the fullest investigation into the matter.

Citizen *Milner* seconded, so as to allow full time for consideration; the only point with him was whether it was desirable to add professional men to the Council; as far as Dr. Sexton was concerned, he knew he would be a valuable ally, he had done good work in the past.

Citizen *Murray* said he hoped the matter would be disposed of at once—he knew Dr. Sexton had been a consistent advocate of advanced principles, he was one of the first men in England who had the courage to stand forward and denounce the *coup d'état*,\*\* and that at a time when it was dangerous for men to express their opinions; he had not only the courage to lecture, but to publish with his name attached; he knew also that he was not a mercenary man, for many a time he had assisted him by lecturing for him. With respect to his being a professional man, he thought that should be no bar, seeing that he had to work hard for his living the same as a workman.

Citizen *Marx* did not think there was anything to fear

---

\* See p. 134 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Of December 2, 1851 in France.—*Ed.*

from the admission of professional men while the great majority of the Council was composed of workers, but he thought the question ought to be adjourned so [as] to afford the fullest opportunities for inquiries—then whatever the result might be the Council would stand clear.

It was then put to the vote and the adjournment was carried.

Citizen *Engels* announced that Citizen Marx and himself had ordered 1,000 copies of the declaration\* to be printed at their own expense and that members of the Council could be supplied with the same.

Citizen *Hales* communicated a note which [he] had received from Citizen Harris respecting his resignation, he simply reiterated his announcement and assigned no reason.

On the motion of Citizen *Engels*, seconded by Citizen *Marx*, the resignation was accepted.

A letter from the Secretary of the Sunderland branch\*\* was read, in which the Council was asked to use its influence to keep workmen from coming from the Continent to take the places of the pressed glass-makers of the north, who were locked out by their employers for forming a Union.

Citizen *Jung* proposed and Citizen *Milner* seconded that the different secretaries communicate the facts to the respective sections on the Continent, and that they be requested to prevent men coming over.

Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Hales* read a letter from Citizen Riley announcing that the agreement between himself and the Council relative to the insertion of reports was at an end.\*\*\*

Citizen Hales said he had received a letter from Madame Huleck who said that a rumour was in circulation to the

---

\* Against Baillie-Cochrane. See pp. 155-61 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* John Lemon.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See pp. 110-11 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

effect that she had been expelled from the General Council *for being a bad woman* and she asked that an official denial might be sent to each of the Federal Councils; this she said was necessary to enable her to vindicate her character. He suggested that the consideration of the letter should be postponed,<sup>168</sup> which was agreed to.

Citizen *Marx* said he had received a letter from America the contents of which he would communicate at the next meeting, but he might state that the new Federal Committee had refused to accept the resolutions of the General Council, and Citizen *Eccarius* had refused to send them the resolutions\*—and had sent word instead that documents and communications had been abstracted or withheld by some member of the Council. He would not say more than it seemed very extraordinary indeed for an officer to refuse to carry out the decisions of the Council, especially as two-thirds of the resolutions were voted by the officer himself.\*\*

Citizen *Eccarius* said he thought that Citizen *Marx* ought to make inquiries before he brought forward charges. He told *Elliott* that he declined to forward the resolutions, as he was dissatisfied and meant to resign. He was found fault with on all sides, and he couldn't stand it any longer. He had received a letter in which he was informed that the new Council had sent three members to see if an arrangement could be come to, but that the writer was afraid that if *Sorge* had anything to do with it, the affair would drop through. The Council declined to accept the resolution relative to two-thirds of the members of sections belonging to the wage-paid class, as well as the one suspending

---

\* The resolutions on the split in the North-American Federation. See pp. 410-13 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* The entry is not exact. The reference is apparently to the resolution demanding that not less than two-thirds of each section should belong to the wage-earners.—*Ed.*

Section 12, and they demanded to know who furnished the statement that Section 12 was the bar to union.

Citizen *Engels* communicated some very interesting information relative to the treatment of Citizen Cuno who had been imprisoned, robbed, and treated like a common felon, by the Italian Government, for belonging to the International. He was finally escorted to the frontier and released on Bavarian soil, the plea used being that he was a rogue and vagabond without means of subsistence, though he was in a good situation and had a large sum of money in his possession when he was arrested.<sup>169</sup>

Citizen *Hales* announced that a section had been formed in Buenos Aires. It had been in existence a month and numbers upwards of seventy members. It desired to keep relationship with the Council.<sup>170</sup>

The Council adjourned at 11.15.

H. JUNG, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF MEETING\*

*Held April 30th, 1872*<sup>171</sup>

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Applegarth, Boon, Barry, Arnaud, Cournet, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Jung, Lessner, Le Moussu, Lochner, Marx, Martin, Mayo, McDonnell, Murray, Roach, Rozwadowski, Rühl, Serraillier, Taylor, Townshend, Vaillant* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed, after which Citizen *Engels* rose to make a motion of order. He said that there was such a pressure of business that it was impossible to get through it unless there were

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 428-31 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

extraordinary sittings. There was first Sexton's election. Second, the American business. Third, the action of Eccarius; fourth, the report of the 18th of March Committee\*, fifth, the report of the deputation to the Cabinet-Makers.\*\* Then sixth, there was the conduct of Citizen Weston to be considered; seventh, the action to be taken with the so-called Federalist Council,<sup>172</sup> and eighth, the motion of Citizen Hales with regard to the formation of Irish Nationalist Sections in England.\*\*\* He therefore proposed that extraordinary sittings be held on Saturday evenings until further notice.

Citizen *Lessner* seconded and the proposition was carried unanimously.

The *Secretary*\*\*\*\* then read a letter from Citizen Sexton in which he denied the truth of the charges which had been brought against him.

Citizen *Yarrow* said he would move the rejection of Citizen Sexton as he thought gross misrepresentations had been made.

Citizen *Hales* pointed out that Citizen *Yarrow* was mistaken. No misrepresentations had taken place.

Citizen *Serraillier* thought the Council had only to consider whether the letter from Citizen Sexton disproved the charges which had been made against him; he thought it did not fully do so, though it did partly.

Citizen *Yarrow* said the fact that Citizen Sexton belonged to a number of Royal Societies was no proof of respectability; anybody could belong to them who would subscribe.

Citizen *Barry* thought that Citizen Sexton's friends would do well to withdraw his nomination. It was an undoubted fact that he propped up Kahn's Museum with his intelli-

---

\* See pp. 112-13, 133-34 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 154 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See pp. 152, 154 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\*\* Hales.—*Ed.*

gence and skill, though he believed he only took it when he was hard up.

Citizen *Martin* thought the opposition raised against Citizen Sexton was a bad omen. The French members did not understand the question and he thought his election might be productive of bitterness.

Citizen *Hales* said he and his friends would be content to let the matter be decided by the English members, though they did not wish it, but he would ask the French members to consider where the opposition came from, he would ask them to remember the past policy of those who opposed, and compare it with that of those who supported. Sexton would be very useful if elected.

Citizen *Eccarius* said his opposition arose from altogether different cause to that of others—he was opposed because of his quarrel with Bradlaugh. He did not wish the Association used in the quarrel; Sexton could do as much for the Association outside the Council, as he could, if he was in.

Citizen *Vaillant* said the real thing to be considered was: would the election of Citizen Sexton bring any influence to the Council? Of course, if the antecedents of the respective parties were only considered, the French members would know how to vote.

The proposition was then put to the vote and was carried by eleven to eight, the Chairman voting.

Citizen *Boon* protested against the Chairman voting and upon being called to order protested.\*

Citizen *Engels* proposed and Citizen *Serrailier* seconded a vote of censure upon Citizen Boon for constant interruption of the Chairman.

Citizen *Murray* hoped the motion would not be pressed.

Citizen *Barry* should feel it his duty to move a vote of

---

\* Further the words "with more warmth than discretion" are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

censure upon everyone who interrupted the Chairman if the proposition was carried.

Citizen *Frankel* proposed and Citizen *Lessner* seconded that the Council should proceed to the order of the day, at the same time condemning the conduct of Citizen Boon.

Citizen *Mottershead* thought it would be unwise to put the proposition. Citizen Boon most likely acted in ignorance. Not usual for the Chairman to vote.

Citizen *Boon* apologised for his conduct to the Chairman, but he would say the Chairman voting was not in accordance with English habits.\* Though he did not care whether it was voted or not.

Citizen *Barry* moved the order of the day pure and simple.

Citizen *Murray* seconded and on being put [to the vote it] was carried.

Citizen *Hales* read a letter from Citizen Weston, explanatory of his name appearing upon the document purporting to be the Federalist Council of the International.

Citizen *Yarrow* moved that the question be postponed for further inquiries. Thought that Weston had not given his consent to the charges as they appeared.

Citizen *Vaillant* said it was necessary to maintain a certain discipline; he proposed that Weston be informed that unless he forwarded a statement to the Council for publication, saying that his name was appended against his knowledge, he would be expelled from the Council; his duty was to have come to the Council and make his complaint if he was not satisfied.

Citizen *Barry* seconded.

Citizen *Marx* said: no member had a right to attack the Council while he was a member—therefore there must be a full retraction.

The proposition was carried unanimously.

---

\* The next sentence was inserted when the Minutes were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Engels* reported that they had made a new discovery in Italy. They had discovered that the International meant to imitate the Commune of Paris, and use plenty of petroleum. A list of lectures had been burnt at one of the colleges, and this was the beginning of the work. A long-winded inquiry had been instituted and a number of arrests had actually been made, the object being of course to get rid of those who were known to hold advanced views.<sup>173</sup>

Citizen *Serrailier* reported that the movement was progressing favourably in France. There were some towns where even the mayors and members of the Municipal Councils were members of the Association; in some places they had begun by enrolling the police; they had the stamps all right. He had received 30 francs for stamps; more than that, Section *Ferré* was going to start a paper in a few days.

Citizen *Le Moussu* said he had received a letter from New York. A section proposed to raise a capital of £1,000 and purchase land, which it was intended to devote to the maintenance of widows and children if the General Council approved of the scheme. Laugrand also informed him that a letter had been written to Hales upon a subject mentioned in his letter.

Citizen *Hales* stated that he had received no other letter besides the one from Madame Huleck. With reference to the proposition from New York he proposed that it be referred to the Rules Committee for examination and that it reports thereon to the Council.

Citizen *Mottershead* seconded.

Citizen *Frankel* thought the proposal reactionary and only calculated to benefit a section. He was opposed to it, but he thought it should be discussed by the Council. He proposed that the question be adjourned.

Citizen *Townshend* seconded, and it was carried by 15 to 6.

Citizen *Mottershead* said it was impossible for him to fulfil the duties of Secretary for Denmark; he had tried to

learn Danish, but he found that he could not do it and he didn't intend holding any office that he could not fulfil. He therefore tendered his resignation. He had no objection whatever to the document lately issued by the Council.

Citizen *Boon* proposed and Citizen *Eccarius* seconded that the resignation of Citizen *Mottershead* be accepted.

Carried unanimously.

The Council adjourned at 11.15.

JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY SITTING\*

*Held May 4th, 1872*

Citizen *Serraillier* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Bradnick*, *Barry*, *Cournet*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Jung*, *Lessner*, *McDonnell*, *Mottershead*, *Rozwadowski*, and *Serraillier*.

On the Minutes of the previous meeting being read, Citizen *Mottershead* proposed that the Minutes relating to the election of Citizen *Sexton* be rejected, not on the ground of incorrectness, but because he objected to the confirmation of the election.

This was declared out of order, it being ruled that the only question that could be discussed was whether the Minutes were a correct record or not.

Citizen *Engels* asked that an observation made by Citizen *Boon* to the effect that "he did not care if a vote of censure was passed upon him" be inserted, which was done.

Citizen *Eccarius* moved that the report of the speech made by *Vaillant* be amended, on the ground that it was incorrect.

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 432-36 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

This was objected to by several citizens and, as Citizen Vaillant was not present, the motion was not pressed, Citizen Eccarius reserving the point.

The Minutes were then confirmed.

Citizen *Serraillier* reported that Section *Ferré* was making progress and that a new section had been started in Paris with 20 members, all of them being revolutionary men. He also reported that the Trades Societies were reorganising very fast and there was good hope that they would join the International. In Toulouse and Bordeaux the leaders already belonged to the Association. He also read a letter from an active citizen which asked that all communications in future be sent upon plain paper without the stamp of the Council, so as to prevent danger that might arise were the letters opened in the Post Office. The different sections proposed federating and had already appointed a Committee of *Salut Public*; they could dispose of any amount of stamps. In the South of France the workmen desired nothing better than revenge.

Citizen *Hales* read a letter from New York giving an account of the action taken by the old Federal Council to carry out the Council's resolutions and stating that the reluctance of the new Federal Council to do the same was owing to a letter which had been written by J. G. Eccarius, in which he stated the documents sent by the new Federal Council had been withheld or *abstracted* by some members of the Council. The letter also stated that a letter had been received from a member of the General Council by Section 6 in which regret was expressed at the passage of the resolutions.\*

Citizen *Engels* reported that the Working Men's Society of Ferrara in Italy gave in its adherence in every respect to the new Rules, and had sent in its rules for confirmation,

---

\* On the split in the North-American Federation (see pp. 205-06, 323-32, 410-13 of the present volume).—*Ed.*

which it was believed would be found in full accordance with those of the Association.

Citizen *McDonnell* reported that he had received a letter from *McKeon* in Dublin which stated that the Association met with much opposition from the clerico-national party. The Dublin section had held a meeting when a member belonging to the Nationalists broke in and threw the meeting into disorder. The Secretary had through family influence been frightened into leaving Dublin, but another one had been elected and they meant to work quietly and let the world believe they were dead; they meant to work privately until they were strong enough to defy the terrorism used against them. *De Morgan* reported that the declaration of the General Council\* had done some good in Cork, but the police influence was brought to bear privately. The establishment of the Association in Cork had done much good: all the large firms in that city and the South of Ireland were conceding the nine hours for fear the men should join the International. The declaration of the General Council upon the Police Terrorism had been printed in all the Cork papers and had been severely commented on. With respect to *De Morgan* he might say that arrangements had been made for supporting him until he had overcome the fearful opposition raised against him. He had received letters from *McCarthy* of Ennis who offered to start branches of the Association in Ennis and Limerick; the writer wished to know if *John Weston* signing the document of the alleged seceders\*\* was the member of the General Council of that name. From Tipperary the news was encouraging; there also it was proposed to start a branch. The section in Cootehill was progressing slowly;

---

\* "Police Terrorism in Ireland" (see pp. 149-50 of the present volume).—*Ed.*

\*\* The reference is to the Universal Federalist Council (see pp. 202-03 of the present volume).—*Ed.*

there also questions were asked in reference to the alleged secession. In Bradford and Middlesbrough the sections were going on favourably. New branches were in process of formation at Sheffield and Peckham. The landlord of the house where the Soho section met had refused to allow any further meetings in his house, and a Conference had been held at which it had been resolved to take a house at which the different sections could meet, so as to enable them to become independent of public houses altogether.

Citizen *Frankel* reported [that] 27 men were arrested at Pesth some time ago for belonging to a socialistic organisation; 20 had been released, but the others were to be tried.\*

Citizen *Jung* said he received a letter some time ago from Geneva asking that Geneva be appointed as the place of meeting for the next Congress. As he had not an opportunity of laying it before the Council owing to pressure of business, he had answered that it was impossible for the General Council to fix upon a place for the Congress yet, owing to the complications upon the Continent.<sup>174</sup>

Citizen *Rozwadowski* said that it was reported in Limburg that the General Council had decided that the next Congress should be held in October next at Geneva.

Citizen *Cournet* asked whether it would not be advisable to announce that a Congress would take place, so as to stop the complaints that were made relative to the non-holding of the Congresses.

Citizen *Engels* replied that it was stated in the declaration upon the Swiss disputes\*\* that the Annual Congress would be held next September.

Citizen *Frankel* said he was annoyed that that declaration was not yet published, but he did not think it advisable to make a special declaration upon the subject.

---

\* See p. 184 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* *Fictitious Splits in the International.*—*Ed.*

Citizen\* pointed out that the document in question was in French, while the complaints were, most of them, made in English.

Citizen *Mottershead* did not think that too much publicity could be given to the fact that it was intended to hold a Congress.

Citizen *Hales* reported that the Committee appointed to take action with regard to the 18th of March meeting\*\* had consulted Messrs. Shaen and Roscoe and it was found that an action could not be entered owing to the fact that Citizen Taylor was about leaving England; an action could not be got through in less than six weeks and Taylor was bound to leave early in May—besides, there was a £10 penalty to pay for the agreement not being stamped. So the Committee had simply instructed Messrs. Shaen and Roscoe to send a lawyer's letter demanding the payment of damages—the matter was in their hands.

Citizen *Eccarius* reported the result of the deputation to the Alliance Cabinet-Makers,\*\*\* but before commencing he made a charge against Citizen Hales of not letting him know that the meeting would not receive the deputation until a quarter to ten while he did let Jung know. The consequence was that he lost half a day's work and had to walk all the way home, having missed the train. With respect to the reception. They were met with a bit of a storm and the Secretary stated that they had received no communication from the Council since Hales had been Secretary; they had received no intimation of changes and had not received the new Rules.

Citizen *Hales* said he did send the Rules to the Cabinet-Makers and he had corresponded with the Secretary and he would bring his letters to prove it. As for not informing

---

\* Name not given in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 133-34 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See p. 154 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Eccarius, he wrote to the Secretary of the Cabinet-Makers on Wednesday asking them to receive a deputation and he did not receive a reply until after dinner on Monday. He called upon Jung, but he could not call upon Eccarius, and it was too late to write.

Citizen *Bradnick* said he did not attend because he did not know the place of meeting.

Citizen *Jung* said Hales called upon him and asked him to go to the Cabinet-Makers and get the affair put off. The letter did not say that the deputation would be received, but said it might get a hearing if it was there about a quarter to ten, and it was a quarter past eleven before they were received. Eccarius made a very good speech, but Yarrow began a speech that he thought ought not to have been delivered outside the Council—he began discussing the right of delegation and questioning the right of the Council to refuse delegates, a proceeding that he thought highly impolitic, to say the least. He tried to explain the constitution of the Council and pointed out that the Rules were made to meet general and not particular cases; the Council might be removed to Switzerland, Belgium or elsewhere and the Rules were made to meet such eventualities. The Secretary did state what Eccarius said about them receiving no Rules or correspondence.

Citizen *Eccarius* said that he should give notice of motion: "That a commission be appointed to inquire into Hales's correspondence with the Trades Unions." It was necessary, for the Trades Unions would not have anything to do with the Federal Council, and he did not want to lose them.

Citizen *Frankel* said he should give notice of motion: "That the duties of General Secretary be confined to the Council and that a Secretary be appointed for England."

Citizen *Hales* said he should resist the motion of Citizen Eccarius as it would be clearly a vote of no confidence. He did not object to the production of any correspondence

asked for, but a motion to enquire into his conduct implied a cause and he could not accede to it.

The Council adjourned at 11.15.

JOHN HALES, Secretary

### COUNCIL MEETING\*

Held May 7th, 1872<sup>175</sup>

Citizen *Serrailier* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Barry, Cournet, Ecarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Jung, Lessner, Lochner, Martin, Mayo, McDonnell, Milner, Mottershead, Murray, Rozwadowski, Serrailier, Townshend, Vaillant* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Hales* announced that he had received a letter from *Sorge* which stated that the Federal Council, to which he belonged, had accepted the Council resolutions and had appointed a Committee to meet the other Council.

Citizen *Engels* communicated the following report upon the Spanish Congress of *Saragossa*.\*\*

He also reported that he had just received a letter from *Milan*, giving fuller details of the affair reported last week, and stating the section had been compelled to suspend its paper\*\*\* owing to the imprisonment of some of the members.<sup>176</sup> He had examined the rules of the *Ferrara* association, and having regard to the unqualified adhesion which

---

\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 437-42 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

\*\* Here a half-page blank follows; for *Engels's* report as printed in *The Eastern Post* No. 189, May 12, 1872, see pp. 293-96 of the present volume.—Ed.

\*\*\* *Martello*.—Ed.

came with them, he moved that they be confirmed. They were plain, practical rules.\*

The proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he had received a letter from Washington; he didn't know to which section the writer belonged, his name was Durant; the section agreed with the resolutions,\*\* but suggested that some other term be employed to that of "wage-labourers", which was open to great misconception. A portion of a letter had been published in one of the American papers, which purported to have been written by the American Secretary—in which regret was expressed that the report had not been received before the resolutions of the Council were adopted, as it threw a new light upon the subject—that letter was not written by him, and he should like to know how many American secretaries there were. He also ought to mention that it had been decided to hold a Congress\*\*\* in the second week in July.

Citizen *Serrailier* said he had received [a letter] from Paris informing him that an active member of the Association had been dismissed from his employment because he had tried to organise a Trades Society; when he asked for the reason of his dismissal, he was told it was because of the continual inquiries made about him by the secret police; but a number of others had been dismissed as well, and there was little doubt that the employers were determined to prevent the workmen organising, and that was the real reason.

Citizen *Engels* said it was reported in the daily journals that the President and Treasurer of the Association had been arrested in Copenhagen, but no particulars had yet come to hand.<sup>177</sup>

\* See pp. 175-76 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Of the General Council on the split in the North-American Federation. See pp. 410-13 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Of the North-American Federation.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Barry* asked through the chair for a personal explanation from Citizen *Vaillant* relative to words uttered in the debate on the election of Citizen *Sexton*. He wanted to know what he meant by saying that the French members would know how to vote, if they only considered those who opposed.\*

Citizen *Vaillant* said he considered there were two parties on the Council, one of which was active in a revolutionary sense, while the other was not so active, and what he meant was that if *Sexton* was proposed by the active section, and opposed by those not so active, they should know how to vote, and he particularly asked if Citizen *Sexton* would bring any influence to [the Council if] he was elected. That question was not answered to his satisfaction, and for that reason he abstained from voting.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he considered the fact that Citizen *Vaillant* did not vote was quite sufficient to show that nothing was intended.

Citizen *Barry* was not satisfied with the answer of Citizen *Vaillant*; he considered it shuffling. he demanded to know if anything personal was meant for him in what was said.

Citizen *Vaillant* said he didn't think of *Barry* at all when he spoke, it never entered his mind to draw a comparison between Citizen *Sexton* whom he did not know, and Citizen *Barry* of whom he knew but little, but since Citizen *Barry* had forced his personality upon him, he must inform him that he considered him an *ultra-moderate*.

Citizen *Hales* said *Barry* ought to have questioned him instead of Citizen *Vaillant*; and it was him who asked the French members to consider the antecedents of those who opposed.\*\*

The Council then proceeded to the order of the day.

Citizen *Hales* reported that he had written to Citizen

---

\* See p. 171 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

Weston informing him what the Council had decided upon,\* but he had not received a reply. He called on Friday night at his house, but he was not at home.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he would propose the Council should proceed to the order of the day; there was not sufficient evidence—he should certainly want to see a fair copy of the letter sent before he took any action.

Citizen *Yarrow* seconded and explained that he had not been quite right in his reporting about the Mile End branch of the Land and Labour League.<sup>178</sup>

Citizen *Martin* said some of the so-called Seceding Committee\*\* met at Weston's and had formed a sort of masonic revolutionary lodge where they went through the form of initiating members, blindfold, etc.

Citizen *Engels* said he was convinced that Citizen Weston was not innocent in the affair, whether he signed his name or not—but to give him every opportunity of disproving the charges, he proposed that the Secretary write a fresh letter to Citizen Weston repeating the resolution of the Council last Tuesday and stating that, as no reply had been received to the letter of the Secretary of last Thursday, and that unless by Saturday next a reply in accordance with the above resolution is received, the Council will consider and vote upon a motion for Citizen Weston's expulsion, and that the Secretary keep a copy of the letter, and send it registered.

Citizen *Mottershead* would support the proposition instead of his own; he did not wish to screen Citizen Weston, but he did not forget that he was an old member of the Council and had done good service. Everyone knew that whatever Citizen Weston might have done he was pure as the driven snow.

Citizen *Jung* said he thought that Citizen *Mottershead*

---

\* See p. 172 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Universal Federalist Council.—*Ed.*

had expressed words that showed very loose morality. He must protest against a man being called pure as driven snow after he had given up his accounts without giving up the balance, and then charged the next Treasurer with being a thief, for that was what the charge amounted to that he had signed.

Citizen *Barry* thought that perhaps Weston was in a minority upon the question and that his name might have been used even while he was opposed to that to which it was attached.

Citizen *Hales* suggested that it would be better to appoint a deputation from those who believed in Weston's innocence.

Citizen *Milner* was in favour of the proposition; it would only show that the Council was not proceeding with indecent haste, when a man's reputation was at stake.

The resolution was then put [to the vote] and carried.

Citizen *Frankel* reported that the members he referred to on Saturday had just been tried at Pesth; only one had been convicted, though some had been detained in prison 10 months awaiting trial, that one was Citizen Politzer; he had been sentenced to six months' imprisonment. Citizen Scheu, the editor of the *Volkswille* of Vienna, had been sentenced to two months for attending a working-class demonstration, though he made no speech whatever.<sup>179</sup>

Citizen *Engels* proposed and Citizen *Frankel* seconded that Citizen Cournet be appointed Corresponding Secretary for Denmark. Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* proposed and Citizen *Yarrow* seconded that Le Moussu be French Corresponding Secretary for the Americas—South as well as North. Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Eccarius* tendered his resignation as Secretary for America: there was a number corresponding with different parties in America and he was made answerable for all—he had been waiting four months for an opportunity to resign; ever since the split there had been nothing but

confusion; the matter had been referred to the Sub-Committee and the Sub-Committee had never met. He had not neglected his duties, for he had had no duty to perform. Only the other day Hales had written a letter.

Citizen *Engels* proposed the resignation be not accepted, but that it should stand over until whole matter regarding the American affair was gone into.

Citizen *Eccarius* said that when he was first charged, he asked for the proofs and he was told that they would be forthcoming immediately. He said months ago he wanted to resign. He wanted to resign before the other came on, or it would be said he was removed.

Citizen *Mottershead* said the Council had better make a virtue of a necessity, it could not compel a man to hold office against his will; he did not see that it would prejudice the matter in dispute in the least whatever it might be.

Citizen *Engels* said there was a distinct charge against *Eccarius*: he was charged with writing a letter which had prevented one of the Federal Councils from recognising the resolutions of the General Council. The charge would be brought on as soon as the health of Citizen Marx would permit him to attend; he had been charged to bring on the matter and had charge of the documents. If *Eccarius* had done nothing the Council would give him an honourable discharge. The matter ought to be investigated before the resignation was accepted.

Citizen *Eccarius*: Then you want to turn me out?

Citizen *Engels*: No! You may clear yourself. *Mottershead* forced the question.

Citizen *Mottershead* said he considered it an excess of cruelty to let a charge of that character hanging over a man's head week after week before it was brought on. He proposed the resignation be accepted.

Citizen *Cournet* thought the two questions were inseparable, and *Eccarius* ought to be the first to see it. The charge ought to be met before the resignation was dealt with.

Citizen *Barry* seconded the amendment of Mottershead.

Citizen *Martin* was of a contrary opinion: the Council could reserve its action, even if it accepted the resignation.

Citizen *Hales* was of the same opinion as *Martin*. He thought the Council could condemn the action of a past Secretary the same as it could the conduct of a present Secretary. He didn't see that it would interfere with the action to be taken. He thought it better the charge should be dealt with apart from the question as to who held office.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he had not neglected the functions as he had had none to perform; all the letters had been handed over to the Sub-Committee and the Sub-Committee had never met.

Citizen *Engels* said the acceptance of the resignation would be looked upon in America as a proof that the duties had been properly performed.

Citizen *Barry* thought it logically absurd to keep a man in office because it was alleged that he was unfitted for it.

Citizen *Milner* thought the case would be met if a time was fixed for the matter to come on.

Citizen *Serraillier* said the Council ought to know how the duties had been performed before it accepted the resignation. If the Council had examined Weston's accounts before they were handed over, it wouldn't have been in the mess it was.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he had to bear the blame of other people's actions, and he did not wish to be responsible any longer.

Citizen *Mottershead*. Never heard a speech with more virus than that of Citizen *Engels*. *Eccarius* had a world-wide reputation, and the Council had the power of gibbeting him whenever it pleased; he couldn't run away and it had no right to be assumed that he was not perfectly ready to meet the charge against him.

Citizen *Martin* said the Council, in the exercise of its

rights, had no right to deprive a member of his right to resign.

The resolution for accepting the resignation was then put to the vote and carried by 14 to 4.

Council adjourned at 11.15.\*

### MINUTES OF MEETING\*\*

*Held at 33, Rathbone Place, Oxford Street, W.  
May 11th, 1872*

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Bradnick*, *Barry*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Jung*, *Lessner*, *Le Moussu*, [*Marx*], *Mayo*, *Rozwadowski*, and *Serraillier*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Hales* read a letter from the wife of Citizen Maurice tendering his resignation as a member of the Council. He was ill and had been so for a long time and was utterly unable to fulfil the duties required.

The resignation was accepted unanimously.

Citizen *Hales* reported that he had written to Weston on the Friday morning,\*\*\* but had not received a reply. He had heard though that he was at work out of town.

It was agreed that the subject should be postponed and that Citizen *Hales* should call upon Citizen Weston personally on Sunday morning.

Citizen *Jung* said he had received a letter from Switzerland. It stated that a Swiss Congress would be held on the 19th inst. and it requested the opinion of the Council upon the advisability of forming a Regional Committee composed

---

\* Unsigned.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 443-47 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* May 7.—*Ed.*

of all the Swiss sections. It also asked that news from France might be supplied for publication in *L'Égalité* and it urged that the next General Congress might be held at Geneva.<sup>180</sup>

It was decided that Citizen Jung should answer that the appointment of a Regional Committee was a matter to be decided by the Swiss themselves, that no information could be supplied with respect to France except such as appeared in the official reports, and that the place of the meeting of the next Congress had not yet been fixed by the Council.

Citizen *Hales* announced that he had received a letter from the Secretary of the Manchester branch\* asking for sheets for "the Irish propaganda fund". He had written back announcing that he knew nothing of any "Irish propagandist fund" and that no such fund had been started or sanctioned by the General or Federal Councils.

Citizen *Engels* supposed it was something done by the Irish branches.<sup>181</sup>

Citizen *Marx* then entered into the charge against Eccarius; he said that the split in the American sections took place on the 19th of November last, and the first letters came to hand about it in December and the beginning of January, but at that time the quarrels amongst the English members of the Council precluded the Council from dealing with the subject. Then came the Swiss dispute, which was of more importance as it affected the very existence of the International. It was in reality caused by a secret society within the Association. Then there was the manifesto, a longer document than the Address on the Civil War, to be written,\*\* calling the French members together to consult upon it, and the debate upon it by the Council to be dealt with before the Council could turn its attention to the

---

\* Edward Jones.—*Ed.*

\*\* This refers to *Fictitious Splits in the International*. See pp. 356-409 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

American affairs—but as soon as the matters referred to had been disposed of, the subject was brought on and the matters referred to the Sub-Committee. Now the object of referring matters to the Sub-Committee was to save time, and he found that it would expedite business by bringing the subject before the Council, for while engaged with the other affairs he had written to Eccarius and Hales for the correspondence which he received as well as that which Le Moussu had received. He found that Eccarius had received a letter from Gregory, a letter from Hubert and a private letter...\* Le Moussu had received a letter from Laugrand and one from Section 10. One had also come addressed to Dupont. Hales had received one from Hubert, one from Elliott, and one from Grosse belonging to the new Counter-Council, and one from Nicholson of the old Council. That those letters were sent to Hales was the fault of the Americans and not the fault of the Council, but none of them contained any new facts; beyond what had appeared in the American press there was nothing except a demand for Rules made by Grosse. On his own part he had received nothing whatever from the Counter-Council and nothing official from the old. He had received private correspondence which had continued from the time when he corresponded with the\*\* German sections as German Corresponding Secretary. But he had long ago written informing them that his official functions had ceased<sup>182</sup> and he had a reply acknowledging the receipt of it. The resolutions were drawn up and the Council accepted (them),\*\*\* even Eccarius himself voting most of them, and yet after their adoption he refused to send them. Now he contended that the decisions of the Council ought not to be subject to the caprice of an individual, and could not recognise the right

---

\* The sentence is left incomplete in the Minutes.—*Ed.*

\*\* Half of the line is left blank in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See pp. 410-13 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

of any officer to set aside the action of the Council, whatever it might be. But knowing that Eccarius had refused, he had sent the resolutions to the old Council and Le Moussu had sent them to the new one, so that they reached both parties, but that did not exculpate Eccarius. He did more than simply refuse to carry out his duty, he wrote a letter stating that he refused to send the resolutions and said things that were said to have influenced one of the Councils into refusing the acceptance of the resolutions and had thereby lowered the influence of the Council. He thought it necessary to press the charge, but before formulating any resolution he would ask Eccarius what he had written.\*

Citizen *Eccarius* said he was in the same position as Hales; he kept no copies, and should decline to answer; he should stand on the principle of English law, which was that those who prosecute should prove. The split was caused by Sorge asking 22 delegates to show their credentials, and demanding that two-thirds of the sections should be composed of wage-slaves. Since then an Irish section had tried to bring about a reconciliation but failed. The Council had no right to pass resolutions three months after that the sections had refused in December. If the Sub-Committee had met and consulted the matter might have been so arranged that the Council would not be implicated.

Citizen *Barry* said he thought a member had the right to entertain an opinion even though the Council had passed resolutions with which he disagreed, but he had no right to hold office to give effect to his own, when they were opposed to the majority. When he could not conscientiously carry out the will of the Council, he ought to resign. On the other hand he would be quite right in refusing to tolerate any interference with his duties.

Citizen *Jung* didn't think a member of the Council had

---

\* Here a line is left blank in the MS.—*Ed.*

a right to advocate opinions that had been condemned by the Council or that were contrary to its declarations; he had a right to hold them but not to advocate them, when he wished to do so he should first resign.

Citizen *Eccarius* said that a letter had been printed which said "that the report sent threw a new light upon the subject and the writer regretted that it had not come to hand when the resolutions were before the Council". That purported to have been written by the Secretary for America. He didn't write it.

Citizen *Hales* said he wrote that letter but he sent it unofficially and did not sign himself as American Secretary. It was printed without the context, which would give an altogether different aspect to it. He would stand by the letter as a whole.

Citizen *Marx* considered Hales had been guilty of grave indiscretion, as he had compromised the Council.

Citizen *Engels* agreed with the remarks of Citizen Marx. With respect to the defence of Citizen Eccarius, the Council has nothing to do with British law. It had a right to know: had Eccarius written the letter he was charged with writing? Yes or No?

Citizen *Jung* read an extract from a letter written by Cristenet, a member of the new Council, which said that Eccarius's letter in which he announced his resignation had done much to re-awake ill-feeling; many of the sections would have accepted the resolutions only for it.<sup>183</sup>

Citizen *Eccarius* thought when the charge was made the proofs would be forthcoming, but instead of the proofs being produced he was asked to acknowledge his guilt. He should refuse to give any answer until the letter was in his hand. It had all along been assumed that he had been guilty of criminal correspondence, and he should let those who made the charge prove it.

Citizen *Marx* said he said nothing about criminal correspondence, but he did say it was a crime if Eccarius wrote

the letter which had the damaging character—of destroying the influence of the Council.

With regard to the demand that the charge should be proved, he would point out that this was not an ordinary tribunal where there was a defendant and a prosecutor. It was a question of the conservation of the influence of the Council. Under the circumstances, he saw nothing but that the matter should be adjourned, and the letter written for.

Citizen *Eccarius* said that had already been done.

Citizen *Engels* said that the sentimentality of the previous sitting, when it was said it was cruel to let charges hang over a man's head, etc., only made the cry for delay more comical. Of course the matter must be delayed, but he was quite convinced. . . \*

Citizen *Bradnick* thought it would be an easy matter for *Eccarius* to say whether he wrote such a letter or not.

Citizen *Eccarius* said had he been asked civilly a fortnight ago he should have answered, but he should decline now.

Citizen *Barry* proposed that all the correspondence be written for. \*\*

Citizen *Marx* proposed and Citizen *Frankel* seconded that Citizen *Le Moussu* be instructed to write for the letter back; the proposition was carried. \*\*\* Two propositions made by Citizens *Barry* and *Hales* not being seconded.

On the motion of Citizen *Serraillier*, seconded by Citizen *Lessner*, it was decided the meetings of the Council should commence at 8.30 irrespective of the numbers present.

Citizen *Hales* announced that Citizen *Truelove* had applied for money for printing.

It was decided the Secretary should write and ask for a detailed account of charge—sale and stock.

The Council adjourned at 11.15\*\*\*\*

\* The record breaks off here.—*Ed.*

\*\* This sentence was apparently inserted later.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Further the word "unanimously" is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\*\*\* Unsigned.—*Ed.*

**COUNCIL MEETING\***

*Held at 33, Rathbone Place, Oxford Street, W.  
May 14th, 1872<sup>184</sup>*

Citizen *Serraillier* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Boon, Barry, Cournet, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Arnaud, Frankel, Hales, Jung, Lessner, Mayo, Martin, McDonnell Milner, Mottershead, Murray, Le Moussu, Rühl, Serraillier, Townshend, Vaillant* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the preceeding meeting having been read and confirmed, the *Secretary\*\** read a declaration from Citizen *Weston*, to the effect that his name had been appended to the document, purporting to be the rules of the Universal Federalist Council of the International, without his knowledge. This document was signed by *Weston* in the presence of *Eccarius, Roach* and himself, and he told them that he visited one of the meetings of the dissentients, but he went upon invitation, unofficially, and knew nothing of any intention to publish. He disagreed with the publication, though he did consider a competent tribunal had a right to arraign the General Council; what he meant by a competent tribunal was a body of men still within the International. He had a complaint against the Council himself, and that was that his name had been used without letting him know of any intention to publish. He knew the Council had a right to use the name of the members, but he thought that out of courtesy information ought to be sent to all, so as to give them an opportunity to be present if they wished. He felt very strongly upon the point because when he did attend the Council he was treated very cavalierly by certain members if he happened to disagree with

---

\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 448-53 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* *Hales.*—*Ed.*

them. He did write a letter in answer to the second one, but found he was too late for post when he had finished. No slight whatever was intended.

A motion was carried accepting the reply as satisfactory and it was ordered to be sent for publication in the report.

Citizen *Engels* reported that the seat of the new Federal Council of Spain had been fixed at Valencia; he had received the first letter; Lorenzo was the new secretary. He asked for the addresses of all the other Federal Councils.<sup>185</sup>

Citizen *McDonnell* reported that the movement was progressing in Cork and Dublin. He read a letter from a correspondent in Dublin, which expressed a hope that the journals of the Association would avoid any articles expressing atheistical opinions, or condemnation of Catholicism, as anything of the kind would do great damage in Ireland, which opinion Citizen McDonnell endorsed.

Citizen *Yarrow* announced that the Alliance Cabinet-Makers (who were members) had formed an amalgamation with the East [End] London Cabinet-Makers, and it had been resolved that all fresh jobs should be taken as day-work and the prices based upon time.

Citizen *Hales* reported that Messrs. Shaen and Roscoe had sent a letter informing the Council that Mr. Wilkinson of St. George's Hall had consented to pay the damages asked for, upon production of receipts.

A suggestion was made by Citizen *Barry* that the Council should celebrate the fall of the *Commune*; but as no proposition was made, the matter fell through.

Citizen *Hales* proposed "That in the opinion of the Council the formation of *Irish* nationalist branches in England is opposed to the General Rules and principles of the Association". He said he brought forward the motion in no antagonism to the Irish members, but he thought the policy being pursued [is] fraught with the greatest danger to the

Association, besides being in antagonism to the Rules and principles. The fundamental principle of the Association was to destroy all semblance of the nationalist doctrine, and remove all barriers that separated man from man, and the formation of either Irish or English branches could only retard the movement instead of helping it on. The formation of *Irish* branches in England could only keep alive that national antagonism which had unfortunately so long existed between the people of the two countries. Misunderstandings—would arise—nay, had arisen, and there was almost certain to be conflicts between the different sections upon important matters of policy. The Secretary for Liverpool\* wrote and said he understood an Irish section had been formed in Liverpool, but he didn't know where it was, nor what it was doing; did that savour of international harmony? A section had been formed in Middlesbrough based upon the section which previously existed in that town—and it had decided that it should not be called an Irish section but simply the Middlesbrough section. Yet when Citizen Roach wrote and asked the section to correspond with the Federal Council, he received an answer telling him virtually to mind his own business and informing him that if he wanted to know anything about the section he could apply to Citizen McDonnell. So that jealousy had already arisen. No one knew what the Irish branches were doing, and in their rules they stated that they were republican, and their first object was to liberate Ireland from a foreign domination. Now he contended that the International had nothing to do with liberating Ireland, nor with the setting up of any particular form of government, either in England or Ireland, and it was the duty of the Council to prevent any mistake upon the subject by passing the resolution he proposed. If such was not done they would have splits which perhaps could not be healed.

---

\* George Gilroy.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Mayo* seconded.

Citizen *Mottershead* could not escape from the logic of the motion, but he deprecated the spirit in which it was made. The speech of Citizen *Hales* showed the animus with which he was actuated, and, seeing that, he could not vote for the motion. He would rather vote for a motion recommending our English members to cultivate a spirit of fraternity with the Irish members. He unfortunately knew too well the domineering spirit with which Englishmen of the ignorant class treated their Irish brethren. They had been treated as aliens in a foreign land, and were looked down upon by the English workers much the same as the mean Whites of the South looked down upon Negroes. He objected to the style and manner of the Secretary's speech and he hoped the Council would show its feeling upon the matter by rejecting the motion.

Citizen *McDonnell* quite agreed with *Mottershead* that it was desirable that Englishmen should cultivate a fraternal feeling with the Irish, and he thought such speeches as that delivered by Citizen *Hales* were the most injurious it was possible to conceive. Why, the speech he made when he gave notice of motion, had it been reported, would have prevented the establishment of the Association in Ireland and would have destroyed all hopes of doing so. It seemed very strange that the General Secretary should, at the moment when there were dangers and difficulties attending the work of propaganda in Ireland, come forward with a motion which would virtually destroy the work that had been done. It looked suspicious. Why, to ask Irishmen to give up their nationality was to insult them. He was proud to say that he had worked for the redemption of Ireland and would continue to do so; it was impossible to crush out the aspirations of the Irish people. The only effect of the passing of the resolution proposed would be to prevent Irishmen joining. He would ask what had been done before he joined the Council to extend the Association among

Irishmen. Nothing! And now [that] he had done something it was proposed to undo it.

Citizen *Boon* was sorry that the motion should have been brought on, though he was not surprised that the Secretary should have done so. The Normans conquered Ireland and held her in subjection by the aid of their Saxon serfs, and the motion made meant that the rule of the Saxon should still continue. The same spirit of domination was still rampant in the minds of some of the English working men. He approved of the nationalist character of the Irish people's organisations and he hoped they would still continue and not be coerced into giving up their rights either by the English Government or the English working class. He was strongly of an opinion that Hales did not understand the Irish character; he would protest against the passage of the motion.

Citizen Engels said<sup>186</sup> the real purpose of the motion, stripped of all hypocrisy, was to bring the Irish sections into subjection to the British Federal Council, a thing to which the Irish sections would never consent, and which the Council had neither the right nor the power to impose upon them. According to the Rules and Regulations, the Council had no power to compel any section or branch to acknowledge the supremacy of any Federal Council. It was certainly bound, before admitting or rejecting any new branch within the jurisdiction of a Federal Council, to consult that Council, but he maintained that the Irish sections in England were no more under the jurisdiction of the British Federal Council than the French, German, Italian or Polish sections in this country. The Irish formed a distinct nationality of their own, and the fact that [they] used the English language could not deprive them of their rights. Citizen Hales had spoken of the relations of England and Ireland being of the most idyllic nature—breathing nothing but harmony. But the case was quite different. There was the fact of seven centuries of English conquest and op-

pression of Ireland, and so long as that oppression existed, it would be an insult to Irish working men to ask them to submit to a British Federal Council. The position of Ireland with regard to England was not that of an equal, but that of Poland with regard to Russia. What would be said if the Council called upon Polish sections to acknowledge the supremacy of a Council sitting in Petersburg, or the North Schleswig and Alsatian sections to submit to a Federal Council in Berlin? Yet that was asked by the motion. It was asking the conquered people to forget their nationality and submit to their conquerors. It was not Internationalism, but simply prating submission. If the promoters of the motion were so brimful of the truly international spirit, let them prove it by removing the seat of the British Federal Council to Dublin and submit to a Council of Irishmen. In a case like that of the Irish, true Internationalism must necessarily be based upon a distinct national organisation, and they were under the necessity to state in the preamble to their rules that their first and most pressing duty as Irishmen was to establish their own national independence. The antagonism. . . \*

Citizen *Murray* didn't regret the discussion though it had all been on one side. Citizen *Hales* seemed to imagine that unity could be obtained by putting down the Irish branches. He thought that a mistake. The Irish could not forget all at once 700 years of English misrule and it must be remembered that the English workmen had not treated the Irish as they ought to have done. It was only yesterday that the columns of the newspapers used to contain the stereotyped advertisement "That no Irish need apply" and the passage of the resolution would be virtually saying no Irish need apply.

---

\* The record breaks off here; 15 lines are left blank in the Minute Book. For the full text of Engels's speech see pp. 297-300 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Hales* said all the speeches made in opposition really proved his case. It was admitted that the Irish did not understand the principles of the International, for all the speakers urged that if the word "Irish" was struck out of the names of the branches, the Irish would not join, which was only saying that they were national and not international. He had been told he didn't understand the Irish character—well, he thought he did, and that was the reason he brought on his motion. He believed the majority of the members of the Irish branches did not understand the principles of the Association; as the correspondent of the *Standard* said: They were only Fenians<sup>187</sup> under another name, and they became members of the International because they saw that it would be a convenient cloak under which to prosecute their special designs—and he objected to that not because he had any objection to Fenianism, but because he wanted the Association [to be] free from special sects or cliques. He had advocated Fenianism for he held that the Irish like other people had a right to govern themselves; the right of self-government was inalienable, and no people could be deprived of that right; he should like to see Ireland ruling herself tomorrow for he was convinced that the Irish themselves would then wake from their enchantment and find that nationalism was no remedy for the ills of society. He asked them to pass the motion and thus prevent future mischief.

The motion was put and lost, only one voting in favour.

A short discussion then took place on the advisability of reporting the discussion and it was decided that Citizen *Hales* should draw up a report to be submitted on Saturday.\*

The Council adjourned at 11.30.\*\*

---

\* May 18.—*Ed.*

\*\* Unsigned.—*Ed.*

**COUNCIL MEETING\***

*Held at 33, Rathbone Place, Oxford Street, W.  
May 18th, 1872*

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Engels, Hales, Jung, Lessner, Mayo, Roach, and Serrailier.*

The Minutes of the preceding meeting were read and confirmed, after which Citizen *Hales* said, upon looking over the debate on the formation of Irish branches in England, he felt that much that he had said in the last speech could not be published without doing great injury to the Association and he therefore proposed that it should not be published.

A short discussion took place upon the subject when it was agreed [that] the matter should be postponed to the next sitting.

Citizen *Roach* asked through the Chairman: If the Middlesbrough section had been recognised as an Irish branch by the General Council, and if so, at what date. The Secretary of the Middlesbrough section had written to him saying that McDonnell had informed him that such was the fact.

The *Secretary\*\** said: It had not been so acknowledged so far as he knew. It was agreed that as Citizen McDonnell [was absent] the matter should be postponed.

The Council adjourned at 9.50.

**CHARLES MURRAY**, Chairman  
**JOHN HALES**, Secretary

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on p. 454 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* Hales.—*Ed.*

*COUNCIL MEETING\***Held May 21st, 1872<sup>188</sup>*

Citizen *Charles Murray* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Barry, Arnaud, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Jung, Lessner, Lochner, Marx, Martin, Mayo, McDonnell, Milner, Murray, Roach, Rühl, Rozwadowski, Serrailier, Townshend, Vaillant* and *Yarrow*.

The Secretary being late, the correspondence was taken first.

Citizen *Serrailier* said he had received a letter from one belonging to the Jurassian section, in which he said the agent they had employed had a very bad reputation in Montpellier, where it was said he had stolen something, and had run away with a friend's wife. He had also received a letter from Bordeaux which said that the sections there only recognised the authority of the London documents, the Swiss intrigues had no influence. He had received a letter from Section *Ferré*; they had formed another group and were going to start a paper which they were going to print themselves; they had bought a press and intended to print the Conference resolutions.\*\* The first No. of the paper was coming out on June 1st and they wanted an article from London, to put in it a sort of appeal.

It was decided that one should be sent and Citizens *Cournet, Serrailier* and *Vaillant* were appointed as a Commission to draw it up and send it.

Citizen *Serrailier* then proposed that the Secretary for Switzerland\*\*\* should write to the Swiss Federal Council asking for a report of the action it had taken in France, the sections it had formed and the names and addresses of

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 455-59 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* The resolutions of the London Conference of 1871.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* *Jung*.—*Ed.*

the correspondents in France. He said it was necessary in order that there might be no clashing—it was necessary that he should know friends from enemies.

Citizen *Engels* seconded and it was carried unanimously.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were then read and confirmed.

Citizen *Martin* announced that a member of the Barcelona section had arrived in London, and had brought credentials from the Federation proving that he was trustworthy.

Citizen *Hales* then proposed that the debate on the Irish question should not be printed.\*

Citizen *Mayo* seconded and on being put to the vote it was carried, an amendment by Citizens *Barry* and *Eccarius* being lost.

Citizen *Mayo* proposed and Citizen *Marx* seconded that the Saturday evening meetings be discontinued. Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* submitted the following declaration<sup>189</sup> which upon the motion of Citizen *Hales*, seconded by Citizen *Mayo*, was adopted.\*\*

Some weeks ago a pamphlet was published under the title "Universal Federalist Council of the International Working Men's Association and of the Republican Socialist Societies Adhering". This pamphlet pretends nothing less than to inaugurate a *coup d'état* within the International. It announces the formation of a second General Council, and it denounces both the organisation of the International, and the administration of its General Council. Now, who are the members of this new self-constituted Council, and the authors of these denunciations? Among the names affixed to the document we find, firstly, that of Citizen John Weston, a member of the General Council, and its former

---

\* See pp. 194-99 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Here a clipping from *The Eastern Post* is pasted into the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

Treasurer, who, in a letter to the Council, declares his name to have been made use of without his authority.\* Secondly, six delegates from the Universal Republican League,<sup>190</sup> a society entirely foreign to the International. Thirdly, two delegates from an "International Republican Federalist Section", which section is totally unknown to the International. Fourthly, two delegates from the Land and Labour League,<sup>191</sup> which society does not form any part of the International. Fifthly, two self-styled delegates of the German Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein, but, in fact, delegates of a few Germans who were excluded from that society on account of their openly avowed hostility to the International.\*\* Lastly, four delegates of two French societies counting together less than a score of members, and which the General Council had declined to admit as branches; amongst these we find M. Vésinier, excluded from the International by a committee appointed by the Brussels Congress in 1868,<sup>192</sup> and M. Landeck, whom the hasty flight of Louis Bonaparte's prefect of police, on the 4th of September, 1870, liberated from the engagement he had voluntarily taken towards that officer, and "scrupulously kept, not to occupy himself any more, in France, either with politics or with the International" (see the published report of the third trial of the International at Paris<sup>193</sup>) and who only lately was expelled from the Society of the Communard Refugees in London.

It must be evident, even to the signatories of this document, that a conclave of such entire strangers to the International has exactly as much right to meddle with its organisation and to constitute itself its General Council, as the General Council of the International has to interfere with the organisation, and to declare itself the Board of Directors of the Great Northern Railway.

---

\* See p. 193 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 87 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

No wonder that these men are utterly ignorant of the history and organisation of the International. How should they be expected to know that according to our Rules the General Council has to render its accounts to the General Congresses, and not to them? or that, when in 1870 the breaking out of the war prevented the Congress meeting, an unanimous vote of all federations empowered the General Council to continue in office until political circumstances should permit the convocation of a public Congress? As to the fund collected by the General Council in favour of the refugees, the sum total received has, from time to time, been acknowledged in the published reports of the Council meetings, and our Treasurer, Citizen Jung, 4, Charles Street, Northampton Square, Clerkenwell, holds the receipts for every farthing expended, which receipts, as well as the accounts, can be inspected any day by any of the donors. Such an inspection will show not only that the Council has devoted a great portion of its time to this object, quite foreign to its regular functions, but also that itself, as a body, and its individual members, have contributed to the refugee fund within the limits of their means.\*

Since the growth and power of the International have become what they are, the only way in which rival and hostile societies can attempt to attack it with any chance of success is to usurp its name in order to undermine its strength. This has been so well understood by the whole press-gang of the Governments, and of the ruling classes, that the same papers, from police press to so-called democratic and republican, which carefully suppress every official declaration of the General Council, always hasten to keep all Europe well-informed of insignificant and ridiculous manifestations like that of the "Universal Federalist Council".\*\*

---

\* See pp. 97-98 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* The newspaper clipping ends here.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Marx* then reverted to the American question<sup>194</sup>; he said he did not think any motion was necessary as the American Congress<sup>195</sup> was near at hand, but he thought a review of the action taken by the Council would prove that it had done right. He didn't concern himself with the quarrels of the two sections\* for he believed there were faults on both sides, but the position he took was that the resolutions\*\* were necessary to keep the Association in its proper limits. 1st. They recommended the two sections\*\*\* to unite: that was only carrying on the Rules. 2nd, in recommending sections numerically weak to amalgamate, the Council was mainly following a suggestion which emanated from Section 6 which belonged to the new Council. In advising the calling of a Congress in July, the Council took a course which had been accepted; to have called it later would have prevented the sections from sending delegates to the General Congress in September. The resolution which suspended Section 12 was the only executive resolution, and the only one for which the Council was responsible to the Congress. The suspension was rendered necessary by the appeal which it issued, an appeal which had created confusion and misunderstanding and upon which new sections had been founded.<sup>196</sup> They had demanded to be put in the place of the New York Federal Council. Not only that but their protest showed that they did not understand the principles of the Association. They objected to the term "wage-slaves" saying that they must necessarily be political slaves, the proper persons to be entrusted with the management being the small self-employers; besides, their other peculiar theories caused a great deal of misconception as to the real objects of the Association.

---

\* New York sections No. 1 and No. 12.—*Ed.*

\*\* On the split in the North-American Federation (see pp. 410-13 of the present volume).—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Should be "councils".—*Ed.*

The new Council itself did not seem to care much either way about the matter, for Hubert's letter seemed to intimate that it would not have mattered if the Council had only censured the other party. The resolution requiring all new sections to be composed of two-thirds wage-slaves was necessary to prevent the Association being used for trading purposes.

The period was a most critical one, and it was necessary that there should not be any mistake as to the principles of the Association. The work of the Association did not concern the real Yankees so much as [it] did some of the other elements. The Yankees were instinctively speculators. The greatest labour interest in the States was Irish, next German, third the Negroes and fourth the Yankees themselves. The document sent to the London Conference from America called attention to the danger which would result from middle-class intrusion and said that Reform Societies did not understand the labour question, and yet those societies were continually growing and working men were being led away by them. Seven of the signatories to that document belonged to the new Council.<sup>197</sup>

Citizen *Eccarius* said: whether it was right or not an impression prevailed that the section had been the victim of an intrigue. For a long time the Council could not get any one to act in America. Jessup simply corresponded, Sylvis might have done more had he lived, Hume was furnished with credentials and Cluseret announced himself as general organiser, but it was not until November 1870 when steps were taken to form a Central Council.<sup>198</sup> It was recognised as a Provisional Council for New York, and since then the work of organisation had gone on. Section 9 dated from 1848. It was in reality the New Democracy which had always advocated the nationalisation of the land.<sup>199</sup> Three of its officers were Allen, a painter, Ira Davis whose doors had always been open to the poor and distressed, [and]

Maddox. The New Democracy dissolved itself to get rid of West but he got in again by starting a section. There soon got to be two elements on the Council; the Germans in Chicago and other places appointed members of Section One, Sorge's section, as their delegates on the Federal Council until out of 11 members 6 were on the Council. Last October Sorge announced he was going to resign; and only 5 voted against, when Sorge proposed dissolution to get rid of West. It was arranged that they should reorganise and a meeting was fixed, but 7 remained behind and constituted themselves a new Committee, and on the day when the new Committee was to have met, the 7 met beforehand and appointed President, Treasurer, Secretary and demanded credentials from 22 of the delegates when they arrived telling them to wait a fortnight. The result was that they met and constituted themselves a Committee and declined to recognise what Sorge had done. They all say that they object to the interference of the middle-class reformers—all statements to the contrary being invented by their opponents. They intended to work with the bona fide working-class elements and meant to bring in the New York Trades Unions. Whether true or not they considered themselves the victims of an intrigue.

Citizen *Marx* said he was quite ready to admit that the resolutions might be misrepresented as in the Swiss dispute. Eccarius had gone into details. He would bring details too—a French section and an Irish one joined the old Council immediately the decision of General Council was known; from San Francisco and New Orleans complaints had come of the new Council; Nicholson wrote that great danger would result from unauthorised versions of the principles being promulgated. Section 10 sent word that the old Council represented the interest of the worker while the new was composed of politicians, who wanted to make capital out of the Association. The working men refused

to join so long as the Association was identified with particular doctrines.

Citizen *Eccarius* said that the antagonism of the Pennsylvania miners arose from the defence of the Commune, the reason being that there were many Irish among them and they forgot everything in the shooting of the priests,<sup>200</sup>—being Catholics.

The English section of San Francisco withdrew its delegate from the old Council.

Citizen *Marx* said that the Irish only took action after the decision of the General Council.

Citizen *Hales* said he wished to say one word in justification of the letter he had written\*<sup>\*</sup>; he stood to the statement he made, he felt that the Council had acted in the dark. Information had been withheld and he charged Citizen *Eccarius* with having withheld it. What he had just stated he ought to have stated before the adoption of the resolutions: he knew the circumstances, and let the Council vote in ignorance.

Citizen *Engels* said it was all very well for Hales to try and justify himself, but he thought it looked very awkward for Hales after what had just been said; he should move that Hales's letter be written for, as well as that of *Eccarius*—it was necessary to deal with one as well as the other.

Citizen *Hales* said he would admit that the letter as printed was correct,<sup>201</sup> but if it was necessary to send for it he would second the proposition; he wanted the matter to be gone into.

It was then decided that Citizen *Le Moussu* should act as Secretary for America provisionally—and as such that he should write for the letter of Hales.

The Council adjourned at 11.15.\*\*

---

\* See p. 191 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Unsigned.—*Ed.*

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

Held at 33, Rathbone Place, Oxford Street  
May 28th, 1872<sup>202</sup>

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members: *Arnaud, Delahaye, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Dupont, Hales, Jung, Keen, Lessner, Lochner, Le Moussu, Marx, Martin, Margueritte, McDonnell, Murray, Roach, Ranvier, Serrailier, Vaillant, Townshend* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, the *Secretary*\*\* read three letters from America, from the old Federal Council, in which were described the efforts made by that Council at conciliation, and said that they had been fruitless because of the contemptuous manner with which they were treated by the other party; the Council in Prince Street declined to recognise the General Council's authority and expressed a determination to form an International of its own. Under the circumstances the old Council felt that further efforts would be useless and it asked the General Council to show its authority in the matter and support them vigorously.

A letter was also read from a German section in St. Louis\*\*\* asking which Council it should recognise.

On the motion of Citizen *Marx*, seconded by Citizen *Engels*, it was decided to advise them to join the old Council, an amendment by *Hales* and *Eccarius* telling them to please themselves being lost by a large majority.<sup>203</sup>

Citizen *Marx* said he had received news from New York: a so-called Convention had been held at the Apollo Music

\* These Minutes open the fourth Minute Book of the General Council which includes the records of its meetings from May 28 to the end of August 1872 (77 foolscap pages). They are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 1-5.—*Ed.*

\*\* *Hales*.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Originally, "Chicago" was written here and then crossed out.—*Ed.*

Hall, ostensibly to nominate Mrs. Woodhull to the Presidency and Douglas, a coloured man, for Vice-President. The proceedings had become the laughing-stock of America. Owing to the action taken Section 6 had withdrawn Grosse and appointed a new delegate. Millot of the French Section No. 2 had rushed into print and repudiated the Woodhull nomination. Though the name of the International was used, it was a fact that only 3 sections were represented: Sections 9, 12 and 35, one of which,\* it was well known, was only organised for political purposes. In three weeks the humbug would break up and it was a good job the Council took the initiative.<sup>204</sup>

In concluding he proposed that a thousand copies of the Rules be at once sent.

Citizen *Hales* said he had a difficulty in getting them from Truelove.

Citizen *Engels* proposed and Citizen *Eccarius* seconded that Citizen *Jung* should wait upon Truelove and ask for the account and stock.

This was carried, and Citizen *Marx* proposed and Citizen *Serraillier* seconded that 1,000 copies be forwarded to *Sorge* as soon as they were received. This was also carried.

Citizen *Marx* said he had received a letter from Belgium: *Rochat* was not coming back; he therefore proposed that Citizen *Cournet* be Secretary for Holland as well as Denmark. Seconded by *Serraillier* and carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* then reported that a Congress had been held in Belgium, but no Flemish delegates were present. The principal point was that a New Statute to be proposed to the General Congress had been under discussion. It proposed nothing less than the abolition of the General Council. A lively discussion took place on it, no decision was come to. It was agreed though that another Congress should be held in July to settle the matter.<sup>205</sup> He had no motion

---

\* Section 12.—*Ed.*

to make on the matter, but he would point out that the time had come to decide upon the holding of a Congress. It was clear that reconstruction of some kind would be proposed and the Council ought to discuss the matter. He proposed that the next sitting be devoted to the question of the Congress to the exclusion of other business.

Citizen *Eccarius* seconded. There were changes floating in the [air]: he gathered from his correspondence.

Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Eccarius* said [that] three weeks ago he received a letter from Neumayer saying he had sent 20 francs, but no money came. Some days after Frankel received another letter from Neumayer saying the money had been returned, but a few days ago Truelove said a small packet was lying for him, and on getting it he found the 20 franc-piece.

Citizen *Frankel* said that his impression was that Neumayer was partly insane; he had a quarrel with the staff of the *Volkswille*. He had written asking them to postpone the matter until after the Congress.

Citizen *Frankel* also announced that a strike of 2,000 spinners had taken place at Reichenberg in Bohemia. Twelve months ago the employers agreed to certain concessions which they now wished to repudiate.

Citizen *Roach* asked the Secretary if the section of Middlesbrough had been recognised as an Irish section and if so when; he also called attention to the fact that Citizen McDonnell had issued a circular for an Irish propaganda fund<sup>206</sup>; he would ask by whose authority that had been done.

Citizen *Marx* said the rules\* were accepted by the Council; as one of the Committee\*\* he remembered them coming before him and the Council passed them with a number of others. They were the same as those of the Soho branch.

---

\* Of the Middlesbrough section.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Rules Committee.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Hales* thought Citizen Marx had made a mistake; he did not remember anything of the kind, and no mention was made on the Minutes of any acceptance or of them having even been brought up.

Citizen *Serraillier* said if they were not in the Minutes it was the fault of the Secretary. The Minutes were read in English and if there were omissions the Continentals could not tell.

Citizen *Engels* agreed with *Serraillier*; he remembered the matter very well; if the subject was not mentioned on the Minutes it was a case of gross neglect.

Citizen *Keen* said he was Secretary on the night when Citizen McDonnell gave in his report and no mention was made of rules: he simply announced the formation of branches.

Citizen *McDonnell* said the rules were brought up on the same night by Citizen Marx; he remembered the matter well; the branch was formed as an Irish branch, but the error arose from Citizen Roach corresponding with Citizen Whalley who was not the Secretary instead of with Citizen Matthews who was.

Citizen *Hales* proposed that the rules of the Middlesbrough section be written for or a copy of the letter recognising the Soho rules.

Citizen *Keen* seconded.

Citizen *McDonnell* read an extract from a letter of Citizen Matthews in which he announced that the branch had adopted the rules of the Soho branch.

Citizen *Roach* read an extract from a letter from Citizen Whalley, in which he said the section had adopted the rules of the Manchester section which was not an Irish one.

Citizen *Boon* said there was a good deal of mystery as to who was who and as to what had really been done.

Citizen *Engels* proposed that the Chairman should write to the Middlesbrough branch asking it to decide whether it would be English or Irish.

Citizen *Eccarius* seconded; he thought there had been two branches in Middlesbrough: an English and an Irish one.

Citizen *Hales* withdrew the former proposition and substituted the following: That the Chairman should write to the Secretary at Middlesbrough and ask what rules they had adopted, when they were adopted and when they were ratified by the Council.

Citizen *Boon* seconded; there had been conflicting statements and the matter ought to be cleared. It had been stated the Minutes were not correct.\*

On being put to the vote, the proposition of Citizen *Engels* was carried.

Citizen *Hales* asked if any steps were to be taken with regard to the second question; ugly rumours were afloat.

Citizen *McDonnell* said that he did issue a circular in conjunction with some Irish friends who desired to support De Morgan who had been ruined in Cork.\*\* He didn't appeal to the English branches until after money had been collected and sent up from Manchester. He thought De Morgan deserved support, for he had sacrificed all for the sake of principle. He would admit that he had done wrong in issuing the circular from the address of the Council.

Citizen *Dupont* said he had been greatly disappointed with the sitting; those Englishmen who thought they were superior to the Irish should remember they were Internationals.

Citizen *Hales* said it was a grave question. It was whether any officer had the right to issue any such circular on his own responsibility. Perhaps some one might follow up the action and collect funds for swindling purposes—and how was it to be checked if no action was taken in the present case?

---

\* This sentence was inserted later.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 148 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Engels* proposed that the Council proceed to the order of the day. McDonnell had confessed he had done wrong; he thought that sufficient when he said he ought not to have used the address of the Council.\*

Citizen *Martin* seconded.

Citizen *Hales* said he understood the funds collected for the Cork coach-makers had been refused by them.\*\* If so the Council ought to know what was done with the money as it was collected in the name of the Council.\*\*\*

The order of the day was carried and Citizen *Boon* gave notice of motion that the Cork coach-makers' fund and the Irish propaganda fund be audited by the Council as early as possible.

The Council adjourned at 11.30.

CHARLES MURRAY, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

#### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*\*\*\*

June 4th, 1872, Held at 33, Rathbone Place,  
Oxford Street<sup>207</sup>

Citizen *Charles Murray* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Delahaye, Dupont, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Jung, Johannard, Lessner, Le Moussu, Martin, Margueritte, Marx, Mayo, Milner, Murray, Rühl, Serrailier, Townshend, Vaillant and Wróblewski.*

---

\* The words "when he said . . . of the Council" were inserted in the Minutes when they were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 148 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* The words "of the Council" were inserted in the Minutes when they were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

\*\*\*\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 6-8 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Serraillier* read a letter from a refugee in Switzerland giving an account of the work he was doing. He also read a letter from Brussels from a French section which had been formed there. It contained 9 francs, being the subscription of 31 members in Rouen, of 14 in Paris and 1 franc from the refugees in Brussels. The letter asked that the section might be recognised as an independent section and there were several reasons why they could not enter the Belgian Federation. Some of the members of the Belgian Federal Council had advised them not to do so, saying that they would be liable to be denounced to the police and would possibly be expelled from the country; besides, the Council refused to recognise the ninth resolution of the Congress resolutions\* which the section adhered to without reserve. It believed in the maintenance of discipline, and asked to be recognised as an independent section.

Citizen *Frankel* thought the Belgian Council ought to be consulted before the section was recognised.

Citizen *Serraillier* said that they would be liable to expulsion if that was done.

Citizen *Marx* said it must be remembered that the Belgian Federal Council had repudiated the resolution of the Conference upon the political action of the working class, though Belgium had a greater representation upon the Conference than any other country. The Council ought not to stultify itself.

Citizen *Dupont* thought the French were in an exceptional position: the refugees represented the spirit of the French revolution, and that rendered the circumstances exceptional; he believed it would be in accordance with the Rules to accept the section.

---

\* This refers to Resolution IX adopted at the London Conference of 1871—"Political Action of the Working Class".—*Ed.*

Citizen *Frankel* suggested that the recognition if given should only be provisional—leaving the final decision to the Congress.

Citizen *Engels* was in favour of first consulting the Belgian Federal Council; he proposed that should be done.

Citizen *Jung* seconded; he thought that that ought to be done.

Citizen *Serraillier* again called attention to the statement in the letter that they would be liable to expulsion.

Citizen *Eccarius* said [that] according to the General Rules the Council could accept the section but it must inform the Federal Council afterwards.

Citizen *Hales* said the French were in an exceptional position, the Association being illegal in France.

Citizen *Marx* said: in the face of the letter he thought the section ought to be recognised and that the Council should take the responsibility before Congress.

Citizen *Vaillant* was of the same opinion. He thought the letter would be a sufficient justification if the Council was called to account at the Congress.

A proposition by *Serraillier*, seconded by *Dupont*, was then carried with one dissident:

“That the French section of Brussels be admitted without first referring to the Belgian Federal Council, in conformity with the advice given to that section by members of the Belgian Federal Council themselves, and in order not to unnecessarily endanger the safety of the French refugees in Belgium.”

Citizen *Vaillant* then introduced a set of administrative regulations intended to expedite [the discussion], and after a few remarks they were taken seriatim.

1st. That each member should only speak once upon each subject (except the movers of resolutions).\* Carried.

---

\* The words in brackets were inserted when the Minutes were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

2nd. That no member should be allowed to speak for more than 5 minutes upon any subject, except the movers of resolutions and those who submitted reports. Carried.

3rd. As far as possible the names of the speakers should be taken one for and then one against.

The proposition under discussion. Carried.

4th. That upon the close of a debate being demanded by 4 members, it should be immediately put to the vote without discussion. Two to suffice when the question was not one of principle. Carried.

Citizen *Jung* then reported that he had seen Truelove and had obtained a quantity of Rules; he was to have some more and a statement of the account in a few days.\*

He also reported he had written to Middlesbrough, but had not received a reply.

Citizen *Hales* in the absence of Citizen *Roach* announced that the British Federal Council had convened a Conference of the British sections to be held in Nottingham on July 21 st.

Citizen *Marx* postponed his motion relative to the consideration of the Congress business until the next sitting.

The Council adjourned at 11.15.\*\*

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

*Held at 33, Rathbone Place on June 11th, 1872*<sup>208</sup>

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Barry*, *Arnaud*, *Cournet*, *Delahaye*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Jung*, *Johannard*, *Lessner*, *Lochner*, *Le Moussu*, *Marx*, *Martin*, *Margueritte*,

\* See p. 211 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Unsigned.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* The Minutes are in *Hales's* hand on pp. 9-15 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

*Mayo, Milner, Ranvier, Rühl, Roach, Serrailier, Townshend, Vaillant, Wróblewski and Yarrow.*

The *Secretary* having read the Minutes of the previous meeting, Citizen *Engels* protested against the Minutes being confirmed, on the ground that they did not faithfully report the debate which took place upon the questions of admitting the French section in Belgium as an independent section. The arguments he adduced were not given, and no mention was made of the proposition which he made, and afterwards withdrew, that ought to have been inserted with the reasons which induced him to withdraw it.

Citizen *Yarrow* did not see how the Minutes could be confirmed if they were not correct.

The *Secretary* said they were correct; he would admit that there was much that might have been included that was not in the Minutes, but there must be some limit as to what was reported, and consequently some discretion must be allowed; it would be impossible to report verbatim. The Minutes would have to be read at the Congress and he thought that all hasty expressions which might provoke quarrels ought to be left out. If the Minutes were not satisfactory the proper method would be to demand that certain matter should be inserted.

Citizen *Engels* protested against the Secretary having any power to decide what should go into the Minutes and what should be excluded. It would never do for the Secretary to be permitted to leave out matter upon the plea that it might be distasteful to the Congress. The subject to which his motion referred would be certain to be brought before the Congress and he wanted it recorded that he made a motion "To first consult the Belgian Federal Council before recognising the French section as an independent section" and the reasons he gave for withdrawing that motion. He moved that the Minutes be rejected.

Citizen *Jung* said it was far more necessary to record what he had said upon the proposition in question than

what Citizen Engels had said, if it was necessary to say anything about the proposition at all, as he refused to withdraw his seconding though Engels withdrew the proposition.

Citizen *Marx* said it would not do to reject the Minutes altogether as the propositions might have to be referred to and they were correctly entered.\*

Citizen *Engels* said he would move that the Minutes only be confirmed so far as the resolutions were concerned, that the rest of them be rejected.

Citizen *Yarrow* seconded the proposition, though he admitted that he didn't know anything about whether the Minutes were correct or not as he was not present at the sitting to which they referred.

Citizen *Hales* objected to the passage of the resolution. He said the proper way would be, if Citizen Engels was not satisfied with the report, to move that such and such matter be inserted. He contended that the Minutes were correct—at least as far as they went, they might be incomplete, but they were not incorrect.

There were then several cries of Vote, Vote, and the *Chairman* put the matter from the chair—six voted for, none against and the *Chairman* declared the proposition carried unanimously.

The *Secretary* then said he begged to tender in his resignation as Secretary.

The *Chairman* said: Oh! but you'll officiate until another is appointed, or at least tonight, so that we may go on with the business.

Citizen *Hales* said: Of course.

Citizen *Jung* then read the following letter from Switzerland.<sup>209</sup>

---

\* This refers to the administrative regulations adopted on June 4, 1872 (see pp. 216-17 of the present volume).—*Ed.*

Enclosed you will find the subscriptions of the Jurrassian Federation for the years 1871 and 1872.

For the year 1871:

section of Moutier, 35 members, 3 fr. 50 c.;

section of Neuchâtel, 12 members, 1 fr. 20 c.;

section of Locle, 14 members, 1 fr. 40 c.;

Courtelary section 32, 3 fr. 20 c. Engravers and Engine Turners of Courtelary, 32 members, 20 fr.;

Section 2 of socialist propaganda of Chaux-de-Fonds, 12 members, 1 fr. 20 c. . . .\*

Citizen *Engels* said he was in favour of accepting the contribution for 1871 but of rejecting the contribution for 1872. He proposed that that should be done.

Citizen *Marx* said there was only one section that had not been acknowledged, that was . . .\*\* The Jurrassian section was dissentient but it was a section—it had not been excluded.

Citizen *Serraillier* said he would accept the money but reject the men.

Citizen *Marx* said the Council could not accept the money for one year and refuse it for the other. The way would be to accept all but that of the one section.

Citizen *Engels* proposed that that should be done.

Citizen *Serraillier* seconded and the proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Jung* reported that he had received two letters from Middlesbrough: both Matthews and Whalley said the section was an Irish one and Matthews was the Secretary.\*\*\*

Citizen *Engels* announced that the French manifesto upon the dissentients\*\*\*\* had just arrived from Geneva, 2,000 co-

\* At this point 17 lines are left blank.—*Ed.*

\*\* A gap in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See pp. 212-13 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\*\* *Fictitious Splits in the International.*—*Ed.*

pies, of which 1,000 had been sent to England, of the 1,000 retained in Switzerland 500 was for the use of the Swiss, 100 for Belgium, 25 for Austria and Hungary, 50 for Leipzig and 120 for Italy, leaving 205 copies for future use; out of the 1,000 received it was proposed to send 200 copies to America and 50 more copies to Germany; besides, one each for the sections and the members of the Council. He had paid £1 7s. 6d. for carriage, and with the consent of the Council he proposed that he should be allowed to keep 100 copies to pay himself, so that there might be no danger of them becoming exhausted; he proposed to keep them as a reserve. He also proposed that 3d. each should be charged for them, to the members and the general public; he had written to Switzerland telling them to charge that there.

The report was accepted and the propositions were agreed to unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* then brought on the question of the General Congress. He proposed that it be held in Holland, leaving it to the Dutch to fix upon the town, and that Citizen *Cournet* be instructed to write and ask them [to] decide immediately. The Belgians themselves proposed Holland in 1870.<sup>210</sup>

Citizen *Vaillant* asked if it could be held in Holland.

Citizen *Marx* said he had already received information from Holland in the affirmative.

Citizen *Serrailier* seconded the proposition and it was carried unanimously.

It was then proposed by Citizen *Marx*, seconded by Citizen *Johannard*, and carried unanimously that it should be held on the first Monday in September.<sup>211</sup>

Citizen *Marx* then said that there was no doubt but that the question of organisation would be the principal subject that would be brought before the Congress. The struggles that had taken place had sufficiently shown that. In dealing with it, it would be well to divide the subject in sections

relating to the General Council and Federal Councils. The proposition of Bakunin would simply reduce the General Council into a bureau of statistics, which would not be worth having a Council for. The papers could give all the information that could be collected, and it must be remembered that as yet no statistics had been gathered, although the General Council had urged upon the sections time after time the necessity of something being done with respect to them.<sup>212</sup>

The proposition of the Belgian Federal Council was logical for it went in for the suppression of the General Council as being no longer necessary. It was contended that the Federal Councils could do all that was necessary. Federal Councils, it was contended, were established or were being established in all countries and that they could take the management into their own hands. The *Emancipacion* of Spain in criticising that proposition said it would be the death of the Association. It was not even consistent as, to be logical, Federal Councils ought to be abolished at the same time.<sup>213</sup> Nevertheless he should not be opposed to accepting the proposition, as an alternative, as an experiment, though he was certain it would only demonstrate the absolute necessity of the re-establishment of the General Council; if the policy of strengthening the hands of the General Council was rejected he was prepared to go in for it, but under no circumstances would he accept the proposition of Bakunin to retain the General Council and make it a nullity.<sup>214</sup>

Citizen *Serraillier* proposed and Citizen *Johannard* seconded that the question of reorganisation be the first subject for discussion at the Congress; carried unanimously.

Citizen *Eccarius* said he had considered the subject a great deal lately and he had arrived at the same conclusion as Marx, namely, that the hands of the Council should be strengthened; he proposed that the proposition for abolishing the General Council be rejected.

Citizen *Frankel* seconded the proposition and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Vaillant* said he thought the Council ought to next declare the advisability of strengthening the Council.

Citizen *Hales* said he thought the composition of the Council should be first discussed—he was in favour of strengthening the Council if it was differently constituted, but he wouldn't vote for strengthening a body composed the same as the present Council.

Citizen *Eccarius* agreed with the remarks of *Hales*.

Citizen *Marx* said he proposed that the General Council should be composed of secretaries only, such secretaries to be appointed by the nations themselves. The number to be left open, but under no circumstances should any nation have more than one vote. Vacancies to be filled up by the nations themselves.

Citizen *Eccarius* seconded the proposition though he thought it would be necessary to limit the number of members.

Citizen *Engels* thought the Council should have the right to fill up vacancies provisionally in such cases where the nations themselves refused or neglected to do so.

Citizen *Serraillier* was opposed to that being done: the countries ought to be consulted.

Citizen *Vaillant* thought the proposition ought to be modified; he thought the nationalities should propose and the Congress should elect.

Citizen *Hales* asked how it would be if a nationality proposed and supported a candidate and all the rest of the Congress voted against, or vice versa, whom would the one elected represent?

Citizen *Yarrow* was opposed to the proposition somewhat; for instance, America would be confined to selecting its representative from those with whom it had been in communication. He thought the Council should have the right to add to its number in a limited degree.

Citizen *Serraillier* also thought the Council ought to have the right to add to its number; the Council had greatly increased its power and usefulness in adding the members who belonged to the Commune.

Citizen *Eccarius* said that was a debatable question.

Citizen *Johannard* said he was in favour of the Congress electing and of the Council having power to add to its numbers. If it was left to the nationalities it would cause all sorts of intriguing.

Citizen *Arnaud* thought the proposition gave too much prominence to the doctrine of nationality. Perhaps in one country there might be a dearth of revolutionary fire while there might be a large number in another; the International owed a duty to society as a whole.

Citizen *Hales* disagreed with the idea of Citizen Arnaud, as under such a policy men might be appointed who knew nothing of the action necessary in certain countries. The General Council ought to represent the ideas of the different people belonging to the Association and ought to so blend them as to form one harmonious whole; different people had different habits of thought.

Citizen *Engels* moved the adjournment of the debate and asked that all propositions should be brought up in writing.

Citizen *Frankel* seconded and it was carried.

Citizen *Roach* on behalf of the Federal Council proposed that the different secretaries write to the different sections acquainting them with all the circumstances connected with the builders' strike in connection with the Nine Hours' League.

Citizen *Frankel* seconded. Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Yarrow* also called attention to the same question on behalf of the shopfitters who are concerned in the strike.

The Council adjourned at 11.30.

*EUGÈNE DUPONT*  
*JOHN HALES*, Secretary

*MINUTES OF MEETING\**

*June 18th, 1872, Held at 33, Rathbone Place,  
Oxford Street, W.<sup>215</sup>*

Citizen *Dupont* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Boon, Cournet, Dupont, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Johannard, Jung, Lessner, Le Moussu, Longuet, Lochner, Marx, Martin, Mayo, McDonnell, Ranvier, Serraillier, Rühl, Townshend, Vailant, Wróblewski* and *Yarrow, Rozwadowski*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed, after which Citizen *Townshend* introduced Citizen *W. E. Harcourt*, who was delegated from the Democratic Association of Victoria to gather facts relating to the various labour movements in Europe. The Association he represented was in accord with the International, having adopted the preamble to the General Rules as its basis,<sup>216</sup> and it was unanimously resolved that he should be present during the sitting.

Citizen *Serraillier* read a letter from Paris which stated that the work of reorganisation was making progress. He had also received a letter from Avignon enclosing the subscriptions for 132 members; there also the Association was progressing. In the country districts many members were being enrolled. In Toulouse a Federation of Students had formed a Committee and declared their adhesion to the International. He had also received a letter from Narbonne. The documents he had sent over to Bordeaux had been received safely and distributed.

Citizen *Engels* reported the receipt of a letter from Anselmo Lorenzo asking that the question of organisation should be placed on the order of the day at the ensuing Congress, and the revision of the Statutes. Their desire was

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 16-24 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

to create a solidarity between the federations in different countries.<sup>217</sup>

Citizen *Eccarius* announced that he had sent the documents of the Association to a gentleman whose position precluded him from becoming a member, and he had sent him 5s. towards the printing expenses, which he handed in to the Treasurer.

Citizen *Frankel* announced that he had received a letter from Neumayer asking a number of questions.

Citizen *Dupont* read a letter from Manchester. The section there was increasing rapidly, they had just obtained the adhesion of the Bricklayers numbering 400. They required Rules and stamps. They were going to try and start an International Club. They had held a meeting in Ancoats with a view to forming a second section.

Citizen *Engels* said he could see that the Federal Council had grossly neglected its duty. He would propose that the Federal Council be called upon to furnish a report as to the steps it had taken to carry out the resolution of the Conference with respect to stamps.\*

Citizen *Frankel* seconded the proposition.

Citizen *Hales* denied the right of the Council to interfere in the internal regulations of the Federal Council. It could not take any action with regard to the stamps until after the 1st of July.

Citizen *Frankel* withdrew his seconding.

Citizen *Marx* had no wish to interfere in the internal regulations of the Federal Council, but the Manchester section had applied for stamps and he proposed that they should be sent.

Citizen *Engels* withdrew his own motion in favour of that of Citizen Marx which he seconded. He thought it was a far stronger censure of the Federal Council than the resolution he proposed.

---

\* See p. 28 of the present volume.—Ed.

Citizen *Hales* moved as an amendment that the matter be referred to the Federal Council. He was opposed to creating unnecessary divisions; besides, he did not think that the letter was addressed to the General Council, but to Dupont, as a member of the Manchester section, and he thought the same application had been already made to the Federal Council.

Citizen *Mayo* seconded the amendment; the Federal Council had been recognised by the General [Council] and he thought it ought to be left to manage its own business.

Citizen *Johannard* was in favour of the proposition of Citizen Marx; he thought the Federal Council had neglected its duty.

On being put to the vote, 2 voted for the amendment, 7 against. The 7 then voted for the proposition and the 2 against—it was then declared carried.

The *Chairman* then read a letter from Citizen Martin, asking for £3 on account of rent for the use of the room.

Citizen *Jung* said the request was first made to him, but he had already paid Martin two pounds, and he asked him to make the application to the Council.

Citizen *Frankel* proposed that the three pounds be paid.

Citizen *Engels* asked what was the amount owing; it would be [well] to pay it all.

Citizen *Jung* said he would remind the Council that there was very little money in hand.

Citizen *Boon* should like to know what rent was due; he was surprised that two pounds of the Council's money had been paid away in the absence of an understanding. He was a member of the Finance Committee, and he had not heard of its meeting; he certainly had received no notice of any meeting.

Citizen *Engels* said the Finance Committee was merely appointed to see that the books were properly kept. It had no power over the expenditure. It was elected because the

[London] Conference was dissatisfied with the way in which the accounts had been kept.

Citizen *Jung* said: though he had paid the two pounds, he had not entered it in the book. He never paid anything without a vote except the regular expenses.

Citizen *Vaillant* said he was surprised that the Council should discuss such matters of detail: it was a matter for the Treasurer to deal with.

Citizen *Serraillier* thought the three pounds ought to be paid without discussion.

Citizen *Hales* said the Council didn't leave Holborn until the end of February,\* so that the three pounds asked for with the two pounds paid would be a higher rental than the Council paid in Holborn. He might be wrong but he was under the impression that when the Council was looking for a room, Martin said that he would find the Council a room to meet in for nothing. He did not say the Council ought to use the room and not pay, but certainly believed it was offered for nothing, and the Council, not having a meeting place when the notice in Holborn was up, came to Martin's without coming to an arrangement and none had been made since.

Citizen *Boon* was also of the same opinion; he would move that the same rent be paid as the Council paid in Holborn. The misunderstanding would never have arisen if the Finance Committee had met as it was intended to do.

Citizen *Mayo* was in favour of the proposition of Boon, so far as principle was concerned, but it took two to make a bargain and Martin was not present, and they did not know whether he would accept it.

Citizen *Serraillier* was in favour of voting the three pounds and then making an arrangement.

Citizen *Milner* thought that some arrangement ought to

---

\* See p. 116 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

have been made when the Council came to the room; he thought the Council had not been treated in a dignified manner at all. It was an insult to first proffer hospitality and then afterwards to present a charge for it. It might be in accordance with French ideas to do so, but it was un-English. He would not vote for any sum at all except as a complimentary gift to Citizen Martin. He was quite willing to pay whatever was necessary as his share, but the dignity of the Council was at stake.

Citizen *Longuet* said there had been some mistake. Whatever the impression the English members entertained, there could not be [the] slightest doubt as to the ideas of the French members upon the subject; they all thought the room was to be paid for. No rent had been fixed, but all knew rent was to be paid.

Citizen *Vaillant* said he was quite sure the sentiments expressed by Milner were not shared by the French members. Nothing could be farther from the character of Martin than the motives imputed.

Citizen *Ranvier* was surprised such small matters should be brought before the Council. What would those say who talked of the great power of the International if it was known that the time of the Council was taken up in such insignificant matters. Could not understand how men could waste time.

Citizen *Engels* said: if the time of the Council was taken up unnecessarily, it was its own fault. The officers were not to blame as it had always acted upon the same principle.

Citizen *Vaillant* on behalf of Citizen Martin withdrew the request.

Citizen *Hales* claimed the right to make a motion upon the letter before the chair; he proposed that the three pounds be paid to Citizen Martin.

Citizen *Eccarius* seconded, suggesting that he should also be offered the same rent as was paid in Holborn.

Citizen *Hales* agreed to add it to his proposition.

It was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

Citizen *Cournet* said he had received a letter from Holland. The writer said that taking all circumstances into consideration The Hague was really the most available place in which to hold Congress. He therefore proposed that it should be held at The Hague.

Citizen *Engels* seconded, as he thought it would be most adapted. It was easily reached and he thought that was a great advantage.

The proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* proposed that the whole of the next sitting should be devoted to Congress, that not even the correspondence should be brought on. The time was going, and it was necessary [that] the Council should thoroughly discuss the question.

Citizen *Engels*, seconded and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Serrailier* said matters might arise out of the correspondence which might require immediate action. He therefore proposed that the Sub-Committee should have full powers to act in all cases arising out of the correspondence.

Citizen *Frankel* seconded and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Marx* said the Council would now be obliged to declare the place of meeting of the Congress and he thought it should be stated at the same time that the Council intended to propose a revision of the Statutes, without waiting for further parts of the programme.

Citizen *Jung* said he would propose that a Sub-Committee be appointed to draw up a statement of reasons which should be embodied in the announcement.

Citizen *Murray* seconded; the Council could not be too explicit in its declarations.

Citizen *Ranvier* should like to know what was intended: if only an announcement was meant, that could be done by the Secretary.

Citizen Engels said if the time of the Council was taken up unnecessarily, it was its own fault. The Officers were not to blame as it had always acted upon the same principle.

Citizen Vaillant on behalf of Citizen Martin withdrew the request.

Citizen Hales claimed the right to make a motion upon the letter before the Chair. He proposed that the three pounds be paid to Citizen Martin.

Citizen Socinus seconded, suggesting that he should also be offered the same rent as was paid in Holborn. Citizen Hales agreed to add it to his proposition.

It was put to the vote and Carried Unanimously.

Citizen Cornut said he had received a letter from Holland. The writer said that taking all Circumstances into Consideration the Hague was really the most available place in which to hold Congress. He therefore proposed that it should be held at the Hague.

Citizen Engels seconded as he thought it would be most adapted. It was easily reached and he thought that was a great advantage.

The proposition was carried unanimously. ↘

Citizen Marx proposed that the whole of the next sitting should be devoted to Congress that not even the Correspondence should be brought on. The time was going and it was necessary the Council should thoroughly discuss the question.

Citizen Engels seconded and it was carried unanimously.

Pages of the Minute Book with Marx's proposal, seconded by Engels, to devote the next Council meeting to preparations for the Hague Congress

Citizen *Jung* thought it advisable [that] reasons should be given.

Citizen *Vaillant* was opposed, thought it would look like prejudging the question. It would be quite sufficient to say the Federal Councils desired it.

Citizen *Johannard* was in favour. Reasons would have to be given, and he preferred that only one version should be used.

Citizen *Cournet* said a statement must be issued, otherwise each secretary might give a different reason.

Citizen *Hales* asked if it was intended to issue it without first submitting it to the Council.

Citizen *Jung* did not think it necessary that that should be done, but it could, if such was desired.

The proposition was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

It was then decided that the Committee should consist of three, and Citizens Engels, Vaillant, McDonnell and Milner were nominated.

Citizen Engels received 22 votes, Citizen Vaillant—19, Citizen McDonnell 18, and Citizen Milner 17; the first three were therefore elected.

Citizen *Boon* then called attention to the paragraph in the Minutes announcing the resignation of the Secretary.\*

Citizen *Johannard* thought that as the Council had been disposing of a number of small questions it might settle that as well.

Citizen *Vaillant* said: hearing nothing more from the Secretary, he concluded it was said in the heat of passion and that the Secretary withdrew it.

Citizen *Boon* said he did not think anything of the kind. The Secretary was not a man to do things in a passion, and he hadn't the slightest doubt he had good reasons for the course he had pursued.

---

\* See p. 219 of the present volume.--Ed.

Citizen *Hales* said the resignation was not given in a moment of passion. He meant what he said—he meant to persist in resigning, for he had no choice. Any other man on the Council would be compelled to [do] the same who had the slightest particle of honour, were he in his place. The rejection of the Minutes implied that they had been falsified, and he held that no man could continue to hold office while he rested under the imputation of falsifying the Minutes; he pointed out before the vote was taken the difference between the Minutes being incomplete and their being incorrect. He maintained they were correct as far [as] they went; they might not be complete, but he denied that they were incorrect.

Citizen *Vaillant* did not look upon it in the same light as Citizen *Hales*; it was simply an expression on the part of the Council and did not reflect at all upon the Secretary's personal honour.

Citizen *Engels* said he proposed the resolution and he could say no personal insult was intended, he did not mean anything of the kind. The vote meant that the Minutes did not convey a correct impression of the proceedings of the sitting to which they referred, and he still maintained the same: they did not give a faithful impression, but he never meant to insinuate that they had been falsified. If he had thought that he should have said so. They might only have been incomplete, and yet convey an altogether erroneous idea. The debate, as well as the motion he made upon the admission of the French section in Belgium, was not reported at all—and it would have been simply impossible to add to; the only way was to get a fresh copy written out and that was what ought to have been done. The Secretary ought not to object to being censured when his work was not done to the satisfaction of the Council.

Citizen *Jung* took a different view from Citizen *Engels*; he always thought that propositions that were made and then withdrawn were not inserted in the Minutes; if they

were not inserted, of course the debate that took place upon them could not be. He believed that was the rule followed by Eccarius when he was Secretary, and he followed that rule himself when he acted as Secretary. If anyone had a right to complain he had, for he still maintained his opposition after Engels withdrew the proposition; he was convinced the Council did wrong and therefore if anybody ought to have been reported he had. He should have done exactly the same had he been in the Secretary's place. After the vote he didn't see how he could continue to hold office; the Secretary hadn't asked his opinion, he simply spoke as he felt.

Citizen *Frankel* proposed that the resignation be not accepted.

Citizen *Murray* seconded. He thought it was injurious to the authority of any Council to change its officers upon the least occasion; he thought the debate had cleared up a misunderstanding. The Secretary could see that his personal honour was not impugned and at the same time he ought to see that the Council had a right to express its dissatisfaction when the work of the Secretary was not done so well as it ought to be.

Citizen *Boon* said he was opposed to anything like eating the leek. This was not the first time that the Council had had to complain of the Minutes written by Citizen Hales and it most likely would not be the last, if it stultified itself by accepting the resolution of Citizen Frankel. There had been some talk about the dignity of the Council, and he thought it would be eating the leek with a vengeance if the resignation was not accepted. The vote meant that the Secretary had either wilfully or from bias imported something into the Minutes which ought not to have been in, or from the same causes had left something out that ought to have been in. In either case he was not fit for the office, and he hoped the Council would not eat its words to please anyone man, let him be Citizen Hales or anyone else.

The proposition of Citizen Frankel was then put to the vote and carried by 12 to 7.

The Council adjourned at 11.30.

*JULES JOHANNARD*, Chairman  
*JOHN HALES*, Secretary

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

*Held June 25th, 1872*

Citizen *Johannard* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud*, *Applegarth*, *Barry*, *Cournet*, *Eccarius*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Hales*, *Johannard*, *Jung*, *Lessner*, *Le Moussu*, *Lochner*, *Longuet*, *Marx*, *Mayo*, *McDonnell*, *Milner*, *Murray*, *Ranvier*, *Rozwadowski*, *Serraillier*, *Townshend*, *Vaillant*, *Wróblewski* and *Yarrow*.

Citizen *De Willebrord*\*\* of the Belgian Federal Council was also present by permission as a visitor.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Serraillier* proposed that no more reports be sent to the *Eastern Post*. He thought the Council should pass the resolution without discussion, as that journal had for some time allowed attacks to be made upon the Council in its columns.

Citizen *Lessner* seconded. He thought that the *Eastern Post* ought not to have allowed the opponents of the Council to thus slander the Council as had been done.

Citizen *Engels* said the matter wanted considering, he therefore proposed the matter be referred to the Sub-Committee with full powers to act.

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 25-30 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* *Glaser de Willebrord*.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Hales* seconded and the proposition was carried unanimously.<sup>218</sup>

Citizen *Le Moussu* then read a copy of a letter which had been sent to Hubert of New York by Citizen *Hales* and said that that letter was calculated to nullify the influence of the Council by encouraging the dissentients. He therefore proposed that the Judicial Committee be called out to consider the conduct of Citizen *Hales* in relation to the said letter.

Citizen *Hales* seconded the proposition: he wished the fullest investigation into the matter.

It was carried unanimously and Citizen *Arnaud* was appointed as convener of the Committee.<sup>219</sup>

Citizen *Engels* then proposed that the Council should take the articles\* and Administrative Regulations as the subjects for discussion, so as to follow on the work already done.

Citizen *Vaillant* said it would be as well to commence with one referring to the Council as that was the subject that had been under discussion.

Citizen *Engels* agreed to the suggestion which was then put as the proposition after being seconded, and carried unanimously.

Article 3 of the Administrative Regulations was then declared to be the subject for discussion and it was agreed that it should be taken section by section.

Section 1 was agreed to without alteration.

Upon Section 2 being read, Citizen *Frankel* moved an addition to it, to the effect that the General Council should watch over the principles of the Association and guard them.<sup>220</sup>

Citizen *Hales* thought the proposition was not clear enough: the powers ought to be defined.

Citizen *Marx* said it only intended as a general declaration; the additional powers proposed to be given would

---

\* This refers to the General Rules.—*Ed.*

come into the Rules relating to the powers and functions of the Council. He supported the proposition, which was then put [to the vote] and carried unanimously.

The proposition was made in French, and to prevent any misinterpretation Citizen *Engels* then proposed that a French Secretary be appointed to take down all the propositions made in that language. The Council would then have the authentic text of the propositions made.

The proposition was seconded and carried.

Citizen Frankel was then appointed to act as French Secretary.

Section 3 was then taken into consideration.

Citizen *Engels* said it was a rule that required consideration. It was not satisfactory as it stood, and he did not quite see the best way to amend it; he proposed that it be adjourned, to be afterwards discussed.

Citizen *Lessner* seconded and it was carried unanimously.<sup>221</sup>

Upon Section 4 Citizen *Arnaud* said that it required a substitution of the word "group" for "branch" as a group must first be formed and admitted before it became a branch.

The alteration was then agreed to, and Section 5 was also altered so as to conform with the preceding one.<sup>222</sup>

The *Chairman* then read Section 6.<sup>223</sup>

Citizen *Hales* proposed the addition of the words "Upon receiving sufficient evidence to prove that such section is acting contrary to the principles of the Association".

No one seconded.

Citizen *Marx* proposed to insert after the word "Congress", "any Section, Group, Federation, or Federal Council"; he said that was the real intention of the Congress of Basle, as would be found by referring to the protocols which were taken in French,<sup>224</sup> and it would be seen that the matter must not be left in its present condition—Federations and Federal Councils could do far more mischief than any single

section, as witness the action of the so-called New Federal Council of the United States, who had acted in such a manner that the Germans and French have withdrawn seeing that the dissentients had only joined as a political trick.

Citizen *Serraillier* said he was of an opinion that the General Council must be strengthened and must have power to suspend, but he would ask if it was intended to suspend a section without consulting the Federal Council to which it might belong. He thought the Federal Council ought to be consulted otherwise they would have it taking part with the suspended section and the General Council would then have to suspend the Federal Council to vindicate its authority.

Citizen *Vaillant* said the only reason that could be urged in favour of *Serraillier's* proposition was that it was necessary that the General Council should have full evidence. He thought that it was unnecessary, as the General Council would never act except upon full evidence.

Citizen *Jung* said the Council must consider what effect the proposition would have upon the Congress. He thought the Federal Council ought to be consulted, for he did not see how sufficient evidence could be got without; besides, if they were not to be consulted the Congress would think the Council wanted to have all the power.

Citizen *Engels* was of the same opinion as *Jung*. The cases, in which the General Council would be mostly called upon to act, would be the cases of separate sections. In the cases of sections belonging to Federations there could be no danger, as the Federal Council would deal with it; unless there was a majority on the Federal Council which approved of the action of the section—in that case it would be the Federal Council which would have to be dealt with instead of the section. He would propose that in the cases of sections belonging to a Federation, the Federal Council be first consulted.

Citizen *Arnaud* said: often in trying to prove a little too

much was proved. If the General Council must have the sanction of a Federation before it could suspend a section, whose sanction must it obtain before it could suspend a Federation?

Citizen *Frankel* said: as Section 5 required the General Council to consult the Federal Council before it could recognise a new section, it resulted that the Council must consult the Federal Council before it could kick one out.

Citizen *Jung* said it was not proposed that the sanction of the Federal Council should be obtained but that it should be *consulted*, so that the best information might be obtained.

Citizen *Marx* said: the resolution of the Congress of Basle was absolute, and there was nothing new in his proposition. If it was supposed that the General Council would suspend a section for the mere sake of suspending it, the proposition of Citizen Engels ought to be passed, but it was not necessary if it was believed that the Council would act reasonably. He did not propose to add anything to the power of the Council.

Citizen *Serraillier* said he was in favour of consulting the Federal Council, because of the requirement in the preceding section; it was a far graver matter to suspend than to admit; besides, the General Council would be always open to attacks from the Federal Councils if their sections were suspended without their knowledge. It must be remembered that, while it consulted the Federal Council, the General Council would reserve its action.

Citizen *Frankel* said *Serraillier* had spoken of attacks upon the General Council; the attacks that had been made were made against the party of Revolution, and he no more feared them than the men of the first Revolution feared the attacks of the aristocracy.

Citizen *Vaillant* said the General Council had been obliged to act in contravention to Section 5 when he admitted the French section in Belgium without consulting the Federal Council; it must reserve its action.

Citizen *Engels* would remind Citizen *Vaillant* that the Council did\* violate the spirit of the 5th section, but it gave special reasons for so doing. The paragraph was recognised and special reasons were given why it was set aside in that particular instance. With respect to the resolution of the Basle Congress, the Council was not bound to continue the same policy\*\*; the object was to improve the Statutes, so as to make them more effective.

Citizen *Barry* thought the Federal Councils should be first consulted; the General Council ought to have the power, but it ought to make a show of considering the other parties—and it would get better information; it ought not to show too much power, even if it exercised it.

Citizen *Hales* said he was in favour of consulting the Federal Councils; it would be unwise to pass a resolution that could not be carried—7 persons had spoken twice in defiance of the administrative regulations carried only two weeks before.\*\*\*

Citizen *Cournet* thought it not necessary to consult the Federal Council; the General Council had the right to suspend under the present Rules.

Citizen *Longuet* proposed the question be adjourned.

Citizen *Serrailier* proposed the close of the debate, which was supported by Citizens *Jung*, *Eccarius* and *Hales*.

On being put to the vote, the close of the debate was rejected by the vote of the Chairman and the adjournment was declared.

The Council adjourned at 11.30.

H. JUNG, Chairman

JOHN HALES, Secretary

---

\* Originally, the wording here was "did not"; this sentence was corrected and expanded at the next Council meeting when the Minutes were being confirmed.—*Ed.*

\*\* The words "to continue the same policy" were inserted between the lines in place of the deletion "by it".—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See pp. 216-17 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

## MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

Held on July 2nd, 1872

Citizen *Jung* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Barry, Boon, Cournet, Delahaye, Dupont, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Johannard, Jung, Lessner, Le Moussu, Lochner, Marx, Martin, Mayo, Murray, Roach, Rozwadowski, Rühl, Townshend, Vaillant, Wróblewski* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, Citizen *Marx* moved that the words "and the General Rules and Regulations of the Association" be added to the resolution of Citizen *Frankel* upon the second section.

Citizen *Engels* seconded and the proposition was put and carried unanimously without discussion.\*\*

Citizen *Hales* announced that in consequence of the vote taken with respect to the *Eastern Post*, he had sent the official notice relative to the Congress to the *International Herald* instead of to the *Eastern Post*,<sup>225</sup> and that he had provided the usual quantity of *International Heralds* for the use of members.

Citizen *Engels* said he had been thinking that whatever might be the intention of the Council, the Congress would take the amendments as a proposition asking for fresh powers for the General Council; he was in favour of increasing the powers of the General Council, but for every increase of power he thought there should be a safeguard provided; he therefore proposed the following as a substitute for the existing rule.<sup>226</sup>

He thought this would meet the difficulty which a change involved. While the Council would possess the right

---

\* The minutes are in *Hale's* hand on pp. 30-36 of the Minute Book—*Ed.*

\*\* This amendment was not included in the final text of the draft Rules; see p. 430 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

to suspend a section, yet it would not exercise that right until it had consulted the Federal Council to which it belonged. In the case of a dissolution of a Federal Council, the Federation would be immediately called upon to elect a new one. While in the case of the dissolution of a Federation, the whole of the Federations composing the Association would have an opportunity of reconsidering the action taken.

Citizen *Dupont* seconded the proposition.

Citizen *Wróblewski* was in favour of the General Council having the right to suspend until the next Congress, without referring to the Federations at all. He thought the plan proposed would give rise to all sorts of intrigues.

Citizen *Martin* thought the proposition complicated matters; the proposed Conference would only be a kind of inner lining to the Council.

Citizen *Marx* said the dissolution of a Federal Council would be a serious affair, but though the General Council would have the right it would never dissolve unless the whole Federation was reactionary. If a Federation was suspended, and the whole of the Federations were opposed to the action taken, it was certain that, whether right or wrong, the General Council would have to give way. It never could constitute itself a power in opposition to the Association. Such a state of things never could occur, unless the General Council committed a great blunder.

Citizen *Dupont* thought the proposition did not weaken the powers of the General Council, it simply meant that the General Council should ask the parties to give evidence who were best able to do so.

Citizen *Eccarius* was opposed to the proposition because it seemed to infer that there was a revolt in prospect and that preparations were being made to meet it. If the Federation should be suspended and then reinstated, it would place the General Council in a false position. If a Federal Council was suspended and then rehabilitated, some pro-

vision ought to be made for the General Council to resign and that would make it the same as a ministry in a chamber, depending upon the will of a majority. Now he was opposed to that system. It was purely a parliamentary system—that was not practicable in the International.

Citizen *Rozwadowski* was opposed to the proposition because it introduced too much the parliamentary element into the International. It would make business impossible owing to the persecutions on the Continent.

Citizen *Arnaud* thought a verbal alteration was required, otherwise two interpretations would be made.

Citizen *Hales* said he had nothing to say upon Engels's proposition, but he thought reasons should be given in all cases of suspension. At present the rule was too arbitrary; under it the General Council could suspend any section without assigning any reason whatever.

Citizen *Mayo* doubted whether the proposed private Conference was practicable.

Citizen *Barry* agreed that it was desirable that reasons should be given, but he did not think it practicable. The General Council for the time being represented the collective wisdom of the Association and might fairly be entrusted with the power proposed to be entrusted to it.

Citizen *Roach* said he should support the idea thrown out by Citizen *Hales*. He thought the General Council should always give its reasons in all cases of suspension.

Citizen *Engels* said that Citizen *Eccarius* opposed because the resolution implied that there was a revolt. Well, he must say that there had been something very much like it, owing to the interposition of a number of middle-class humbugs in America who have been turned out by the energy of our own men. All the efforts at improvement are the outcome of the requirements of the times. If the General Council did not at any time represent the Association, it ought not to hold power but ought to be kicked out. With respect to what was said by *Rozwadowski*, he might say

that he believed in centralising power when it was necessary, but it must be remembered that the International was not a conspiracy for an armed revolt. It might be, but at present it had nothing to do with anything of the kind. In reply to Citizen Arnaud, he only used the word "consult", because it was used in the preceding clause. There was no consultation as to power, for it distinctly said "The General Council before exercising this right". With respect to the remarks of Citizen Hales, he would say at once that he was not opposed to the spirit of his remarks, but he thought his suggestion altogether unnecessary, as any General Council who might be in office would read the rules according to its own light, and so it would make no difference. As for Mayo's remarks, he would point out that it was only proposed to call one delegate from each nation, so that the Conference would not be expensive.

On being [put] to the vote it was carried, four voting against.

Citizen *Hales* then proposed that after the words "shall have power to suspend" the following words should be inserted: "Upon receiving sufficient evidence to prove that such Section, Group, Federal Council, or Federation has violated the principles or General Rules of the Association. In all cases of suspension reasons to be given."\* He said if such was the meaning intended, it could do no harm to state such meaning in words, there could then be no mistake. It was desirable to have the Rules as clear as possible so that there could not be any mistake as to their meaning. He did not believe in leaving anything to be inferred, especially when such inference would permit arbitrary action, and he contended that the greatest amount of arbitrary action was possible under the rule as it then stood.

Citizen *Roach* seconded, because he thought the General Council should always furnish a reason for such a grave

---

\* This sentence was inserted between the lines.—*Ed.*

action as the suspension of any branch of the Association.

Citizen *Marx* opposed the proposition upon the ground that it was unnecessary. If the Council was to go into details, it would require a complete Criminal Code. The Council did not ask for increased powers—in reality it asked that the powers it already possessed should be limited.

Citizen *Roach* said there was always danger of the General Council labouring under a mistake as to the meaning of the General Rules; he believed the Council had violated the Rules in recognising Irish branches in England without first consulting the British Federal Council. The Rules distinctly said that the General Council should not recognise new sections in any country without first consulting the Federal Council of the country in which they were formed. He was therefore of an opinion that reasons should always be given.

Citizen *Dupont* thought the resolutions proposed by Engels quite sufficient. It was understood that no sections would be suspended except [if] they acted in violation of the principles or Statutes of the Association.

Citizen *Barry* thought the publication of reasons would cause confusion.\*

Citizen *Eccarius* said the speech of Citizen Roach would have been in order if the motion had been to appoint a Committee to interpret the Rules, but it was out of place as it was; there was no misinterpretation of the Rules in the case of admitting the Irish sections, but there had been a misinterpretation of the Rules on the part of some members in dealing with the Trades Unions, and action would have to be taken upon the matter before the meeting of Congress.

Citizen *Hales* said Citizen Dupont had furnished a reason why the resolution should be carried. He said that "it was understood no action would be taken except in cer-

---

\* This paragraph was inserted later.—*Ed.*

tain cases". Now he did not wish to leave it to be understood; he wanted it laid down as an absolute rule about which there could be no misunderstanding whatever. He was opposed to giving any Council arbitrary and irresponsible power, under the Rules as proposed as well as under the existing Rules. The General Council would be able to suspend and therefore virtually be able to destroy the Association in any country without furnishing any reasons for so doing. It would simply have to say to a Federation: you are dissolved, and it would be, and if one Federation could be dissolved, all could, so that the General Council could at any time it pleased dissolve the whole of the Association, by simply dissolving all the Federations and suspending all the Sections. It must be remembered too that the present General Council might not be the next General Council. Citizen Engels had repeatedly spoken of a secret society within the International. Suppose the men who had belonged to that were to compose the next General Council—and that was quite possible—what guarantee would there be that the whole of the organisation would not be perverted?—because all who opposed a policy could be suspended. There was nothing whatever to prevent dishonest men from turning the whole Association into a secret one with secret aims; the power given by the rule was arbitrary enough to cover anything—that power would not be needed by honest men with honest intentions, for they would never object to give reasons and if they did not object, there was no reason that it should not be so laid down in the Rules.

It\* was then put to the vote: 4 voted for, 13 against, it was therefore lost.

Section 7 was then agreed to as it stood.

Section 8 was also agreed after a verbal alteration was made, which was necessary to make it accord with the reading of Sections 4 and 5.

---

\* Hales's proposal.—*Ed.*

Section 9 was agreed to without alteration.

Citizen *Frankel* proposed that Section 3 should be struck out and the following substituted: "The General Council shall publish a report of its proceedings once a week."

A short discussion took place, and it [was] agreed to adjourn it.

Citizen *Hales* gave notice that he should move the addition of the following section at the next meeting of the Council:

"All members of the Association shall have the right to attend, and speak at (except upon matters of expenditure), all meetings of members—upon production of proof of membership—except at meetings of the General and Federal Councils."

Citizen *Eccarius* gave notice that he should move its rejection.

The Council adjourned at 11.30.

J. P. McDONNELL, Chairman  
JOHN HALES, Secretary

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING \*

*Held July 9th, 1872*

Citizen *McDonnell* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Barry, Bradnick, Cournet, Delahaye, Dupont, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Johannard, Jung, Lessner, Le Moussu, Martin, Margueritte, Milner, Murray, Ranvier, Rozwadowski, Serrailier, Townshend, Vaillant, Wróblewski* and *Yarrow*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed, after which Citizen *Frankel* proposed that Sec-

---

\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 37-43 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

tion 3 of Article 2<sup>227</sup> should be abolished and the following substituted: "The General Council shall publish a report of its proceedings every week." He said the Bulletin had always been superseded by publications of the General Council, whilst the long paragraph about statistics had never been complied with—and it was useless to have rules on the book that were not complied with.

Citizen *Engels* seconded, because the rule as it stood, with all its red tapeism, had never been carried out, and the resolution proposed was practicable.

Citizen *Hales* would like to see the resolution framed somewhat differently, as some weeks there might not be anything to report, especially when the Council was engaged upon matters of detail.

Citizen *Frankel* said there would always be something in the correspondence, which could be reported.

The resolution was then put to the vote and carried.\*

Citizen *Hales* then brought forward the proposition of which he had given notice, viz.: "All members of the Association, upon production of proof of membership, shall have the right to attend and speak at all meetings of members, except meetings of the General and Federal Councils."

He said he brought forward that proposition, because he had a desire for the members to take an interest in the action of the Association generally, and not confine themselves to the doings of their own branch, and he also desired to take all precautions against the possibility of the Association drifting into a secret one, which was possible unless the rule he proposed was adopted. It would give members a greater interest in the work of propaganda and would do more than anything else to promote that fraternal feeling which ought to exist amongst the members of the Association, if the proposition was adopted as he

---

\* See p. 430 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

hoped it would be. He did not wish the rule to apply to those countries under special legislation.

Citizen *Vaillant* was altogether opposed to the proposition. There were all sorts of sections and much mischief would accrue if the branches were to be thrown open to all sorts of members. The police could then form sections and enter any branch they pleased, and could thus obtain all the information they required; besides, if all Frenchmen in London who claimed to be members had the right to enter into the French branch, no business whatever could be done.

Citizen *Jung* seconded the proposition. At the same time he hoped that it would be modified so as not to include those countries, where the International was under a ban. He thought no objection could be raised against its adoption in countries that were free, like England, Switzerland and America. It would do much good, for he knew of a number of instances in which members of the Association had come over to England and never had an opportunity of mixing with other members here, because the French branch, of which he was a member, admitted none but their own members. The consequence was that they went back to the Continent with a very poor impression of the organisation in England. He thought safeguards could be taken against the introduction of spies.

Citizen *Eccarius* proposed "That the Council proceed to the next business". He said: just fancy two quarrelsome members going about to all the branches in London and interfering in their business. Suppose a few of the Republican agitators joined the Association and then tried to force all the others to adopt their policy. The same result would follow as occurred in America. The split was principally brought about by the members of Section 1 going about and interfering, carrying reports and telling how men had voted, or not voted. It was quite possible that the sections might be quite in accord upon matters of principle

and yet differ upon matters of policy. If they had the right to go and interfere with each other business would become impossible.

Citizen *Yarrow* seconded the amendment, because he believed the resolution was a blow aimed at the Irish branches in England. All the English branches he had visited were absolutely free, so that they could not require it. He believed there was an ulterior motive. It was well known that some members of the Council were strongly opposed to the Anglo-Irish branches and if they had the opportunity they would do all they could to destroy them.

Citizen *Jung* disclaimed all idea of aiming a blow at the Irish branches. He had made up his mind upon the Irish question years ago, as might be proved by the fact that he was asked to be the agent of the Fenian leaders in London.

Citizen *Yarrow* did not throw the imputation upon Citizen *Jung*.

Citizen *Engels* was against the motion; he did not believe the Council had the right to pass any such rule, or that the Congress would accept it if it was submitted to it. Everybody knew with what levity members were introduced into the Association, and there would be a great danger if all sorts of characters were allowed to go into all the branches. In Switzerland the sections belonging to the Romand Federation were open, but owing to the quarrelsome conduct of some of the French refugees they had been obliged to pass a law not to admit non-members. It was well known that there were members [looking] upon the Irish branches with distrust, and they might create all sorts of disputes, and on the other hand they might have some drunken Irishman going about and interfering with English branches, and thus all sorts of ill-will would be created. With respect to the secession in America, what *Eccarius* said went for nothing: the secession was not caused by any action of Section 1, but by the entrance into

the Association of a lot of middle-class humbugs who only joined to make political capital and to give an opportunity of putting up Mrs. Woodhull as a candidate for the Presidency.

Four members here moved the close of the debate, and in accordance with the standing order it was at once put and carried.

Citizen *Hales* replying said he was deeply grieved to see the manner in which his resolution had been received, for it proved that the Council was filled with distrust, mistrust and suspicions, and possessed nothing of an international spirit. In answer to his proposition to give the members greater facilities for mutual intercourse, nothing was heard but the danger to be apprehended from spies, drunken members, all sorts of characters and middle-class humbugs. It proved that whatever fraternal feeling the members possessed the Council possessed none.

He was sorry indeed, because he could see that there was a tendency to drift the Association into a secret organisation. He would point out the danger to which the Association was liable. At present there was nothing to prevent branches joining in secret conspiracies, and keeping everybody in the dark by refusing admittance to anybody except their own members; again look at the facilities offered for the formation of bogus branches—shams with no real existence. Half a dozen men could constitute themselves into half a dozen branches, and defy enquiry by saying: we don't admit anybody but our members into our meetings. He might not be believed but he could honestly assert that he never thought of the Irish branches when he brought on his motion, and he did not see how it could affect them if they were real branches and not shams—with no existence—created for some purpose. With regard to swamping them, that would be impossible, for he did not ask for the vote, but only the right to attend and speak. As for the argument of Citizen Vaillant about

the danger there would be of admitting spies, he might say that he did not intend the rule to apply to countries under special legislation, and, besides, the precautions ought to be taken in admitting the sections. It must be remembered that the rule would require proof of membership. It would not be enough for persons to simply say they were members. The arguments of Eccarius about America and of Citizen Engels about Switzerland—he would answer by saying that if the members did so disagree, it was far better that they should have a common platform, on which they could meet to settle their differences, rather than that they should fight section against section, branch against branch. One word about America: the Council, he was convinced, had laboured under a great misunderstanding, and it had landed itself in the absurd position of being on the horns of a dilemma. It was bitterly opposing the abstentionists of Europe while it was upholding the abstentionists in America.

The amendment\* was then put to the vote and carried, only four voting for the proposition.

Citizen *Vaillant* then proposed and Citizen *Marguerite* seconded that the Council should go back and begin the General Rules, as it should really carry on the discussion consecutively.

Carried unanimously.

Citizen *Hales* then proposed a motion of order, viz., "That all names be registered upon all votes, showing who voted for, who against and who abstained".

Citizen *Engels* agreed with the proposition, if it was worded so that it should be only done upon the request of four members.

Citizen *Eccarius* seconded it in that form.

Citizen *Barry* seconded the motion as proposed by Citizen *Hales*. He thought the interests of three, two, or one of as much importance as of four.

---

\* Proposed by Hales.—Ed.

Citizen *Bradnick* thought it would have been productive of much good if the rule had been adopted before.

Citizen *Milner* did not see the necessity of the motion.

Citizen *Frankel* did not know why the time of the Council was to be wasted upon such petty matters.

On being put to the vote, it was rejected by 12 to 7.

Citizen *Engels* then read the preamble to the General Rules.\*

Citizen *Hales* proposed and Citizen *Eccarius* seconded that it should stand without alteration.

Citizen *Vaillant* thought the words "manifold divisions of labour" in the fourth paragraph gave it too much of a Trades Union character and moved that they be expunged.

Citizen *Serraillier* said: if that was struck out, the economical would be struck out and it would be purely political, and there would be nothing to bind the different Trades together.

Citizen *Barry* thought it could not be improved either in substance or style. It pointed out the absence of Combination and the absence of Solidarity.

Citizen *Arnaud* was opposed to the retention of the words. He thought it made the Association too much of a Trades Council.

Citizen *Serraillier* would not object to the change of the words but could not agree to leave it out altogether.

Four members demanded the close of the debate, and it was carried.

Citizen *Vaillant* saw no reason to alter the proposition; on the contrary, he had been more firmly convinced. He had been charged with desiring to eliminate the social element. Nothing was more contrary to his intentions. He believed his proposition would make it more logical.

It was then put to the vote and 9 voted for, 12 against.

Citizen *Barry* then proposed the omission of the words

---

\* See pp. 420-21 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

“in which modern society exists”, and the insertion of the words “the people” after the word “concurrence” in the fifth paragraph. The wording of the rule as it stood, he thought, restricted the scope of the Association. The resolution he proposed would embrace the people of all countries. The latter part of the resolution was to give sense to the passage.

Citizen *Yarrow* seconded the proposition.

Citizen *Milner* said: in his opinion modern society was really the thing the International was fighting against. The system which accumulated capital and machinery in the hands of a class, and made the mass of the people wages-slaves, was the thing which had rendered the International necessary. Modern society was the cause of the International.

Citizen *Frankel* said the words which Citizen Barry proposed to leave out were the most important of all.

Citizen *Engels* said the elimination of the words as proposed would turn the Association in a philanthropic society like those inaugurated by the middle class. Modern society is the society in which capital rules and labourers are used as instruments. It was absurd to imagine that the slaves of Cuba and Brazil, or the population of China and India, could be at once developed in associative labourers, they must first be made free labourers before they could be emancipated. To take out the words “modern society” would be to take out the pith.

Citizen *Rozwadowski* was in favour of the amendment proposed; he thought the Association ought not to be limited. He thought the slave might be freed and made a free man without going through the intermediate stage, as argued by Citizen Engels. If the Negro had fallen into the condition of a wages-slave, it was the fault of a bad state of society.

Citizen *Frankel* said “the slave was still the property of the middle class indirectly if not directly”.

Citizen *Martin* thought the words ought to be left out because he thought the Association should include the whole world.

Citizen *Bradnick* thought the words ought to be retained, otherwise working men would think modern society was the height of excellence. To make men free it was necessary to alter the conditions of society.

Citizen *Barry* said he had been misapprehended. He recognised the fact that the Association was up in arms against modern society, but he thought the International ought to embrace all mankind. None should be excluded, but all included.

On being put to the vote, 7 voted for, 10 against.

The Council adjourned at 11.30.\*

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*\*

*Held July 16th, 1872<sup>228</sup>*

Citizen *Lochner* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Barry, Delahaye, Dupont, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Johannard, Jung, Lessner, Lochner, Le Moussu, Marx, Martin, Mayo, Rozwadowski, Serrailier, Vaillant, Wróblewski* and *Yarrow*.

Citizen Hubert of New York was also present as a visitor.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, the *Secretary*\*\*\* read a letter from the British Federal Council asking for information as to the number of Irish branches which had been formed in

\* Unsigned.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in Hales's hand on pp. 44-49 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Hales.—*Ed.*

England, the date at which they were recognised by the General Council, the times and places of meeting, the names of secretaries, and the language used in the transaction of branch business. The information was wanted for the Congress at Nottingham.

Citizen *Engels* proposed that it be referred to the Sub-Committee; as the answer was wanted for the Congress it would be quite in time.\*

Citizen *Jung* seconded, because he thought that if the rule which had been adopted, referring the correspondence to the Sub-Committee,\*\* was broken through, the Council could not refuse to take Continental correspondence, and he did not think there was sufficient time to discuss the subject.

The proposition was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* then proceeded with the reading of the General Statutes.

Citizen *Eccarius* proposed and Citizen *Hales* seconded that the word "persons" should be substituted for "men" in the declaration, upon the ground that the word "men" was generally understood as being a limitation to one sex.

Citizen *Engels* thought it was generally understood "men" was a generic term including both sexes.

Citizen *Jung* supported the proposition. He thought that while we understood the word in that sense, many outside the Association understood it differently. In all cases, in which women had tested the question, the judges had decided against them.

Citizen *Frankel* said he preferred the whole passage should be expunged upon the ground that he could not act with justice to the middle class.

Citizen *Vaillant* thought there was no necessity to alter anything as the word "men" was a general term, while

---

\* July 21-22, 1872.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 230 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

justice to the middle class meant that they should be destroyed.

Citizen *Hales* hoped the proposition would be carried as the rule in the first instance was intended to enlighten non-members; the declaration must be accepted before a person could be a member.

It was then put to the vote and lost—5 voted for, 9 against.

Citizen *Hales* then proposed an addition to the declaration, viz., “and adopts the principle of solidarity”.

No one seconded the proposition and it fell through.

Upon Rule 1 Citizen *Marx* proposed to strike out the words relative “to a central medium” upon the ground that the development of the Association had changed the aspect\* and he moved the insertion of the following words instead: “To organise a common action between the working classes of different countries.”\*\* He said the alteration was rendered necessary to prevent misinterpretations.

Citizen *Eccarius* seconded the proposition and it was carried unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* proposed to substitute “is” for “shall”.

Citizen *Yarrow* proposed to transpose Rule 1 and Rule 2; he thought the name should come before the object.

Citizen *Hales* did not see the use of the name in the Rules.

Citizen *Eccarius* said it must be in.

The two propositions of Citizens *Engels* and *Yarrow* were amalgamated and carried.

Citizen *Barry* proposed to strike out the words “Working Men’s” between “General” and “Congress” in Rule 3\*\*\*; he said it was unnecessary to retain them, as the rule further declared that the Congress should be composed of dele-

---

\* Further the words “of working-class struggles” are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 421 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

gates of the Association, which was a Working Men's Association.

Citizen *Marx* said it was only a question of redaction, but he thought it would be best not to alter it, as the Congress might think there was a lurking design on the part of the Council to take away the working-class character of the Congress.

Citizen *Barry* said the action of the Council upon the American question with regard to the two-thirds wages-labourers\* was a sufficient disapproval of that idea.

Citizen *Eccarius* seconded the proposition: he thought it necessary to make the rule clear; at present it gave an idea that all sorts of working men's societies were invited, who did not belong to the Association, and that idea had been acted upon at the different Congresses.

Citizen *Vaillant* agreed with the remarks of Citizen *Marx*, but he admitted that the argument of Citizen *Eccarius* was logical; as different interpretations might be put upon an alteration he thought it should be left to the Congress.

Citizen *Serrailier* said some alteration was necessary, owing to the narrow interpretation some Frenchmen put upon the word *Ouvrier*.\*\*<sup>229</sup>

Citizen *Hales* said the Congresses were always spoken of as the Working Men's Congresses and the title was the mark which distinguished them from all other Congresses. He would suggest the insertion of the word only before "delegates".

On being put to the vote, only three voted for it, and it was lost by a large majority.

Upon Rule 4 Citizen *Engels* proposed to substitute the following, after the word "invitation", for the concluding part of the rule<sup>230</sup>: "The General Council may, in case of need, change the date and place of Congress, and with the

---

\* See p. 412 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* Worker.—*Ed.*

sanction of the majority of the federations substitute to it a private Conference, which shall have the same power as a Congress. In any case, the Congress, or the Conference which may replace it, must meet within 3 months after the date fixed by the Annual Congress.”\*

He said it was necessary to meet the possibilities which might arise. Owing to circumstances which it could not control the Council was compelled to pass over 1870 without the Congress taking place and in 1871 it was obliged to substitute a private Conference for the Congress, an act which was not legal and for which it would have to answer to the Congress. His motion really only proposed to make that legal which was necessary.

Citizen *Frankel* seconded.

Citizen *Hales* opposed the proposition as it would, if carried, put the most despotic power into the hands of the General Council; in fact it would become entirely master of the Association and could do what it pleased. It could under a previously passed rule suspend all who differed with it, it could then call a private Conference of those favourable to its policy, and then sweep away all the rules that interfered with its will. It would become nothing more than a secret society wielded by a few men—who were irresponsible.

The proposition was then put to the vote and carried by a large majority.

Citizen *Eccarius* then proposed [that] the power of the General Council to add to its number should be abolished. It was adopted because it was an English custom to have large Councils, and there was no Federal Council, and it was thought advisable to allow the delegates of the Trades Societies to enter, so that, as *Cremer* said, they might have an opportunity of being educated. There had been no advantage from the additions of the last 18 months as it

---

\* See p. 422 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

had become too unwieldy for business. It was more like a Parliament than an Executive Committee.

Citizen *Hales* seconded.

Citizen *Vaillant* proposed that the Congress should appoint the General Council which ought to be composed of 3 to represent each nationality. The Council should have no power to add to the number fixed, but should have the power to fill up vacancies of the numbers which the Congress should leave vacant.

Citizen *Barry* was opposed; he thought that the Council ought not to tie its hands, but ought to leave itself free to take in such talent as it might find at the door waiting to come in. The Council could always discriminate between the good and bad.

Citizen *Marx* supported the proposition of Citizen *Vaillant*: it met both cases. It stopped the unlimited right to add, and at the same time under special circumstances gave the Council the right to fill up vacancies. The number 3 was accidental, any number would do if the principle was affirmed.

Citizen *Eccarius* thought 3 too many, as 33 would be an unworkable Council.

Citizen *Vaillant* said the Congress was the right place to elect the Council, and the resolution affirmed that principle and said how it should be composed.

Citizen *Eccarius* didn't care so long as the right of adding to its number was taken away.

Citizen *Serraillier* thought if another clause was added Article 5 could be dispensed with.

Citizen *Marx* saw no difficulty in the last paragraph of Article 5 being removed.\*

Citizen *Barry* asked if the 3 must be from each country or representing each country.

Citizen *Vaillant* said representing each country.

---

\* The words "being removed" were written by Marx.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Hales* proposed one from each country.

Citizen *Engels* said that would only be the number required for secretaries.

It was then agreed that the number should be left for the Congress, the vote to be taken upon the principle only.

The proposition was then carried, only one voting against.

The first clause of Article 5 was then unanimously struck out and the last clause adopted as Article 5.\*

The Council adjourned at 11.20.

Chairman *CH. LONGUET*

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*\*

*Held July 23d, 1872*

Citizen *Longuet* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Arnaud, Barry, Cournot, Eccarius, Engels, Frankel, Jung, Lessner, Le Moussu, Lochner, Marx, Margueritte, Martin, Serraillier, Rozwadowski, Ranvier, Milner, Vaillant* and *Wróblewski*.

In the absence of the Secretary Citizen *Jung* read the Minutes and they were confirmed.

The discussion of Article 6 of the General Rules was proceeded with when *Frankel* proposed that the words "as, for instance, in case of international quarrels" and "to facilitate the communications the General Council shall publish periodical reports" be struck out.<sup>231</sup>

Citizen *Barry* would second the first part of *Frankel's* proposition, but could not do so with the second.

Citizen *Frankel* said the Council published reports when it was required, but he thought the rule was useless.

---

\* See pp. 422-23 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in *Jung's* hand on pp. 49-55 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

The proposition was put to the vote and carried\*.

Citizen *Barry* proposed that every member of the Council should be consulted before his name could be appended to any document issued by the Council and that every member should be at liberty to append or withhold his name.

Citizen *Eccarius* would like some alteration and would second Citizen *Barry's* proposition, if the latter would bring it on when the Administrative Regulations were discussed.

The majority of the Council thought the principle could be discussed at once and if carried could be put in its proper place.

Citizen *Vaillant* opposes the resolution; he thinks it necessary for the Council to represent a unit; if some members are not satisfied with the action of the Council they can withdraw from it.

Citizen *Frankel* supports *Vaillant's* views.

Citizen *Barry* thinks his proposition ought to be adopted because it is right and appeals to one's intelligence; it is in the highest degree immoral to append a man's name to a document with the contents of which he disagrees; it is well for those who want to make a show to stifle other people's opinions, but we must stand upon truth and justice and not deceive the public by pretending to be united when we are disunited.

The proposition was lost, 2 voting for it.

Citizen *Arnaud* proposes to add to Article 7 the words: "to assume as far as possible an international character."

Citizen *Rozwadowski* seconds and it is carried.<sup>232</sup>

Citizen *Vaillant* proposes to introduce between Articles 7 and 8 the resolution of the Conference: "Against the collective power of the propertied classes the working class cannot act, as a class, except by constituting itself into a

---

\* See p. 423 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

“The constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to ensure the triumph of the social revolution and its ultimate end—the abolition of classes.

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

“The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies and for enslaving labour. To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes.”<sup>233</sup>

It has produced a great sensation and most of the success of the International of late is due to that resolution, hence the Council ought to reaffirm it and adopt it as one of the fundamental rules of the society.

Citizen *Engels* seconds it—the same reasons that made us adopt it at the Conference still exist and we shall have to fight it out at the Congress.

Citizen *Marx* says there is another view; we have two classes of enemies: the abstentionists, and they have attacked that resolution more than any other; the working classes of England and America let the middle classes use them for political purposes; we must put an end to it by exposing it.

The resolution is carried.

Citizen *Cournet* reporting on behalf of the Subcommittee recommends that the General Secretary\* be suspended until the Judicial Committee have made their report.\*\*

---

\* Hales.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 308-09 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Barry* would like to know the reasons for which the Secretary is to be suspended.

Citizen *Serrailier* says he is accused by the American Secretary\* of having abused his powers.

Citizen *Marx* says we have had evidence given\*\* that the Secretary works against the Council while he is paid by the Council.

*Eccarius* will vote for the suspension; months ago he had sufficient proofs that Hales was unfitted to be Secretary,\*\*\* but the Council would not listen to him and considered the matter as a personal quarrel and he and his friends were blamed for bringing it on.

*Vaillant* regrets that the question should be discussed in the absence of Hales.

*Frankel* says the absence of Hales is no ground for delaying the vote.

The proposition was carried.

*Cournet* proposes that every meeting-night a fresh Secretary shall be appointed.

*Barry* thinks it inconvenient to suspend a Secretary without at the same time announcing where the correspondence is to go to.

*Cournet's* proposition is carried.

*Eccarius* says two members of affiliated trade societies have complained of their societies not having received any communication from the Council since the appointment of Hales as Secretary and he proposes that a Corresponding Secretary for England be appointed.

*Frankel* would second the proposition had it been made sooner, but it was not worthwhile appointing one now.

*Eccarius* says: Are you prepared to go to the Congress and say that the Trades Unions have been neglected?

---

\* *Le Moussu*.—*Ed.*

\*\* The words "had evidence given" were inserted in place of the deleted word "proofs".—*Ed.*

\*\*\* See p. 100 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

*Marx* thinks any member can be appointed to correspond with the affiliated societies with the view to ascertain the treatment they have experienced at the hands of the Secretary.

*Barry* thinks we are all agreed on the principle but differ only in the form.

*Milner* thinks we could appoint a correspondent to assist the Secretary for the time being.

*Eccarius* agrees with *Marx's* views and alters his resolution in accordance, which is carried.

*Barry* proposes *Eccarius*.

*Frankel* proposes *Jung*.

*Jung* refuses.

*Frankel* thinks no one has the right to refuse.

*Jung* cannot undertake to do more.

*Marx* proposes *Milner*.

*Barry* thinks *Eccarius* the most fitted person to do the work.

*Jung* considers *Eccarius* is placed in the same position as *Hales*.

*Margueritte* hopes that as no one should refuse, *Milner* will accept.

*Milner* was elected by 9 votes, *Eccarius* getting 5.

Returning to the discussion of the Rules it was proposed and carried that Article 8 be expunged.

*Marx* proposes that to Article 9 be added "that each branch be composed of at least two-thirds of wage-labourers".<sup>234</sup>

Attempts have been made in America to alter the character of the Society and it is necessary not to lose that character; for special conditions, such as they exist in Poland and in other countries, special clauses can be made.

*Eccarius* thinks the safeguard proposed by *Marx* will not accomplish what is desired; turn out all the middle-class men or none at all.

*Martin* objects to laws being made that shall extend to so many different countries; there is no more reason for having branches with two-thirds of working men as three-fourths.

*Frankel* supports Marx's proposition, because branches might be formed composed entirely of lawyers or doctors.

*Barry* opposes for the same reasons that he opposed the American resolutions\*; he considers it a great blunder; is a man who wears a black coat not to be a member of the Society? The middle classes have more political wisdom and are better educated than the working classes; there are warm-hearted men among the middle-class men; but he fears his opposition will be of little avail, for anything that comes from Mount Sinai is sacred.

*Serrailier* thinks the Rules show that a warm heart is not enough to entitle one to become a member.

*Milner* thinks that if the working men are wanting in intelligence, by admitting one-third of intellectual men—that ought to be enough; the basis is sound, let us adhere to it.

*Jung* admits that the middle classes have more political wisdom than the working classes, for the working classes being in a majority would not let the middle classes rule any longer; he also admits the middle classes are better educated, but whose fault is it, unless it be the fault of those who have hitherto ruled and who have had the education of the people in their hands; he hates the warm-hearted men who, while dispensing charity with one hand, despoil and rob the working classes with the other; he wants the full produce of his labour and nothing more, and above all he objects to receiving charity.

The resolution was then put to the vote and carried, 2 voting against it.

The meeting adjourned at 11.20.

*H. JUNG*, Secretary for the evening  
*CH. LONGUET*, Chairman

---

\* See pp. 124 and 126 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

---

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING\****Held July 30th, 1872*

Citizen *Longuet* Chairman.

Members present: Citizens *Marx, Engels, Jung, Martin, Barry, Milner, Murray, Lessner, Dupont, Frankel, Hales, Serrailier, Vaillant, Eccarius, Johannard, Townshend, Lochner*

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Citizen *Jung*, being requested to continue as Secretary, declined, the Council therefore appointed *Milner* to take notes of the sitting.

Citizen *Frankel* moved that the first business for consideration be the conduct of Citizen *Hales* at the Nottingham Congress; he contended that the Council had a perfect right to demand a satisfactory account of their Secretary of his conduct at the Nottingham Congress.<sup>235</sup>

Citizen *Dupont* seconded the motion, and stated that he was present at the Nottingham Congress and from what he had heard spoken there by Citizen *Hales*, he (*Dupont*) considered it amounted to treason against the General Council.

Citizen *Hales* objected to *Dupont's* statement being received, as he was present at the Congress without credentials. He (*Hales*) claimed to be judged by the General Council and not by the Judicial Committee.

He (*Hales*) would indict Citizens *Marx* and *Engels*, and, though called to order by *Chairman*, persisted in saying that he would not give up the books and papers of the Society until he had a satisfactory reason given him.

Citizen *Vaillant* moved that the consideration of *Hales's* conduct be referred to the Judicial Committee.

---

\* The Minutes are in *Milner's* hand on pp. 55-57 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Dupont* seconded the motion; it was then put from the chair and carried.

Citizen *Marx* called the attention of the Council to the statement made by Hales that he would not give up the books and papers of the Society. Marx contended that the books were the property of the entire Association and held in trust by the General Council. That being the case, Hales had no right to the books.

Citizen Marx further considered that for such expressions as Hales had made that night, he deserved to be expelled from the Association.

Citizen *Hales* offered to withdraw his statement that he would hold the books and papers in opposition to the General Council and said he used those words in the heat of the moment, that all he meant was to vindicate his conduct.

The sitting was continued some time longer and was devoted to the consideration of the Rules.

*J. JOHANNARD*, Chairman  
*GEORGE MILNER*, Secretary *pro tem.*

### *MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING\**

*August 6th, 1872*

Citizen *Johannard* in the chair.

Members present: *Marx, Engels, Jung, Murray, Martin, Milner, Frankel, Barry, Townshend, Lessner, Vaillant, Dupont, Lochner, Eccarius, Hales, Serrailier* and others omitted.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

---

\* The Minutes are in Milner's hand on pp. 59-62 of the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

By 1193

New York Section No. 1 der Int. Arb. Off.  
in Nordamerika

Mandat

Zunföhrer des "Red News" werden in  
der Sitzung obiger Section am 28ten Juli 1872  
als Vertreter für dieselbe auf dem allgem. Congress  
in Haag erwählt und ist der Vertreter der  
Section 1 New York fürmlich erwähltigt für Abgabe  
seiner und gültigen Stimmen abzugeben

28ten Juli 1872

C. Speyer cor. Sec

F. A. Sorge, Hauptred.  
der Zeitung



Mandate issued to Marx by New York Section No. 1 for him to take part in the Hague Congress

Citizen *Engels* read the report of the Sub-Committee on the new movement entitled the Socialist Alliance.

After translating the paper,\* Citizen *Engels* spoke of the Alliance as intended to fetter and destroy our Association.<sup>236</sup> Bakunin was the chief organiser of this Alliance; he had given us a great deal of trouble before, but we had our duty to do and that was to expose this scheme; he submitted that the report be received.

Citizen *Vaillant* was opposed to publishing the report; we had, he said, better fight the battle at the next Congress.

Citizen *Serrailier* said that Committee, in preparing a report, considered that they were ready in the best manner to combat the plans of the Alliance.

Citizen *Martin* was opposed to publishing the report, as that would do the Alliance more good than harm.

Citizen *Dupont* said that the duty of the Council was to oppose the Alliance immediately, if only one day before the Congress.

Citizen *Vaillant* approved of what Dupont said, but objected to the manner of drawing the report. If a Federal Council was false to the Association it was our duty to expel them.

Citizen *Murray* said that, taking the present state of Spain into consideration, that secret society might to some extent be justified; the report modified might be accepted.

Citizen *Barry* said our duty was to unmask our enemies and cut them down in detail; he approved the report of the Sub-Committee.

Citizen *Vaillant* said that the Council should consider most that part of the report relating to Spain.

Citizen *Hales* doubted the statements of the [Sub-] Committee; he could not vote without proof, he looked on the whole affair as an election dodge, he demanded the

---

\* The circular letter of the New Madrid Federation.—Ed.

facts, he looked on the whole affair as an intrigue on the part of one secret society to build itself up by the destruction of another.

Citizen *Serraillier* said: the Sub-Committee were ordered by you to see into the matter; they have done what they were ordered to do; that being the case, you must vote the acceptance of the report. If you modify the Address, that is another thing.

Citizen *Frankel* said he could not see that the Sub-Committee had the power they claim to have; what the Council should do was to correspond direct with the Spanish section complained of.

Citizen *Engels* in reply to *Vaillant* asserted that this report was drawn up in the same spirit as all former reports of the General Council. He (*Engels*) contended that this Alliance was a secret society directed against our Association; in reply to *Hales*, who demanded proofs, he, *Engels*, asserted that we had the proofs in our correspondence<sup>237</sup>; he concluded by demanding that we now vote on the Address; there is no time for *Vaillant's* proposition, as Congress was so near.

Citizen *Martin* said he had confidence in the Committee.

Citizen *Serraillier* urged that the vote be taken on the principle of the Address.

Citizen *Vaillant* demanded that his proposition be put from the chair.

Citizen *Milner* said he regarded opposition as factious and thought that the confidence, placed in the Committee in their appointment to do the work, should not be withheld now in the acceptance of the report.

Citizen *Barry* did not share in *Milner's* ideas.

The *Chairman* then put *Vaillant's* proposition.

The proposition [of] *Vaillant* being lost, the *Chairman* in order put the adoption of the report of the Sub-Committee.

Citizen *Johannard* demanded that the proofs be added to the report as there was nothing [in] it to explain the attacks on Bakunin.

Citizen *Vaillant* would oppose the vote unless the proofs were added to the report.

Amidst loud cries of Vote, the *Chairman* proposed that the report of the Sub-Committee as read [by] Citizen Engels be accepted, which was declared to be carried by twelve votes for and eight votes against.

The Council adjourned, after which Citizen *Hales* handed in a protest written in pencil, which was in substance a repeat of what he had already stated in his speeches.

J. JOHANNARD

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

August the 13th, 1872

Citizen *Johannard* in the chair.

Members present: *Marx, Martin, Milner, Murray, Boon, Barry, Jung, Mottershead, Engels, Frankel, Margueritte, Serraillier, Vaillant, Applegarth, Rozwadowski.*

The Minutes of the previous meeting being read, Citizen *Hales* objected that his speech was not correctly reported.

The Council ruled that in substance Hales's speech was correctly reported, but it was open to him [to] correct any word before the Minutes were signed.

Citizen *Hales* objected that Vaillant's resolution was not correctly worded; the Council decided that Vaillant could correct his resolution and then the Minutes could be passed.

Citizen *Engels* said that he had been appointed by the Sub-Committee to present a financial statement of the affairs of the Association, of all money received and ex-

---

\* The Minutes are in Milner's hand on pp. 63-64 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

pended since the last Congress; he (Engels) now called on Citizen Hales to give up all books and papers relating to the money affairs of the Association.

Citizen *Hales* objected to the demand of Citizen Engels on the ground that his books had not been audited: his books might be tampered with to his discredit; he (Hales) therefore moved that before Citizen Engels's demand is agreed to, that three auditors be appointed to audit the accounts.

Citizen *Murray* supported Hales's view of the case and seconded the appointment of auditors.

Citizens *Marx* and *Mottershead* rose and expressed great indignation at the base insinuation made by Citizen Hales that any honourable member of that Council could be guilty of falsifying books.

Citizen *Boon* called upon the Financial Committee to do their duty.

Citizen *Jung* moved that the auditors be appointed at once, which was then put by the *Chairman* and agreed to; no opposition.

Citizens *Boon*, *Margueritte*, and *Lessner* were appointed auditors of Citizen Hales's accounts.

The consideration of the Rules occupied the Council till the close of the sitting.

CH. LONGUET

GEORGE MILNER, Secretary *pro tem*.

### MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING\*

Friday, August 23rd, 1872

Citizen *Longuet* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Marx*, *Boon*, *Barry*, *Engels*, *Vaillant*, *Mayo*, *Martin*, *Jung*, *Townshend*, *Eccarius*,

\* The Minutes are in Milner's hand on pp. 65-68 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

*Johannard, Margueritte, Milner, Dupont, Wróblewski, Serrailier, Frankel.*

The Minutes of the previous meeting being read, Citizen *Barry* proposed to leave out the words "uncalled for". Agreed to.

Citizen *Marx* pointed out [that] the decision of the Council calling upon Citizen *Hales* to give up all books and papers necessary for him to prepare his report for the Congress had been omitted.

The *Chairman* ordered the correction and the Minutes were then passed.\*

Citizen *Engels* asked the auditors to hand in their accounts as agreed to at the sitting.\*\*

Citizen *Boon* said he was not prepared to sign the books as he could [find] no authority for Citizen *Hales* receiving the 15 shillings beyond the 3 weeks\*\*\* voted by Council; the Treasurer had no right to pay money without the consent of Council.

Citizen *Jung* said that it was understood that in voting the 15 shillings for the 3 months that after that time the Council would consider the matter. They had not done so, it was not his fault.

Citizen *Boon* remarked that Citizen *Hales* had offered to [do] the work first for 5 shillings and then for 10 shillings, when *Eccarius* was Secretary; but now he found that *Hales* had been receiving 15 shillings for a long time.

Citizen *Barry* thought the Treasurer was not to blame, but Citizen *Hales* as Secretary to the Council should [have] brought the matter forward. He, *Barry*, and few other members had called attention to this matter.

---

\* This correction was omitted in the Minute Book.—*Ed.*

\*\* August 13, 1872.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Should read "months".—*Ed.*

Citizen *Engels* proposed, Citizen *Johannard* seconded, that the 15 shillings per week received by Hales "be now assented to by vote, as it was now too late to raise the question".

Citizen *Barry* proposed, and *Boon* seconded, that Citizen Hales be called upon to refund the money he had received until the Council decide whether he shall have it or not.

Put from the chair and lost.

Citizen *Engels* proposed, seconded by *Johannard*, as stated above; was put by the chair and carried.

Citizen *Marx* asked that in order to prepare his report for the Congress all books and papers in possession of Citizen Hales be handed over to him.

The Council voted unanimously that Citizen Hales should comply with Citizen Marx's request.

The correction as ordered by the Council—*G. Milner*, Secretary *pro tem*.\*

Citizen *Serraillier* said the Sub-Committee had asked to remind the members of their obligation to the Association\*\*; they were in want of funds.

The *Chairman* read the rule relating to contribution of members, etc.

Citizen *Johannard* proposed, *Frankel* seconded, that the contribution in future be one penny per month.

Citizen *Murray* opposed raising the contribution and moved that it remain as it is.

Citizen *Dupont* was opposed to *Johannard* (proposition) as it would be fatal to the interests of the Association.

Citizen *Vaillant* supported *Johannard* (proposition); thought persons would give more if they were asked.

*Serraillier* said the penny was the smallest sum to enable the labourers and poorer trades to join the Society, but it

---

\* This sentence was inserted later.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 317 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

was expected [that] those who could afford it would give more.

Citizen *Cournet*: the Council wanted money, the Association had done much for the Trades Unions, they should give more.

Citizen *Jung* admitted it was important; the Council wanted money but it was useless to make rules that could not be observed; in parts of France and Switzerland the people were very poor.

Citizen *Johannard*: the Trades Unions could afford to pay more. If the Council had money to send out persons many splits would be prevented.

Citizen *Barry* proposed that 6d. be the yearly contribution.

Citizen *Eccarius* was opposed to any alteration: unsettling things doing no good. No political society ever paid. Trades Unions paid. When the contributions were 3d. on the Continent we had less money; when they were  $\frac{1}{2}$  penny we had most money. Look at the books and see who paid and who [did] not.

Citizen *Serraillier* moved and *Hales* seconded that the debate be adjourned.

Put from the chair and carried.

The Council adjourned.

CH. LONGUET

GEORGE MILNER, Secretary *pro tem*.

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

August 27, 1872

In the chair Citizen *Longuet*.

Members present: *Marx, Boon, Martin, Dupont, Johannard, Hales, Lessner, Mayo, Vaillant, Roach, Murray,*

\* The Minutes are in Milner's hand on pp. 69-72 of the Minute Book.—Ed.

*Frankel, Serraillier, Eccarius, Wróblewski, Jung, Milner, Rozwadowski, Cournet, Le Moussu, Engels, Barry, Margueritte, Arnaud, Mottershead, Townshend, Ranvier.*

Citizen *Marx* complained that the books and papers asked of Citizen Hales had not been given up as ordered by the Council.

Citizen *Dupont* proposed and *Le Moussu* seconded:

That Citizen Hales be ordered to give up the books and papers within 24 hours.

Citizen *Engels* proposed to add: or be expelled from the Association.

Citizen *Vaillant* suggested that Citizen Jung be asked to induce Citizen Hales to comply.

Citizen *Jung* was willing to do all [in] his power to comply with the expressed wish of the Council.

Citizen *Hales* a little later in the evening brought the books and handed [them] over to Citizen *Marx*.

Citizen *Engels* proposed that the charge brought by Citizen Hales against Citizen Engels, on Tuesday, August 6th, be inserted in the Minutes, viz., that Engels in his communications to the Council had falsified information received by him\* and that Citizen Hales be ordered to specify in writing within two days to the Chairman of the Judicial Committee, Citizen Wróblewski, the facts upon which he founds the said charge.

This proposition was put from the chair and carried.

The Council resumed the adjourned debate on the alteration of contributions to the Association.\*\*

Citizen *Martin* was in favour of the 12d. per year; the money should be collected monthly; he would appeal to the people direct as the leaders were conservative.

Citizen *Marx* said the Trades Unions were praised too much; they must in future be treated as affiliated

---

\* See pp. 270-71 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 275-76 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

societies and used as centres or points of attack in struggle of Labour against Capital.

He wished it to be borne in mind also that new Trades Unions are in formation on the Continent. He thought that the Council should vote on the necessity of raising the contributions of members but leave the amount and mode of collection to be settled by the next Congress.<sup>238</sup>

Citizen *Vaillant* proposed to take the vote on Citizen Marx's proposition.

Citizen *Boon* asked the Chairman for the close of the debate.

Citizen *Hales* was opposed to any alteration. We must have a regular collection; the sections must find money for local as well as general expenses. Raising contributions would be a great injury to the Association.

Citizen *Arnaud*: trade societies will not object to give more, and if the I.W.A. is to be a leading society it must have more funds.

Citizen *Murray* demanded some explanation in reference to Citizen Marx's proposition.

Citizen *Eccarius* said that Citizen Johannard must withdraw his proposition before we can vote on Citizen Marx's.

Citizen *Vaillant* thought that the Council could vote on Citizen Marx's proposition.

Citizen *Mottershead* rose to order and demanded order; he moved that no member be allowed to speak more than once on propositions, except the mover.

This was put from the chair and carried.

Citizen *Serraillier* asked that the votes be taken by name as this was a very important question. Put by the chair and agreed to; no opposition.

The several propositions were then put by the *Chairman* in the order following: First—Citizen *Murray's*, seconded by *Serraillier*, that no alteration be made in contribution of members.

Names of [those] who voted for Murray's proposition: Citizens Boon, Dupont, Hales, Lessner, Milner, Murray, Roach, Mottershead, Jung, Eccarius, Serraillier.

Number of votes for, 11.

Against Citizen Murray's proposition: Citizens Arnaud, Cournet, Johannard, Margueritte, Rozwadowski, Ranvier, Vaillant, Marx, Frankel, Le Moussu, Engels, Wróblewski, Longuet, Barry, Martin.

Number of votes against, 15.

Citizen *Marx* proposed that contributions of members be raised but the mode of collection and the amount be settled by the Congress.

Names of voters for: Engels, Barry, Marx, Frankel, Le Moussu, Longuet (in all 6 votes).

Names of voters against: Hales, Lessner, Mottershead, Milner, Murray, Eccarius, Roach, Serraillier, Jung, Dupont (in all 10 votes).

Citizen *Johannard* proposed that the contributions be one penny [per] month or 12 pence per year.

Seconded by Citizen *Vaillant*.

Voted for by Citizens Arnaud, Cournet, Johannard, Margueritte, Martin, Rozwadowski, Ranvier, Vaillant, Frankel, Barry, Wróblewski; 11 votes for.

Voted against by Dupont, Hales, Lessner, Milner, Murray, Jung, Mottershead, Eccarius, Serraillier, Roach; 10 votes against.

Those that did not vote: Engels, Marx, Frankel, Le Moussu, Longuet; 5 in number.

The proposition [of] Citizen Johannard was put from the chair and declared to [be] carried by one vote.

The Council adjourned.

*THOS. MOTTERSHEAD*, Chairman  
*GEO. MILNER*, Secretary *pro tem*.

. MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING\*

August, 1872

Citizen *Mottershead*, Chairman.

Members present: Citizens *Marx*, *Engels*, *Murray*, *Boon*, *Lessner*, *Martin*, *Eccarius*, *Dupont*, *Barry*, *Hales*, *Bradnick*, *Johannard*, *Cournet*, *Vaillant*, *Margueritte*, *Milner*, *Roach*, *Wróblewski*.

In the commencement of the proceedings great diversity of opinion was shown as to the method of electing the delegates to represent the General Council at the ensuing Congress.

The *Chairman* ruled first that the Council do elect them, which was put from the chair and carried.

Next in order was the number. Several propositions were put as to the number of delegates and were afterwards withdrawn in favour of the proposition of *Vaillant*, seconded by *Frankel*, that 6 be the number of delegates to represent the General Council at the Congress, which, being put from the chair, was carried.

As to the method of taking the votes for the delegates, great difference of opinion [was] shown at first but finally it was agreed to and put from the chair:

That only those who had an absolute majority of votes could be considered elected. Carried.

At this point of the proceedings a slight interruption was caused by the presentation of Citizen *West*, delegate of Section 12, Federal Council, America.

The *Chairman* ruled that Citizen *West* could not be received, according to the previous decision of the General Council, but that *West* must go to the Congress with his credentials.<sup>239</sup>

---

\* The Minutes are in *Milner's* hand on pp. 73-74 of the Minute Book. Precise date not given.—*Ed.*

## Vollmacht

Die Breslauer Mitglieder der  
Internationalen Arbeiter-Association  
beauftragen Herrn Friedrich Engels  
in London mit ihrer Vertretung auf  
dem Congreß der Internationalen  
Arbeiter-Association am 2<sup>ten</sup> Septbr  
vielfach Instruktion in Haag.

Breslau den 14<sup>ten</sup> August 1872.

Heinrich Oetring  
Paul Borch  
Herrmann Kriemichen

Mandate issued to Engels by the Breslau section for him to take part  
in the Hague Congress

The voting of delegates was then proceeded with and after a slow and orderly ballot the *Chairman* declared that the names of the members chosen as delegates to represent the General Council to be Citizens Marx, Dupont, Serrailier, Wróblewski, Cournet and Milner.<sup>240</sup>

The next question for consideration was that of funds, but the hour being late the Council adjourned.

*DUPONT*  
*MILNER*, Secretary *pro tem*.

### MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING\*

*August*

Citizen *Dupont* in the chair.

Members present: Citizens *Marx*, *Jung*, *Lessner*, *Eccarius*, *Townshend*, *Frankel*, *Serrailier*, *Vaillant*, *Le Moussu*, *Murray*, *Longuet*, *Johannard*, *Wróblewski*, *Engels*, *Sexton*, *Lochner*, *Arnaud*, *Mayo*, *Bradnick*, *Martin*, *Roach*, *Hales*, *Margueritte*, *Boon*, *Mottershead*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read,\*\* Citizen *Marx* proceeded to read the Address to the Congress, drawn by him at the request of the General Council.

Citizen *Longuet* read the translation in French.

The *Chairman* put the adoption of the Address, which was carried without dissent.<sup>241</sup>

Citizen *Milner* stated that in consequence of illness he must decline the honour the Council had confided on him of representing it.

The election of a delegate in place of *Milner* resigned.

---

\* The Minutes are in an unknown hand on pp. 75-77 of the Minute Book. Precise date not given.—*Ed*.

\*\* Here three lines are left blank—*Ed*.

The vote was then taken for the election; the *Chairman* then declared Citizen Sexton elected.

Citizen *Boon* asked what funds were in the hands of the Treasurer to pay the expenses of delegates.

Citizen *Jung* [said] that there were no funds in hand but some money was expected.

Citizen *Engels* said that money would be advanced to the Council to meet its obligations.

Citizen *Jung* proposed that the next Congress be held on the Continent.

*Jung's* proposition.

*Eccarius* supported.

*Hales* supported.

*Engels* opposed.

*Johannard* supported.\*

The *Chairman* put the close of the debate, which was carried.

*Hales* demanded that vote on *Jung's* proposition be taken by name.

Agreed to names: *Jung's* proposition.

Against *Jung's* proposition . . .

This being the last sitting.

Chairman *EUGÈNE DUPONT*\*\*

*Oui*

*Non*

Boon

Arnaud

Bradnick

Cournet

Dupont

Lessner

Hales

Martin

---

\* Here one line is left blank—*Ed.*

\*\* Below a small sheet of paper was pasted into the Minute Book bearing (in pencil) the names of those voting on *Jung's* proposition.—*Ed.*

Johannard	Ranvier
Mayo	Townshend
Milner	Vaillant
Roach	Marx
Mottershead	Frankel
Eccarius	Le Moussu
Serraillier	Engels
Jung	Longuet
	Margueritte
	Lochner
	Murray—abstention*

---

\* This was the last record in the fourth Minute Book of the General Council.—*Ed.*

**RECORDS OF ENGELS'S REPORTS  
TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
NOT INCLUDED IN THE MINUTES**

---

## THE SITUATION IN ITALY

REPORT BY ENGELS AT THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF NOVEMBER 7, 1871<sup>242</sup>

The news from Italy was of a peculiar interest; letters were received from a number of Italian cities, amongst whom were Turin, Milan, Ravenna, and Girgenti. These confirmed in every respect the immense strides with which the Association was advancing in Italy.

The working classes, in the towns at least, were rapidly abandoning Mazzini, whose denunciations of the International had no effect whatever upon the masses.<sup>243</sup> But Mazzini's denunciations had produced one good effect; they had caused Garibaldi, not only to pronounce himself entirely in favour of our Association, but also, on this very question, to come to an open rupture with Mazzini. In a long letter addressed to M. Petroni, a Sardinian lawyer, who has been since elected president of the Italian working men's congress, now sitting at Rome, Garibaldi expresses his indignation that the Mazzinians should venture to speak of him as of an old fool, who always had done whatever the men surrounding him, his satellites and flatterers, had persuaded him to do. Who were these satellites, he asks? Were they the men of his staff that came with him from South America in 1848, those he found at Rome in 1849, or those of his staff of 1859 and 1860,<sup>244</sup> or those who fought with him recently against the Prussians? If so, he

maintains they were men whose names will for ever live in the memory of grateful Italy. But let them re-enter these satellites and flatterers.

"I repeat it, you have not even the merit of originality, when you dig up again my satellites and flatterers [who] have always led that grey-headed baby from Nice by the nose. And while you, Petroni, were suffering for eighteen years in the prisons of the Inquisition, the people of your sect (the Mazzinians) were the very men accused by the Royalists of being my satellites and followers. Read all the dynastic trash published especially since 1860, and there you will find Garibaldi might be good for something if he had not the misfortune of being led by Mazzini, and to be surrounded by the Mazzinians. This is all false, and you may ask those that have known me more closely and more intimately, whether they ever found a man more obstinate than myself when I had made up my mind to do something which I had recognised to be right. Ask Mazzini himself whether he has found me to be easily persuaded, whether he attempted to draw me over to some of his impracticable realities. Ask Mazzini whether the origin of our disagreement is not this, that, in 1848, I told him he was doing wrong in holding back in the city, under one pretext or another, the youth of Milan, while our army was fighting the enemy on the Mincio. And Mazzini is a man who never forgives if any one touches his infallibility."

Garibaldi then states that Mazzini, in 1860, did everything in his power to frustrate and to render abortive the general's expedition to Sicily, which ended in the unification of Italy; that when Mazzini heard of Garibaldi's success, he insisted upon the latter proclaiming the Republic in Italy, a thing absurd and utterly foolish under the circumstances, and he\* finally reproaches "the great exile, whom everybody knew to be in Italy", with his meanness in bespattering the fallen of Paris, the only men who in this time of tyranny, of lies, of cowardice and degradation have waved high, even while dying, the sacred banner of rights and justice.<sup>245</sup>

He continues:

---

\* Garibaldi.—*Ed.*

"You cry anathema upon Paris, because Paris destroyed the Vendôme Column and the house of Thiers. Have you ever seen a whole village destroyed by the flames for having given shelter to a volunteer, or a *franc tireur*? And that not only in France, the same in Lombardy, in Venetia. As to the palaces set fire to in Paris by petroleum, let them ask the priests, who, from their intimate acquaintance with the hell-fire about which they preach, ought to be good judges, what difference there is between petroleum fire and those fires which the Austrians lit in order to burn down the villages in Lombardy and Venetia, when those countries were still under the yoke of the men who shot Ugo Bassi, Ciceruachio and his two sons, and thousands of Italians who committed the sacrilege of demanding a free Rome and a free Italy.

"When the light of day shall once have dispersed the darkness which covers Paris, I hope that you, my friend, will be more indulgent for the acts caused by the desperate situation of a people which, certainly, was badly led, as it generally happens to nations, who allow themselves to be allured by the phraseology of the *doctrinaires*, but which, in substance, fought heroically for its rights. The detractors of Paris may say what they like, they will never succeed in proving that a few miscreants and foreigners—as they said of us in Rome in 1849—have resisted for three months against a grand army, backed as it was by the most potent armies of Prussia.

"And the International? What need is there to attack an Association almost without knowing it? Is that Association not an emanation of the abnormal state of society all over the world? A society where the many have to slave for bare subsistence, and where the few, by lies and by force, appropriate the greater portion of the produce of the many, without having earned it by the sweat of their brow, must not such a society excite the discontent, and the vengeance of the suffering masses?

"I wish that the International should not fare as did the people of Paris—that is, to allow itself to be circumvented by the concoctors of doctrines which would drive it to exaggerations, and finally to ridicule; but that it should well study, before trusting them, the character of the men who are to lead it on the path of moral and material improvement."

### He returns for a moment to Mazzini:

"Mazzini and I, we are both old; but no one speaks of reconciliation between him and me. Infallible people die, but they do not bend. Reconciliation with Mazzini? There is only one possible way for it—to obey him; and of that I do not feel myself capable."

And finally the old soldier proves, by referring to his past, that he has always been a true International, that he has fought for liberty everywhere and anywhere, first in South America, then offering his services to the Pope (aye, even to the Pope, when he played the liberal), then under Victor-Emmanuel, lastly in France, under Trochu and Jules Favre—and he concludes:

“I and the youth of Italy are ready to serve Italy, also side by side with you, the Mazzinians, if it should be necessary.”

This crowning letter of Garibaldi's, coming as it does after a number of others, in which he had plainly expressed his sympathies for the International, but abstained from speaking plainly as to Mazzini, has had an immense effect in Italy, and will induce many recruits to rally round our banner.

It was also announced that a full report of the working men's congress at Rome, would be laid before the next meeting of the Council.<sup>246</sup>

---

## THE POSITION OF THE DANISH INTERNATIONALISTS IN THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

REPORT BY ENGELS AT THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF DECEMBER 5, 1871<sup>247</sup>

A report was received from Denmark referring chiefly to the condition of the agricultural labourers, and the agitation taking place amongst them. In Denmark there are but two official political parties—the “*Doctrinaires*” who represent the capitalist class, and the “*Peasants Friends*”, as they call themselves, who represent the landed proprietors including the landed nobility, and the large peasant owner. They also pretend to represent the agricultural labourers, but as a matter of course nothing was ever done for them. The nobility are comparatively powerless in Denmark, so the large peasant holders form the bulk of the “*Peasants Friends*” party. The small farmers and labourers have hitherto been led by them, for though a few representatives of the latter class had been elected to Parliament, they acted under the influence of the large peasant holders, and were used as mere instruments by them.

The International aims at freeing the small peasants and agricultural labourers from this submission to the men who grow rich out of their labour, and is endeavouring to form them into an independent party—distinct from the so-called “*Peasants Friends*”, but in intimate union with the

working men of the towns. This new labourer's party starts with the basis laid down by the Congress of Basle, *the Nationalisation of the Land*.<sup>248</sup>

"It is a truth more and more acknowledged," says *Socialisten*, our Copenhagen organ, "that the land is the common property of the people, that the people ought to cultivate it in common, enjoy its common produce, and hand over its excess (rent) to the state for common purposes."

But as the land in Denmark is principally the property of a numerous class of Peasant Proprietors, each holding from 50 to 100 acres of good soil, the immediate expropriation of such a considerable body would be impossible. A plan has therefore been proposed, which offers many advantages to the holder as well as to the labourers, that is, to establish Agricultural Co-operative Societies consisting of peasant holders and labourers, for the common cultivation of the land, now cultivated by them individually. The small and medium farms would thus be replaced by farms of 500 acres and upwards, and would allow of the introduction of agricultural implements, steam culture, and other modern improvements, which cannot be taken advantage of, when agriculture is conducted on a small scale. The necessary capital is to be advanced by the state on the security of the land belonging to each association; these propositions are necessarily of a very elementary character, but they appear to be well adapted to the intellect and capacity of the agricultural population, whilst the constant reference to the *Nationalisation of the land as the ultimate end of the movement*, will powerfully assist in breaking up that political subserviency in which the large landowners, with the help of the parson, the village schoolmaster, and the government official, have hitherto held the agricultural labourers.

---

## THE SARAGOSSA CONGRESS

REPORT BY ENGELS AT THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF MAY 7, 1872<sup>249</sup>

The Congress of the Spanish Internationals at Saragossa, which took place in the beginning of April, but the proceedings of which are only now published, has ended in the total defeat of that small but active faction, which, under the leadership of Bakunin, had for the last four years never ceased to promote discord in the ranks of our Association. This faction, united in an international society calling itself the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, had, on its admittance into the International Working Men's Association, solemnly pledged itself to dissolve its separate organisation and to become entirely fused in the International. But in spite of this solemn pledge, the Alliance continued to exist, as a *secret* society, within the International; the first example of a secret society directed, not against the ruling classes and their governments, but against that very same proletarian organisation in which it had professed to disappear. In Spain, this secret society had, for some time, succeeded in directing the International, but shortly before the Conference of Valencia. (Sept., 1871) dissensions arose within its ranks. Those amongst its members who really had the interest of the International more at heart than that of a petty sectarian clique, were attacked by the fanatics and intriguers of the sect, and the quarrel was to be finally settled by the Congress of Saragossa. Here, the faithful adherents of the Alliance came out with a plan for revised rules which treated the Spanish Federal Council exactly in the same way as the circular of their co-sectarians in the Swiss Jura had treated the General Council<sup>250</sup>; both councils, and indeed

all and every council, were to be deprived of all attributions of authority, and to be reduced to mere offices for correspondence and the statistics; the branches and local federations were to have the right to adopt such bye-laws as they thought proper, without any control on the part of the Federal Council, merely subject to the approval of the next congress. The absolute autonomy of all the branches, their right to do entirely what they liked, to disregard all rules and bye-laws, was to be established; in fact, the whole Association was to be practically dissolved, its organisation as a political party completely nullified, its action paralysed; and that at a moment when the International in Spain was under the thumb of the government, its meetings prohibited, the public sittings of this same Congress put down by force, and the Carlist agitators,<sup>251</sup> arms in hand, only waiting for a pretext to make use of the International for a rising in Saragossa which should in the end serve their purposes! Moreover, such proposals were made at a moment when the really excellent organisation, which the Congress of Valencia had put in force, had borne the most unexpected fruit; when the number of local federations, officially constituted, from fifteen, had increased to fifty-five, besides nineteen whose organisation was all but completed, and ninety-four localities, where branches but not yet fully organised local federations were in existence. With such results to show in favour of the rules voted at Valencia, and of the Federal Council, which had put them in force, what was the chance of the champions of a system which, by re-establishing a state of complete chaos, would undo all that had been done and throw open the doors of the Association to any government or police agent, or to any number of middle-class traitors? The Congress unanimously, only two or three delegates abstaining, declared that the rules, as voted at Valencia, were to remain in full effect, and thus the attempt to annihilate the International in Spain, under pretext of more perfectly organising it, signal-

ly failed. This result is of great importance for the whole of our Association. It proves again that the strong good sense of the working class, in Spain as well as elsewhere, need only be appealed to, in order to put down the tricks and the sectarian crotchets of bogus reorganisers and would-be prophets. Bakunin and his followers considered Spain as their stronghold, because for a few years they had directed the propaganda in that country. But no sooner had the proletarian movement become general in Spain, than the Spanish working men refused to be fettered by the narrow tenets of a sect, and to sacrifice the organisation they themselves had erected and perfected to the private ends of a few intriguers, who, having been foiled in their oft-repeated attempts to make the International their instrument, now do everything they can to practically dissolve it. It is well known that the Federation of the Swiss Jura—counting all in all nine branches, most of them in a state of utter dissolution—proposed, last December, the immediate convocation of an extraordinary general congress in order to reorganise the International generally upon these same principles, which were now submitted, with such a telling effect, to the Saragossa Congress. Of all the local Federations of Spain, but one, that of Palma, in Mallorca, declared in favour of this extraordinary Congress. And now the delegate, at Saragossa, of this same local Federation of Palma, declares that he has formal instructions from his constituents to vote against all this pretended reorganisation, and for the simple maintenance of the existing rules! The vote of the Saragossa Congress, therefore, in confirming the powers entrusted to the Spanish Federal Council, indirectly confirms the analogous powers delegated by the Basel Congress to the General Council of the Association, and lately attacked by the Jura circular as oppressive and dictatorial.

In Italy the attempts of the aristocracy and middle class to put themselves forward as the true representatives

of the working class are continued with unabated impudence. In the last days of April a so-called working men's congress<sup>252</sup> was held in Rome, in one of the most highly respectable theatres of the city. The chair was taken by Prince Teano. The delegates were princes, dukes, marquesses, counts, and similar "most nobles", bankers, manufacturers, members of parliament, and a few shopkeepers. Of real working men there were just eight. This did not prevent the congress, which was held under the auspices and special protection of the Government, to hold forth in the name of the Italian working men, and to pass a heap of resolutions declaring that the working men were exceedingly contented and thankful to their "betters" for what those latter kindly condescended to do for them; and if they only got a few more credit and co-operative societies, their utmost wishes would be more than fulfilled. Unfortunately, the real workmen of Rome resolved to meet and discuss the qualification of this congress to represent the Italian working class. Although the Government refused permission to have the placards convoking this meeting posted on the walls, large numbers met and protested against the resolutions of this sham congress, and declared that only the Italian working men themselves, in harmony with those of the rest of the world, were competent to resolve all social questions affecting them.

He [Engels] also reported that he had just received a letter from Milan, giving fuller details of the affair reported last week, and stating the section had been compelled to suspend its paper owing to the imprisonment of some of the members. He had examined the rules of the Ferrara Association, and having regard to the unqualified adhesion which came with them, he moved that they be confirmed. They were plain, practical rules.

Written by Engels  
about May 7, 1872  
Published in *The Eastern Post*  
No. 189, May 12, 1872

Printed according to the  
newspaper text (except  
for the last paragraph  
taken from the Minutes)

---

## RELATIONS BETWEEN THE IRISH SECTIONS AND THE BRITISH FEDERAL COUNCIL

ENGELS'S RECORD OF HIS REPORT AT THE GENERAL  
COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 14, 1872<sup>253</sup>

Citizen *Engels* said the real purport of this motion was to bring the Irish sections under the jurisdiction of the British Federal Council, a thing to which the Irish sections would never consent, and which the Council had neither the right nor the power to impose upon them. According to the Rules and Regulations, this Council had no power to compel any section or branch to acknowledge the supremacy of any Federal Council whatsoever. It was certainly bound, before admitting or rejecting any new branch, within the jurisdiction of any Federal Council, to consult that Council. But he maintained that the Irish sections in England were no more under the jurisdiction of the British Federal Council than the French, German or Italian sections in this country. The Irish formed, to all intents and purposes, a distinct nationality of their own, and the fact that they used the English language could not deprive them of the right, common to all, to have an independent national organisation within the International.

Citizen Hales had spoken of the relations between England and Ireland as if they were of the most idyllic nature, something like those between England and France at the time of the Crimean war, when the ruling classes of the two countries never tired of praising each other, and everything breathed the most complete harmony. But the case

was quite different. There was the fact of seven centuries of English conquest and oppression of Ireland, and so long as that oppression existed, it was an insult to Irish working men to ask them to submit to a British Federal Council. The position of Ireland with regard to England was not that of an equal, it was that of Poland with regard to Russia. What would be said if this Council called upon Polish sections to acknowledge the supremacy of a Russian Federal Council in Petersburg, or upon Prussian Polish, North Schleswig, and Alsatian sections to submit to a Federal Council in Berlin? Yet what it was asked to do with regard to Irish sections was substantially the same thing. If members of a conquering nation called upon the nation they had conquered and continued to hold down to forget their specific nationality and position, to "sink national differences" and so forth, that was not Internationalism, it was nothing else but preaching to them submission to the yoke, and attempting to justify and to perpetuate the dominion of the conqueror under the cloak of Internationalism. It was sanctioning the belief, only too common among the English working men, that they were superior beings compared to the Irish, and as much an aristocracy as the mean Whites of the Slave States considered themselves to be with regard to the Negroes.

In a case like that of the Irish, true Internationalism must necessarily be based upon a distinctly national organisation; the Irish, as well as other oppressed nationalities, could enter the Association only as equals with the members of the conquering nation, and under protest against the conquest. The Irish sections, therefore, not only were justified, but even under the necessity to state in the preamble to their rules that their first and most pressing duty, as Irishmen, was to establish their own national independence. The antagonism between Irish and English working men in England had always been one of the most powerful means by which class rule was upheld in England. He

recollected the time when he saw Feargus O'Connor and the English Chartists turned out of the Hall of Science in Manchester by the Irish.<sup>254</sup> Now, for the first time, there was a chance of making English and Irish working men act together in harmony for their common emancipation, a result attained by no previous movement in their country. And no sooner had this been effected, than they were called upon to dictate to the Irish, and to tell them they must not carry on the movement in their own way, but submit to be ruled by an English Council! Why that was introducing into the International the subjugation of the Irish by the English.

If the promoters of this motion were so brimful of the truly International spirits, let them prove it by removing the seat of the British Federal Council to Dublin, and submit to a Council of Irishmen.

As to the pretended collisions between Irish and English branches, they had been provoked by attempts of members of the British Federal Council to meddle with the Irish sections, to get them to give up their specific national character and to come under the rule of the British Council.

Then the Irish sections in England could not be separated from the Irish sections in Ireland; it would not do to have some Irishmen dependent upon a London Federal Council and others upon a Dublin Federal Council. The Irish sections in England were our base of operations with regard to the Irish working men in Ireland; they were more advanced, being placed in more favourable circumstances, and the movement in Ireland could be propagated and organised only through their instrumentality. And were they to wilfully destroy their own base of operations and cut off the only means by which Ireland could be effectually won for the International? For it must not be forgotten that the Irish sections, and rightly so, would never consent to give up their distinct national organisation

and submit to the British Council. The question, then, amounted to this: were they to leave the Irish alone, or were they to turn them out of the Association? If the motion was adopted by the Council, the Council would inform the Irish working men, in so many words, that, after the dominion of the English aristocracy over Ireland, after the dominion of the English middle class over Ireland, they must now look forth to the advent of the dominion of the English working class over Ireland.

Written by Engels  
about May 14, 1872

Published in the original  
for the first time

**MINUTES OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE  
(EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE)**

*June 28-August 28, 1872*

---

## SÉANCE DU SOUS-COMITÉ\*

122, Regent's Park Road,  
vendredi, 28 juin 1872<sup>255</sup>

Présents: *Cournet, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Marx, Jung, Serraillier, Wróblewski.*

Communication faite du rapport pour mai 1872 du Comité provisoire de New York.

A imprimer sauf les affaires intérieures de l'Internationale.

Dito de la résolution du même Comité sur la grève des Ebénistes, etc.

A publier ici et au Continent<sup>256</sup>.

Cournet chargé de la transmettre en Belgique et de la correspondance avec ce pays.

Proposition *Serraillier* de ne plus donner les rapports des séances à l'*Eastern Post*.

Résolu d'écrire à Keen à ce sujet que l'*Eastern Post* se faisant l'organe du Conseil Universaliste ne pourra plus être traité par nous comme celui de l'Internationale\*\*.

Engels à écrire.

*Serraillier* lit des correspondances de Paris où l'on menace de l'accuser devant le Conseil Général parce qu'il n'a pas envoyé l'article promis au nom du Conseil Général pour leur journal.\*\*\*

---

\* See Appendix, pp. 479-80.—Ed.

\*\* See pp. 235, 241 of the present volume.—Ed.

\*\*\* See p. 201 of the present volume.—Ed.

Résolu que c'est une affaire française et que l'article sera soumis demain soir aux français qui se réuniront chez Marx.

Sur la proposition *Wróblewski* : que ce sera en forme de lettre à la section Ferré que le journal publiera comme telle ; et que Serrailier écrira à la section Ferré qu'il a communiqué la chose au Conseil immédiatement, mais que la commission nommée à cet effet a dû prendre des renseignements avant d'engager le Conseil dans une affaire aussi grave<sup>257</sup>.

*F. ENGELS*, Secrétaire  
*KARL MARX*, Président de la séance

Written in French

Published in the original  
for the first time

### SÉANCE DU SOUS-COMITÉ DU VENDREDI 5 JUILLET 1872\*

*Frankel* président, *Serrailier* secrétaire.

Membres présent : *Engels*, *Wróblewski*, *Cournet*, *McDonnell*, *Le Moussu*.

*Marx* lit une lettre de Laugrand reprochant au Conseil d'avoir sacrifié la justice au bon plaisir dans l'affaire relative à la section 12. La lettre de J. Hales l'a bien prouvé et la nouvelle décision du Conseil Général n'a fait qu'aggraver son tort. Devant son incapacité le Conseil Fédéral a pris la résolution suivante\*\* :

La lettre termine en accusant le Conseil Général d'avoir été acheté par la section de Sorge laquelle a gardé tout l'argent en dépit des réclamations des autres sections.<sup>258</sup>

---

\* See Appendix, pp. 480-82.

The Minutes are in Serrailier's hand on three pages with the letter heading: "International Working Men's Association. 256, High Holborn, London, W.C." and the stamp: "International Working Men's Association. Central Council. London."—*Ed.*

\*\* Further two lines are left blank.—*Ed.*

Séance du Sous-Comité 122 R. P. P. mardi: 28 Juin 71.  
Présent: Gueset, Engels, ~~Frankel~~, ~~Rebas~~, ~~Chap. Jany~~, ~~Swinkel~~, ~~Wroblewski~~.

Communication faite du rapport pour Juin 71  
du Comité provisoire de St. J. P. A'imprimer sans  
les affaires intérieures de l'Int.

Débat de la résolution du même Comité sur  
la grève des Ébénistes & A'publier ici & au Con-  
seil. Combes chargé de la transmettre au  
Belgique & de la Correspondance avec ce pays

Proposition Swinkel de ne plus donner les  
rapports des séances à l'Esther Post. Klean  
d'écrire à Klean à ce sujet que l'E. P. se  
faisant l'organe du Cons. Universel ne pourra  
plus être traité par vous comme cela de l'Int.  
Engels a écrit

Swinkel lit des Correspondances de Paris  
où l'on menace de l'accuser devant le Cons. qui  
puisque il n'a pas envoyé l'article promis au  
nom du C. J. pour leur journal. ~~Chap. Jany~~  
que c'est une affaire française & que l'article  
deux semaines demanderait aux français qui se réunissent  
deux fois sur la proposition de Wroblewski: que  
ce sera en forme de lettre aux français  
à la lecture faite que le journal publie tout cela.  
- Et que ~~Swinkel~~ Swinkel écrira à la lecture faite  
qu'il a communiqué la chose au Conseil n'a édicté  
rien, mais que la commission nommée à cet  
effet a dû prendre les renseignements avant

A'engager le Conseil dans une affaire aussi grave  
J. Engels, Secrétaire. Karl Marx, porte de la Waarde.

Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of June 28, 1871,  
recorded by Engels

*Engels* lit une lettre de Turin disant que la propagande des Jurassiens est en contradiction avec leur circulaire, elle annonce aussi qu'une conférence de soi-disants ouvriers doit avoir lieu dans la première quinzaine d'août.<sup>259</sup>

*Engels* a reçu du Portugal une longue lettre donnant des détails statistiques sur la classe ouvrière. Les Internationaux portugais se déclarent en complète communion d'idées avec le Conseil Général qu'ils déclarent indispensable.<sup>260</sup>

*Bakounine* a répondu à la brochure du Conseil Général « Les prétendues scissions, etc. » par une lettre traduite par le cit. *Engels*, d'après laquelle cette brochure ne serait que la collection de toutes les infâmies les plus perverses, que les Allemands Juifs ont pu inventer. Il y dit qu'à Bâle il a voté contre la politique Marxienne. Il se réserve d'en appeler au Congrès par un Jury d'honneur, pourvu cependant que le Congrès lui offre toutes les garanties pour statuer. Néanmoins il se réserve de publier une brochure avant ce temps les renseignements qu'il jugera nécessaires à sa défense.<sup>261</sup>

*Wróblewski* dit que la lecture de cette lettre le confirme dans l'idée qu'il était utile pour le Conseil Général de publier cette brochure et croit que si *Bakounine* a des faits pour y répondre il eût mieux fait de les publier en réponse que de se répandre en grossièreté.

Après avoir entendu la lecture des documents se rapportant à l'Espagne le Sous-Comité prend les résolutions suivantes :

1° Qu'il ne sera pas répondu à la lettre de *Bakounine*.

2° Le citoyen *Engels* écrira à Valence, au Conseil fédéral, pour lui demander compte de ses relations avec l'*Alliance*, le Conseil ayant au moins trois de ses membres appartenant à cette société.

3° Le Sous-Comité demandera au Conseil Général de proposer l'expulsion de *Bakounine* et des *Alliancistes* au prochain Congrès.

Les citoyens Marx et Engels sont chargés de rédiger considérants à présenter au Conseil Général<sup>262</sup>.

D'après des informations envoyées au citoyen Engels par le cit. Herman il semble que si on eût procédé au vote sur le maintien du Conseil Général lors des premières séances du Congrès belge une grande majorité aurait voté dans ce sens<sup>263</sup>.

*Frankel* a reçu 5 florins pour les timbres ; on lui en a renvoyé 100. Son correspondant dit que lors des dernières élections, ils n'étaient pas encore prêts et que bien que les journalistes leur soient favorables ils sont impuissants à rien fonder en ce moment. Ils proposent de traduire *La guerre civile*. Le secrétaire écrira à Bude pour engager les ouvriers à fonder des sections ouvrières.

Plusieurs lettres de France montrent le mouvement dans ce pays comme progressant rapidement. Le premier envoi des statuts est arrivé à destination.

La séance est levée à 11 heures.

Le secrétaire de la séance,  
A. SERRAILLIER

Written in French

Published in the original  
for the first time

### SÉANCE DU 19 JUILLET 1872\*

La Séance est ouverte à 9 heures.

Sont présents les citoyens : *Engels, Marx, Jung, Wróblewski, Serraillier, Cournet, Frankel, Dupont, Le Moussu.*

Président le citoyen *Wróblewski* ; secrétaire le citoyen *Cournet*.

Après la lecture du procès-verbal de la précédente séance, le citoyen *Serraillier* donne communication au Sous-Comité

\* See Appendix, pp. 482-86.

The Minutes are in Cournet's hand on four pages.—Ed.

de la correspondance de France, Cette correspondance relate le développement de l'Association dans un certain nombre des départements, entre autres : le Lot-et-Garonne, l'Aveyron, l'Aude, l'Hérault, et expose la situation dans les villes de Bordeaux, Avignon, Toulouse, Lisieux, Montbart (Côte-d'Or) et Paris. A Toulouse, création d'une section des Ecoles. Constitution à Paris de plusieurs sections.

Le cit. Serrailier a reçu les règlements de la Section Ferré. Dépôt de ces règlements est fait à la Commission d'examen spécialement chargée.

*PROPOSITIONS:*

1°. Le citoyen *Marx* propose au Sous-Comité d'examiner la conduite du citoyen Hales relativement à ses agissements tant contre le Conseil Général que contre les intérêts de l'Association. Il propose de demander la révocation du cit. Hales comme secrétaire général. Il rappelle à ce sujet que jamais le citoyen Hales n'a donné de renseignements sur l'organisation des sections anglaises et qu'à cet égard il a poussé très loin le mauvais vouloir. En revanche il a demandé au Conseil Fédéral de reprendre en sous-œuvre les propositions rejetées par le Conseil Général et aurait même émis cette prétention que les Conseils fédéraux devaient avoir le pouvoir de changer le Conseil Général.

Le cit. *Marx* rappelle succinctement la conduite du citoyen Hales dans la question des sections irlandaises et la fâcheuse ingérence dans les affaires d'Amérique\*.

Le citoyen *Wróblewski* propose qu'il soit demandé au Conseil Général, au nom du Sous-Comité, la suspension du citoyen Hales, comme Secrétaire Général, jusqu'à ce que la Commission d'Enquête ait statué sur son compte\*\*.

\* See pp. 141-42, 191, 194-99 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 236, 263-64 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Le citoyen *Jung* seconde la proposition à laquelle le cit. Marx se rallie.

Le citoyen *Frankel* demande si les renseignements qui ont été fournis au citoyen Marx sur l'attitude du cit. Hales au Conseil Fédéral méritent toute créance.

Le cit. *Engels* : Là n'est pas la question, mais bien de savoir si les renseignements sont exacts et ils le sont.

Le cit. *Jung* fait savoir que le citoyen qui a donné ces renseignements a cependant secondé les propositions du cit. Hales.

Le cit. *Le Moussu* insiste sur la part déplorable qu'a prise le cit. Hales dans les questions relatives à l'Amérique.

Le cit. *Marx* : Tout ce qui vient d'être dit confirme et prouve que le cit. Hales a proposé et laissé proposer des résolutions absolument contraires au Conseil Général ou déjà rejetées par lui. Tout dans sa conduite démontre au surplus qu'il agit en dehors du Conseil Général et presque toujours contre lui.

Le cit. *Serraillier* appuie les raisons développées par le cit. Marx.

Le cit. *Dupont* rappelle les faits de Manchester relatifs au cit. Hales<sup>264</sup>.

Après quelques mots du cit. *Engels* sur les droits que s'est arrogé le cit. Hales à l'égard du Congrès de Nottingham<sup>265</sup>, la discussion est close et l'on passe au vote.

A l'unanimité, il est résolu que le Sous-Comité proposera au Conseil Général de suspendre le cit. Hales de ses fonctions de Secrétaire Général du Conseil jusqu'à ce que la Commission d'enquête ait statué définitivement sur son compte.

Le secrétaire demeure chargé de faire cette proposition au Conseil Général<sup>266</sup>.

2°. La deuxième proposition était de savoir si l'on répondait au Conseil Fédéral.

Le cit. *Marx* déclare que le Conseil Général n'a pas à répondre au Conseil fédéral qui du reste va expirer. On

doit se rappeler au surplus comment ce Conseil Fédéral a été formé ; il est l'œuvre du cit. Hales\*.

Il est résolu à l'unanimité que le Conseil Général ne répondra pas au Conseil Fédéral.

3°. Le cit. *Engels* propose que des pouvoirs soient donnés au citoyen Dupont pour représenter le Conseil Général au Congrès de Nottingham. Le citoyen Dupont reste juge d'user de ses pouvoirs au mieux des intérêts de l'Association.

A l'unanimité, des pouvoirs sont donnés au cit. *Dupont*<sup>267</sup>.

Le cit. *Jung* donne lecture d'une correspondance de Suisse, regrettant la fixation du prochain Congrès Général à La Haye (Hollande). La Suisse paraissait préférable au correspondant. La réunion à la Haye a causé une impression fâcheuse sur les sections romandes, allemandes et italiennes.

Le cit. *Jung* a reçu également les règlements du Conseil Régional Suisse. Ces règlements seront donnés à la Commission chargée spécialement de cet examen<sup>268</sup>.

Le cit. *Engels* fait la statistique des délégués qui désirent se rendre au Congrès. Le résultat de cette statistique, forcément approximative, le fait conclure en faveur de La Haye.

Le cit. *Serraillier* est également de l'avis du cit. *Engels* ; il développe cette idée qu'à la Haye le succès du Conseil Général sera général et non local, comme on ne manquerait pas de le dire si le Conseil avait choisi la Suisse pour lieu de réunion. Ici la guerre est internationale et non nationale.

Le cit. *Marx* signale toutefois les dangers que présente la ville de la Haye.

Le cit. *Engels* propose, en tout état de choses, le statu quo adopté.

Le cit. *Frankel* propose que le Conseil Général fasse un rapport pour le Congrès.

Cette proposition est adoptée et le cit. *Marx* est nommé rapporteur à l'unanimité\*\*.

---

\* See pp. 29-32 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 453-62 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Il fait observer qu'il y aura donc un rapport général et des rapports particuliers.

Le cit. *Serrailier* propose qu'à part le rapport financier, il y ait aussi une sorte de rapport général, ou mieux, un relevé général des cotisations depuis l'origine, comprenant également les dépenses qui ont été faites par le Conseil Général. On verra le peu de ressources dont pouvait disposer le Conseil Général et cependant tout ce qu'il a fait malgré leur insuffisance.

Cette proposition est votée à l'unanimité.

Le cit. *Engels* est nommé rapporteur\*.

L'ordre du jour étant épuisé, la séance est levée à 11 heures.

Le Président *WALERY WRÓBLEWSKI*  
Le Secrétaire *F. COURNET*

Written in French

Published in the original  
for the first time

### SÉANCE DU 27 JUILLET 1872\*\*

La séance commençait à 9 heures.

Etaient présents: les citoyens *Cournet*, *Dupont*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Jung*, *Marx* et *Wróblewski*.

Absents: les citoyens *Le Moussu* et *Serrailier*.

Président citoyen *Cournet*.

Secrétaire citoyen *Frankel*.

Après la lecture du procès-verbal de la dernière séance qui fut accepté à l'unanimité, le citoyen *Cournet* donne

\* See pp. 272-73 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See Appendix, pp. 486-89.

The Minutes are in Frankel's hand on four pages with the letter heading: "International Working Men's Association. 256, High Holborn, London, W.C." and the stamp: "International Working Men's Association. Central Council. London."—*Ed.*

lecture d'une lettre de Hollande de laquelle il résulte que les journaux de ce pays se montrent en général ou curieux ou indifférents à propos du prochain Congrès qui doit se tenir à La Haye. Le Journal Officiel seul en fait l'exception et ne trouve pas assez des mots venins pour attaquer notre Association. En général, dit cette lettre, on craint plus l'Internationale qu'elle effraie. On demande ensuite dans cette lettre que le Conseil Général fasse l'avance d'une certaine somme nécessaire pour les préparatifs du prochain Congrès, tels que le loyer de la salle, etc. frais, qui se montraient à 200 francs à peu près. Il leur est impossible de faire cette avance, vu qu'il n'y a que 250 membres en Hollande, ayant payé leurs cotisations.

On demande en outre, si le Conseil Général leur pouvait faire savoir combien de délégués assisteront à ce Congrès, pour pouvoir préparer des logements à ceux-ci<sup>269</sup>.

*Jung* dit qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de savoir combien de délégués assisteront au Congrès, que les Internationaux de La Haye fassent un appel pour les logements, qu'ils en prennent l'adresse ensuite avec l'indication du prix de loyer pour une semaine, alors ils n'auront qu'à distribuer les adresses aux délégués à fur et mesure qu'ils arriveront ainsi que les choses se sont passées en Suisse lors du dernier Congrès.\*

*Engels* dit que la salle où le Congrès doit se tenir devrait être louée aussitôt que possible en indiquant au propriétaire l'usage auquel elle doit servir. « Je suis sûr, » dit-il, « que le propriétaire demanderait immédiatement près du Gouvernement, c'est ce qu'il doit faire dans ce cas, et à ce compte nous serions sûr si le Gouvernement hollandais permettra que notre Congrès ait lieu à La Haye. »

*Marx* propose qu'on envoie 75 francs aux Internationaux de la Hollande pour les premiers frais.

(Accepté à l'unanimité.)

---

\* In Basle in 1869.—Ed.

Le citoyen Cournet est chargé d'envoyer cet argent avec les renseignements donnés par les précédents orateurs.

*Jung* donne lecture d'une lettre de la Fédération Jurasienne dans laquelle il est dit, que le Conseil Général ait le droit en cas d'urgence de changer le lieu du Congrès mais *qu'il devrait d'abord consulter* les différentes fédérations, que le Conseil a fait un mauvais choix en désignant La Haye, qu'il aurait mieux fait en choisissant une ville quelconque de la Suisse, et elle espère que le Conseil reviendra sur sa décision<sup>270</sup>.

*Marx* dit qu'on a déjà tenu trois Congrès en Suisse\*, que la Hollande fut déjà proposée par les Belges en 1870, que la Hollande est le centre pour l'Angleterre, la Belgique, l'Allemagne et le Nord de la France et qu'il n'y a pas lieu de revenir sur la première décision du Conseil.

(Accepté.)

Le citoyen *Jung* est chargé d'en faire communication à la Fédération Jurassienne<sup>271</sup>.

*Marx* propose au nom de la Commission des Statuts les Statuts présentés par les Suisses Allemands\*\* comme il n'y se trouve rien de contraire aux Statuts généraux.

(Accepté.)

*Marx* propose ensuite l'acceptation des Statuts de la Section Ferré (Paris) sauf l'article concernant le Conseil Fédéral.

(Accepté avec cette réserve<sup>272</sup>.)

*Engels* donne lecture d'une lettre d'Espagne dans laquelle il lit ensuite une lettre qu'il a l'intention comme Secrétaire d'Espagne d'envoyer au Conseil Fédéral de Valencia. Il demande dans cette lettre des renseignements sur l'existence et les agissements de l'Alliance<sup>273</sup>.

On donne lecture d'une lettre de la Section de langue française dans laquelle on fait savoir au Conseil Général

\* In Geneva, Lausanne and Basle.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 485 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

que le citoyen Wolfers ayant donné sa démission comme délégué de ladite section n'est plus, par conséquent, membre du Conseil Général.

Lecture d'une lettre d'Italie sur laquelle on passe à l'ordre du jour parce que c'est une lettre émanant d'une section qui n'a jamais payé les cotisations dues au Conseil Général.

*Dupont* fait un rapport sur le Congrès de Nottingham, il accuse Hales d'avoir eu une tenue ambiguë à ce Congrès. Il lui reproche entre autres d'avoir proposé une résolution qui donne permission aux Conseils Fédéraux de correspondre entre eux, sans se servir du Conseil Général comme intermédiaire. Comme le Conseil Général ne s'est jamais opposé à cette manière de correspondre il s'ensuit que Hales ne cherche que de semer la discorde entre le Conseil fédéral anglais et le Conseil Général.

*Engels* propose que cette affaire de Nottingham soit soumise au Comité Judiciaire du Conseil Général.

(Accepté.)

*Frankel* donne lecture d'une lettre de Vienne.

La séance est levée à 11h<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>.

WALERY WRÓBLEWSKI, Président  
LEO FRANKEL, Secrétaire

Written in French

Published in the original  
for the first time

### SÉANCE DU SOUS-COMITÉ LE 4 AOÛT 1872\*

*Serrailier* président, *Marx* secrétaire.

Présents: *Wróblewski*, *Serrailier*, *Jung*, *Engels*, *Marx*,  
*Le Moussu*, *Cournet*.

*Marx* fait des communications sur la Hollande, l'Italie, l'Amérique.

\* See Appendix, pp. 489-91.

The Minutes are in Marx's hand on three pages.—Ed.

Séance de sous-comité le 4 Août 1872

Assistances: présidents, Marx secrétaire.

Présents: Wobleski, Zarnitzkes, Long,

Engels, Marx, de Moins, Courat.

Marx <sup>fait</sup> les communications sur la Hollande, l'Italie  
l'Amérique.

Engels <sup>22 pages</sup>. Lettre de Cuno de Liège. Impression de la section  
allemande à Venise par le Comité Fédéral de Bruxelles, <sup>de</sup>  
~~sur~~ la simple demande de W. Kins. D'après un  
allemand, de Liège <sup>par la section, inséré</sup> au Congrès de Bruxelles. Cet allemand  
avait été déposé en prison de Kins <sup>comme</sup>  
policiers, et par conséquent ~~il est~~ <sup>il est</sup> son capitaine  
il est devenu de la section de Verviers, lui-même  
il est ~~pas~~ dans un Congrès de Bruxelles

relève la lettre de Weber <sup>(Madrid?)</sup> Manifeste de la nouvelle  
fédération de Madrid. <sup>(22 pages)</sup> L'Europe  
26 juillet. Réclamations sur l'Alliance.

Lettre de Bakounine à Morays, où il lui donne  
toutes les instructions  
lettre a été envoyée <sup>pour l'Espagne. Elle</sup>  
Mesa. <sup>par un message</sup> dans mes cabinets à

*Engels* lit une *Lettre de Cuno*<sup>274</sup> de Liège\*.

Il lit encore une *Lettre de Mesa* (Madrid). Manifeste de la nouvelle fédération de Madrid (22 juillet). Voir *l'Emanicipacion* 26\*\* Juillet. Révélutions sur l'Alliance. Lettre de Bakounine à Morago, où il lui donne toutes les instructions pour l'Espagne. Cette lettre a été communiquée par Morago dans un café à Mesa.<sup>275</sup>

*Engels* chargé unanimement par le Sous-Comité de traduire en français, anglais et allemand la circulaire de la nouvelle fédération de Madrid\*\*\*.

*Engels* lit une lettre de 26 de la part de Mesa, communication de Becker de Genève.<sup>276</sup>

*Lettre de Lisbon de Franca* 27 Juillet (le Conseil Fédéral de Portugal)<sup>277</sup>.

La section Varia\*\*\*\* a expulsé deux membres en communication avec Morago, le bakouniniste.

*Marx* demande si les 31. St. ont été envoyés à Hollande\*\*\*\*\*. *Engels* les avancera.

*Marx* demande que Weiler soit cité comme témoin au Comité judiciaire.

Accepté.

*Serraillier*: 500 agents envoyés de Paris dans les provinces pour découvrir les agents de l'Internationale et les sections formées.

---

\* Further the following words are crossed out in the MS: "Suspension de la section allemande à Verviers par le Conseil Fédéral de Bruxelles sur la simple demande de M. Hins d'expulser un Allemand délégué par la section susdite au Congrès de Bruxelles. Cet Allemand avait osé dénoncer un partisan de Hins comme policier, et pour ce crime-là son expulsion était dmandée de la section de Verviers, lui-même n'étant pas admis au Congrès de Bruxelles."—*Ed.*

\*\* An error; should be "27".—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Further the following words are crossed out in the MS: "*Cournet* fait la communication suivante du *Rappel* du 3 août."—*Ed.*

\*\*\*\* The section of various trades.—*Ed.*

\*\*\*\*\* See p. 312 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

*Dupont*: Histoire sur Scholl et la conspiration néo-bonapartiste-prolétaire.

*Engels* fait la proposition, supportée par *K. Marx*: que le citoyen Le Moussu de concert avec le citoyen Combault soit chargé de suivre les intrigues bonapartistes de Scholl dévoilées par le citoyen Dupont et de faire un rapport au Sous-Comité chaque séance.

Accepté unanimement (Le Moussu n'a pas voté).

*Wróblewski*: il faut faire une statistique préalable des délégués à la Haye.

*Cournet* parle dans le même sens.

*Marx* propose une publication au nom du Conseil Général chargeant les différentes sections de lui communiquer le nombre des délégués qu'ils enverront au Congrès, en rappelant la résolution du Congrès de Bâle par rapport aux sections qui ne sont pas en règle avec le Conseil Général.<sup>278</sup>

Secondé par *Wróblewski*.

*Cournet* propose Marx et Engels pour la rédaction.

Adopté à l'unanimité.

Written in French

Published in the original  
for the first time

### SÉANCE DU 28 AOÛT 1872\*

Séance commence à 9 heures 1/2.

Président cit. *Marx*.

Secrétaire *Frankel*.

Le procès-verbal de la dernière séance est perdu.

*Wróblewski* donne connaissance d'une grève qui se prépare parmi les tailleurs.

*Cournet* demande si le citoyen Serrailier ait reçu des mandats en blanc de la France pour pouvoir les remettre aux membres du Conseil qui sont pourvus des mandats.

\* See Appendix, pp. 491-93.

The Minutes are in Frankel's hand on three pages.—Ed.

*Serraillier* répond qu'il a reçu un mandat pour citoyen *Ranvier*, un pour *Longuet*, un pour *Johannard*, un fut donné à *Vilmart* de Manchester. 2 délégués viendront de la France à la Haye.

Il lit ensuite plusieurs lettres qui démontrent qu'il a fait son possible pour avoir des mandats de la France.

Il donne le nombre des sections fondées en France en indiquant les noms des lieux où elles se trouvent.

Citoyen *Marx* demande, que le Sous-Comité exprime sa satisfaction avec les gestions du citoyen *Serraillier*.

Citoyen *Cournet* dit qu'il s'abstiendra.

Citoyen *Marx* dit qu'on ne devra pas s'abstenir et qu'il serait regrettable si en face des faux Internationaux de l'Italie, de l'Espagne, de la Suisse on voudrait encore s'accuser entre membres du Conseil Général.

*Wróblewski* est du même avis.

*Frankel* dit qu'il ne votera pas si *Serraillier* ne déclare que lui aussi ne fera pas des accusations de sa part contre certains membres français du Conseil Général.

*Wróblewski* est du même avis.

*Serraillier* n'accepte pas le vote avec des conditions.

*Marx* dit que sa proposition n'a rien à faire avec les discussions sur les attaques de part et d'autre.

*Frankel* dit qu'il sait qu'il n'y a aucun secrétaire qui a travaillé autant que *Serraillier*, et qu'il est prêt de le défendre quand on l'attaquerait sur sa gestion; néanmoins il ne voterait pas si *Serraillier* ne déclare pas de ne pas vouloir attaquer, ceux des membres qui puissent différer quant aux idées politiques.

*Marx* dit qu'il y a une société n'appartenant pas à l'Internationale qui se prononçait contre *Serraillier* et qu'il retire sa proposition.

*Cournet* déclare qu'avec les membres français du Conseil Général il n'a jamais été question de *Serraillier* pour la seule raison que la société ne s'occupe pas de l'Internationale.

*Serrailier* a fait la déclaration de ne pas attaquer mais qu'il ne craint pas les attaques.

*Marx* fait la proposition qu'aucun membre du Conseil Général n'ait le droit d'accuser un autre au Congrès international des Travailleurs, jusqu'à la discussion sur l'élection des membres du Conseil Général.

Accepté à l'unanimité.

On discute à qui on devrait donner le mandat envoyé en blanc.

*Serrailier* propose Combault.

*Frankel*, *Vaillant*, *Cournet* secondent.

*Marx*—Arnaud.

*Frankel* dit que dans le cas que *Vaillant* pour recevoir un mandat comme on le dit du Conseil Général, il voudrait alors qu'on le donne à Combault parce qu'il connaît toutes les affaires concernant Malon.

*Marx* dit que la lettre que *Sorge*, délégué du Congrès américain<sup>279</sup>, possède, dans laquelle il est affirmé que la section de San Francisco l'a nommé comme délégué au Congrès, suffira à *Vaillant* pour être admis, même dans le cas que le mandat n'arriverait pas.

Après la déclaration de *Marx* *Frankel* retire la proposition.

Combault fut par un vote accepté pour qu'on lui donne un mandat.

La séance est levée à minuit.

LEO FRANKEL

**FROM THE MANUSCRIPTS  
OF  
KARL MARX**

---

KARL MARX  
AMERICAN SPLIT<sup>280</sup>

MAY 1872\*

15 October 1871 was published in the journal of *Woodhull* (a banker's woman, free-lover, and general humbug) and *Clafin* (her sister in the same line) an *Appeal of Section No. 12* (founded by *Woodhull*, and almost exclusively consisting of middle-class humbugs and worn-out Yankee swindlers in the Reform business; *Section IX* is founded by Miss *Clafin*).

An *Appeal of Section XII* (to the *English-speaking citizens of the United States*) (d.d. August 30, 1871, signed by *W. West*, Secretary of *Section 12*).

Folgende Auszüge aus diesem Appeal:

"The object of the International is simply to emancipate the labourer, male and female, by the conquest of political power." "It involves, first, the *Political Equality* and *Social Freedom* of men and women alike." "*Political Equality* means the personal participation of each in the preparation, administration and execution of the laws by which all are governed." "*Social Freedom* means *absolute immunity* from impertinent intrusion in all affairs of exclusively personal concernment, such as religious belief, the *sexual relation*, *habits of dress*, etc."

"The proposition involves, secondly, the *establishment of a Universal Government*. . . . Of course, the abolition of . . . even *differences of language are embraced in the programme*."

---

\* The heading was given by Engels on a separate sheet of paper.  
—Ed.

“Section No. 12” invites the formation of “English-speaking sections” in the United States upon this programme.

Daß die ganze Organisation für *place-hunting* und *electoral purposes*:

“If practicable, *for the convenience of political action*, there should be a section formed *in every primary election district*.”

“There must ultimately be instituted *in every town a Municipal Committee or Council*, corresponding with the Common Councils; in every State a State Committee or Council, corresponding with the State legislature, and in the Nation a National Committee or Council, corresponding with the United States National Congress.”

“The work of the International includes nothing less than the institution, *within existing forms, of another form of Government*, which shall supersede them all.”

Dieser Appeal—und die Formation daraufhin of all sorts of middle-class humbug sections, free-lovers, spiritists, spiritist Shakers,<sup>281</sup> etc.—gab den Anlaß zum split, in der Section I (deutsch) des Old Council das Herauswerfen der Section 12, die Nichtzulassung von Sektionen, die nicht wenigstens aus 2/3 Arbeitern beständen, verlangte.\*

Erst 5 Dissidents bilden Separatcouncil *November 19, 1871*, bestand aus Yankees, Franzosen, Deutschen.

*In Woodhull's, etc., Journal vom 18 November 1871* protestiert *Section 12* (West als Secretary) gegen *Section I* und erklärt daselbst u. a.:

“The simple truth is that Political Equality and Social Freedom for all alike, of all races, both sexes, and *every condition*, are necessary precursors of the more radical reforms demanded by the International.”

“*The extension of equal citizenship to women*, the world over, *must precede any general change in the subsisting relations of capital and labour*.” “Section 12 would also remonstrate against the vain assumption, running all through the Protest (of Section I) under review, that the International Working Men's Association is an *organisation of the working classes*...”

\* Further the words “Dieser neue Council gestiftet!” (“This new Council is founded”) are crossed out in the MS.—Ed.

Vorher schon in *Woodhull's Journal vom October 21, 1871*, Section 12 asserts

*"the independent right of each section to have, hold and give expression to its own constructions of said proceedings of the several Congresses, and the Rules and Regulations (!) of said General Council, each section being alone responsible for its own action"*.

*Woodhull's, etc., Journal. 25 November 1871. Protest der Section 12 gegen "Address of Section I"*<sup>282</sup> (dieselbe Adresse, die Du in italienischen etc. Blättern hast abdrucken lassen).

*"It is not true that the 'common understanding or agreement' of the working men of all countries, of itself, standing alone, constitutes the Association.... The statement that the emancipation of the working classes can only be conquered by themselves, cannot be denied, yet it is true so far as it describes the fact that the working classes cannot be emancipated against their will."*

*3 December 1871.* The new Federal Council for North America formally gebildet (Yankees, Deutschen, Franzosen).

*4 December.* Der old Council (10 Ward Hotel) denunciert die Schwindler in Circular an alle Sektionen der Internationalen in United States. Darin heißt es u. a.:

*"In dem Committee (dem alten Central Committee), welches eine Abwehr gegen alle Reformschwindeleien sein sollte, bestand schliesslich die Majorität aus schon beinahe in Vergessenheit geratenen Reformatoren und Volksbeglückern.... So kam es, daß die Leute, welche das Evangelium der freien Liebe predigten, brüderlichst neben denen saßen, welche die ganze Welt mit einer gemeinsamen Sprache beglücken wollten—Land Cooperative-Gesellschaftler, Spiritualisten, Atheisten und Deisten—jeder suchte sein Steckenpferd zu reiten. Namentlich Sektion 12 Woodhull.... Der erste Schritt welcher hier getan werden muß, um die Bewegung zu fördern, ist zu organisieren und zu gleicher Zeit das revolutionäre Element anzuregen, welches in dem Gegensatz der Interessen des Kapitalisten und des Arbeiters liegt...."*

*"Die Delegierten der Sektionen 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, und anderer Sektionen, nachdem sie gesehen, daß alles Bemühen, diesem Unfug zu steuern vergeblich war, beschlossen deshalb nach Vertagung des alten Central Committee sine die (3 December 1871), ein neues zu gründen, welches aus wirklichen Arbeitern besteht, und von*

welchem alle diejenigen ausgeschlossen bleiben sollen, welche die Frage nur zu verwirren vermögen" (*New Yorker Democrat*. 9 December 1871.)

West elected as delegate für den neuen Council.

Zu bemerken, daß der neue Council sich sehr rasch mit Delegierten füllte, meist von neuen Sektionen, gestiftet von Section 9 (Clafin) und Section 12 (Woodhull), ruffraff, dazu meist so schwach, daß sie nicht zahlreich genug, selbst um die nötigen officers zu ernennen.

Unterdes log das Woodhull Journal (West, etc.) unverschämt, indem es behauptete der Unterstützung des General Council sicher zu sein.

Beide Councils appellierten an den Generalrat. Verschiedene Sektionen, z.B. französische Section 10 (New York) und sämtliche irische Sektionen zogen ihre Delegierte von beiden Councils zurück, bis der Generalrat entschieden habe. Über die Lügen des Woodhull Journal, article in *No. von December 2* unter dem Titel: "*Section 12 Sustained.—The Decision of the General Council*" (Diese war die Entscheidung des Generalrats vom 5 November 1871, worin umgekehrt das Central Committee aufrecht erhalten gegen die Prätension der Section 12 sich *als Yankees* an seine Stelle zu setzen.\*)

*Resolutionen des Generalrats vom 5 und 12 März 1871.\*\**

Das Schicksal der Internationalen in den United States hing davon ab. (Nebenbei zu bemerken den Humbug Cultus, den das Woodhull Journal bis dato mit mir getrieben hatte.)

Sobald die Resolutionen nach New York kamen, befolgten die Leute des Counter Committee ihre alte Politik. Sie hatten zuerst den ursprünglichen Split in den verrufensten Bourgeoisblättern von New York besprochen. Sie taten jetzt dasselbe gegen den Generalrat (stellten die Sache als Kampf

\* See p. 338 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* A slip of the pen in Marx's MS: should be "1872". See pp. 410-13 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

zwischen Franzosen und Deutschen, Socialismus und Kommunismus dar) unter dem Jubelruf aller arbeiterfeindlichen Organe.

Sehr charakteristisch die Randglossen in *Woodhull's Journal*, 4 May, 1872 zu den Resolutionen des General Council.

Vorher noch: *Woodhull's Journal*, 16 December 1871:

"No new test of membership, as that two-thirds or any part of a section shall be *wages-slaves*, as if it were a crime to be free, was required."

(Nämlich bei der Composition des Counter Council.)

*Woodhull's Journal*, 4 May 1872.

"...In this decree of the General Council its authors presume to recommend that in future no *American* section be admitted, of which two-thirds at least are not *wages-slaves*. *Must they be politically slaves* also? As well one thing as the other..." "The intrusion into the International Working Men's Association of *bogus reformers, middle-class quacks* and *trading politicians* is mostly to be feared from *that class of citizens* who have nothing better to depend upon *than the proceeds of wages-slavery*."

Unterdes wie die Presidential Elections näher rückten, kam der Pferdefuss heraus—nämlich daß die *Internationale* dienen sollte sur Election der—*Madame Woodhull!*

A propos. Vorher noch: *Woodhull's etc. Journal*, 2 March 1872 in article, signed *W. West*, liest man:

"The issue of the 'Appeal' of Section 12 to the English-speaking citizens of the United States in August last, *was a new departure in the history of the International*, and has resulted in the recognition by the General Council of *Political Equality and Social Freedom of both sexes alike*, and of the essential *political* character of the work before us."

*Woodhull's etc. Journal*, 2 March 1872. Unter dem Titel: "*The Coming Combination Convention*" heißt's:

"There is a proposition under consideration by the representatives of the various reformatory elements of the country looking to a grand consolidated convention to be held in this city in May next,

during Anniversary week. . . . Indeed, if this convention in May acts wisely, who can say that *the fragments of the defunct Democratic Party* will come out from them and take part in the proposed convention. . . . *Everybody of Radicals* everywhere in the United States should, as soon as the call is made public, take immediate steps to be represented in it."

[A propos. Das Woodhull Journal, ich kann das Datum nicht finden, tröstet die *Spiritist Sections*, sich den Teufel um den Generalrat zu scheren.]

*Woodhull etc. Journal, April 6, 1872:*

"Every day the evidence, that the convention called for the 9 and 10 May, by representatives of the various reforms . . . is to be a spontaneous uprising of the people, increases in volume."

*National Women Suffrage Association* fordern dazu auf:

"This Convention will . . . consider the nominations for President and Vice-President of the United States."

Ditto unter dem Titel:

"*The Party of the People to secure and maintain human rights, to be inaugurated in the United States, in May, 1872.*"

Aufruf signed an der Spitze: *Victoria C. Woodhull*, dann *Theodore H. Banks*, *R. W. Hume* (fellows and Banks einer der Stifter des *Counter Council*). In diesem Aufruf: Die Convention will consider "nominations for President and Vice-President of the United States." Laden speziell ein

"Labor, Land, Peace and Temperance reformers, and *Internationals* and *Women Suffragists*—including all the various Suffrage Associations—as well as *all others*, who believe the time has come when the principles of eternal justice and human equality should be carried into our halls of legislation."

*Woodhull etc. Weekly, 13 April 1872.* Der Präsidenschaftsdodge immer klarer herausgestellt. Diesmal zur Abwechslung

"*Internationals*, and other Labor Reformers—the friends of peace, temperance and education, and by all those who believe that the

time has come to carry the principles of true morality and religion into the State House, the Court and the Market Place".

*Unter dem Titel: "The Party of the People etc."* neuer Aufruf, immer *Victoria C. Woodhull* an der Spitze; im Gefolge die Hauptlumpen des Counter Council, *Th. H. Banks*, *R. W. Hume*, *G. R. Allen*, *William West*, *G. W. Maddox* (der spätere Präsident der Apollo Versammlung), *J. T. Elliott* (der englische Sekretär des Counter Council), *T. Millot* (Delegate der French Section II).

*Woodhull etc. Weekly* (nicht Journal heisst's), 20 April, 1872. Fortsetzung desselben Dodges.

Die Listen wachsen, immer duce *V. C. Woodhull* (Auch "Honorable" drunter).

*Woodhull etc. Weekly*, 27 April 1872.\* Fortsetzung derselben Reklame. (Beginnt die Liste der Delegates zu drucken.)

*Woodhull etc. Weekly*, May 4, 1872. Fortsetzung des Dodge. (Beständiger Abdruck derselben und erweiterter Listen.)

*Woodhull etc. Weekly*, 25 May 1872. Endlich (9, 10, 11 May Apollo Hall Scandal) *Woodhull* for President of United States, *F. Douglas* for Vice-präsident. (*Maddox* of Counter Council, Präsident der Convention, first day.) Laughing-stock of New York and United States.

Sonst Beamte des Counter Council: *John T. Elliott*, Vice-präsident, *G. R. Allen*, Secretary (und Member of Committee on Resolutions and Platform). In letzterem Committee: *Th. H. Banks* (einer der 5 Stifter des Counter Council vom 19 November 1871). Auch die *Mrs. Maria Huleck* in einem Committee. In *Central National Committee at New York* für die United States figurieren: *G. R. Allen*, *Th. H. Banks* (neben Colonel Blood, member von Section 12, und Nebengatte der *Victoria*), *I. B. Davis*.

*Break-up of the Counter Council.*

---

\* A slip of the pen in Marx's MS: should be "1872".—Ed.

Section 2 (French) setzt den *Laugrand* als Delegate ab (bisher French Secretary des Counter Council). Werfen den Kerls vor "of using the organisation for political purposes, and as a sort of adjunct to the free-love branch of the women's rights' party. . . . Citizen *Millot* stated (er schlug vor das withdrawal der Section 2 vom Counter Council, was angenommen) upon the introduction of the Resolution that only 3 sections—9 (Clafin), 12 (Woodhull) and 35—were represented in the Apollo Hall 'odds and ends' convention, by scheming men for political purposes, and that the delegation in the said convention pretending to act for the Federal Council was a spurious one and self-appointed". (*Aber der Federal Counter Council did not repudiate them.*) (*The World, May 13, 1872.*)

Section 6 (deutsch) setzt ihren Delegierten E. Grosse (Ex-Privatsekretär des H. von Schweitzer) ab und erklärt auszutreten, wenn der Counter Council nicht alle Resolutionen des General Council annimmt.

*Le Socialiste* (New York), 18 Mai, 1872.

La Section 2, de New York, dans sa séance du dimanche, 12 mai, a pris les résolutions suivantes:

"Considérant, etc., etc.,

"Que la Section 2 a des raisons de croire que l'Union des bijoutiers refuse de s'affilier à l'Internationale, et que, cependant, un délégué continue de la représenter au Conseil fédéral;

"Que la Section 2 a des raisons de penser que d'autres délégués représentent des Sections fictives ou composées de 6 à 8 membres;

"La Section 2 déclare: Qu'une enquête est nécessaire etc. . . ."

"Considérant, qu'à tort ou à raison, la Section 12 a été suspendue par le Conseil Général, agissant en vertu d'un pouvoir qui lui a été concédé par le Congrès de Bâle; la Section 2 proteste contre le maintien, au Conseil fédéral, du délégué de la Section 12, avec voix délibérative.

"Enfin, considérant que l'Internationale est l'Association des travailleurs, ayant pour but d'affranchir les travailleurs par les Travaillleurs eux-mêmes:

"La Section 2 proteste contre l'admission de Sections en majorité composées de non-travailleurs."

*Andere Resolution der Section 2.*

"La Section 2,

"Tout en reconnaissant en principe le droit électoral pour les femmes, *en présence des insinuations de la citoyenne Woodhull*, dans l'assemblée d'Apollo Hall, *laissant croire au public que l'Internationale supporte les candidatures de cette Assemblée*,

"Declare:

"Que, pour le présent, l'Internationale ne peut, ni ne doit, se mettre à la remorque d'aucun parti politique américain; car aucun d'eux ne représente les aspirations ouvrières; aucun d'eux n'a pour programme et pour but l'émancipation économique des travailleurs.

"La Section 2 a pensé:

"Que notre seul objet doit être, quant à présent, l'organisation et la solidarisation de la classe ouvrière en Amérique."

Unter dem Titel: "*Internationaux, prenez garde à vous!*", bringt dieselbe Nummer des "Socialiste" u. a.:

"L'Internationale n'est pas, ne peut pas être persécutée en Amérique; les politiciens, loin de viser à la détruire, ne songent qu'à s'en servir comme levier et point d'appui pour le triomphe de leurs vues personnelles. Que l'Internationale se laisse entraîner dans cette voie, et elle cessera d'être *l'Association des travailleurs* pour devenir un ring des politiciens.

"Depuis longtemps, le cri d'alarme a été jeté; mais la Convention d'Apollo Hall, nommant, *au nom de l'Internationale*, madame Woodhull comme candidat à la présidence, doit désormais ouvrir les yeux aux moins clairvoyants. Internationaux d'Amérique, prenez garde à vous!"

*The World*, May 20, 1872.

*Sitting of Counter Council, 19 May 1872.* Maddox (of Apollo Hall) in the Chair. *Withdrawal of 8 delegates (for 8 sections) (French and German).*

*Herald*, May 20, 1872

bringt dieselbe Sitzung under the heading:

"*The French [are] insulted and leave in disgust. . . . Terrible slang used. But 1,500 Members in the United States. A Split among the Internationals of London. The Woodhull Crowd Victorious.*"

*Resolution of General Council of 28 May 1872, by which—in reply to the questions put by the German Section of St. Louis and the French Section of Nouvelle Orléans—the old Council<sup>283</sup> (Provisional Federal Council for the United States) is alone recognised.*

Written by Karl Marx  
in May 1872

Published for the first time  
in the original

**DOCUMENTS  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION**

---

STATEMENT FROM THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
CONCERNING COCHRANE'S LETTER<sup>284</sup>

TO THE EDITOR OF *THE EASTERN POST*

Sir.—A letter appeared in the *Times* on October 31st on the International, signed Alexander Baillie-Cochrane, which I ask space to reply to in your columns. In the first instant, Mr. A. B. C. is

“ignorant whether Mr. Odger is still president of the English branch of the society”.

Ever since September 1867, the office of president of the General Council of the International, which Mr. A. B. C. calls the English branch of this society, has been abolished. It is well known that after the publication of our manifesto on the civil war in France (in June last) Mr. Odger withdrew from the General Council.

Having read some continental gossip about the composition of our conference of delegates, held in London last September, Mr. A. B. C. applies this information to the public meeting held in St. Martin's Hall, on the 28th September, 1864. At that meeting, as the writer to the *Times* of October 27th correctly stated,\* the Provisional Council of the International Working Men's Association was elected, but not “Mr. Odger elected President, Mr. Cremer and Mr. Wheeler, Secretary”, as Mr. A. B. C. says.

---

\* The reference is apparently to Eccarius.—Ed.

Mr. A. B. C. then proceeds to prove the trustworthiness of his information by the following "authentic comment":  
Firstly,

"The red flag is the symbol of universal love."

This authentic document is nothing but the preamble of one of the innumerable forgeries, lately published, in the name of the International, by the Paris police, and disowned at the time by the General Council.

Secondly,

"The programme of Geneva under the presidency" (it is rather hard to make out how a programme can be under a presidency) "of the Russian Michael Bakounine was accepted by the General Council of London, July 1869."

This programme of Geneva is nothing else but the statutes of the "Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste", of Geneva, already quoted in Jules Favre's circular on the International. Now, in reply to that circular I stated (see the *Times*, of June 13th) the General Council never issued such a document. On the contrary, it issued a document which quashed the original statutes of the Alliance<sup>285</sup>.

I may now add that the conference, lately held at London, has finally disposed of the Alliance, founded by Michael Bakounine, and that the *Journal de Genève*,<sup>286</sup> this worthy representative of the party tenets of Mr. A. B. C., has taken up the defence of the Alliance against the international.

Thirdly, Mr. A. B. C. pulls out of his bundle of "authentic documents" some garbled extract from private letters written by our friend Eugène Dupont, long since published by the Bonapartist ex-procureur Oscar Testut.<sup>287</sup> Before Mr. A. B. C. set out for the Continent in search of this "trustworthy information", it had already gone the round of the English press.

Mr. Alexander Baillie-Cochrane calls our society "infamous". How am I to call a society which instructs the business of law-making to that same Alexander Baillie-Cochrane?

I am, Sir,

Yours obediently,

*JOHN HALES,*  
General Secretary,  
International Working Men's Association

256, High Holborn

Written by Engels  
on October 31, 1871

Published in *The Eastern Post*  
No. 163, November 11, 1871

Printed according  
to the newspaper text

---

**RESOLUTION ON THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL'S SECTIONS  
IN THE UNITED STATES<sup>288</sup>**

**DRAWN UP BY THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

Considering:

1. That every section in America has the right of being represented at the New York Federal Committee for the United States, which thereby receives the character of a truly representative body;

2. That the organisation and progress of the International in the United States is to a great extent due to the New York Federal Committee;

3. That there is nothing, either in the Rules of the Association or in the special organisation of the International in the United States, to prevent any section from extending the Association amongst their own nationality;

The Council advises that the New York Central Committee for the United States be maintained until the extension of the International in America may render opportune the convocation of all the branches in the United States for the election of a new Federal Committee.

Adopted by the General  
Council on November 5, 1871

Published in *Le Socialiste*  
No. 8, November 25, 1871 and in  
*Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly*  
No. 3/81, December 2, 1871

Printed according  
to Eccarius's MS

---

ON THE FRENCH SECTION OF 1871\*289

RÉSOLUTIONS DU CONSEIL GÉNÉRAL,  
SÉANCE DU 7 NOVEMBRE 1871

I. REMARQUES PRÉLIMINAIRES

Le Conseil Général considère comme n'ayant nullement trait à la question, sur laquelle il est appelé à se prononcer, les idées émises par la « Section française de 1871 » sur un changement radical à apporter dans les articles des Statuts Généraux, relatifs à la constitution du Conseil Général.

Quant aux insultes lancées par ladite Section contre le Conseil Général, elles seront appréciées à leur juste valeur par les conseils et comités fédéraux des divers pays.

Seulement le Conseil remarque :

Que depuis le Congrès de Bâle (tenu du 6 au 11 septembre 1869) il n'y a pas *trois ans* d'écoulés, comme l'affirme à dessein ladite Section ;

Qu'en 1870, à la veille de la guerre franco-allemande, le Conseil, dans une circulaire générale, adressée à toutes les fédérations, y compris le conseil fédéral de Paris, proposa d'éloigner de Londres le siège du Conseil Général<sup>290</sup> ;

---

\* See Appendix, pp. 494-500.—Ed.

Que les réponses reçues furent unanimes pour maintenir le siège actuel du Conseil et pour la prorogation de ses pouvoirs ;

Qu'en 1871, aussitôt que les événements l'ont permis, le Conseil Général a convoqué une Conférence de délégués, seule convocation possible dans les circonstances données ;

Qu'à cette Conférence\* les délégués du Continent ont déclaré que dans leurs pays respectifs on craignait de voir compromis le caractère international du Conseil Général par l'adjonction trop nombreuse de réfugiés français ;

Que la Conférence (voir ses « Résolutions, etc. » XV.) a laissé à l'appréciation du Conseil Général le soin de fixer, selon les événements, la date et le siège du prochain congrès ou de la conférence qui le remplacerait.<sup>291</sup>

Quant à la prétention de la susdite Section de représenter exclusivement « l'élément révolutionnaire français parce que parmi ses membres elle compte des ex-présidents de sociétés ouvrières parisiennes, le Conseil fait remarquer.

Avoir été président d'une société ouvrière peut bien être une considération pour le Conseil Général, mais dans aucun cas cela ne saurait être un titre d'admission « comme de droit » à y représenter « l'élément révolutionnaire ». Car s'il en était ainsi, le Conseil aurait dû admettre comme membre le sieur Gustave Durand, lequel a été président de la société des bijoutiers de Paris et secrétaire à Londres de la Section française. — D'ailleurs, les membres du Conseil Général ont plutôt pour mission de représenter les principes de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs que les opinions et les intérêts de telle ou telle corporation.

\* The second MS continues as follows: "tenue à Londres du 17 au 23 septembre 1871, comme ne l'ignorent point les membres de la Section française."—Ed.

II. OBJECTIONS PRÉSENTÉES PAR LA « SECTION FRANÇAISE  
DE 1871 » DANS LA SÉANCE DU CONSEIL GÉNÉRAL  
DU 31 OCTOBRE CONTRE SES RÉSOLUTIONS DU 17 OCTOBRE\*

1) Quant au passage suivant de l'article 2 de ses "Statuts":

« Pour être reçu membre de la section, il faut justifier ses moyens d'existence, présenter des garanties de moralité etc. »

la Section remarque :

« Que les Statuts généraux rendent les sections responsables de la moralité de leurs membres et leur reconnaissent par conséquent le droit de prendre, *comme elles l'entendent*, leurs garanties. »

D'après cette manière de voir, une section internationale, fondée par des *teetotallers*, pourrait insérer dans ses statuts particuliers un article à cet effet : « Pour être reçu membre de la section, il faut jurer de s'abstenir de toute boisson alcoolique. » En un mot, les conditions d'admission dans l'Internationale les plus absurdes et les plus disparates pourraient être imposées par les statuts particuliers des diverses sections, toujours sous le prétexte qu'elles « entendent de cette manière » couvrir leur responsabilité pour l'intégrité de leurs membres.

Le Conseil Général a dit dans sa résolution I du 17 octobre, qu'il y a des « cas où l'absence des moyens d'existence peut bien être une garantie de moralité ». Il croit que la Section aurait pu se dispenser de répéter cette sentence en disant, que « les réfugiés » sont « défendus contre tout soupçon par l'éloquent témoignage de leur misère. »

A la phrase que « les moyens d'existence » des grévistes consistent dans « la caisse de grève », on peut répondre d'abord que cette « caisse » est souvent fictive.\*\*

\* For the full text of the Council resolutions see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 435-39.—*Ed.*

\*\* The second MS continues as follows: « et que ce n'est bien souvent qu'aux privations et aux souffrances des grévistes que sont dûs les résultats constatés : ce que paraît ignorer la Section de 1871. »—*Ed.*

D'ailleurs, les enquêtes officielles anglaises ont prouvé que la majorité des ouvriers anglais qui, généralement parlant, sont mieux placés que leurs frères continentaux, est forcée—soit par les grèves ou par le manque de travail, soit par l'insuffisance des salaires ou par suite des termes du paiement, et bien d'autres causes—d'avoir recours sans cesse aux monts-de-piété et aux *dettes*, « moyens d'existence » dont on ne pourrait exiger la justification; sans s'immiscer d'une manière inqualifiable dans la vie privée des citoyens.

De deux choses l'une.

Ou la Section ne cherche dans « les moyens d'existence » que des « garanties de moralité », \* et alors la proposition du Conseil Général ainsi conçue : « Pour être reçu membre de la section, il faut présenter des garanties de moralité » remplit ce but, puisqu'elle implique (voir la Résolution I du 17 octobre) que « dans des cas douteux une section pourra bien prendre des informations sur les moyens d'existence *comme garantie de moralité* : »<sup>292</sup>

Ou la Section, dans l'article 2 de ses Statuts, a intentionnellement parlé de la justification des « moyens d'existence » comme condition d'admission en outre des « garanties de moralité » qu'elle a le droit d'exiger, et dans ce cas le Conseil Général affirme que « c'est une innovation bourgeoise, contraire à la lettre et à l'esprit des Statuts Généraux. »

2) Au rejet par le Conseil Général de ce paragraphe de l'art. 11 des « Statuts, etc. :

« Un ou plusieurs délégués seront envoyés au Conseil Général ».

la Section répond :

« Nous n'ignorons point ... que la lettre des Statuts Généraux lui (au Conseil Général) donnent le droit d'accepter ou de n'accepter pas les délégués. »

\* The second MS continues as follows: « pour couvrir sa responsabilité. »—*Ed.*

C'est prouver jusqu'à l'évidence que\* la lettre des Statuts Généraux n'est pas familière à la Section.

En effet, les Statuts Généraux, ne reconnaissant que deux modes d'élection pour le Conseil Général—soit la nomination du Congrès soit l'adjonction par le Conseil lui-même—, il n'y est parlé *nulle part* de l'admission ou de la non-admission des délégués de sections ou des groupes.

L'admission de délégués, proposés en premier lieu par les sections de Londres, n'a jamais été qu'une *mesure administrative* du Conseil Général qui en cela a fait une application particulière de son droit d'adjonction. (Voir Résolutions II, 2, du Conseil Général du 17 octobre.)

Les circonstances exceptionnelles qui ont fait accepter au Conseil Général ce mode d'adjonction ont été suffisamment expliquées dans ses Résolutions du 17 octobre.

Dans les mêmes résolutions (II, 3) le Conseil se déclare prêt à admettre des délégués de la « Section française de 1871 » *sous les mêmes conditions* que les autres délégués des sections de Londres. Mais il ne saurait considérer comme sérieuse une demande constituant un privilège pour cette Section au mépris des Statuts Généraux.

En introduisant dans l'article 11 de ses Statuts ce paragraphe : « Un ou plusieurs délégués *seront envoyés* au Conseil Général » la « Section française de 1871 » revendique la délégation au Conseil Général comme un droit, fondé sur les Statuts Généraux. Elle affectait si bien d'être convaincu de ce droit imaginaire que même avant d'être reconnue par le Conseil Général (voir l'art. VI des Résolutions Administratives du Congrès de Bâle<sup>293</sup>), elle n'hésita point à envoyer « comme de droit », le 17 octobre, au milieu du Conseil Général, deux délégués avec « mandats impératifs, » *sanctionnés* par 20 votants. Enfin, dans sa dernière missive, elle in-

---

\* « The second MS continues as follows: « sur ce point comme sur beaucoup d'autres. »—Ed.

siste de nouveau sur « le devoir et le pouvoir d'envoyer des délégués au Conseil Général. »

La Section cherche dans la position du citoyen Herman au Conseil Général un précédent pour justifier ses prétentions. Elle feint d'ignorer que le citoyen Herman, sur la récommandation d'un *Congrès Belge*, a été adjoint au Conseil Général et n'y représente nullement une section liégeoise.\*

3) Au refus par le Conseil Général d'admettre le passage suivant des « Statuts de la Section etc. » :

« Tout membre de la section s'engage à n'accepter aucune délégation du Conseil Général autre que de sa section ».

la Section répond :

« Nous nous bornerons à répondre que notre règlement nous est particulier; nos conventions ne concernant et ne regardant que nous et cette prétention ne contredit en rien aux Statuts généraux qui sont muets à cet égard. »

Il semble difficile de comprendre comment des Statuts qui sont muets sur le droit de délégation au Conseil Général, pourraient être éloquents sur les conditions de cette délégation. Mais ce qui est plus facile à comprendre, c'est que les règlements particuliers d'une section lui soient particuliers. Néanmoins, on ne peut pas admettre que les règlements particuliers d'une section « ne concernent et ne regardent qu'elle. »<sup>294</sup> Car, par exemple, l'article 11 du règlement de la « Section française de 1871 » étant admis par le Conseil Général, ce dernier serait forcé de l'admettre dans les règlements de toute autre section et, en se généralisant, cet article annulerait entièrement le droit d'adjonction, conféré au Conseil par les Statuts Généraux.<sup>295</sup>

Par ces raisons :

1) Le Conseil Général maintient purement et simplement ses résolutions du 17 octobre 1871.<sup>296</sup>

\* The second MS continues as follows: « quoi qu'il en soit membre. »—Ed.

II) Dans le cas où ces Résolutions ne seraient pas acceptées lors de la séance du Conseil du 21 novembre, ses secrétaires correspondants seront chargés de communiquer aux Conseils ou Comités fédéraux des différents pays, etc., à leur défaut, aux groupes locaux, les « Statuts de la Section française de 1871 », le mandat des délégués de ladite Section, communiquée au Conseil Général dans sa séance du 17 octobre, les Résolutions du Conseil Général du 17 octobre, la réponse de la « Section française de 1871 », communiquée au Conseil Général dans sa séance du 31 octobre, et ces Résolutions finales du Conseil Général du 7 novembre.

Londres, le 7 novembre, 1871

Au nom et par ordre  
du Conseil Général<sup>297</sup>

Written by Marx

Printed in the original  
for the first time

---

STATEMENT SENT BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE EDITORS OF *FRANKFURTER ZEITUNG*  
*UND HANDELSBLATT*<sup>298</sup>

On page 2 of *Frankfurter Zeitung*, No. 326, is a report, dated *London*, November 18, which runs as follows:

"At its last meeting the London section of the *International* passed the following resolution: 'The outstanding services of Sir Charles Dilke to the people's cause give him the right to recognition by the people; therefore he is invited to accept the title of honorary member of the international working men's union.' At an earlier meeting Kossuth was elected member."

The *International* does not recognise any honorary membership. In all probability the above-mentioned decision relates to a small London society, which first called itself "The International Democratic Association" and later changed its name to "The Universal Republican League".<sup>299</sup> It has no connection whatsoever with the *International*.

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

Corresponding Secretary for Germany,  
**KARL MARX**

Written by Marx  
on November 24, 1871

Published in *Frankfurter*  
*Zeitung und Handelsblatt*  
No. 333, November 28, 1871

Translated from  
the newspaper

---

ALLA REDAZIONE DEL *PROLETARIO ITALIANO*\*300

Cittadini,

Nel vostro No. 39 si trova una dichiarazione di operai Torinesi, ove si legge:

“Dichiariamo al pubblico che la decisione del Gran Consiglio di Londra di posporre il socialismo alla politica venne a noi comunicata dalla Redazione del *Proletario* appena emanata e che tal decisione non rivestì carattere ufficiale perchè di bel nuovo ritratta dal Gran Consiglio attesochè molte Associazioni Europee l'avrebbero in massa respinta come si sarebbe operato anche da noi.”

Quest'asserzione obbliga il Consiglio Generale di dichiarare:

- 1) Che giammai esso non ha preso alcuna decisione di posporre il socialismo alla politica,
- 2) Che dunque non può aver ritirata cotale decisione,
- 3) Che nessuna associazione Europea od Americana ha potuto respingere cotale decisione, nè ha respinta qualunque altra decisione del Consiglio Generale.

La posizione del Consiglio Generale in riguardo all' azione politica del proletariato è assai definita.

E definita:

- 1) Negli statuti generali i quali dicono nel quarto *Considerando*: “Che l'emancipazione economica della classe operaia è il grande scopo cui ogni movimento politico deve essere subordinato come mezzo.”\*\*

---

\* See Appendix, pp. 501-03.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 420 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

2) Pel testo dell'Indirizzo Inaugurale dell'Associazione (1864), commentario ufficiale ed obbligatorio degli Statuti, che dice:

"I signori delle terre ed i signori del capitale si serviranno sempre di loro privilegi politici per difendere e perpetuare i loro monopoli economici. Ben lungi dallo spingere all'emancipazione del lavoro, continueranno ad opporvi tutti gli ostacoli possibili... La conquista del potere politico è dunque divenuta il primo dovere della classe operaja."<sup>301</sup>

3) Pella risoluzione del Congresso di Losanna (1867) a quest'effetto: L'emancipazione sociale degli operaj è inseparabile dalla loro emancipazione politica.<sup>302</sup>

4) Pella risoluzione IX della Conferenza di Londra (Settembre 1871) la quale in armonia con ciò che precede ricorda ai membri dell'Internazionale che nello stato militante della classe operaja, il suo movimento economico e la sua azione politica sono indissolubilmente uniti.<sup>303</sup>

La condotta così prescritta al Consiglio, esso l'ha sempre seguita e la seguirà nel venturo. Dichiara dunque falsa e calunniosa la suddetta comunicazione fatta, non si sa da chi, alla Redazione del *Proletario*.

Per ordine ed in nome del Consiglio Generale

Il Segr. per l'Italia,

F. E.

P.S. Ricevo all'istante la *Révolution Sociale*<sup>304</sup> di Ginevra la quale dice che un piccolo gruppo del Jura ha respinto le decisioni della Conferenza di Londra.\* Nessuna comunicazione ufficiale ne è stata fatta al Consiglio Generale. Tosto che l'avrà ricevuto, prenderà le misure necessarie.

29 November 1871

Written by Engels in Italian

Published in the original  
for the first time

\* See p. 43 of the present volume.—Ed.

---

**CREDENTIALS FOR GIUSEPPE BORIANI\*305**

li 30 Novembre 1871

Il Cittadino Giuseppe Boriani è ammesso Membro dell'Associazione Internazionale degli Operai ed è autorizzato ad ammettere nuovi membri ed a formare nuove sezioni, sotto la condizione che egli, ed i membri e le sezioni da ammettersi, riconoscano come obbligatorii gli atti ufficiali dell'Associazione, cioè:

Gli Statuti Generali e Regolamenti Amministrativi,  
L'Indirizzo Inaugurale,  
Le Risoluzioni dei Congressi,  
Le Risoluzioni della Conferenza di Londra, Settembre 1871.

Per ordine ed in nome del Consiglio Generale

Il Segretario per l'Italia,

**FEDERICO ENGELS**

Written by Engels in Italian

Published in the original  
for the first time

---

\* See Appendix, p. 504—Ed.

---

DECLARATION SENT BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE EDITORS OF ITALIAN NEWSPAPERS  
CONCERNING MAZZINI'S ARTICLES ABOUT  
THE INTERNATIONAL<sup>306</sup>

International Working Men's Association,  
256, High Holborn, London,  
December 6, 1871

**TO THE EDITOR OF *LA ROMA DEL POPOLO***

Dear Sir,

I count on you having the honesty to publish the enclosed declaration. If we are going to fight, let's fight honestly.

Yours most respectfully,

*F. ENGELS*  
*General Council Secretary for Italy*  
International Working Men's Association,

**TO THE EDITORS OF *LA ROMA DEL POPOLO***

In number 38 of *La Roma del Popolo* Citizen Giuseppe Mazzini publishes the first of a series of articles entitled "Documents about the International". Mazzini notifies the public:

"I ... have gathered from all the sources I was able to refer to all its resolutions, all the spoken and written declarations of its influential members."

And these are the documents he intends publishing. He begins by giving two samples.

1) "The abstention" (from political action) "went so far that some of the French founders [of the International] promised Louis Napoleon that they would renounce all political action provided he grant the workers I don't know what sum of material aid."

We defy Citizen Mazzini to prove this assertion which we regard as false.

2) "In a speech at the Berne Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom in 1868, Bakunin said: 'I want the equalisation of individuals and classes: without this an idea of justice is impossible and peace will not be established. The worker must no longer be deceived with lengthy speeches. *He must be told what he ought to want, if he doesn't know himself.* I'm a collectivist, not a communist, and if I demand the abolition of inheritance rights, I do so to arrive at social equality more quickly'."

Whether Citizen Bakunin pronounced these words or not is quite immaterial for us. What is important for the General Council of the International Working Men's Association to establish is:

a) that these words, as Mazzini himself asserts, were spoken at a congress not of the International but of the bourgeois League of Peace and Freedom;

b) that the International congress, which met at Brussels in September 1868, disavowed this same congress of the League of Peace and Freedom by a special vote<sup>307</sup>;

c) that when Citizen Bakunin pronounced these words, *he was not even a member of the International*;

d) that the General Council has always opposed the repeated attempts to substitute for the broad, comprehensive programme of the International Working Men's Association (which has made membership open to Bakunin's followers) Bakunin's narrow and sectarian programme, the adoption of which would automatically entail the exclusion of the vast majority of members of the International;

e) that the International can therefore in no way accept responsibility for the acts and declarations of Citizen Bakunin.

As for the other documents about the International, which Citizen Mazzini intends to publish shortly, the General Council hereby declares that it is only responsible for its official documents.

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

Secretary for Italy,  
**FREDERICK ENGELS**

Published in the newspapers  
*La Plebe* No. 144, December 12,  
1871, *Gazzettino Rosa* No. 345,  
December 12, 1871, and *La Roma*  
*del Popolo* No. 43, December 21, 1871

Translated from *La Roma del*  
*Popolo* and verified  
with Engels's MS in Italian  
and French

---

LETTER TO THE EDITORS OF *GAZZETTINO ROSA*<sup>308</sup>

International Working Men's Association  
256, High Holborn, London, W. C.  
February 7

TO THE EDITOR OF *GAZZETTINO ROSA*

Citizen,

For some months now the Florentine newspaper *Liberò Pensiero* has been attacking the International, as if the great Working Men's Association could possibly be a rival to the society of rationalist prebendaries whose interests this newspaper stands up for. Up to now I have felt it unnecessary to answer these attacks, but when the same paper sinks so low as to spread in Italy the libellous fabrications of the Bismarckian press against the International and its General Council, the time has come to protest. I have therefore addressed the following letter to *Liberò Pensiero* which I beg you to publish in the *Gazzettino Rosa* too.

Greetings and fraternity.

F. ENGELS,  
General Council Secretary for Italy

TO MR. LUIGI STEFANONI, EDITOR OF *LIBERÒ PENSIERO*

Dear Sir,

In No. I of *Liberò Pensiero*, for January 4, 1872, is an article entitled "The International and the Supreme Council

of London" about which I would like to say a few words.

The article contains the following query:

"We should very much like to know by what authority Mr. Engels claims to represent Italy."

I have not, and have never had, any claim to represent Italy. I have the honour of being the secretary at the General Council specially entrusted with correspondence with Italy, in fulfilling which function my duty is to represent the Council and not Italy.

The article continues with some London reports from the Berlin newspaper *Neuer Social-Demokrat*<sup>309</sup> which are full of the most malicious calumnies against the General Council and the International as a whole. I shall not reply to them. There is no point in arguing with such a newspaper. The *Neuer Social-Demokrat* is well known throughout Germany as a newspaper financed by Bismarck, and the organ of Prussian government socialism. If you require more exact information about the newspaper, write to your Leipzig correspondent Liebknecht, and he will doubtless be able to provide you with plenty. I merely venture to add that if you are so interested in similar calumnies against the International you will find them by the thousand in *Figaro*, *Gaulois*, *Petit-Journal*, and the rest of the Parisian *demi-monde* press, in the London *Standard*, in the *Journal de Genève*, the Vienna *Tages-Presse* or the *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, authorities which will enable you to dispense with quoting that poor wretch Schneider.

A note by the editors runs as follows:

"Perhaps this is an allusion to the secret communist society formed by Karl Marx in Cologne in 1850; as usual in such cases, when it was discovered many poor wretches fell into the hands of the Prussian police while the ringleaders escaped to London."

Whoever said such things is a liar. I was a member of the society in question.<sup>310</sup> It was not founded by Marx, or in 1850 or in Cologne. It was already in existence ten years

earlier. Marx and I had been in England for a year, having emigrated there because of persecution by the Prussian Government, when the Cologne section fell into the hands of the police due to its own imprudence. If you would like further details you can apply to Messrs. Becker, Mayor of Dortmund and member of the Prussian and German parliaments; Klein, doctor and town councillor in Cologne; Bürgers, editor of *Wiesbadener Zeitung*<sup>311</sup>; and Lessner, tailor and member of the General Council of the International in London. All of them were convicted in this case against the communists.<sup>312</sup>

Please be so kind as to publish this refutation in your next issue.

Yours most respectfully,

*FREDERICK ENGELS*

Published in *Gazzettino Rosa*  
No. 50, February 20, 1872

Translated from  
the newspaper

---

## FICTITIOUS SPLITS IN THE INTERNATIONAL

PRIVATE CIRCULAR FROM THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>313</sup>

Until now the General Council has completely refrained from any interference in the International's internal squabbles and has never replied publicly to the overt attacks launched against it during more than two years by some members of the Association.

But if the persistent efforts of certain meddlers to deliberately maintain confusion between the International and a society\* which has been hostile to it since its origin allowed the General Council to maintain this reserve, the support which European reaction finds in the scandals provoked by that society at a time when the International is undergoing the most serious trial since its foundation obliges it to present a historical review of all these intrigues.

### I

After the fall of the Paris Commune, the General Council's first act was to publish its Address on *The Civil War in France* in which it came out in support of all the Commune's acts which, at the moment, served the bourgeoisie, the press and all the governments of Europe as an excuse to heap the most vile slander on the vanquished

---

\* International Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—*Ed.*

Parisians. Within the working class itself some still failed to realise that their cause was lost. The Council came to understand the fact, among other things, by the resignation of two of its members, Citizens Odger and Lucraft, who repudiated all support of the Address. It may be said that the unity of views among the working class regarding the Paris events dates from the publication of the Address in all the civilised countries.

On the other hand, the International found a very powerful means of propaganda in the bourgeois press and particularly in the leading English newspapers, which the Address forced to engage in the polemic kept going by the General Council's replies.<sup>314</sup>

The arrival in London of numerous refugees from the Commune made it necessary for the General Council to constitute itself as a Relief Committee and function as such for more than eight months, besides carrying on its regular duties.<sup>315</sup> It goes without saying that the vanquished and exiles from the Commune had nothing to hope for from the bourgeoisie. As for the working class, the appeals for aid came at a difficult moment. Switzerland and Belgium had already received their contingent of refugees whom they had either to support or send on to London. The funds collected in Germany, Austria and Spain were sent to Switzerland. In England, the big fight for the nine-hour working day, the decisive battle of which was fought at Newcastle,<sup>316</sup> had exhausted both the workers' individual contributions and the funds set up by the Trades Unions, which could be used, incidentally, according to the rules, only for labour conflicts. Meanwhile, by working diligently and sending out letters, the Council managed to accumulate, bit by bit, the money which it distributed weekly. The American workers responded more generously to its appeal. It is unfortunate that the Council could not avail itself of the millions which the terrified bourgeoisie believed the International to have amassed in its safes!

After May 1871, some of the Commune's refugees were asked to join the Council, in which, as a result of the war, the French side was no longer represented. Among the new members were some old Internationalists and a minority composed of men known for their revolutionary energy whose election was an act of homage to the Paris Commune.<sup>317</sup>

Along with all these preoccupations, the Council had to prepare for the Conference of Delegates that it had just called.<sup>318</sup>

The violent measures taken by the Bonapartist government against the International had prevented the holding of the Congress at Paris, which had been provided for by a resolution of the Basle Congress. Using the right conferred upon it by Article 4 of the Rules, the General Council, in its circular of July 12, 1870, convened the Congress at Mainz.<sup>319</sup> In letters addressed at the same time to the various federations, it proposed that the General Council should transfer its seat from England to another country and asked that the delegates be provided with definite mandates to that effect. The federations unanimously insisted that it should remain in London.<sup>320</sup> The Franco-Prussian war which began a few days later made it necessary to abandon any plans for convening the Congress. It was then that the federations which we consulted authorised us to fix the date of the next Congress as may be dictated by the political situation.

As soon as the political situation permitted, the General Council called a private Conference, acting on the precedents of the 1865 Conference<sup>321</sup> and the private administrative meetings of each Congress. A public Congress was impossible and could only have resulted in the continental delegates being denounced at a moment when European reaction was celebrating its orgies; when Jules Favre was demanding from all governments, even the British, the extradition of refugees as common criminals; when Dufaure

was proposing to the Rural Assembly a law banning the International,<sup>322</sup> a hypocritical counterfeit of which was later presented by Malou to the Belgians; when, in Switzerland, a Commune refugee was put under preventative arrest while awaiting the federal government's decision on the extradition order; when hunting down members of the International was the ostensible basis for an alliance between Beust and Bismarck, whose anti-International clause Victor-Emmanuel was quick to adopt; when the Spanish Government, putting itself entirely at the disposal of the butchers of Versailles, was forcing the Madrid Federal Council to seek refuge in Portugal<sup>323</sup>; at a time, lastly, when the International's prime duty was to strengthen its organisation and to accept the gauntlet thrown down by the governments.

All sections in regular contact with the General Council were invited in good time to the Conference, which, even though it was not to be a public meeting, nevertheless faced serious difficulties. In view of the internal situation France was, of course, unable to elect any delegates. In Italy, the only organised section at the time was that of Naples; but just as it was about to nominate a delegate it was broken up by the army. In Austria and Hungary, the most active members were imprisoned. In Germany, some of the more well-known members were persecuted for the crime of high treason, others landed in gaol, and the party's funds were spent on aid to their families.<sup>324</sup> The Americans, though they sent the Conference a detailed Memorandum on the situation of the International there,<sup>325</sup> employed the delegation's money for maintaining the refugees. All federations, in fact, recognised the necessity of substituting the private Conference for a public Congress.

After meeting in London from September 17 to 23, 1871, the Conference authorised the General Council to publish its resolutions; to codify the Administrative Regulations

and publish them with the General Rules, as reviewed and corrected, in three languages; to carry out the resolution to replace membership cards with stamps; to reorganise the International in England<sup>326</sup>; and, lastly, to provide the necessary money for these various purposes.

Following the publication of the Conference proceedings, the reactionary press of Paris and Moscow, of London and New York, denounced the resolution on working-class policy<sup>327</sup> as containing such dangerous designs—the *Times* accused it “of coolly calculated audacity”—that it was to outlaw the International with all possible speed. On the other hand, the resolution that dealt a blow at the fraudulent sectarian sections<sup>328</sup> gave the international police a long-awaited excuse to start a noisy campaign ostensibly for the unrestricted autonomy of the workers whom it professed to protect against the despicable despotism of the General Council and the Conference. The working class felt itself so “heavily oppressed”, indeed, that the General Council received from Europe, America, Australia and even the East Indies, reports regarding the admission of new members and the formation of new sections.

## II

The denunciations in the bourgeois press, like the lamentations of the international police, found a sympathetic echo even in our Association. Some intrigues, directed ostensibly against the General Council but in reality against the Association, were hatched in its midst. At the bottom of these intrigues was the inevitable *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, fathered by the Russian Mikhail Bakunin. On his return from Siberia, the latter began to write in Herzen's *Kolokol* preaching the ideas of Pan-Slavism and racial war,<sup>329</sup> conceived out of his long experience. Later, during his stay in Switzerland, he was

nominated to head the steering Committee of the League of Peace and Freedom founded in opposition to the International. When this bourgeois society's affairs went from bad to worse, its president, Mr. G. Vogt, acting on Bakunin's advice, proposed to the International's Congress which met at Brussels in September 1868 to conclude an alliance with the League. The Congress unanimously proposed two alternatives: either the League should follow the same goal as the International, in which case it would have no reason for existing; or else its goal should be different, in which case an alliance would be impossible. At the League's Congress held in Berne a few days after, Bakunin made an about face. He proposed a makeshift programme whose scientific value may be judged by this single phrase: "*economic and social equalisation of classes*."<sup>330</sup> Backed by an insignificant minority, he broke with the League in order to join the International, determined to replace the International's General Rules by the makeshift programme, which had been rejected by the League, and to replace the General Council by his personal dictatorship. To this end, he created a special instrument, the *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, intended to become an International within the International.

Bakunin found the necessary elements for the formation of this society in the relationships he had formed during his stay in Italy, and in a small group of Russian emigrants, serving him as emissaries and recruiting officers among members of the International in Switzerland, France and Spain. Yet it was only after repeated refusals of the Belgian and Paris Federal Councils to recognise the *Alliance* that he decided to submit for the General Council's approval his new society's rules, which were nothing but a faithful reproduction of the "misunderstood" Berne programme. The Council replied by the following circular dated December 22, 1868<sup>331</sup>:

THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE  
OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

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

The programme and rules published by this Initiative Committee were communicated to the General Council of the International Working Men's Association only on December 15, 1868. According to these documents, the said Alliance is "absorbed entirely in the International", at the same time as it is established entirely outside the Association. Besides the General Council of the *International*, elected successively at the Geneva, Lausanne and Brussels congresses, there is to be, in line with the rules drawn up by the Initiative Committee, another General Council in Geneva, which is self-appointed. Besides the local groups of the *International*, there are to be local groups of the *Alliance*, which through their national bureaus, operating independently of the national bureaus of the *International*, "*will ask the Central Bureau of the Alliance to admit them into the International*"; the *Alliance* Central Committee thereby takes upon itself the right of admittance to the *International*. Lastly, the *General Congress of the International Working Men's Association* will have its counterpart in the *General Congress of the Alliance*, for, as the rules of the Initiative Committee state, at the annual working men's congress the delegation of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, as a branch of the International Working Men's Association, "*will hold its meetings in a separate building*".

Considering,  
that the existence of a second international body operating within and outside the International Working Men's

Association would be the surest means of its disorganisation;

that every other group of individuals, anywhere, would have the right to imitate the Geneva initiative group, and, under more or less plausible excuses, to bring into the International Working Men's Association other international associations with other special missions;

that the International Working Men's Association would thereby soon become a plaything of any meddlers of whatever nationality or party;

that the Rules of the International Working Men's Association furthermore admit only local and national branches into its membership (see Article I and Article VI of the Rules);

that sections of the International Working Men's Association are forbidden to adopt rules or administrative regulations contrary to the Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Association (see Article XII of the Administrative Regulations);

that the Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Working Men's Association can be revised by the General Congress only, provided two-thirds of the delegates present vote in favour of such a revision (see Article XIII of the Administrative Regulations);

that a decision on this question is already contained in the resolutions against the *League of Peace*, unanimously passed at the General Congress in Brussels;

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

that a number of members of the Geneva initiative group of the Alliance, as delegates to the Brussels Congress, had voted for these resolutions;

The General Council of the International Working Men's

Association unanimously resolved at its meeting of December 22, 1868, that:

1) All articles of the rules of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, defining its relations with the International Working Men's Association, are declared null and void;

2) The International Alliance of Socialist Democracy may not be admitted as a branch of the International Working Men's Association.

G. ODGER, Chairman of the meeting  
R. SHAW, General Secretary

London, December 22, 1868

A few months later, the Alliance again appealed to the General Council and asked whether, *yes or no*, it accepted its *principles*. If yes, the Alliance was ready to dissolve itself into the International's sections. It received a reply in the following circular of March 9, 1869<sup>332</sup>:

THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE  
OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

According to Article 1 of our Rules, the Association admits all working men's societies aiming at the same end, viz., the *mutual protection, progress and complete emancipation of the working class*.

The sections of the working class in the various countries finding themselves in different conditions of development, it follows necessarily that their theoretical opinions, which reflect the real movement, should also differ.

The community of action, however, established by the International Working Men's Association, the exchange of

ideas facilitated by the public organs of the different national sections, and, lastly, the direct debates at the General Congresses, are sure gradually to engender a common theoretical programme.

Consequently, it is not the function of the General Council to *subject the programme of the Alliance to a critical examination*. We have not to inquire whether, *yes or no*, it is an adequate expression of the proletarian movement. All we have to establish is whether it may contain anything contrary to the *general tendency* of our Association, that is, *the complete emancipation of the working class*. There is one sentence in your programme which fails in this respect. Article 2 reads:

"It (Alliance) aims above all at the *political, economical, and social equalisation of classes*."

The *equalisation of classes*, literally interpreted, means *harmony between Capital and Labour* so persistently preached by the bourgeois socialists. It is not the logically impossible *equalisation of classes*, but on the contrary the *abolition of classes*, this true secret of the proletarian movement, which forms the great aim of the *International Working Men's Association*.

Considering, however, the context, in which the phrase *equalisation of classes* occurs, it seems to be a mere slip of the pen. The General Council feels confident that you will be anxious to remove from your programme a phrase which may give rise to such dangerous misunderstandings. The principles of our Association permit every section freely to shape its own theoretical programme, except in cases when the general policy of our Association is contradicted.

There exists, therefore, no obstacle to the *transformation* of the sections of the Alliance into sections of the *International Working Men's Association*.

The *dissolution of the Alliance*, and the *entrance of its sections into the International* once settled, it would, accord-

ing to our Regulations, become necessary *to inform the Council of the seat and the numerical strength of each new section.*

*Meeting of the General Council  
on March 9, 1869*

Having accepted these conditions, the Alliance was admitted to the International by the General Council, misled by certain signatures affixed to Bakunin's programme and supposing it recognised by the Romance Federal Committee in Geneva which, on the contrary, had always refused to have any dealings with it. Thus, it had achieved its immediate goal: to be represented at the Basle Congress. Despite the dishonest means employed by his supporters, means used on this and solely on this occasion, in an International Congress, Bakunin was deceived in his expectation of seeing the Congress transfer the seat of the General Council to Geneva and give an official sanction to the old Saint-Simon rubbish, to the immediate abolition of hereditary rights which he had made the practical point of departure of socialism. This was the signal for the open and incessant war which the Alliance waged not only against the General Council but also against all International sections which refused to adopt this sectarian clique's programme and particularly the doctrine of total abstention from politics.

Even before the Basle Congress, when Nechayev came to Geneva, Bakunin got together with him and founded, in Russia, a secret society among students. Always hiding his true identity under the name of various "revolutionary committees", he sought autocratic powers based on all the tricks and mystifications of the time of Cagliostro. The main means of propaganda used by this society consisted in compromising innocent people in the eyes of the Russian police by sending them communications from Geneva in yellow envelopes stamped in Russian on the outside "secret revolutionary committee". The published accounts of the

Nechayev trial bear witness to the infamous abuse of the *International's* name.\*

The Alliance commenced at this time a public polemic directed against the General Council, first in the *Locle Progrès*,<sup>334</sup> then in the Geneva *Égalité*, the official newspaper of the Romance Federation, where several members of the Alliance had followed Bakunin. The General Council, which had scorned the attacks published in the *Progrès*, Bakunin's personal organ, could not ignore those from the *Égalité*, which it was bound to believe were approved by the Romance Federal Committee. It therefore published the circular of January 1, 1870<sup>335</sup> which said:

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

“It is *certain* that the General Council is neglecting extremely important matters. We remind it of its obligations under Article 1 of the Regulations: The General Council is *under obligation* to carry the resolutions of the Congress into effect, etc. We could put enough questions to the General Council for its replies to make up quite a long report. They will come later. . . . Meanwhile, etc. . . .”

The General Council does not know of any article, either in the Rules, or the Regulations, which obliges it to enter into correspondence or into polemic with the *Égalité* or to provide “answers to questions” from newspapers. Only the Federal Committee in Geneva represents the branches of French Switzerland vis-à-vis the General Council. When the Federal Committee sends us requests or reprimands by the only legitimate means, i.e., through its secretary, the General Council will always be ready to reply. But the Federal Committee has no right either to abdicate its functions in favour of the *Égalité* and *Progrès*, or to let these newspapers usurp its functions. Generally speaking, the General Council's administrative correspondence with

---

\* An extract from the Nechayev trial will be published shortly.<sup>333</sup> The reader will find there a sample of the maxims, both stupid and infamous, which Bakunin's friends have laid at the door of the *International*.

national and local committees cannot be published without greatly prejudicing the Association's general interests. Consequently, if the other organs of the International were to follow the example of the *Progrès* and *Égalité*, the General Council would be faced with the alternative of either discrediting itself publicly by remaining silent or violating its obligations by replying publicly. The *Égalité* joined the *Progrès* in inviting the *Travail* (Paris paper)<sup>336</sup> to denounce, in its turn, the General Council. Which makes it akin to a League of Public Welfare.<sup>337</sup>

Meanwhile, before having read this circular, the Romance Federal Committee had already expelled supporters of the Alliance from the editorial board of the *Égalité*.

The January 1, 1870 circular, like those of December 22, 1868 and March 9, 1869, was approved by all International sections.

It goes without saying that none of the conditions accepted by the Alliance have ever been fulfilled. Its sham sections have remained a mystery to the General Council. Bakunin sought to retain under his personal direction the few groups scattered in Spain and Italy and the Naples section which he had detached from the International. In the other Italian towns he corresponded with small cliques composed not of workers but of lawyers, journalists and other bourgeois doctrinaires. At Barcelona some of his friends maintained his influence. In some towns in the South of France the Alliance made an effort to found separatist sections under the direction of Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc, of Lyons, about whom we shall have more to say later. In a word, the international society within the International continued to operate.

The big blow—the attempt to take over the leadership of French Switzerland—was to have been executed by the Alliance at the Chaux-de-Fonds Congress, opened on April 4, 1870.

The battle began over the right to admit the Alliance

delegates, which was contested by the delegates of the Geneva Federation and the Chaux-de-Fonds sections.

Although, on their own calculation, the Alliance supporters represented no more than a fifth of the Federation members, they succeeded, thanks to repetition of the Basle manoeuvres, to procure a fictitious majority of one or two votes, a majority which, in the words of their own organ (see the *Solidarité*<sup>338</sup> of May 7, 1870), represented no more than *fifteen* sections, while in Geneva alone there were thirty! On this vote, the French-Switzerland Congress split into two groups which continued their meetings independently. The Alliance supporters, considering themselves the legal representatives of the whole of the Federation, transferred the Federal Committee's seat to Chaux-de-Fonds and founded at Neuchâtel their official organ, the *Solidarité*, edited by Citizen Guillaume. This young writer had the special job of decrying the Geneva "factory workers",<sup>339</sup> those odious "bourgeois", of waging war on the *Égalité*, the Federation newspaper, and of preaching total abstention from politics. The authors of the most important articles on this theme were Bastelica in Marseilles, and Albert Richad and Gaspard Blanc in Lyons, the two big pillars of the Alliance.

On their return, the Geneva delegates convened their sections in a general assembly which, despite opposition from Bakunin and his friends, approved their actions at the Chaux-de-Fonds Congress. A little later, Bakunin and the more active of his accomplices were expelled from the old Romance Federation.

Hardly had the Congress closed when the new Chaux-de-Fonds Committee called for the intervention of the General Council in a letter signed by F. Robert, secretary, and by Henri Chevalley, president, who was denounced two months later as a *thief* by the Committee's organ the *Solidarité* of July 9. After having examined the case of both sides, the General Council decided on June 28, 1870

to keep the Geneva Federal Committee in its old functions and invite the new Chaux-de-Fonds Federal Committee to take a local name.<sup>340</sup> In the face of this decision which foiled its plans, the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee denounced the General Council's *authoritarianism*, forgetting that it had been the first to ask for its intervention. The trouble that the persistent attempts of the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee to usurp the name of the Romance Federal Committee caused the Swiss Federation obliged the General Council to suspend all official relations with the former.

Louis Bonaparte had just surrendered his army at Sedan. From all sides arose protests from International members against the war's continuation. In its address of September 9, the General Council, denouncing Prussia's plans of conquest, indicated the danger of her triumph for the proletarian cause and warned the German workers that they would themselves be the first victims.<sup>341</sup> In England, the General Council organised meetings which condemned the pro-Prussian tendencies of the court. In Germany, the International workers organised demonstrations demanding recognition of the Republic and "an honourable peace for France". . . .

Meanwhile, his bellicose nature gave the hot-headed Guillaume (of Neuchâtel) the brilliant idea of publishing an *anonymous* manifesto as a supplement and under cover of the official newspaper *Solidarité*, calling for the formation of a Swiss volunteer corps to fight the Prussians, something which he had always been doubtlessly prevented from doing by his abstentionist convictions.<sup>342</sup>

Then came the Lyons uprising.<sup>343</sup> Bakunin rushed there and, supported by Albert Richard, Gaspard Blanc and Bastelica, installed himself on September 28 in the Town Hall, where he *refrained* from posting a guard, however, lest it would be viewed as a political act. He was driven out in shame by some of the National Guard at the moment

when, after a difficult accouchement, his decree on the *abolition of the State* had just seen the light of day.

In October 1870, the General Council, in the absence of its French members, co-opted Citizen Paul Robin, a refugee from Brest, one of the best-known supporters of the Alliance, and, what is more, the instigator of several attacks in the *Égalité* against the General Council where, since that moment, he acted constantly as official correspondent of the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee. On March 14, 1871, he suggested the calling of a private Conference of the International to sift out the Swiss trouble. Foreseeing that important events were in the making in Paris, the Council flatly refused. Robin returned to the question on several occasions and even suggested that the Council take a definite decision on the conflict. On July 25, the General Council decided that this affair would be one of the questions for the Conference due to be convened in September 1871.

On August 10, the Alliance, hardly eager to see its activities looked into by a Conference, declared itself dissolved as from the 6th of August.<sup>344</sup> But on September 15, it reappeared and requested admission to the Council under the name of the *Atheist Socialist Section*. According to Administrative Resolution No. V of the Basle Congress,<sup>345</sup> the Council could not admit it without consulting the Geneva Federal Committee, which was exhausted after its two years of struggle against the sectarian sections. Moreover, the Council had already told the Young Men's Christian Association that the International did not recognise theological sections.

On August 6, the date of the dissolution of the Alliance, the Chaux-de-Fonds Federal Committee renewed its request to enter into official relations with the Council and said that it would continue to ignore the June 28 resolution and to regard itself, in relation to Geneva, as the Romance Federal Committee, and "that it was up to the General Congress to judge this affair". On September 4, the same

Committee challenged the Conference's competence, even though it had been the first to call for its convocation. The Conference could have replied by questioning the competence of the Paris Federal Committee which the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee had requested before the siege of Paris to deliberate on the Swiss conflict.<sup>346</sup> But it confined itself to the General Council decision of June 28, 1870 (see the motives expounded in the *Égalité* of Geneva, October 21, 1871<sup>347</sup>).

### III

The presence in Switzerland of some of the outlawed French who had found refuge there put some life back into the Alliance.

The Geneva members of the International did all they could for the emigrants. They came to their aid right from the beginning, initiated a wide campaign and prevented the Swiss authorities from serving an extradition order on the refugees as demanded by the Versailles government. Several risked the grave danger by going to France to help the refugees to gain the frontier. Imagine the surprise of the Geneva workers when they saw several of the ringleaders such as B. Malon\* immediately come to an understanding

---

\* Do the friends of B. Malon, who have been advertising him in a stereotyped way for the last three months as *the founder of the International*, who have called his book<sup>348</sup> *the only independent work on the Commune*, know the attitude taken by this assistant of the Mayor of Batignolles on the eve of the February elections? At that time, B. Malon, who did not yet foresee the Commune and saw nothing more than the success of his election to the Assembly, plotted to get himself put on the list of the four committees as a member of the International. To these ends he insolently denied the existence of the Paris Federal Council and submitted to the committees the list of a section founded by himself at Batignolles as coming from the entire Association.—Later, on March 19, he insulted in a public document the leaders of the great Revolution accomplished on the

with the Alliance people and with the help of N. Zhukovsky, ex-Secretary of the Alliance, try to found at Geneva, outside of the Romance Federation, the new "Socialist Revolutionary Propaganda and Action Section".<sup>349</sup> In the first article of its rules it

"pledges allegiance to the General Rules of the International Working Men's Association, *while reserving for itself the complete freedom of action* and initiative to which it is entitled as a logical consequence of the principle of autonomy and federation recognised by the Rules and *Congresses of the Association*".

In other words, it reserves for itself full freedom to continue the work of the Alliance.

In a letter from Malon, of October 20, 1871, this new section for the third time asked the General Council for admission into the International. Conforming to Resolution V of the Basle Congress, the Council consulted the Geneva Federal Committee which vigorously protested against the Council recognising this new "seedbed of intrigues and dissensions". The Council acted, in fact, in a rather "authoritarian" manner so as not to bind the whole Federation to the will of B. Malon and N. Zhukovsky, the Alliance's ex-secretary.

The *Solidarité* having gone out of business, the new Alliance supporters founded the *Révolution Sociale*<sup>350</sup> under the supreme management of Madame André Léo who had just said at the Lausanne Peace Congress that

"Raoul Rigault and Ferré were the two sinister figures of the Commune who, up till then (up till the execution of the hostages), had not stopped calling for bloody measures, albeit in vain".<sup>351</sup>

---

eve.—Today, this anarchist from top to toe prints or has printed what he was saying a year ago to the four committees: I am the International! B. Malon has hit on a way of parodying Louis XIV and Perron the chocolate manufacturer at one and the same time. It was Perron who declared that his chocolate was the *only* edible chocolate!

From its very first issue, the newspaper hastened to put itself on the same level as the *Figaro*, *Gaulois*, *Paris-Journal*<sup>352</sup> and other disreputable sheets which have been throwing mud at the General Council. It thought the moment opportune to fan the flames of national hatred, even within the International. It called the General Council a German Committee led by a Bismarckian brain.\*

After having definitely established that certain General Council members could not boast of being "*Gauls first and foremost*" the *Révolution Sociale* could find nothing better than to take up the second slogan put in circulation by the European police and to denounce the Council's *authoritarianism*.

What, then, were the facts on which this childish rubbish rested? The General Council had let the Alliance die a natural death and, in accord with the Geneva Federal Committee, had prevented it from being resurrected. Moreover, it had suggested to the Chaux-de-Fonds Committee to take a name which would permit it to live in peace with the great majority of International members in French Switzerland.

Apart from these "authoritarian" acts, what use did the General Council make, between October 1869 and October 1871, of the fairly extensive powers that the Basle Congress had conferred upon it?

1) On February 8, 1870, the Paris "Society of Positivist Proletarians" applied to the General Council for admission. The Council replied that the principles of the positivists, the part of the society's special rules concerning capital, were in flagrant contradiction with the preamble of the General Rules; that the society had therefore to drop them and join the International not as "positivists" but as "prole-

---

\* Here is the national composition of the Council: 20 Englishmen, 15 French, 7 Germans (of whom five are foundation members of the International), 2 Swiss, 2 Hungarians, 1 Pole, 1 Belgian, 1 Irishman, 1 Dane and 1 Italian.

tarians", while remaining free to reconcile their theoretical ideas with the Association's general principles. Realising the justness of this decision, the section joined the International.

2) At Lyons, there was a split between the 1865 section and a recently-formed section in which, amidst honest workers, the Alliance was represented by Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc. As had been done in similar cases, the judgement of a court of arbitration, formed in Switzerland, was turned down. On February 15, 1870, the recently-formed section, besides requesting the General Council to resolve the conflict by virtue of Resolution VII of the Basle Congress, sent it a ready-made resolution excluding and branding the members of the 1865 section, which was to be signed and sent back by *return mail*. The Council condemned this unprecedented procedure and demanded that the necessary documents be produced. In reply to the same request, the 1865 section said that the accusatory documents against Albert Richard, which had been submitted to the court of arbitration, were in Bakunin's possession and that he refused to give them up. Consequently, it could not completely satisfy the desires of the General Council. The Council's decision on the affair, dated March 8, met with no objection from either side.

3) The French branch in London, which had admitted people of a more than dubious character, had been gradually transformed into a concern virtually controlled by Mr. Félix Pyat. He used it to organise damaging demonstrations calling for the assassination of Louis Bonaparte, etc., and to spread his absurd manifestos in France under cover of the International. The General Council confined itself to declaring in the Association's organs that Mr. Pyat was not a member of the International and it could not be responsible for his actions. The French branch then declared that it no longer recognised either the General Council or the Congresses; it plastered the walls of London with bills

proclaiming that with the exception of itself the International was an anti-revolutionary society. The arrest of French members of the International on the eve of the plebiscite, on the pretext of a conspiracy, plotted in reality by the police and to which Pyat's manifestos gave an air of credibility, forced the General Council to publish in the *Marseillaise* and *Réveil* its resolution of May 10, 1870, declaring that the so-called French branch had not belonged to the International for over two years, and that its agitation was the work of police agents.<sup>353</sup> The need for this *démarche* was proved by the declaration of the Paris Federal Committee, published in the same newspapers, and by that of the Paris members of the International during their trial, both declarations referring to the Council's resolution. The French branch disappeared at the outbreak of the war, but, like the Alliance in Switzerland, it was to reappear in London with new allies and under other names.

During the last days of the Conference, a "French Section of 1871", about 35 members strong, was formed in London among the Commune refugees. The first "authoritarian" act of the General Council was to publicly denounce the secretary of this section, Gustave Durand, as a French police spy.<sup>354</sup> The documents in our possession prove the intention of the police to assist Durand, firstly, to attend the Conference and then to secure for him membership in the General Council. Since the rules of the new section directed its members "not to accept any delegation to the General Council other than from its section", Citizens Theisz and Bastelica withdrew from the Council.

On October 17, the section delegated to the Council two of its members, holding imperative mandates; one was none other than Mr. Chautard, ex-member of the artillery committee. The Council refused to admit them prior to an examination of the rules of the "1871 section".\* Suffice it

\* A little later, this Chautard whom they had wanted to put on the General Council was expelled from the section as an agent of

to recall here the principal points of the debate to which these rules gave rise. Article 2 states:

"To be admitted as member of the section, a person must provide information as to his means of sustenance, present guarantees of morality, etc."

In its resolution of October 17, 1871, the Council proposed deleting the words "*provide information as to his means of sustenance*". "In dubious cases," said the Council, "a section may well take information about means of sustenance as 'guarantee of morality', while in other cases, like those of the refugees, workers on strike, etc., absence of means of sustenance may well be a guarantee of morality. But to ask candidates to provide information as to their means of sustenance as a general condition to be admitted to the International, would be a bourgeois innovation contrary to the spirit and letter of the General Rules." The section replied:

"The General Rules make the sections responsible for the morality of their members and, as a consequence, recognise their right to demand such guarantees *as they deem necessary*."

To this the General Council replied, November 7: "On this argument, a section of the International founded by *teetotallers* could include in its own rules this type of article: To be admitted as member of the section, a person must swear to abstain from all alcoholic drinks. In other words, the most absurd and most incongruous conditions of admittance into the International could be imposed by sections' rules, always on the pretext that they intend, in this way, to be assured of the morality of their members. . . . 'The means of sustenance of strikers', adds the French Section of 1871, 'consist of the strike fund'. This might be answered by saying, first, that this fund is often ficti-

---

Thiers's police. He was accused by the same people who had judged him worthy among all others of representing them on the General Council.

tious. . . . Moreover, official English questionnaires have proved that the majority of English workers . . . is forced—by strikes or unemployment, by insufficient wages or terms of payment, as well as many other causes—to resort incessantly to pawnshops or to *borrowing money*. These are means of sustenance about which one cannot demand information without interfering in an unqualified manner in a person's private life. There are thus two alternatives: either the section is only to seek guarantees of morality through means of sustenance, in which case the General Council's proposal serves the purpose. . . . Or the section, in article 2 of its rules, intentionally says that the members have to provide information as to their means of sustenance as a condition of admission, *over and above* the guarantees of morality, in which case the Council affirms that it is a bourgeois innovation, contrary to the letter and spirit of the General Rules."

Article 11 of their rules states:

"One or several delegates shall be sent to the General Council."

The Council asked for this article to be deleted "because the International's General Rules do not recognise any right of the sections to send delegates to the General Council". "The General Rules," it added, "recognise only two ways of election for General Council members: either their election by the Congress, or their co-option by the General Council. . . ."

It is quite true that the different sections existing in London had been invited to send delegates to the General Council which, so as not to violate the General Rules, has always proceeded in the following manner: it has first determined the number of delegates to be sent by each section, reserving itself the right to accept or refuse them depending on whether it considered them able to fulfil the general functions assigned to them. These delegates became members of the General Council not by virtue of their

nomination by their sections, but by virtue of the right that the Rules accord the Council to co-opt new members. Having operated up to the decision taken by the last Conference both as the International Association's General Council and as the Central Council for England, the London Council thought it expedient to admit, besides the members that it co-opted directly, also members nominated initially by their respective sections. It would be a serious mistake to identify the General Council's electoral procedure with that of the Paris Federal Council which was not even a national Council nominated by a national Congress like, for example, the Brussels Federal Council or that of Madrid. The Paris Federal Council was only a delegation of the Paris sections. . . . The General Council's electoral procedure is defined in the General Rules . . . and its members would not know how to accept any other imperative mandate than that of the Rules and General Regulations. . . . If we take into consideration the article that precedes it, Article 11 means nothing else but a complete change of the General Council's composition, turning it, contrary to Article 3 of the General Rules, into a delegation of the London sections, in which the influence of local groups would be substituted for that of the whole International Working Men's Association. Lastly, the General Council, whose first duty is to carry out the Congress resolutions (see Article 1 of the Geneva Congress's Administrative Regulations), said that it "considers that the ideas expressed by the French Section of 1871 about a radical change to be made in the articles of the General Rules concerning the constitution of the General Council have no bearing on the question. . . ."

Moreover, the Council declared that it would admit two delegates from the section on the same conditions as those of the other London sections.\*

---

\* See p. 343 of the present volume.—Ed.

The "1871 section", far from being satisfied with this reply, published on December 14 a "declaration"<sup>355</sup> signed by all its members, including the new secretary who was shortly expelled as a scoundrel from the refugee society. According to this declaration, the General Council, by refusing to usurp the legislative functions, was accused of "a gross distortion of the social idea".

Here are some samples of the good faith displayed in the drawing up of this document.

The London Conference approved the conduct of the German workers during the war.<sup>356</sup> It was apparent that this resolution, proposed by a Swiss delegate\* seconded by a Belgian delegate and approved unanimously, only referred to the German members of the International who paid and are still paying for their anti-chauvinist behaviour during the war by imprisonment. Furthermore, in order to avoid any possible misinterpretation, the Secretary of the General Council for France\*\* had just explained the true sense of the resolution in a letter published by the journals *Qui Vive!*,<sup>357</sup> *Constitution*, *Radical*, *Emancipation*, *Europe*, etc. Nonetheless, eight days later, on November 20, 1871, fifteen members of the "French Section of 1871" inserted in *Qui Vive!* a "protest" full of abuse against the German workers and denouncing the Conference resolution as irrefutable proof of the General Council's "pan-Germanic idea". On the other hand, the entire feudal, liberal and police press of Germany seized avidly upon this incident to demonstrate to the German workers how their international dreams had come to naught. In the end the November 20 protest was endorsed by the entire 1871 section in its December 14 declaration.

To show "the dangerous slope of authoritarianism down which the General Council was slipping" the declaration

---

\* Nikolai Utin.—*Ed.*

\*\* Auguste Serraillier.—*Ed.*

cited "the publication by the very same *General Council* of an *official* edition of the General Rules as *revised by it*".

One glance at the new edition of the Rules is enough to see that each new article has, in the appendix, reference to the original sources establishing its authenticity! As for the words "*official* edition", the first Congress of the International decided that "the *official* and *obligatory* text of the Rules and Regulations would be published by the General Council" (see "Working Congress of the International Working Men's Association held at Geneva from September 3 to 8, 1866, page 27, note"<sup>358</sup>).

Naturally enough, the 1871 section was in continuous contact with the dissidents of Geneva and Neuchâtel. One Chalain, a member who had shown more energy in attacking the General Council than he had ever shown in defending the Commune, was unexpectedly rehabilitated by B. Malon, who had earlier levelled very grave charges against him in a letter to a Council member. The "French Section of 1871", however, had scarcely launched its declaration when civil war exploded in its ranks. First Theisz, Avrial and Camélinat withdrew. Thereafter the section broke up into several small groups, one of which was led by Mr. Pierre Vésinier, expelled by the General Council for his slander against Varlin and others, and then expelled from the International by the Belgian Commission appointed by the Brussels Congress of 1868. Another of these groups was founded by B. Landeck who had been relieved by the sudden flight of police prefect Pietri, on September 4, of his obligation,

"scrupulously fulfilled, not to engage any more in *political affairs*, nor in the International in France!" (see "*Third Trial of the International Working Men's Association in Paris*", 1870, p. 4<sup>359</sup>)

On the other hand, the mass of French refugees in London have formed a section which is in complete harmony with the General Council.

## IV

The men of the Alliance, hidden behind the Neuchâtel Federal Committee and determined to make another effort on a vaster scale to disorganise the International, convened a Congress of their sections at Sonvillier on November 12, 1871. Back in July two letters from *maitre* Guillaume to his friend Robin had threatened the General Council with an identical campaign if it did not agree to recognise them to be in the right "*vis-à-vis* the Geneva bandits".

The Sonvillier Congress was composed of sixteen delegates claiming to represent nine sections in all, including the new "Socialist Revolutionary Propaganda and Action Section" of Geneva.

The Sixteen made their *début* by publishing the anarchist decree declaring the Romance Federation dissolved, and the latter retaliated by restoring to the Alliance members their "autonomy" by driving them out of all sections. However, the Council had to recognise that a stroke of good sense brought them to accept the name of the Jura Federation that the London Conference had given them.<sup>360</sup>

The Congress of Sixteen then proceeded to "reorganise" the International by attacking the Conference and the General Council in a "Circular to All Federations of the International Working Men's Association".

Those responsible for the circular accused the General Council primarily of having called in 1871 a Conference instead of a Congress. The preceding explanations show that these attacks were made directly against the International as a whole, which had unanimously agreed to convene a Conference at which, incidentally, the Alliance was conveniently represented by Citizens Robin and Bastelica.

The General Council has had its delegates at every Congress; at the Basle Congress, for example, it had six. The Sixteen claim that

"the majority of the Conference was fraudulently assured in advance by the admission of six General Council delegates with deciding vote".

In actual fact, among the General Council delegates at the Conference, the French refugees were none other than the representatives of the Paris Commune, while its English and Swiss members could only take part in the sessions on rare occasions, as is attested to by the Minutes which will be submitted before the next Congress. One Council delegate had a mandate from a national federation. According to a letter addressed to the Conference, the mandate of another was withheld because of the news of his death in the papers.\* That left one delegate. Thus, the Belgians alone outnumbered the Council by 6 to 1.

The international police, who in the person of Gustave Durand were kept out, complained bitterly about the violation of the General Rules by the convening of a "secret" conference. They were not conversant enough with our General Regulations to know that the administrative sittings of the Congress *have to be in private*.

Their complaints, nonetheless, found a sympathetic echo with the Sonvillier Sixteen who cried out:

"And on top of it all, a decision of this Conference declares that the General Council will itself fix the time and place of the next Congress or of the *Conference to replace it*; thus, we are threatened with the suppression of the General Congresses, these great public sessions of the International."

The Sixteen refused to see that this decision was only affirmed before the various governments to show that, despite all the repressive measures, the International was firmly resolved to hold its general meetings one way or another.

At the general assembly of the Geneva sections, held on December 2, 1871, which gave a bad reception to Citizens

---

\* This refers to Marx.—*Ed.*

Malon and Lefrançais, the latter put forward a proposal confirming the decrees passed by the Sonvillier Sixteen and censuring the General Council, as well as disavowing the Conference.<sup>361</sup>—The Conference had resolved that “the Conference resolutions which are not due to be published shall be communicated to the *Federal Councils of the various countries* by the corresponding secretaries of the *General Council*”.

This resolution, which was in complete conformity with the General Rules and Regulations, was fraudulently revised by B. Malon and his friends to read as follows:

“Some Conference resolutions shall be communicated *only* to the Federal Councils *and* to the corresponding secretaries.”

They further accused the General Council of having “violated *the principle of sincerity*” in refusing to hand over to the police, by means of “*publicity*”, the resolutions which were aimed exclusively at reorganising the International in the countries where it is proscribed.

Citizens Malon and Lefrançais complain further that

“the Conference had aimed a blow at freedom of thought and its expression . . . in conferring upon the General Council the right to denounce and disavow any publicity organ of the sections or federations that discussed either the principles on which the Association rests, or the respective interests of the sections and federations, or finally the general interests of the Association as a whole (see the *Égalité* of October 21)”.

What, then, had the *Égalité* of October 21 published? It had published a resolution in which the Conference “gives warning that henceforth the General Council will be bound to publicly denounce and disavow all newspapers calling themselves organs of the International which, following the precedents of the *Progrès* and the *Solidarité*, should discuss in their columns, before the middle-class public, questions exclusively reserved for the local or Federal Committees and the General Council, or for the private and

administrative sittings of the Federal or General Congresses".<sup>362</sup>

To appreciate properly the spiteful lamentation of B. Malon we must bear in mind that this resolution puts an end once and for all to the attempts of some journalists who wished to substitute themselves for the main committees of the International and to play therein the role that the journalists' Bohemia is playing in the bourgeois world. As a result of one such attempt the Geneva Federal Committee had seen some members of the *Alliance* edit the *Égalité*, the official organ of the Romance Federation, in a manner completely hostile to the latter.

Incidentally, the General Council had no need of the London Conference to "publicly denounce and disavow" the improper use of the press, for the Basle Congress had decided (Resolution II) that:

"All newspapers countenancing attacks on the Association must be immediately sent by the sections to the General Council."

"It is evident," says the Romance Federal Committee in its December 20, 1871 declaration (*Égalité*, December 24) "that this article was adopted not in order that the General Council might keep in its files newspapers which attack the Association, but to enable it to reply, and to nullify in case of need, the pernicious effect of slander and malevolent denigrations. It is also evident that this article refers in general to all newspapers, and that if we do not want to leave the attacks of the bourgeois papers without retaliation, it is all the more necessary to disavow, through our main representative body, i.e., the General Council, those newspapers whose attacks against us are made under cover of the name of our Association."

Let us note, in passing, that the *Times*, that Leviathan of the capitalist press, the *Progrès* (of Lyons), a publication of the liberal bourgeoisie, and the *Journal de Genève*, an ultra-reactionary paper, have brought the same charges against the Conference and used virtually the same terms as Citizens Malon and Lefrançais.

After having challenged the convocation of the Conference

and, later, its composition and its allegedly secret character, the Sixteen's circular challenged the Conference resolutions.

Stating first that the Basle Congress had surrendered its rights

"having authorised the General Council to grant or refuse admission to, or to suspend, the sections of the International",

it accuses the Conference, farther on, of the following sin:

"This Conference has ... taken resolutions ... which tend to turn the International, which is a free federation of autonomous sections, into a hierarchical and authoritarian organisation of disciplined sections placed entirely under the control of a General Council which may, at will, refuse their admission or suspend their activity!"

Still farther on, the circular once more takes up the question of the Basle Congress which had allegedly "distorted the nature of the General Council's functions".

The contradictions contained in the circular of the Sixteen may be summed up as follows: the 1871 Conference is responsible for the resolutions of the 1869 Basle Congress, and the General Council is guilty of having observed the Rules which require it to carry out Congress resolutions.

Actually, however, the real reason for all these attacks against the Conference is of a more profound nature. In the first place, it thwarted, by its resolutions, the intrigues of the *Alliance* men in Switzerland. In the second place, the promoters of the Alliance had, in Italy, Spain and part of Switzerland and Belgium, created and upheld with amazing persistence a calculated confusion between *the programme of the International Working Men's Association and Bakunin's makeshift programme.*

The Conference drew attention to this deliberate misunderstanding in its two resolutions on proletarian policy and sectarian sections. The motivation of the first resolution, which makes short work of the political abstention preached

by Bakunin's programme, is given fully in its recitals, which are based on the General Rules, the Lausanne Congress resolution and other precedents.\*

\* The Conference resolution on *political action of the working class* reads as follows:

"Considering the following passage of the preamble to the Rules: 'The economical emancipation of the working classes is the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means';

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"That the combination of forces which the working class has

We now pass on to the sectarian sections:

The first phase of the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie is marked by a sectarian movement. That is logical at a time when the proletariat has not yet developed sufficiently to act as a class. Certain thinkers criticise social antagonisms and suggest fantastic solutions thereof, which the mass of workers is left to accept, preach and put into practice. The sects formed by these initiators are abstentionist by their very nature, i.e., alien to all real action, politics, strikes, coalitions, or, in a word, to any united movement. The mass of the proletariat always remains indifferent or even hostile to their propaganda. The Paris and Lyons workers did not want the Saint Simonians, the Fourierists, the Icarians, any more than the Chartists and the English trades unionists wanted the Owenists. These sects act as levers of the movement in the beginning, but become an obstruction as soon as the movement outgrows them; after which they become reactionary. Witness the sects in France and England, and lately the Lassalleans in Germany who, after having hindered the proletariat's organisation for several years, ended by becoming simple instruments of the police. To sum up, we have here the infancy of the proletarian movement, just as astrology and alchemy are the infancy of science. If the International were to be founded it was necessary that the proletariat would go through this phase.

Contrary to the sectarian organisations with their vagaries and rivalries, the International is a genuine and militant organisation of the proletarian class of all countries united in their common struggle against the

---

already effected by its economical struggles ought at the same time to serve as a lever for its struggles against the political power of landlords and capitalists—

“The Conference recalls to the members of the *International*:

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

capitalists and the landowners, against their class power organised in the state. The International's Rules, therefore, speak of only simple "workers' societies", all following the same goal and accepting the same programme, which presents a general outline of the proletarian movement, while leaving its theoretical elaboration to be guided by the needs of the practical struggle and the exchange of ideas in the sections, unrestrictedly admitting all shades of socialist convictions in their organs and Congresses.

Just as in every new historical phase old mistakes reappear momentarily only to disappear forthwith, so within the International there followed a resurrection of sectarian sections, though in a less obvious form.

The Alliance, while considering the resurrection of the sects a great step forward, is in itself conclusive proof that their time is over: for, if initially they contained elements of progress, the programme of the Alliance, in tow of a "Mohammed without the Koran", is nothing but a heap of pompously worded ideas long since dead and capable only of frightening bourgeois idiots or serving as evidence to be used by the Bonapartist or other prosecutors against members of the International.\*

The Conference, at which all shades of socialism were represented, unanimously acclaimed the resolution against sectarian sections, fully convinced that this resolution, stressing once again the International's true character, would mark a new stage of its development. The Alliance supporters, whom this resolution dealt a fatal blow, construed it only as the General Council's victory over the

---

\* Recent police publications on the *International*, including the Jules Favre circular to foreign powers and the report of Sacase, a deputy in the rural assembly, on the Dufaure project, are full of quotations from the Alliance's pompous manifestos.<sup>363</sup> The phraseology of these sectarians, whose radicalism is wholly restricted to verbiage, is extremely useful for promoting the aims of the reactionaries.

International, through which, as their circular pointed out, the General Council assured "the domination of the special programme" of some of its members, "their personal doctrine", "the orthodox doctrine", "the official theory, and the sole permissible within the Association". Incidentally, this was not the fault of those few members, but the necessary consequence, "the corrupting effect", of the fact that they were members of the General Council, for

"it is absolutely impossible for a person who has power (!) over his fellows to remain a moral person. The General Council is becoming a hotbed of intrigue".

According to the opinion of the Sixteen, the General Rules of the International should be censured for the grave mistake of authorising the General Council to co-opt new members. Thus authorised, they claim,

"the Council could, whenever it saw fit, co-opt a group numerous enough to completely change the nature of its majority and its tendencies".

They seem to think that the mere fact of belonging to the General Council is sufficient to destroy not only a person's *morality*, but also his common sense. How else can we suppose that a majority will transform itself into a minority by voluntary co-options?

At any rate, the Sixteen themselves do not appear to be very sure of all this, for they complain further on that the General Council has been

"composed for five years running of *the same persons, continually re-elected*",

and immediately afterwards they repeat:

"*most of them are not regular mandatories, not having been elected by a Congress.*"

The fact is that the body of the General Council is constantly changing, though some of the founding members remain, as in the Federal Councils in Belgium, French Switzerland, etc.

The General Council must fulfil three essential conditions, if it is to carry out its mandate. In the first place, it must have a numerically adequate membership to carry on its diverse functions; secondly, a membership of "working men belonging to the different nations represented in the International Association"; and, lastly, labourers must be the predominant element therein. Since the exigencies of the worker's job incessantly cause changes in the membership of the General Council, how can it fulfil all these indispensable conditions without the right of co-option? The Council none the less considers a more precise definition of this right necessary, as it indicated at the recent Conference.

The re-election of the General Council's original membership, at successive Congresses, at which England was definitely under-represented, would seem to prove that it has done its duty within the limits of the means at its disposal. The Sixteen, on the contrary, view this only as a proof of the "blind confidence of the Congresses" carried at Basle to the point of

"a sort of voluntary abdication in favour of the General Council".

In their opinion, the Council's "normal role" should be "that of a simple correspondence and statistical bureau". They justify this definition by adducing several articles extracted from an incorrect translation of the Rules.

Contrary to the rules of all bourgeois societies, the International's General Rules touch only lightly on its administrative organisation. They leave its development to practice, and its regularisation to future Congresses. Nevertheless, inasmuch as only the unity and joint action of the sections of the various countries could give them a genuinely international character, the Rules pay more attention to the Council than to the other bodies of the organisation.

Article 5 of the original Rules<sup>364</sup> states: "The General

Council shall form an *international agency* between the different national and local groups", and proceeds to give some examples of the manner in which it is to function. Among these examples is a request to the Council to see that "when immediate practical steps should be needed, as, for instance, in case of international quarrels, the action of the associated societies be simultaneous and uniform".

The article continues: "Whenever it seems opportune, the General Council shall take the initiative of proposals to be laid before the different national or local societies."

In addition, the Rules define the Council's role in convening and arranging Congresses, and charge it with the preparation of certain reports to be submitted thereto. In the original Rules so little distinction is made between the independent action of various groups and unity of action of the Association as a whole, that Article 6 states:

"Since the success of the working men's movement in each country cannot be secured but by the power of union and combination, while, on the other hand, the activity of the General Council will be more effective . . . the members of the International Association shall use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected working men's societies of their respective countries into national bodies, represented by central national organs."

The first administrative resolution of the Geneva Congress (Article I) says:

"The General Council is *commissioned to carry* the resolutions of the Congress into effect."

This resolution legalised the position that the General Council has held ever since its origin: that of the Association's *executive delegation*. It would be difficult to carry out orders without enjoying moral "authority" in the absence of any other "freely recognized authority". The Geneva Congress at the same time charged the General

Council with publishing "the official and obligatory text of the Rules".

The same Congress resolved (Administrative Resolution of Geneva, Article 14):

"Every section has the right to draw up its own rules and regulations adapted to local conditions and to the laws of its own country, but they must not contain anything contrary to the General Rules and Regulations."

Let us note, first of all, that there is not the least allusion either to any special declarations of principles, or to any special tasks which this or that section should set itself apart from the common goal pursued by all the groups of the International. The issue simply concerns the right of sections to adapt the General Rules and Regulations "to local conditions and to the laws of their country".

In the second place, who is to establish whether or not the particular rules conform to the General Rules? Evidently, if there would be no "authority" charged with this function, the resolution would be null and void. Not only could police or hostile sections be formed, but also the intrusion of declassed sectarians and bourgeois philanthropists into the Association could warp its character and, by force of numbers at Congresses, crush the workers.

Since their origin, the national and local federations have exercised in their respective countries the right to admit or reject new sections, according to whether or not their rules conformed to the General Rules. The exercise of the same function by the General Council is provided for in Article 6 of the General Rules, which allows *local independent societies*, i.e., societies formed outside the federal body in the country concerned, the right to establish direct contacts with the General Council. The *Alliance* did not hesitate to exercise this right in order to fulfil the conditions set for the admission of delegates to the Basle Congress.

Article 6 of the Rules deals further with legal obstacles to the formation of national federations in certain countries

where, consequently, the General Council is asked to function as a Federal Council (see *Minutes of the Lausanne Congress*, etc., 1867, p. 13<sup>365</sup>).

Since the fall of the Commune, these legal obstacles have been multiplying in the various countries, making action by the General Council therein, designed to keep doubtful elements out of the Association, more necessary than ever. That is why the French committees recently demanded the General Council's intervention to rid themselves of informers, and why, in another great country,\* members of the International requested it not to recognise any section which has not been formed by its direct mandates or by themselves. Their request was motivated by the necessity of ridding themselves of *agents-provocateurs*, whose burning zeal manifested itself in the rapid formation of sections of unparalleled radicalism. On the other hand, the so-called anti-authoritarian sections do not hesitate to appeal to the Council the moment a conflict arises in their midst, nor even to ask it to deal severely with their adversaries, as in the case of the Lyons conflict. More recently, since the Conference, the Turin "Workers' Federation" decided to declare itself a section of the International. As the result of the split that followed, the minority formed the Emancipation of the Proletariat Society.<sup>366</sup> It joined the International and began by passing a resolution in favour of the Jura people. Its newspaper, *Il Proletario*, is filled with outbursts against all authoritarianism. When sending in the society's subscriptions, the secretary\*\* warned the General Council that the old federation would probably also send its subscriptions. Then he continues:

"As you will have read in the *Proletario*, the *Emancipation of the Proletariat Society* ... has declared ... its rejection of all solidarity with the bourgeoisie, who, under the mask of workers, are organising the *Workers' Federation*",

\* Austria.—Ed.

\*\* Carlo Terzaghi.—Ed.

and begs the Council to

"communicate this resolution to all sections and to refuse the 10 centimes in subscriptions in the event of their being sent".\*

Like all the International's groups, the General Council is required to carry on propaganda. This it has accomplished through its manifestos and its agents, who laid the basis for the first organisations of the International in North America, in Germany and in many French towns.

Another function of the General Council is to aid strikers and organise their support by the entire International (see General Council reports to the various Congresses). The following fact, *inter alia*, indicates the importance of its intervention in the strike movement. The Resistance Society of the English Foundrymen is in itself an international Trades Union with branches in other countries, notably in the United States. Nonetheless, during a strike of American foundrymen, the latter found it necessary to invoke the intercession of the General Council to prevent English foundrymen being brought into America.

The growth of the International obliged the General Council and all Federal Councils to assume the role of arbiter.

The Brussels Congress resolved that:

"The Federal Councils are obliged to send a report every quarter to the General Council on their *administration* and *financial state*" (Administrative Resolution, No. 3<sup>367</sup>).

Lastly, the Basle Congress, which provokes the bilious wrath of the Sixteen, occupied itself solely with regulating

---

\* At this time these were the *apparent* ideas of the Emancipation of the Proletariat Society, represented by its corresponding secretary, a friend of Bakunin. Actually, however, this section's tendencies were quite different. After expelling this double-dealing traitor for embezzlement and for his friendly relations with the Turin police chief, the society set forth its explanations, which cleared up all misunderstanding between it and the General Council.

the administrative relations engendered by the Association's continuing development. If it extended unduly the limits of the General Council's powers, whose fault was it if not that of Bakunin, Schwitzguebel, F. Robert, Guillaume and other delegates of the Alliance, who were so anxious to achieve just that? Or will they accuse themselves of "blind confidence" in the London General Council?

Here are two resolutions of the Basle Congress:

"No. IV. Each new section or society which is formed and wishes to be part of the International, must immediately announce its adhesion to the General Council",

and "No. V. The General Council has the right to admit or reject the affiliation of any new society or group, subject to appeal at the next Congress".

As for local independent societies formed outside the federal body, these articles only confirm the practice observed since the International's origin, the maintaining of which is a matter of life or death for the Association. But extending this practice and applying it indiscriminately to every section or society in the process of formation is going too far. These articles do authorise the General Council to intervene in the internal affairs of the federations; but they have never been applied in this sense by the General Council. It defies the Sixteen to cite a single case where it has intervened in the affairs of new sections desirous of affiliating themselves with existing groups or federations.

The resolutions cited above refer to sections in the process of formation, while the resolutions given below refer to sections already recognised:

"VI. The General Council has equally the right to suspend until the next Congress any section of the International."

"VII. When conflicts arise between the societies or branches of a national group, or between groups of different nationalities, the General Council shall have the right to decide the conflict, subject to appeal at the next Congress which will decide definitely."

These two articles are necessary for extreme cases, although up to the present the General Council has never had recourse to them. The review presented above shows that the Council has never suspended any section and, in cases of conflict, has only acted as arbiter at the request of the two parties.

We arrive, at last, at a function imposed on the General Council by the needs of the struggle. However shocking this may be for supporters of the Alliance, it is the very persistence of the attacks to which the General Council is subjected by all the enemies of the proletarian movement that has placed it in the vanguard of the defenders of the International Working Men's Association.

## V

Having dealt with the International, such as it is, the Sixteen proceed to tell us what it should be.

Firstly, the General Council should be nominally a simple correspondence and statistical bureau. Once it has been relieved of its administrative functions, its correspondence would be concerned only with reproducing the information already published in the Association's newspapers. The correspondence bureau would thus become needless. As for statistics, that function is possible only if a strong organisation, and especially, as the original Rules expressly say, a common direction are provided. Since all that smacks very much of "authoritarianism", however, there might perhaps be a bureau, but certainly no statistics. In a word, the General Council would disappear. The Federal Councils, the local committees and other "authoritarian" centres would go by the same token. Only the autonomous sections would remain.

What, one may ask, will be the purpose of these "autonomous sections", freely federated and happily rid of

all superior bodies, "even of the superior body elected and constituted by the workers"?

Here it becomes necessary to supplement the circular by the report of the Jura Federal Committee submitted to the Congress of the Sixteen.

"In order to make the working class the real representative of humanity's new interests," its organisation must be "guided by the idea that will triumph. To *evolve* this idea from the needs of our epoch, from mankind's vital aspirations, by a consistent study of the phenomena of social life, to then carry this idea to our workers' organisations,—such should be our aim, etc." Lastly, there must be created "amidst our working population a real revolutionary socialist *school*".

Thus, the autonomous workers' sections are in a trice converted into *schools*, of which these gentlemen of the Alliance will be the masters. They *evolve the idea* by "consistent studies" which leave no trace behind. They then "*carry this idea to our workers' organisations*". To them, the working class is so much raw material, a chaos into which they must breathe their Holy Spirit before it acquires a shape.

All of which is but a paraphrase of the old Alliance programme<sup>368</sup> beginning with these words:

"The socialist minority of the League of Peace and Freedom, having separated itself from the League," proposes to found "a new Alliance of Socialist Democracy... having a *special mission* to study political and philosophical questions..."

This is the *idea* that is being "*evolved*" therefrom!

"Such an enterprise ... would provide sincere socialist democrats of Europe and America with the *means* of being understood and of affirming *their ideas*."\*

---

\* The gentlemen of the Alliance, who continue to reproach the General Council for calling a private Conference at a time when the convocation of a Congress would be the height of treachery or folly, these absolute proponents of clamour and publicity organised within the International, in contempt of our Rules, a real secret society directed against the International itself with the aim of bringing its

That is how, on its own admission, the minority of a bourgeois society slipped into the International shortly before the Basle Congress with the exclusive aim of utilising it *as a means* for posing before the working masses as a hierarchy of a secret science that may be expounded in four phrases and whose culminating point is "the economic and social equality of the classes".

Apart from this "theoretical mission", the new organisation proposed for the International also has its practical aspect.

"The future society," says the circular of the Sixteen, "should be nothing but a universalisation of the organisation which the International will establish for itself. We must therefore take care to bring this organisation as near as possible to our ideal."

"How could one expect an egalitarian and free society to grow out of an authoritarian organisation? That is impossible. The International, embryo of the future human society, must be, from now on, the faithful image of our principles of liberty and federation."

In other words, just as the medieval convents presented an image of celestial life, so the International must be the image of the New Jerusalem, whose embryo the Alliance bears in its womb. The Paris Communards would not have failed if they had understood that the Commune was "the embryo of the future human society" and had cast away all discipline and all arms, that is, the things which must disappear when there are no more wars!

Bakunin, however, the better to establish that despite their "consistent studies" the Sixteen did not hatch this pretty project of disorganisation and disarmament in the International when it was fighting for its existence, has

---

sections, unbeknown to them, under the sacerdotal direction of Bakunin.

The General Council intends to demand at the next Congress an investigation of this secret organisation and its promoters in certain countries, such as Spain, for example.

just published the original text of that project in his report on the International's organisation (see *Almanach du Peuple pour 1872, Genève*).<sup>369</sup>

## VI

Now turn to the report presented by the Jura Committee at the Congress of the Sixteen.

"A perusal of the report," says their official organ, *Révolution Sociale* (November 16), "will give the *exact measure* of the devotion and practical intelligence that we can expect from the Jura Federation members."

It begins by attributing to "these terrible events"—the Franco-Prussian war and the Civil War in France—a "somewhat *demoralising* influence ... on the situation within the International's sections".

If, in fact, the Franco-Prussian war could not but lead to the *disorganisation* of the sections because it drew great numbers of workers into the two armies, it is no less true that the fall of the empire and Bismarck's open proclamation of a war of conquest provoked in Germany and England a violent struggle between the bourgeoisie, which sided with the Prussians, and the proletariat, which more than ever demonstrated its international sentiments. This alone should have been sufficient for the International to have gained ground in both the countries. In America, the same fact produced a split in the vast German proletarian émigré group; the internationalist party definitely dissociating itself from the chauvinist party.

On the other hand, the advent of the Paris Commune gave an unprecedented boost to the expansion of the International and to a vigorous support of its principles by sections of all nationalities, except the Jura sections, whose report continues thus: "The beginning of the gigantic battle ... has caused people to think ... some go away to hide

their weakness. . . . For many this situation (within their ranks) is a sign of decrepitude," but "on the contrary . . . this *situation is capable of transforming the International completely*" according to their own pattern. This modest wish will be understood after a deeper examination of so propitious a situation.

Leaving aside the dissolved Alliance, replaced since by the Malon section, the Committee had to report on the situation in twenty sections. Among them, seven simply turned their backs on the Alliance; this is what the report has to say about it:

"The section of *box-makers* and that of *engravers and designers of Bienne* have *never* replied to any of the communications that we sent them.

"The sections of *Neuchâtel* craftsmen, i.e., *joiners, box-makers, engravers and designers*, have made *no* reply to letters from the Federal Committee.

"We have not been able to obtain *any* news of the *Val-de-Ruz* section.

"The *section of engravers and designers of Locle* have given *no* reply to letters from the Federal Committee."

That is what is described as *free* intercourse between the autonomous sections and their Federal Committee.

Another section, that

"of *engravers and designers* of the *Courtelay* district after three years of stubborn perseverance . . . at the present time . . . is forming a resistance society"

*independent of the International*, which does not in the least deter them from sending two delegates to the Congress of the Sixteen.

Next come four completely defunct sections:

"The *central section of Bienne* has currently been *dissolved*; one of its devoted members wrote to us recently, however, saying that *all hope* of seeing the rebirth of the International at Bienne *is not lost*.

"The *Saint-Blaise* section has been *dissolved*.

"The *Catébat* section, after a brilliant existence, *has had to yield*

to the intrigues woven by the masters" (!) "of this district in order to dissolve this *valiant*" (!) section.

"Lastly, the Corgémont section also has *fallen victim* of intrigues on the part of the employers."

*The central section of Courtelary district follows, which "took the wise step of suspending its activity"; which did not deter it from sending two delegates to the Congress of the Sixteen.*

Now we come to four sections whose existence is more than problematical.

"The *Grange* section has been reduced to a *small nucleus* of socialist workers... Their local action is paralysed by their numerically modest membership.

"The *central section of Neuchâtel* has *suffered considerably* from the events, and *would have inevitably disbanded* if it were not for the dedication and activity of some of its members.

"The *central section of Locle, hovering between life and death* for some months, ended up by *being dissolved*. It has been reconstituted quite recently, however,"

evidently for the sole purpose of sending two delegates to the Congress of the Sixteen.

"The *Chaux-de-Fonds section of socialist propaganda* is in a *critical situation*... Its position, far from getting better, *tends rather to deteriorate*."

Next come two sections, the *study-circles of Saint-Imier* and of *Sonvillier*, which are only mentioned in passing, without so much as a word about their circumstances.

There remains the model section, which to judge by its name of *central* section, is nothing but the residue of other defunct sections.

"The *central section of Moutier* is certainly the one that has suffered least... Its Committee has been in constant contact with the Federal Committee ... *no sections have yet been founded*..."

That is easily explained:

"The action of the *Moutier* section was particularly *favoured* by the *excellent attitude* of a working population ... given to their tradi-

tional ways; we would like to see the working class of this district make itself still more independent of political elements."

One can see, in fact, that this report

"gives the *exact measure* of the devotion and *practical intelligence* that we can expect from the Jura Federation members".

They might have rounded it off by adding that the workers of Chaux-de-Fonds, the original seat of their committee, have always refused to have anything to do with them. Just recently, at the general assembly of January 18, 1872, they replied to the circular of the Sixteen by a unanimous vote confirming the London Conference resolutions, as also the French Switzerland Congress resolution of May 1871:

"To exclude forever from the International Bakunin, Guillaume and their supporters."

Is it necessary to say anything more about the courage of this sham Sonvillier Congress which, in its own words, "caused war, open war within the International"?

Certainly these men, who make more noise than their stature warrants, have had an incontestable success. The whole of the liberal and police press has openly taken their side; they have been backed in their personal slander of the General Council and the insipid attacks aimed against the International by ostensible reformers in many lands:—by the bourgeois republicans in England, whose intrigues were exposed by the General Council; by the dogmatic free-thinkers in Italy, who, under the banner of Stefanoni, have just formed a "Universal Rationalist Society" with permanent headquarters in Rome, an "authoritarian" and "hierarchical" organisation, monasteries for atheist monks and nuns, whose rules provide for a marble bust in the Congress hall for every bourgeois who donates ten thousand francs<sup>370</sup>; and, lastly, by the Bismarck socialists in Germany, who, apart from their police mouthpiece, the *Neuer*

*Social-Demokrat*, played the role of "white shirts"<sup>371</sup> for the Prusso-German empire.

The Sonvillier conclave requests all sections of the International, in a pathetic appeal, to insist on the urgency of an immediate Congress "to curb the consistent encroachments of the London Council", according to Citizens Malon and Lefrançais, but actually to replace the International with the Alliance. This appeal received such an encouraging response that they immediately set about falsifying a resolution voted at the last Belgian Congress. Their official organ (*Révolution Sociale*, January 4, 1872) writes as follows:

"Lastly, which is even more important, the Belgian sections met at the Congress of Brussels on December 24 and 25 and voted unanimously for a resolution identical with that of the Sonvillier Congress, on the urgency of convening a General Congress."

It is important to note that the Belgian Congress voted the very opposite. It charged the Belgian Congress, which was not due to meet until the following June, to draft new General Rules for submission to the *next Congress* of the International.<sup>372</sup>

In accordance with the will of the vast majority of members of the International, the General Council is to convene the annual Congress only in September 1872.

## VII

Some weeks after the Conference, Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc, the most influential and most ardent members of the *Alliance*, arrived in London. They came to recruit, among the French refugees, aides willing to work for the restoration of the Empire, which, according to them, was the only way to rid themselves of Thiers and to avoid being left destitute. The General Council warned all concerned, including the Brussels Federal Council, of their Bonapartist plots.

In January, 1872, they dropped their mask by publishing a pamphlet entitled "THE EMPIRE AND THE NEW FRANCE. *Call of the People and the Youth to the French Conscience*, by Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc. Brussels, 1872".

With the modesty characteristic of the charlatans of the Alliance, they declaim the following humbug:

"We who have built up the great army of the French proletariat ... we, the most influential leaders of the International in France,\* ... happily, we have not been shot, and we are here to flaunt in their face (to wit: *ambitious parliamentarians, smug republicans, sham democrats of all sorts*) the banner under which we are fighting, and despite the slander, threats, and all manner of attacks that await us, to hurl at an amazed Europe the cry that comes from the very heart of our conscience and that will soon resound in the hearts of all Frenchmen: '*Long Live the Emperor!*'"

"Napoleon III, disgraced and scorned, must be splendidly reinstated";

---

\* Under the heading "*To the Pillory!*", *L'Égalité* (of Geneva), February 15, 1872, had this to say:

"The day has not yet come to describe the story of the defeat of the movement for the Commune in the South of France; but what we can announce today, we, most of whom witnessed the deplorable defeat of the Lyons insurrection on April 30, is that one of the reasons for the insurrection's failure was the cowardice, the treachery and the thievery of G. Blanc, who intruded everywhere carrying out the orders of A. Richard, who kept in the shade.

"By their carefully prepared manoeuvres these rascals intentionally compromised many of those who took part in the preparatory work of the insurrectionary Committees.

"Further, these traitors managed to discredit the International at Lyons to such an extent that by the time of the Paris Revolution the International was regarded by the Lyons workers with the greatest distrust. Hence the total absence of organisation, hence the failure of the insurrection, a failure which was bound to result in the fall of the Commune which was left to rely on its own isolated forces! It is only since this bloody lesson that our propaganda has been able to rally the Lyons workers around the flag of the International.

"Albert Richard was the pet and prophet of Bakunin and company."

and Messrs. Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc, paid out of the secret funds of Invasion III, are specially charged with this restoration.

Incidentally, they confess:

"It is the normal evolution of our ideas that has made us imperialists."

Here is a confession that should give pleasure to their co-religionists of the *Alliance*. As in the heyday of *Solidarité*, A. Richard and G. Blanc mouth again the old clichés regarding "abstention from politics" which, on the principle of their "normal evolution", can become a reality only under the most absolute despotism, with the workers abstaining from any meddling in politics, much like the prisoner abstaining from a walk in the sun.

"The time of the revolutionaries," they say, "is over . . . communism is restricted to Germany and England, especially Germany. That, moreover, is where it had been developed in earnest for a long time, to be subsequently spread throughout the International, and this disturbing expansion of *German influence* in the Association has in no small degree contributed to retarding its development, or rather, to giving it a new course in the sections of central and southern France, whom no German has ever supplied with a slogan."

Perhaps this is the voice of the great hierophante,\* who has taken upon himself, ever since the Alliance's foundation, in his capacity as a Russian, the special task of representing the *Latin races*? Or do we have here "the true missionaries" of the *Révolution Sociale* (November 2, 1871) denouncing

"the backward march which endeavours to foist German and Bismarckian mentality on the International"?

Fortunately, however, the true tradition has survived, and Messrs. Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc have not been shot! Thus, their own "contribution" consists in "set-

---

\* Mikhail Bakunin.—*Ed.*

ting a new course" for the International in central and southern France to follow, by an effort to found Bonapartist sections, *ipso facto* basically "autonomous".

As for the constitution of the proletariat as a political party, as recommended by the London Conference,

"After the restoration of the Empire," we—Richard and Blanc—"shall quickly deal not only with the socialist theories but also with any attempts to implement them through revolutionary organisation of the masses." Briefly, exploiting the great "autonomy principle of the sections" which "constitutes the real strength of the International ... especially in the *Latin* countries (*Révolution Sociale*, January 4),"

these gentlemen base their hopes on anarchy within the International.

Anarchy, then, is the great war-horse of their master Bakunin, who has taken nothing from the socialist systems except a set of slogans. All socialists see anarchy as the following programme: once the aim of the proletarian movement, i.e., abolition of classes, is attained, the power of the State, which serves to keep the great majority of producers in bondage to a very small exploiter minority, disappears, and, the functions of government become simple administrative functions. The Alliance draws an entirely different picture. It proclaims anarchy in proletarian ranks as the most infallible means of breaking the powerful concentration of social and political forces in the hands of the exploiters. Under this pretext, it asks the International, at a time when the old world is seeking a way of crushing it, to replace its organisation with anarchy. The international police want nothing better for perpetuating the Thiers republic, while cloaking it in a royal mantle.\*

---

\* In the report on the Dufaure law, Sacase, the rural assembly deputy, attacks above all the International's "organisation". He positively hates that organisation. After having verified "the mounting popularity of this formidable Association," he goes on to say: "This Association rejects...the shady practices of the sects that preceded

## General Council:

*R. APPLGARTH, ANTOINE ARNAUD, M. J. BOON, F. BRADNICK, G. H. BUTTERY, F. COURNET, DELAHAYE, EUGÈNE DUPONT, W. HALES, HURLIMAN, JULES JOHANNARD, HARRIET LAW, F. LESSNER, LOCHNER, MARGUERITTE, CONSTANT MARTIN, Z. MAURICE, HENRY MAYO, GEORGE MILNER, CHARLES MURRAY, PFÄNDER, VITALE REGIS, J. ROZWADOWSKI, JOHN ROACH, RÜHL, G. RANVIER, SADLER, COWELL STEPNEY, ALF. TAYLOR, W. TOWNSHEND, ED. VAILLANT, JOHN WESTON, F. J. YARROW.*

## Corresponding Secretaries:

*KARL MARX, Germany and Russia; LEO FRANKEL, Austria and Hungary; A. HERMAN, Belgium; TH. MOTTERSHEAD, Denmark; J. G. ECCARIUS, United States; LE MOUSSU, French sections in the United States; AUG. SERRAILLIER, France; CHARLES ROCHAT, Holland; J. P. McDONNELL, Ireland; FRED. ENGELS, Italy and Spain; WALERY WRÓBLEWSKI, Poland; H. JUNG, Switzerland.*

---

it. Its organisation was created and modified quite openly. Because of the power of this organisation...it has steadily extended its sphere of activity and influence. It is expanding throughout the world." Then he gives a "short description of the organisation" and concludes: "Such is, in its wise unity,... the plan of this vast organisation. Its strength lies in its very conception. It also rests in its numerous adherents, who are linked by their common activities, and, lastly, in the invincible impulse which drives them to action."

*CHARLES LONGUET*, President of the meeting  
*HERMANN JUNG*, Treasurer  
*JOHN HALES*, General Secretary

London, March 5, 1872  
33, Rathbone Place, W.

Written by Marx and Engels  
between mid-January  
and March 5, 1872

Published as a pamphlet  
in Geneva in 1872  
(*Les Prétendues scissions  
dans l'Internationale,  
Genève, 1872*)

Translated from  
the French pamphlet  
Published in English for the first time

---

RESOLUTIONS ON THE SPLIT  
IN THE UNITED STATES' FEDERATION PASSED  
BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE I.W.A.  
IN ITS SITTINGS OF 5TH AND 12TH MARCH, 1872<sup>373</sup>

I. THE TWO FEDERAL COUNCILS

*Art. 1.* Considering, that Central Councils are but instituted in order to secure, in every country, to "the Working Men's movement the power of union and combination" (Art. 7 of the General Rules); that, consequently, the existence of two rival Central Councils for the same federation is an open infraction of the General Rules;

The General Council calls upon the two provisional Federal Councils at New York to re-unite and to act as one and the same provisional Federal Council for the United States until the meeting of an American General Congress.

*Art. 2.* Considering, that the efficiency of the Provisional Federal Council would be impaired if it contained too many members who have only quite recently joined the International Working Men's Association;

The General Council recommends that such new-formed sections as are numerically weak, should combine amongst each other for the appointment of a few common delegates.

## II. GENERAL CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES' FEDERATION

*Art. 1.* The General Council recommends the convocation, for the 1st of July 1872, of a General Congress of the delegates of sections and affiliated societies of the United States.

*Art. 2.* To this Congress will belong the appointment of the members of the Federal Council for the United States. It may, if convenient, empower the Federal Council thus appointed to add to itself a certain limited number of members.

*Art. 3.* This Congress will have the sole power of determining the bye-laws and regulations for the organisation of the I.W.A. in the United States, "but such bye-laws and regulations must not contain anything contrary to the General Rules and Regulations of the Association" (Adm. Reg., V. Art. 1).

## III. SECTIONS

*Art. 1.* Considering, that Section No. 12 at New York has not only passed a formal resolution by virtue of which "each section" possesses "the independent right" to construe, according to its fancy, "the proceedings of the several congresses" and the "General Rules and Regulations", but moreover has fully acted up to this doctrine which, if generally adopted, would leave nothing of the I.W.A. but its name;

that the same section has never ceased to make the I.W.A. the vehicle of issues some of which are foreign to, while others are directly opposed to, the aims and purposes of the I.W.A.;

For these reasons the General Council considers it its duty to put in force Administrative Resolution VI of the

Bâle Congress<sup>374</sup> and to declare Section No. 12 *suspended* till the meeting of the next General Congress of the I.W.A. which is to take place in September 1872.

*Art. 2.* Considering, that the I.W.A., according to the General Rules, is to consist exclusively of "working men's societies" (see Art. 1, Art. 7 and Art. 11 of the General Rules);

that, consequently, Art. 9 of the General Rules to this effect: "Everybody who acknowledges and defends the principles of the I.W.A. is eligible to become a member", although it confers upon the active adherents of the *International*, who are no working men, the right either of individual membership or of admission to working men's sections, does in no way legitimate the foundation of sections, exclusively or principally composed of members not belonging to the working class;

that for this very reason the General Council was some months ago precluded from recognising a Slavonian section, exclusively composed of students<sup>375</sup>;

that, according to the General Regulations V, 1, the General Rules and Regulations are to be adapted "to local circumstances of each country";

that the social conditions of the United States, though in many other respects most favourable to the success of the working-class movement, peculiarly facilitate the intrusion into the *International* of bogus reformers, middle-class quacks and trading politicians;

For these reasons the General Council recommends that in future there be admitted no new American section of which two-thirds at least do not consist of wages-labourers.

*Art. 3.* The General Council calls the attention of the American Federation to Resolution II, 3, of the London Conference relating to "sectarian sections" or "separatist bodies pretending to accomplish special missions" distinct from the common aim of the Association, viz., to emanci-

pate the man of labour from his "economical subjection to the monopoliser of the means of labour", which "lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation, and political dependence" (see Preamble of the General Rules).

Written by Marx  
about March 5, 1872

Published in the newspapers  
*La Emancipacion* No. 43,  
April 6, 1872,  
*Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly*  
No. 103, May 4, 1872,  
and *Der Volksstaat* No. 37,  
May 8, 1872

Printed according to Marx's  
English manuscript

---

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MEETING HELD TO CELEBRATE  
THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARIS COMMUNE<sup>376</sup>

[I]

“That this meeting assembled to celebrate the anniversary of the 18th March last, declares, that it looks upon the glorious movement inaugurated upon the 18th March, 1871, as the dawn of the great social revolution which will for ever free the human race from class rule.”

[II]

“That the incapacity and the crimes of the middle classes, extended all over Europe by their hatred against the working classes, have doomed old society no matter under what form of government—Monarchical or Republican.”

[III]

“That the crusade of all governments against the International, and the terror of the murderers of Versailles as well as of their Prussian conquerors, attest the hollowness of their successes, and the presence of the threatening army of the proletariat of the whole world gathering in the rear of its heroic vanguard crushed by the combined forces of Thiers and William of Prussia.”

Written by Marx between  
March 13 and 18, 1872  
Published in *La Liberté* No. 12,  
March 24, 1872 and in *The  
International Herald* No. 3,  
March 30, 1872

Printed according  
to *The International Herald*

---

TO DELEGATES OF THE NATIONAL SPANISH  
CONGRESS ASSEMBLED AT SARAGOSSA<sup>377</sup>

London, April 3, 1872

Citizens,

The General Council of the International Working Men's Association has asked me to congratulate you on its behalf on the occasion of the second congress of the Spanish sections. You are indeed to be congratulated for the results you have obtained in so short a time. The International, founded in Spain less than three years ago, now covers the whole country with its sections and federations, is established in all the towns and is penetrating into the countryside. Thanks to your efforts, and also to the senseless and ridiculous persecution by successive governments of your country, you have obtained these fine results and made the International a real force in Spain. We ought not to forget, at the same time, that these results are also due to the special constitution of our Association which leaves every national or local federation complete freedom of action, granting the central organs only such powers as are absolutely essential to enable them to safeguard the unity of the programme and common interests, and to prevent the Association from becoming a plaything of bourgeois and police intrigues.\*

---

\* The rough copy of the letter continues: "No bourgeois society will ever be able to subsist in such conditions; the merit of the modern proletariat is that it organised for the common struggle an association embracing all civilised countries and yet in no way restricting the autonomy of each federation.—Ed.

You have probably still to come in for further persecutions. Remember then that there are other countries, like France, Germany and Austria-Hungary, where the members of the International suffer even harsher government repression and yet do not bow their heads, knowing, as you know, that persecution is the best means of propaganda for our Association, and that there is no force in the world strong enough to suppress the ever-growing revolutionary movement of the modern proletariat. In order to destroy the International it would be necessary to destroy the soil of which it is the natural product: modern society itself.

Greetings and fraternity,

On behalf of the General Council,  
Secretary for Spain,

*FREDERICK ENGELS*

Published in *La Emancipacion*  
No. 44, April 13, 1872;  
*La Liberté* No. 17, April 28,  
1872; and *Der Volksstaat* No. 36,  
May 4, 1872

Translated from  
*La Emancipacion* and verified  
with the rough copy  
of Engels's letter

---

TO THE SARAGOSSA CONGRESS

London, April 6, 1872

The General Council and the British Federal Council  
greet the Congress of Saragossa.

Long live the emancipation of the proletariat!

*ENGELS*

Published in *La Emancipacion*  
No. 44, April 13, 1872

Translated from  
the Spanish newspaper

---

**RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE CONVOCATION AND THE AGENDA  
OF THE CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE<sup>378</sup>**

Considering the resolution of the Congress of Basel fixing the seat of the next Congress at Paris;

Also the resolution of the General Council dated 12/7/70, by which, it being then impossible to hold a Congress in Paris, and conformable with Article 4 of the General Rules, the Congress was convoked to meet at Mainz;

Considering further that up to this day the Government persecutions directed against the International in France, as well as in Germany, render impossible the meeting of a Congress either in Paris or in Mainz.

Conformably with Article 4 of the General Rules, which confers upon the General Council the right of changing, in case of need, the place of meeting of the Congress; the General Council convokes the next Congress of the I.W.M.A. for Monday, September 2nd, 1872, at The Hague, Holland.

Considering that the questions contained in the programme of the Congress which was to be held at Mainz on the 5th September 1870 do not correspond with the present wants of the International, these wants having been profoundly affected by the great historic events which have taken place since then;

That numerous sections and federations belonging to various countries have proposed that the next Congress

should occupy itself with the revision of the General Rules and Regulations;

That the persecutions to which the International finds itself exposed at this moment in almost all European countries, impose upon it the duty of strengthening its organisation.

The General Council, while reserving to itself the faculty of drawing up hereafter a more extensive programme, to be completed by the propositions of the sections and federations, places on the order of the day as the most important question to be discussed by the Congress of The Hague:

The revision of the General Rules and Regulations.

London, 18 June 1872

Written by Engels  
Published in *The International Herald* No. 13, June 29, 1872;  
*Der Volksstaat* No. 53, July 3, 1872;  
*L'Egalité* No. 14, July 7, 1872;  
*La Emancipacion* No. 57, July 13, 1872;  
*La Liberté* No. 28, July 14, 1872

Printed according to Engels's  
English MS

---

**STATUTS GÉNÉRAUX ET RÉGLEMENTS  
ADMINISTRATIFS DE L'ASSOCIATION  
INTERNATIONALE DES TRAVAILLEURS<sup>379</sup>**  
[AVEC LES CORRECTIONS APPORTÉES PAR LE CONSEIL  
GÉNÉRAL EN 1872]

**STATUTS GÉNÉRAUX DE L'ASSOCIATION  
INTERNATIONALE DES TRAVAILLEURS**

Considérant,\*

Que l'émancipation de la classe ouvrière doit être l'œuvre des travailleurs eux-mêmes ;

Que la lutte pour l'émancipation de la classe ouvrière n'est pas une lutte pour des privilèges et des monopoles de classe, mais pour l'établissement de droits et de devoirs égaux, et pour l'abolition de tout régime de classe ;

Que l'assujettissement économique du travailleur aux détenteurs des moyens du travail, c'est-à-dire des sources de la vie, est la cause première de la servitude dans toutes ses formes, — la misère sociale, l'abaissement intellectuel et la dépendance politique ;

Que par conséquent l'émancipation économique de la classe ouvrière est le grand but auquel tout mouvement politique doit être subordonné comme moyen ;

Que tous les efforts tendant à ce but ont jusqu'ici échoué, faute de solidarité entre les travailleurs des différentes pro-

---

\* For the discussion of the preamble to the General Rules see pp. 253-57 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

fessions dans le même pays et d'une union fraternelle entre les classes ouvrières des divers pays ;

Que l'émancipation du travail, n'étant un problème ni local ni national, mais social, embrasse tous les pays dans lesquels existe la société moderne, et nécessite, pour sa solution, le concours théorique et pratique des pays les plus avancées ;

Que le mouvement qui vient de renaître parmi les ouvriers des pays les plus industriels de l'Europe, tout en réveillant de nouvelles espérances, donne un solennel avertissement de ne pas retomber dans les vieilles erreurs et de combiner le plus tôt possible les efforts encore isolés ;

*Pour ces raisons,*

*L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs est fondée.*

*Elle déclare,*

Que toutes les sociétés et individus y adhérant reconnaîtront comme base de leur conduite envers tous les hommes, sans distinction de couleur, de croyance et de nationalité, la *Vérité*, la *Justice* et la *Morale*.

*Pas de devoirs sans droits, pas de droits sans devoirs.*

C'est dans cet esprit que les statuts suivants ont été conçus :

Art. 1<sup>er</sup> — L'Association est **fondée\*** pour **organiser l'action commune des travailleurs\*\*** des différents pays aspirant du même but, savoir : le concours mutuel, le progrès et le complet affranchissement de la classe ouvrière.

Art. 2. — Le nom de cette association est: *Association Internationale des Travailleurs*.

Art. 3. — Tous les ans aura lieu un Congrès ouvrier général composé de délégués des branches de l'Association.

---

\* Here and below in bold type are changes approved by the General Council in the summer of 1872. For the discussion of articles 1-5 of the Rules see pp. 257-61 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* "to organise a common action by the workers".—*Ed.*

Ce Congrès proclamera les aspirations communes de la classe ouvrière, prendra l'initiative des mesures nécessaires pour le succès de l'œuvre de l'Association Internationale, et en nommera le Conseil général.

Art. 4 — Chaque Congrès fixera la date et le siège de la réunion du Congrès suivant. Les délégués se réuniront de plein droit aux lieu et jour désignés, sans qu'une convocation spéciale soit nécessaire. En cas d'urgence, le Conseil général pourra changer le lieu et la date du Congrès et avec la sanction de la majorité des fédérations le remplacer par une Conférence privée avec les mêmes pouvoirs. Toutefois, le Congrès ou la Conférence qui le remplacerait devra se réunir dans les trois mois après la date fixée par le Congrès précédent.\*

Tous les ans le Congrès réuni indiquera le siège du Conseil général et en nommera les membres à raison de trois par nationalité. Le Conseil ainsi élu aura le droit de remplacer les membres démissionnaires ou mis par une cause quelconque dans l'impossibilité de remplir leur mandat, et de se compléter par voie d'adjonction dans les cas où le Congrès aurait élu un nombre de membres inférieur à celui fixé par les statuts.\*\*

A chaque Congrès annuel, le Conseil général fera un rapport public de ses travaux. Il pourra, au cas de besoin, convoquer le Congrès avant le terme fixé.

Art. 5. — Le Conseil général choisira dans son sein les

---

\* "and date of the Congress and with the sanction of the majority of the federations replace it with a private Conference, which shall have the same powers. However, the Congress or the Conference which may replace it must meet within three months after the date fixed by the previous Congress."—*Ed.*

\*\* "three from each nationality. The Council thus elected has the power to replace members who have resigned or who are unable, for one reason or another, to carry out their duties, and to co-opt members in the event the Congress elects fewer members than stipulated by the Rules."—*Ed.*

membres du bureau nécessaires pour la gestion des affaires.\*

Art. 6. — Le Conseil général fonctionnera comme agent international entre les différents groupes nationaux et locaux, de telle sorte que les ouvriers de chaque pays soient constamment au courant des mouvements de leur classe dans les autres pays ; qu'une enquête sur l'état social soit faite simultanément et dans un même esprit ; — que les questions d'intérêt général, proposées par une société, soient examinées par toutes les autres, et qu'une action immédiate étant réclamée, tous les groupes de l'Association puissent agir simultanément et d'une manière uniforme.

Suivant qu'il le jugera opportun, le Conseil général prendra l'initiative des propositions à soumettre aux sociétés locales et nationales.

Art. 7. — Puisque le succès du mouvement ouvrier dans chaque pays ne peut être assuré que par la force résultant de l'union et de l'association ; — que, d'autre part, l'action du Conseil général sera plus efficace si, au lieu de correspondre avec une foule de petites sociétés locales, isolées les unes des autres, il peut se mettre en rapport avec quelques grands centres nationaux des sociétés ouvrières ; — par ces raisons, les membres de l'Association Internationale devront faire tout leur possible pour réunir les sociétés ouvrières, encore isolées, de leurs pays respectifs, en associations nationales, représentées par des organes centraux **dont la Composition aura autant que possible un caractère international.\*\***

Il va sans dire que l'application de cet article est subordonnée aux lois particulières à chaque pays, et qu'abstrac-

---

\* For the discussion of clauses 6-9 see pp. 261-63, 265-66 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* "which, as far as possible, should be international in their composition."—*Ed.*

Que tous les efforts tendant à ce but ont jusqu'ici échoué, faute de solidarité entre les travailleurs des différentes professions dans le même pays et d'une union fraternelle entre les classes ouvrières des divers pays ;

Que l'émancipation du travail, n'étant un problème ni local ni national, mais social, embrasse tous les pays dans lesquels existe la société moderne, et nécessite, pour sa solution, le concours théorique et pratique des pays les plus avancés ;

Que le mouvement qui vient de renaître parmi les ouvriers des pays les plus industriels de l'Europe, tout en réveillant de nouvelles espérances, donne un solennel avertissement de ne pas retomber dans les vieilles erreurs et de combiner le plus tôt possible les efforts encore isolés ;

*Pour ces raisons,*

*L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs a été fondée.*

*Elle déclare,*

Que toutes les sociétés et individus y adhérant reconnaîtront comme base de leur conduite envers tous les hommes, sans distinction de couleur, de croyance et de nationalité, la *Vérité*, la *Justice* et la *Morale*.

*Pas de devoirs sans droits, pas de droits sans devoirs.*

C'est dans cet esprit que les statuts suivants ont été conçus :

Art 1er. — L'Association est <sup>fondée</sup> établie pour <sup>organiser</sup> créer un point central de communication et de coopération entre ~~les sociétés ouvrières des différents pays~~ aspirant au même but, savoir : le concours mutuel, le progrès et le complet affranchissement de la classe ouvrière.

avec le conseil de  
 majorité  
 après avoir consulté les fédérations  
 des ouvriers ou le conseil général  
 par un professeur  
 présidé par le conseil dans les pays où  
 la date sera fixée le congrès prochain

Art. 2. — Le nom de cette association est : Association Internationale des Travailleurs.

3) Art. — Tous les ans aura lieu un Congrès ouvrier général composé de délégués des branches de l'Association. Ce Congrès proclamera les aspirations communes de la classe ouvrière, prendra l'initiative des mesures nécessaires pour le succès de l'œuvre de l'Association Internationale, et en nommera le Conseil général.

4) Art. — Chaque Congrès fixera la date et le siège de la réunion du Congrès suivant. Les délégués se réuniront de plein droit au lieu et jour désignés, sans qu'une convocation spéciale soit nécessaire. En cas d'urgence, le Conseil général pourra changer le lieu du Congrès et remettre toutefois la date.

Tous les ans, le Congrès réuni indiquera le siège du Conseil général et nommera les membres. Le Conseil général ainsi élu aura le droit de s'adjoindre de nouveaux membres.

A chaque Congrès annuel, le Conseil général fera un rapport public de ses travaux. Il pourra, au cas de besoin, convoquer le Congrès avant le terme fixé.

5) Art. 5. — Le Conseil général se composera de travailleurs appartenant aux différentes nations représentées dans l'Association Internationale. Il choisira dans son sein les membres du bureau nécessaires pour la gestion des affaires, tels que trésorier, secrétaire général, secrétaires particuliers pour les différents pays, etc.

6) Art. — Le Conseil général fonctionnera comme agent international entre les différents groupes nationaux et locaux, de telle sorte que les ouvriers de chaque pays soient constamment au courant des mouvements de leur classe dans les autres pays; qu'une enquête sur l'état social soit faite simultanément et dans un même esprit; — que les questions d'intérêt général,

les  
 de manière de rendre  
 à la son de haut par  
 par nationalité

tion faite d'obstacles légaux, chaque société locale indépendante aura le droit de correspondre directement avec le Conseil général.

Art. 8 — Dans sa lutte contre le pouvoir collectif des classes possédantes le prolétariat ne peut agir comme classe qu'en se constituant *lui-même en parti politique distinct, opposé à tous les anciens partis formés par les classes possédantes.*— Cette constitution du prolétariat en parti politique est indispensable pour assurer le triomphe de la révolution sociale et son but suprême, *l'abolition des classes.* — La coalition des forces ouvrières déjà obtenue par les luttes économiques doit aussi servir de levier aux mains de cette classe dans sa lutte contre le pouvoir politique de ses exploiters. — Les seigneurs de la terre et du capital se serviront toujours de leurs privilèges politiques pour défendre et perpétuer leurs monopoles économiques, et asservir le travail. La conquête du pouvoir politique devient donc le grand devoir du prolétariat.\*

Art. 9.— Quiconque adopte et défend les principes de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs peut en être reçu membre.

---

\* "In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes the working class cannot act, as a class, except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes.—This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to ensure the triumph of the social revolution and its ultimate end—the abolition of classes.—The combination of forces which the working class has already effected by its economical struggles ought at the same time to serve as a lever for its struggles against the political power of its exploiters.—The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies and for enslaving labour. To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the proletariat."

For the discussion of this clause see pp. 262-63 of the present volume.—Ed.

**Toutefois pour garantir le caractère prolétaire de l'Association toute section doit être composée pour les deux tiers au moins d'ouvriers salariés.\***

Chaque section est responsable pour l'intégrité de ses membres.

Art. 10. — Chaque membre de l'Association Internationale, en changeant de pays, recevra l'appui fraternel des membres de l'Association.

Art. 11. — Les sociétés ouvrières de résistance adhérant à l'Association Internationale **pourront** conserver intacte leur organisation particulière.

Art. 12. — La révision des statuts présents peut être faite à chaque Congrès sur la demande des deux tiers de délégués présents.

Art. 13. — Tout ce qui n'est pas prévu par les présents statuts sera déterminé par des règlements spéciaux que chaque Congrès p o u r r a r é v i s e r.

### RÈGLEMENTS ADMINISTRATIFS

REVISÉ CONFORMÈMENT AUX RÉSOLUTIONS  
DES CONGRÈS SUCCESSIFS (1866 à 1869)  
ET DE LA CONFÉRENCE DE LONDRES (1871)

#### I.—DU CONGRÈS GÉNÉRAL

1. — Chaque membre d'une section de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs a le droit de voter aux élections pour le Congrès, et tout membre de l'Association\*\* est éligible comme délégué.

2) Chaque section ou groupe de sections comptant au moins 50 membres a le droit d'envoyer un délégué au Congrès.

---

\* "However, in order to guarantee the proletarian character of the Association, no less than two-thirds of the members of each section must consist of wage-workers."—Ed.

\*\* "each member of the Association".—Ed.

3) **Chaque section ou groupe de sections qui compte plus de 50 membres a le droit d'envoyer un délégué additionnel pour 100 membres additionnels.\***

4) Chaque délégué n'a qu'une voix au Congrès.

5) Les délégués recevront une indemnité de la section ou du groupe qui les a nommés.

6) A l'avenir, ne seront plus admis à siéger et à voter dans le Congrès que les délégués des sociétés, sections ou groupes affiliés à l'Internationale, et qui seront en règle avec le Conseil général pour le payement de leurs cotisations.

7) Les séances du Congrès seront de deux sortes : les unes administratives et privées, les autres publiques. Dans les dernières, on discutera et on votera les questions de **principe** proposées par le programme du Congrès.

8) Le Conseil général rédigera le programme officiel du Congrès, lequel contiendra les questions mises à l'ordre du jour par le Congrès précédent, les questions que le Conseil général y aura ajoutées, et les questions soumises à ce Conseil par les différentes sections et groupes ou par leurs comités respectifs **et qu'il aura adoptées.\*\***

Toute section qui voudra proposer à la discussion du prochain Congrès une question en dehors du programme adopté par le dernier Congrès, devra en prévenir le Conseil général avant le 31 mars.

9) Le conseil général est chargé d'organiser le Congrès et de communiquer son programme, en temps opportun, à

---

\* "2) Every branch or group of branches consisting of not less than 50 members, may send a delegate to the Congress.

"3) Every branch or group of branches numbering more than 50 members may send an additional delegate for every additional 100 members."

With the deletion of Clause 5: "If a branch be unable to send a delegate, it may unite with other neighbouring branches for the appointment of one," the subsequent clauses have been renumbered.—*Ed.*

\*\* "and which it will accept."—*Ed.*

toutes les sections par l'intermédiaire des Conseils ou comités fédéraux.

10) Le Congrès formera autant de commission qu'il y aura de questions à l'ordre du jour. Chaque membre désignera la commission dont il veut faire partie. Les rapports présentés par les divers groupes ou sections seront lus dans la séance de la commission à laquelle ils auront été référés. Elle en fera un rapport unique qui seul sera lu en séance publique, et elle désignera les rapports particuliers à joindre au compte rendu officiel.

11) Dans les séances publiques, le Congrès s'occupera en premier lieu des questions mises à l'ordre du jour par le Conseil général ; toute autre question sera discutée ensuite.

12) Les votes sur les questions de principe auront lieu à l'appel nominal.

13) Chaque section ou fédération de sections doit envoyer au Conseil général, au plus tard deux mois avant le Congrès annuel, un rapport détaillé sur sa marche et son développement pendant l'année.

De ces documents le Conseil général fera un rapport unique qui seul sera lu en séance du Congrès.

## II.—DU CONSEIL GÉNÉRAL\*

1. La désignation de *Conseil général* est réservée au Conseil central de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs.

Les Conseils centraux des divers pays où l'*Internationale* est régulièrement organisée, se désigneront sous le nom de *Conseil fédéral* ou *Comité fédéral*, en y ajoutant le nom de leur pays respectif.

---

\* For the discussion of clauses 1-9 see pp. 236-46 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

2. Le Conseil général est tenu d'exécuter les résolutions des Congrès et de veiller dans chaque pays à la stricte observation des principes fondamentaux de l'Internationale.\*

3. Le Conseil général publiera chaque semaine un bulletin de ses séances.\*\*

4. Tout groupe en dehors de liens fédéraux voulant\*\*\* faire partie de l'Internationale, doit annoncer immédiatement son adhésion au Conseil général.

5. Le Conseil général a le droit d'admettre ou de refuser l'affiliation de toute nouvelle société ou groupe, sauf l'appel au Congrès.

Néanmoins, là où il existe des conseils ou comités fédéraux, le Conseil général, tout en réservant son droit de décision provisoire, les consultera avant d'admettre ou de refuser l'affiliation d'une nouvelle section ou société.

6. Le Conseil général a également le droit de suspendre des branches, sections, conseils ou comités fédéraux et fédérations de l'Internationale jusqu'au prochain congrès.

Cependant, vis-à-vis des sections appartenant à une fédération, il n'exercera ce droit qu'après avoir consulté le Conseil fédéral respectif. Dans le cas de la dissolution d'un Conseil fédéral, le Conseil général devra demander en même temps aux sections de la fédération d'élire un nouveau Conseil fédéral dans 30 jours au plus. Dans le cas de la suspension de toute une fédération, le Conseil général devra immédiatement en aviser toutes les autres fédérations. Si la majorité de la fédération le demande, le Conseil général devra convoquer une Conférence extraordi-

---

\* "and see to it that the basic principles of the International are strictly observed in every country".—Ed.

\*\* "3. The General Council shall publish a report of its proceedings every week".—Ed.

\*\*\* Each "group which is outside federal associations".—Ed.

naire composée d'un délégué par nationalité qui se réunira un mois après et qui statuera définitivement sur le différend. Néanmoins il est bien entendu que les pays où l'Internationale est brohibée exerceront les mêmes droits que les fédérations régulières.\*

7. Si des différends s'élevaient entre des sociétés ou branches d'un groupe national, ou entre des groupes de différentes nationalités, le Conseil général aura le droit d'en statuer, sauf l'appel au Congrès dont la décision sera définitive.

8. Tous les délégués du Conseil général chargés de missions spéciales auront le droit d'assister et de se faire entendre à toutes les réunions fédérales ou locales ou des **groupes internationaux** sans cependant avoir le droit de vote.

9. Les éditions anglaise, française et allemande des statuts et règlements généraux doivent être imprimées conformément au texte officiel publié par le Conseil général.

Avant leur publication, les traductions des statuts et règlements généraux, dans les autres langues, doivent être soumises à l'approbation du Conseil général.

---

\* "...branches, sections, Federal Councils or Committees or Federations of the International.

However, with regard to the branches that are members of a Federation, it exercises this right only after consultation with the respective Federal Council. In case of the dissolution of a Federal Council the General Council shall instruct the branches of the Federation at once to elect a new Federal Council not later than within 30 days. In the case of the suspension of an entire Federation the General Council shall immediately inform all the other federations of this. If requested by a majority of the Federations, the General Council shall convene within a month an extraordinary conference attended by one delegate from every nationality whose decision on the disputed questions shall be final. It goes without saying that the countries where the International is prohibited enjoy the same rights as the Federations that exist legally." See Note 226.—*Ed.*

### III.—COTISATIONS À PAYER AU CONSEIL GÉNÉRAL

1. — Une cotisation mensuelle de 10 centimes par membre sera perçue par le Conseil général sur toutes les sections et sociétés affiliées.

Cette cotisation est destinée à couvrir les diverses dépenses du Conseil général.

2. — Le Conseil général fera imprimer des timbres uniformes, représentant la valeur de 10 centimes chacun, dont le nombre demandé sera envoyé annuellement aux conseils ou comités fédéraux.

3. — Les conseils ou comités fédéraux feront parvenir aux comités locaux ou, à défaut, aux sections de leur ressort le nombre de timbres correspondant au nombre de leurs membres respectifs.

4. — Ces timbres seront alors appliquées sur une feuille du livret ou sur l'exemplaire des statuts dont tout membre de l'Association doit être muni.

5. **Chaque trimestre** les Conseils fédéraux des divers pays ou régions seront tenus d'envoyer au Conseil général le montant des timbres employés et à lui rendre les timbres restants.

6. — Ces timbres porteront le chiffre de l'année courante.

### IV.—CONSEILS OU COMITÉS FÉDÉRAUX

1. — Les frais d'administration des conseils ou comités fédéraux sont à la charge de leurs sections respectives.

2. — Chaque conseil ou comité fédéral doit une fois par mois envoyer un rapport au Conseil général.

3. — Les conseils ou comités fédéraux sont tenus d'envoyer, chaque trimestre, au Conseil général, un rapport sur l'administration et l'état financier des sections de leur ressort.

4. — Toute fédération pourra refuser d'admettre ou exclure de son sein des sections ou sociétés, sans toutefois

pouvoir les priver de leur caractère d'internationalité, mais elle pourra demander leur suspension au Conseil général.

#### V.—SOCIÉTÉS, BRANCHES ET GROUPES LOCAUX

1. — Chaque section a le droit de rédiger ses statuts et règlements particuliers adaptés aux circonstances locales et aux lois de son pays ; mais ils ne doivent être contraires en rien aux statuts et règlements généraux.

2. — **La conformité de ces statuts et règlements particuliers avec les statuts et règlements généraux sera constatée par les Conseils fédéraux, et pour les sections en dehors des liens fédéraux, par le Conseil général.\***

3. — Les branches, sections ou groupes locaux et leurs comités se désigneront et se constitueront simplement et exclusivement comme branches, sections, groupes et comités de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs en ajoutant le nom de leur localité respective.

4. — Il est donc défendu aux branches, sections et groupes de se désigner par des noms de secte, comme par exemple, les noms de branches positivistes, mutualistes, collectivistes, communistes, etc., ou de former des groupes séparatistes, sous le nom de « sections de propagande » etc., se donnant des missions spéciales en dehors du but commun poursuivi par tous les groupes de l'*Internationale*.

5. — Toutefois, il est bien entendu que l'article 2 ne s'applique pas aux Sociétés de Résistance (Trades' Unions) affiliées à l'*Internationale*.

6. — Toutes les sections et sociétés ouvrières affiliées à

---

\* "2.—Conformity of the local rules and regulations with the General Rules and Regulations shall be established by the Federal Councils and, for branches outside the federal associations, by the General Council."

With the introduction of this new clause the subsequent clauses have been renumbered.—*Ed.*

*l'Internationale* sont invitées à abolir l'office de président de section ou de société.

7. — La formation de sections de femmes, dans la classe ouvrière, est recommandée. Il est bien entendu que cet article ne porte nullement atteinte à l'existence, et n'exclut en aucune façon la formation de sections composées de travailleurs des deux sexes.

8. — Tous les journaux, contenant des attaques contre l'Association, doivent être immédiatement envoyés au Conseil général par les sections.

9. — Les adresses des **comités fédéraux** et du Conseil général seront publiées tous les trois mois dans les journaux de l'Association.

#### VI.—STATISTIQUE GÉNÉRALE DE LA CLASSE OUVRIÈRE

1. — Le Conseil général est tenu de mettre à exécution l'article VI des statuts originaux relatif à la statistique de la classe ouvrière et à appliquer les résolutions prises par le Congrès de Genève (1866) à ce même effet.

2. — Chaque section locale est tenue d'avoir dans son sein un comité spécial de statistique qui sera toujours prêt dans la mesure de ses moyens à répondre aux questions qui pourront lui être adressées par le conseil ou le comité fédéral du pays ou par le Conseil général de l'Internationale. Il est recommandé à toutes les sections de rétribuer les secrétaires des comités de statistique, vu l'importance et l'utilité générale de leur travail pour la classe ouvrière.

3. — Au premier août de chaque année, les conseils ou comités fédéraux enverront les documents recueillis au Conseil général qui en soumettra un résumé aux Congrès ou Conférences.

4. — Le refus par une société de résistance ou une branche internationale de donner les renseignements deman-

dés, sera porté à la connaissance du Conseil général, qui aura à statuer à ce sujet.

5. — Les résolutions du Congrès de Genève, mentionnées dans l'article 1<sup>er</sup>, sont les suivantes :

Une grande combinaison d'efforts internationaux sera *l'enquête statistique*, faite par les ouvriers eux-mêmes, sur les conditions des classes ouvrières des divers pays. Evidemment, pour agir avec quelque chance de succès, on doit connaître les matériaux sur lesquels on veut agir. En même temps, les travailleurs prouveront, par l'initiative d'une si grande œuvre, qu'ils sont capables d'être les maîtres de leurs propres destinées. C'est pourquoi le Congrès propose :

Que dans chaque pays où il y a des branches de notre Association, le travail statistique soit commencé immédiatement, et les faits recueillis à l'égard des différents sujets spécifiés dans le questionnaire ci-joint ;

Que tous les ouvriers de l'Europe et de l'Amérique collaborent à cette statistique du travail ;

Que les rapports et les pièces justificatives soient envoyés au Conseil général ;

Que le Conseil général les résume en un rapport unique suivi d'un appendice contenant les pièces justificatives ;

Que ce rapport et cet appendice soient soumis au Congrès annuel, et qu'après en avoir reçu la sanction, il soit publié aux frais de l'Association.

#### **QUESTIONNAIRE QUI POURRA ÊTRE MODIFIÉ SELON LES BESOINS DE CHAQUE LOCALITÉ**

1. — Industrie, laquelle ?

2. — Age et sexe des ouvriers.

3. — Nombre des employés.

4. — Salaires et gages : *a.* Apprentis ; *b.* Salaire à la journée ou à la pièce. Echelle des salaires payés par les sous-entrepreneurs. Salaire moyen pour la semaine et l'année.

5. — a) Heures de travail dans les manufactures. —  
b) Heures de travail chez les petits patrons et à domicile. —  
c) Travail de jour et de nuit. d) **Heures de repos.**\*

6. — **Règlements d'ateliers.**\*\*

7. — Description des ateliers et de la nature du travail. Encombrement, ventilation insuffisante. Privation de lumière. Emploi du gaz. Conditions de propreté, etc.

8. — Effets du travail sur l'état sanitaire.

9. — Condition morale. Education.

10 — Conditions de l'industrie : si elle change avec les saisons ou si elle se distribue avec plus ou moins d'uniformité sur toute l'année ; s'il y a de grandes fluctuations de prospérité et de stagnation ; si l'industrie est exposée à la concurrence étrangère ; si elle produit principalement pour le marché intérieur ou pour les marchés étrangers.

11. — Lois particulières affectant les rapports entre l'ouvrier et le patron.

12. — **Habitation et nourriture.**\*\*\*

Published in the original  
for the first time  
Printed according to a copy  
of the French edition of the  
Rules with changes approved by  
the General Council for  
the submission to the Hague Congress

---

\* "hours of rest".—*Ed.*

\*\* "Regulations in workshops".—*Ed.*

\*\*\* "Habitation and nourishment".—*Ed.*

---

**THE GENERAL COUNCIL'S REPLY TO THE PROTEST  
OF THE JURA FEDERATION AT THE CONVENING  
OF A CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE<sup>380</sup>**

**GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION**

33, Rathbone Place,

Oxford Street, London

**To Citizen Schwitzguebel, Corresponding Secretary of  
the Jura Federal Committee.**

I have placed your letter of July 15 inst. before the General Council and it has instructed me to inform you that its decision to hold the next Congress at The Hague was reached after due consideration of all the arguments contained in your letter, and that this choice was dictated by the following considerations:

The Congress could not be held in Switzerland, since that is the place of origin and focal point of the disputes; the Congress is always influenced to some extent by the place in which it is held; in order to add more weight to its decisions and enhance the wisdoms of its debates, the local character must be avoided, for which it was necessary to choose a place remote from the main centre of disputes.

You can scarcely be ignorant of the fact that three of the last four congresses were held in Switzerland, and that at Basle the Belgian delegates were most insistent that the next Congress should be held either at Verviers or in Holland.

In spite of the relative freedom which she enjoys, Switzerland can hardly claim the right to monopolise congresses.

The Romance Federal Council has also expressed its dissatisfaction with the General Council's choice and does not approve it.

Fraternal greetings,

H. JUNG, Corresponding Secretary  
for Switzerland

July 28, 1872

Published in *Bulletin  
de la Fédération jurassienne*  
No. 14, August 1, 1872

Translated from the French

---

THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO ALL THE MEMBERS  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S  
ASSOCIATION<sup>381</sup>

Citizens,

The General Council finds itself under the necessity of publicly denouncing to you the existence, within the International, of intrigues which, although in full work for several years past, have never been even suspected by the majority among you.

In our private circular dated 5th March 1872, on "the pretended divisions within the International",\* we were compelled to call your attention to the manoeuvres of the so-called "Alliance of Socialist Democracy", manoeuvres aiming at the creation of discord in our ranks, and at the handing over, in an underhand manner, of the supreme direction of our Association to a small clique directed by Michael Bakounine.

The Alliance of Socialist Democracy, you will recollect, published, at its very origin, a set of rules which, if we had sanctioned them, would have given it a double existence, within and without the International at the same time. It would have had its own sections, federations and congresses at the side of the sections, federations and congresses of the International, and yet it pretended to take part in the latter. Its aim was to supersede our General

---

\* See pp. 356-409 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Rules by the special programme of M. Bakounine and to force upon our Association his personal dictatorship.

The General Council, by its circular of the 22 December 1868, repelled these pretensions.<sup>382</sup> It admitted the Alliance of Socialist Democracy into the International on the express condition only, that it should cease to be an international body; that it should dissolve its organisation; that its sections should enter simply as local sections. These conditions were formally accepted by the Alliance. But of all its pretended sections, only the Central Section of Geneva entered into our Association. The others remained a mystery to the General Council, thus leaving it under the impression that they did not exist.

And now, three years later, we are put in possession of documents which prove irrefragably that this same Alliance of Socialist Democracy, in spite of its formal promise, has continued and does continue to exist as an international body within the International, and that in the shape of a secret society; that it is still directed by M. Bakounine; that its ends are still the same, and that all the attacks which for the last twelve months have been directed apparently against the London Conference and the General Council, but in reality against the whole of our organisation, have had their source in this Alliance. The same men who accuse the General Council of authoritativeness without ever having been able to specify one single authoritative act on its part, who talk at every opportunity of the autonomy of sections, of the free federation of groups; who charge the General Council with the intention of forcing upon the International its own official and orthodox doctrine and to transform our Association into a hierarchically constituted organisation—these very same men, in practice, constitute themselves as a secret society with a hierarchical organisation, and under a, not merely authoritative, but absolutely dictatorial leadership; they trample under their feet every vestige of autonomy of sections and

federations; they aim at forcing upon the International, by means of this secret organisation, the personal and orthodox doctrines of M. Bakounine. While they demand that the International should be organised from below upwards, they themselves, as members of the Alliance, humbly submit to the word of command which is handed down to them from above.

Need we say that the very existence of such a secret society within the International is a flagrant breach of our General Rules? These Rules know only one kind of members of the International, with rights and duties equal for all; the Alliance separates them into two classes, the initiated and the profane, the latter destined to be led by the first, by means of an organisation whose very existence is unknown to them. The International demands of its adherents to acknowledge Truth, Justice and Morality as the basis of their conduct; the Alliance imposes upon its adepts, as their first duty, mendacity, dissimulation and imposture, by ordering them to deceive the profane Internationals as to the existence of the secret organisation and to the motives and ends of their own words and actions. The programme of the International is laid down in our Rules and known to all; that of the Alliance has never been avowed and is unknown up to this day.

The nucleus of the Alliance is in the federation of the Jura. From it the watchword is issued which is taken up and repeated immediately by the other sections and by the newspapers belonging to the secret organisation. In Italy, a certain number of societies are controlled by it. These societies call themselves International sections, but have never either demanded their admission, or paid any contributions, or fulfilled any of the other conditions prescribed by our Regulations. In Belgium, the Alliance has a few influential agents. In the South of France, it has several correspondents, among them pluralists, who couple their functions of correspondents to the Alliance with the office

of clerk to the inspector of police. But the country where the Alliance is organised most effectively, and where it has the most extended ramifications is Spain. Having managed to slip itself quietly and from the commencement into the ranks of the Spanish Internationals, it has managed to control, most of the time, the successive Federal Councils and Congresses. The most devoted Internationals in Spain were induced into the belief that this secret organisation existed everywhere within our Association and that it was almost a duty to belong to it. This delusion was destroyed by the London Conference where the Spanish delegate,\* himself a member of the Alliance, could convince himself that the contrary was the fact, and by the lies and violent attacks which, immediately afterwards, Bakounine ordered his faithful flock to launch against the Conference and the General Council. After a prolonged struggle within the Alliance, those of its Spanish members who had more at heart the International than the Alliance, retired from the latter. Immediately they were assaulted by the most atrocious insults and calumnies on the part of those who remained faithful to the secret society. Twice they were expelled from the local federation of Madrid, in open violation of the existing regulations. When they proposed constituting themselves as the "New Federation of Madrid",<sup>383</sup> the Federal Council refused its authorisation and returned the contributions they had proffered. And here we must state that out of eight members of that Federal Council there are five (Vicente Rossell, Peregrin Montoro, Severino Albarracin, Francisco Tomas, and Franco Martinez) whom we know to be members of the Alliance; it is moreover likely that there are others besides these. Thus the sections and local federations of Spain, so proud of their autonomy, are led like a flock of sheep, without even suspecting it, by secret orders sent from Switzerland, which

---

\* Anselmo Lorenzo.—*Ed.*

the Federal Council has to carry out without a murmur, under penalty of being outlawed by the Alliance.

The Spanish Federal Council, in order to ensure the election, as delegates for the Congress at The Hague, of members of the Alliance, has sent to the sections and local federations a private circular dated 7th July, in which it calls upon them for an extraordinary contribution with which to defray the expenses of the delegates, and moreover orders them, authoritatively, to vote for a certain number of delegates, to be elected by the whole of the Spanish Internationals; all voting papers to be sent to the Federal Council which would ascertain the result of the election. In this manner, the success of the candidates of the Alliance was placed beyond all doubt. Moreover, the Federal Council announced that it will draw up instructions by which the delegates elected shall be bound. As soon as we had cognisance of this plot to have the delegates of the Alliance sent to the Congress with the money of the International, and had received, besides, the proofs of the complicity of the Spanish Federal Council in the manoeuvres of the secret society, we have summoned it, on the 24th July:

1) To hand us in a list of all members of the Alliance in Spain, with the designation of such offices as they may hold in the International;

2) To institute an inquiry into the character and action of the Alliance in Spain, as well as into its organisation and its ramifications beyond the frontier;

3) To send us a copy of their private circular of July 7th;

4) To explain to us how they reconciled with their duties towards the International, the presence, in the Federal Council, of at least three notorious members of the Alliance;

5) To send a categorical reply by return.\*

---

\* See the next article.—*Ed.*

This reply could have been in our hands on the 1st August at latest. But only on the 5th August we received a letter dated Valencia, Aug. 1st (postmark illegible), in which a reply was deferred under the pretence that the members of the Council did not understand our letter which was written in French, and that time was required to translate it. That same Council, in its letter of June 15th, had requested us to send them our publications, etc., as much as possible in French, they (the members of the Council) being somewhat familiarised with that language! Thus the pretence is false; all that is wanted is to make us lose time while it is precious.

We are therefore under the necessity of denouncing to all the members of the Association, and above all to the Spanish Internationals, the Spanish Federal Council as *traitors towards the International Working Men's Association*. Instead of faithfully fulfilling the mandate entrusted to them by the Spanish Internationals, they have made themselves the organ of a society not only foreign, but hostile to the International. Instead of obeying the General Rules and Regulations, and the resolutions of the General and Spanish Congresses, they obey to secret orders emanating from M. Bakounine. The very existence of a Federal Council composed, in its majority, of members of a secret society foreign to the International, is a flagrant violation of our General Rules.

These are, Citizens, the facts which we have to lay before you before the elections for the Congress take place. For the first time in the history of the working-class struggles, we stumble over a secret conspiracy plotted in the midst of that class, and intended to undermine, not the existing capitalist *régime*, but the very Association in which that *régime* finds its most energetic opponent. It is a conspiracy got up to hamper the proletarian movement. Thus, wherever we meet it, we find it preaching the emasculating doctrine of absolute abstention from political action; and

while the plain profane Internationals are persecuted and imprisoned over nearly all Europe, the valiant members of the Alliance enjoy a quite exceptional immunity.

Citizens, it is for you to choose. What is at stake at this moment, is neither the autonomy of sections, nor the free federation of groups, nor the organisation from below upwards, nor any other formula equally pretentious and sonorous; the question today is this: Do you want your central organs composed of men who recognise no other mandate but yours, or do you want them composed of men elected by surprise, and who accept your mandate with the resolution to lead you, like a flock of sheep, as they may be directed by secret instructions emanating from a mysterious personage in Switzerland?

To unveil the existence of this secret society of dupers, is to crush its power. The men of the Alliance themselves are not foolish enough to expect that the great mass of the Internationals would knowingly submit to an organisation like theirs, its existence once made known. Yet there is complete incompatibility between the dupers and those who are intended for the dupes, between the Alliance and the International.

Moreover, it is time once and for all to put a stop to those internal quarrels provoked every day afresh within our Association, by the presence of this parasite body. These quarrels only serve to squander forces which ought to be employed in fighting the present middle-class *régime*. The Alliance, in so far as it paralyses the action of the International against the enemies of the working class, serves admirably the middle class and the governments.

For these reasons, the General Council will call upon the Congress of The Hague to expel from the International all and every member of the Alliance and to give the Council such powers as shall enable it effectually to prevent the recurrence of similar conspiracies.

Written by Engels  
on August 4-6, 1872

Printed in the English  
original for the first time

---

TO SPANISH SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>384</sup>

London, August 8, 1872

In view of the intrigues launched against the *International Working Men's Association* by members of the secret society Alliance, the Executive Committee of the General Council had at its meeting of July 24, 1872, instructed Citizen F. Engels, Secretary for Spain, to write the Spanish Federal Council in Valencia the following letter:

TO THE SPANISH FEDERAL COUNCIL

Citizens,

We hold proof that within the International, and particularly in Spain, there exists a secret society called the *Alliance of Socialist Democracy*. This society, whose centre is in Switzerland, considers it its special mission to guide our great Association in the direction of its own particular inclinations and lead it towards goals unknown to the vast majority of International members. Moreover, we know from the Seville *Razon*<sup>385</sup> that at least three members of your Council belong to the Alliance.

When this society was formed in 1868 as an open society, the General Council was obliged to refuse it admission to the International, so long as it preserved its international character, for it pretended to form a second in-

ternational body functioning within and without the *International Working Men's Association*. The Alliance was admitted to the International only after promising to limit itself to being purely a local section in Geneva (see the private circular of the General Council on "Fictitious Splits, etc.", p. 7 onwards\*).

If the character and organisation of this society were already contrary to the spirit and the letter of our Rules, when it was still public, its secret existence within the International, in spite of its promise, represents no less than treason against our Association. The International knows but one type of members, all with equal rights and duties; the Alliance divides them into two classes, the initiated and the uninitiated, the latter doomed to be led by the former by means of an organisation of whose very existence they are unaware. The International demands that its members should acknowledge Truth, Justice and Morality as the basis of their conduct; the Alliance obliges its supporters to hide from the uninitiated members of the International the existence of the secret organisation, the motives and even the aim of their words and deeds. The General Council had already announced in its private circular that at the coming Congress it would demand an inquiry into this Alliance, which is a veritable conspiracy against the International. The General Council is also aware of the measures taken by the Spanish Federal Council on the insistence of the gentlemen of the Alliance in the interests of their society, and is determined to put an end to this underhand dealing. With this end in view, it requests from you for the report it will be presenting at the Hague Congress:

- 1) a list of all the members of the Alliance in Spain, with indication of the functions they fulfill in the International;
- 2) an inquiry into the nature and activities of the

---

\* See pp. 362-66 of the present volume.—Ed.

Alliance, and also into its organisation and ramifications outside Spain;

3) a copy of your private circular of July 7 [1872];

4) an explanation of how you reconcile your duties towards the International with the presence in your Council of at least three notorious members of the Alliance.

Unless it receives *a categoric and exhaustive answer by return*, the General Council will be obliged to denounce you publicly in Spain and abroad for having violated the spirit and the letter of the General Rules, and having betrayed the International in the interests of a secret society that is not only alien but hostile to it.

Greetings and fraternity.

On behalf of the General Council

Secretary for Spain,

*FREDERICK ENGELS*

33, Rathbone Place,  
London, July 24, 1872

The Spanish Federal Council replied to the inquiries of the General Council in a letter dated "Valencia, August 1", and received in London on August 5. It ran as follows:

"Comrades, we have received your last letter, but as it is in French we are unable to acquaint ourselves with its contents since our usual translator is not in Valencia. We have asked another comrade to translate it as soon as possible so that we can answer it."

At its meeting of August 8, 1872, the Executive Committee of the General Council decided that pending the receipt of the requested information from the Spanish Federal Council, it was necessary to publish the above letter in order to move all the Spanish sections to undertake their general inquiries into the existence, acts and aims of the secret society Alliance.

The Executive Committee  
of the General Council:

<i>LEO FRANKEL</i> , Corresponding Secretary for	Austria and Hungary
<i>J. P. McDONNELL</i>	Ireland
<i>F. ENGELS</i>	Spain and Italy
<i>A. SERRAILLIER</i>	France
<i>LE MOUSSU</i>	America
<i>HERMANN JUNG</i>	Switzerland
<i>KARL MARX</i>	Germany and Russia

Chairman of the meeting

*WALERY WROBLEWSKI*, Secretary for Poland.

Secretary of the meeting

*F. COURNET*, Secretary for Holland

Written by Marx and Engels  
on August 8, 1872

Published in *La Emancipacion*  
No. 62, August 17, 1872

Translated from the newspaper

---

THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE NEW MADRID  
FEDERATION<sup>386</sup>

The Executive Committee, entrusted by the General Council with temporarily carrying out all the administrative business of the Association,

in view of the New Madrid Federation's letter of August 5, requesting its recognition by the General Council;

in view of the Spanish Federal Council's resolution of July 16, refusing to admit the said federation;

considering that, formally, it would be ridiculous to share in this matter the attitude of a Federal Council, the majority of which are members of a secret society hostile to the International, and which the General Council intends opposing at the Congress;

considering that, essentially, the founders of the New Madrid Federation are the very people who were the first in Spain to dare disassociate themselves from this secret society called the *Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, and disclose and thwart its schemes.

For these reasons,

the Executive Committee, on behalf of the General Council, has resolved to recognise the New Madrid Federation and enter into regular and direct relations with it.

London, August 15, 1872

In the name of the Executive Committee

Secretary for Spain,

*FREDERICK ENGELS*

---

TO ITALIAN SECTIONS CONCERNING  
THE RIMINI CONFERENCE<sup>387</sup>

33, Rathbone Place,  
London, August 23, 1872

We have received a resolution dated "Rimini, August 6" from the conference of an Italian Federation supposedly belonging to the International Working Men's Association, breaking all solidarity with the General Council in London and on *its own initiative* calling an\* anti-authoritarian congress at Neuchâtel in Switzerland, to which all sections of like opinion are invited to send their delegates, instead of to The Hague where the regular congress of the International is to be held.

It should be noted that of the 21 sections whose delegates have signed this resolution, *only one* (the Neapolitan) belongs to the International. None of the remaining 20 sections have ever fulfilled a single one of the conditions prescribed by our General Rules and Regulations for the admission of new sections. Consequently, there does not exist an Italian Federation of the International Working Men's Association. Those who claim to form it, are forming an International of their own outside the great Working Men's Association.

---

\* "so-called" (*sedicente*) follows here in the rough copy.—Ed.

It will be for the Congress at The Hague to pass a resolution on such usurpations.

In the name and by order of the General Council

Secretary for Italy,

*FREDERICK ENGELS*

Published in part in  
*La Plebe* No. 95, August 28,  
1872 and in its entirety  
in *Il Popolino* No. 20,  
September 29, 1872

Translated from  
*Il Popolino* and verified  
with the rough copy

---

REPORT OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE FIFTH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
HELD AT THE HAGUE

From THE 2nd TO THE 7th SEPTEMBER, 1872<sup>388</sup>

Citizens,—Since our last Congress at Basel, two great wars have changed the face of Europe: the Franco-German War and the Civil War in France. Both of these wars were preceded, accompanied, and followed by a third war—the war against the International Working Men's Association.

The Paris members of the International had told the French People, publicly and emphatically, that voting the plebiscite was voting despotism at home and war abroad. Under the pretext of having participated in a plot for the assassination of Louis Bonaparte, they were arrested on the eve of the plebiscite, the 23rd of April, 1870. Simultaneous arrests of Internationalists took place at Lyons, Rouen, Marseilles, Brest, and other towns. In its declaration of May 3rd, 1870, the General Council stated<sup>389</sup>:

“This last plot will worthily range with its two predecessors of grotesque memory. The noisy and violent measures against our French sections are exclusively intended to serve one single purpose—the manipulation of the plebiscite.”

In point of fact, after the downfall of the December empire its governmental successors published documentary evidence to the effect that this last plot had been fabricated by the Bonapartist police itself,<sup>390</sup> and that on the eve of the plebiscite, Ollivier, in a private circular, directly told his subordinates,

"The leaders of the International must be arrested or else the voting of the plebiscite could not be satisfactorily proceeded with."

The plebiscitary farce once over, the members of the Paris Federal Council were indeed condemned, on the 8th of July, by Louis Bonaparte's own judges, but for the simple crime of belonging to the International and not for any participation in the sham plot.<sup>391</sup> Thus the Bonapartist government considered it necessary to initiate the most ruinous war that was ever brought down upon France, by a preliminary campaign against the French sections of the International Working Men's Association. Let us not forget that the working class in France rose like one man to reject the plebiscite. Let us no more forget that "the stock exchanges, the cabinets, the ruling classes, and the press of Europe celebrated the plebiscite as a signal victory of the French emperor over the French working class".— (Address of General Council on the Civil War, 23rd July, 1870.<sup>392</sup>)

A few weeks after the plebiscite, when the Imperialist press commenced to fan the war-like passions amongst the French people, the Paris Internationalists, nothing daunted by the government persecutions, issued their appeal of the 12th of July, "to the workmen of all nations", denounced the intended war as a "criminal absurdity", telling their "brothers of Germany" that their "division would only result in the complete triumph of despotism on both sides of the Rhine", and declaring that "we, the members of the International Association, know of no frontiers"<sup>393</sup>. Their appeal met with an enthusiastic echo from Germany, so that the General Council was entitled to state,

"The very fact that while official France and Germany are rushing into a fratricidal feud, the workmen of France and Germany send each other messages of peace and good will—this great fact, unparalleled in the history of the past—opens the vista of a brighter future. It proves that in contrast to old society, with its economical miseries and

its political delirium, a new society is springing up whose international rule will be *Peace*, because its national ruler will be everywhere the same—*Labour*. The pioneer of that new society is the International Working Men's Association."—(Address of July 23rd, 1870.<sup>394</sup>)

Up to the proclamation of the Republic, the members of the Paris Federal Council remained in prison, while the other members of the Association were daily denounced to the mob as traitors acting in the pay of Prussia.

With the capitulation of Sedan, when the Second Empire ended as it began, by a parody, the Franco-German War entered upon its second phase. It became a war against the French people. After her repeated solemn declarations to take up arms for the sole purpose of repelling foreign aggression, Prussia now dropped the mask and proclaimed a war of conquest. From that moment she found herself compelled not only to fight the Republic in France, but simultaneously the International in Germany. We can here but hint at a few incidents of that conflict.

Immediately after the declaration of war, the greater part of the territory of the North German Confederation, Hanover, Oldenburg, Bremen, Hamburg, Brunswick, Schleswig-Holstein, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and the province of Prussia, were placed in a state of siege, and handed over to the tender mercies of General Vogel von Falkenstein. This state of siege, proclaimed as a safeguard against the threatening foreign invasion, was at once turned into a state of war against the German Internationals.

The day after the proclamation of the Republic at Paris, the Brunswick Central Committee of the German Democratic Socialist Working Men's Party, which forms a section of the International within the limits imposed by the law of the country, issued a manifesto (5th September) calling upon the working class to oppose by all means in their power the dismemberment of France, to claim a peace honourable for that country, and to agitate for the recogni-

tion of the French Republic.<sup>395</sup> The manifesto denounced the proposed annexation of Alsace and Lorraine as a crime tending to transform all Germany into a Prussian barracks, and to establish war as a permanent European institution. On the 9th September, Vogel von Falkenstein had the members of the Brunswick Committee arrested, and marched off in chains, a distance of 600 miles, to Lötzen, a Prussian fortress, on the Russian frontier, where their ignominious treatment was to serve as a foil to the ostentatious feasting of the Imperial guest at Wilhelmshöhe.<sup>396</sup> As arrests, the hunting of workmen from one German state to another, suppression of proletarian papers, military brutality, and police-chicane in all forms, did not prevent the International vanguard of the German working class from acting up to the Brunswick manifesto, Vogel von Falkenstein, by an ukase of September 21st,\* interdicted all meetings of the Democratic Socialist Party. That interdict was cancelled by another ukase of October 5th, wherein he naively commands the police spies

“to denounce to him personally all individuals who, by public demonstrations, shall encourage France in her resistance against the conditions of peace imposed by Germany, so as to enable him to render such individuals innocuous during the continuance of the war”.

Leaving the cares of the war abroad to Moltke, the King of Prussia contrived to give a new turn to the war at home. By his personal order of the 17th October, Vogel von Falkenstein was to lend his Lötzen captives to the Brunswick District Tribunal, which, on its part, was either to find grounds for their legal durance, or else return them to the safe keeping of the dread general.

Vogel von Falkenstein's proceedings were, of course, imitated throughout Germany, while Bismarck, in a diplomatic circular, mocked Europe by standing forth as the indignant champion of the right of free utterance of

---

\* 1870.—*Ed.*

opinion, free press, and free meetings, on the part of the peace party in France. At the very same time that he demanded a freely-elected National Assembly for France, in Germany he had Bebel and Liebknecht imprisoned for having, in opposition to him, represented the International in the German Parliament, and in order to get them out of the way during the impending general elections.<sup>397</sup>

His master, William the Conqueror, supported him, by a decree from Versailles, prolonging the state of siege, that is to say, the suspension of all civil law, for the whole period of the elections. In fact, the King did not allow the state of siege to be raised in Germany until two months after the conclusion of peace with France. The stubbornness with which he was insisting upon the state of war at home, and his repeated personal meddling with his own German captives, prove the awe in which he, amidst the din of victorious arms and the frantic cheers of the whole middle class, held the rising party of the proletariat. It was the involuntary homage paid by physical force to moral power.

If the war against the International had been localised, first in France, from the days of the plebiscite to the downfall of the Empire, then in Germany during the whole period of the resistance of the Republic against Prussia, it became general since the rise, and after the fall, of the Paris Commune.

On the 6th of June, 1871, Jules Favre issued his circular to the Foreign Powers demanding the extradition of the refugees of the Commune as common criminals, and a general crusade against the International as the enemy of family, religion, order, and property, so adequately represented in his own person.<sup>398</sup> Austria and Hungary caught the cue at once. On the 13th June, a raid was made on the reputed leaders of the Pesth Working Men's Union, their papers were seized, their persons sequestered, and proceedings were instituted against them for high treason.<sup>399</sup> Several delegates of the Vienna International, happening to be

on a visit to Pesth, were carried off to Vienna, there to undergo a similar treatment. Beust asked and received from his parliament a supplementary vote of £30,000,

"on behalf of expenses for political information that had become more than ever indispensable through the dangerous spread of the International all over Europe".

Since that time a true reign of terror against the working class has set in in Austria and Hungary. In its last agonies the Austrian Government seems still anxiously to cling to its old privilege of playing the Don Quixote of European reaction.

A few weeks after Jules Favre's circular, Dufaure proposed to his rurals a law which is now in force, and punishes as a crime the mere fact of belonging to the International Working Men's Association, or of sharing its principles. As a witness before the rural committee of inquiry on Dufaure's Bill, Thiers boasted that it was the offspring of his own ingenious brains and that he had been the first to discover the infallible panacea of treating the Internationals as the Spanish Inquisition had treated the heretics. But even on this point he can lay no claim to originality. Long before his appointment as saviour of society, the true law which the Internationals deserve at the hands of the ruling classes had been laid down by the Vienna courts.

On the 26th July, 1870, the most prominent men of the Austrian proletarian party were found guilty of high treason, and sentenced to years of penal servitude, with one fast day in every month. The law laid down was this:

"The prisoners, as they themselves confess, have accepted and acted according to the programme of the German Working Men's Congress of Eisenach (1869). This programme embodies the programme of the International. The International is established for the emancipation of the working class from the rule of the propertied class, and from political dependence. That emancipation is incompatible with the existing institutions of the Austrian state. Hence, whoever accepts and

propagates the principles of the International programme, commits preparatory acts for the overthrow of the Austrian Government, and is consequently guilty of high treason."

On the 27th November, 1871, judgment was passed upon the members of the Brunswick Committee. They were sentenced to various periods of imprisonment. The court expressly referred, as to a precedent, to the law laid down at Vienna.

At Pesth, the prisoners belonging to the Working Men's Union, after having undergone for nearly a year a treatment as infamous as that inflicted upon the Fenians by the British Government, were brought up for judgment on the 22nd April, 1872. The public prosecutor, here also, called upon the court to apply to them the law laid down at Vienna. They were, however, acquitted.

At Leipzig, on the 27th March, 1872, Bebel and Liebknecht were sentenced to two years' imprisonment in a fortress for attempted high treason upon the strength of the law as laid down at Vienna. The only distinctive feature of this case is that the law laid down by a Vienna judge was sanctioned by a Saxon jury.

At Copenhagen, the three members of the Central Committee of the International, Brix, Pio, and Geleff, were thrown into prison on the 5th of May\* because they had declared their firm resolve to hold an open air meeting in the teeth of a police order forbidding it. Once in prison they were told that the accusation against them was extended, that the socialist ideas in themselves were incompatible with the existence of the Danish state, and that consequently the mere act of propagating them constituted a crime against the Danish constitution. Again the law as laid down in Vienna! The accused are still in prison awaiting their trial.

The Belgian Government, distinguished by its sympathetic reply to Jules Favre's demand of extradition, made haste

\* 1872.—Ed.

to propose, through Malou, a hypocritical counterfeit of Dufaure's law.

His Holiness Pope Pius IX gave vent to his feelings in an allocation to a deputation of Swiss Catholics.

"Your government," said he, "which is republican, thinks itself bound to make a heavy sacrifice for what is called liberty. It affords an asylum to a goodly number of individuals of the worst character. It tolerates that sect of the International which desires to treat all Europe as it has treated Paris. These gentlemen of the International, who are no gentlemen, are to be feared because they work for the account of the everlasting enemy of God and mankind. What is to be gained by protecting them! One must pray for them."

Hang them first and pray for them afterwards!

Supported by Bismarck, Beust, and Stieber, the Prussian spy-in-chief, the Emperors of Austria and Germany, met at Salzburg in the beginning of September, 1871, for the ostensible purpose of founding a holy alliance against the International Working Men's Association.

"Such a European alliance," declared the *North German Gazette*,<sup>400</sup> Bismarck's private *Moniteur*,\* "is the only possible salvation of state, church, property, civilisation, in one word, of everything that constitutes European states."

Bismarck's real object, of course, was to prepare alliances for an impending war with Russia, and the International was held up to Austria as a piece of red cloth is held up to a bull.

Lanza suppressed the International in Italy by simple decree. Sagasta declared it an outlaw in Spain,<sup>401</sup> probably with a view to curry favour with the English stock exchange. The Russian Government which, since the emancipation of the serfs, has been driven to the dangerous expedient of making timid concessions to popular claims today, and withdrawing them tomorrow, found in the general hue and cry against the International a pretext for a recrudescence of reaction at home. Abroad, with the

\* Herald.—Ed.

intention of prying into the secrets of our Association, it succeeded in inducing a Swiss judge to search, in presence of a Russian spy, the house of Outine, a Russian International, and the editor of the Geneva *Égalité*, the organ of our Romance Federation.\* The republican government of Switzerland has only been prevented by the agitation of the Swiss Internationals from handing up to Thiers refugees of the Commune.

Finally, the government of Mr. Gladstone, unable to act in Great Britain, at least set forth its good intentions by the police terrorism exercised in Ireland against our sections then in course of formation, and by ordering its representatives abroad to collect information with respect to the International Working Men's Association.

But all the measures of repression which the combined government intellect of Europe was capable of devising, vanish into nothing before the war of calumny undertaken by the lying power of the civilised world. Apocryphal histories and mysteries of the International, shameless forgeries of public documents and private letters, sensational telegrams, followed each other in rapid succession; all the sluices of slander at the disposal of the venal respectable press were opened at once to set free a deluge of infamy in which to drown the execrated foe. This war of calumny finds no parallel in history for the truly international area over which it has spread, and for the complete accord in which it has been carried on by all shades of ruling class opinion. When the great conflagration took place at Chicago, the telegraph round the world announced it as the infernal deed of the International; and it is really wonderful that to its demoniacal agency has not been attributed the hurricane ravaging the West Indies.

In its former annual reports, the General Council used to give a review of the progress of the Association since the

---

\* See pp. 104-06, 111-12 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

meeting of the preceding Congress. You will appreciate, Citizens, the motives which induce us to abstain from that course upon this occasion. Moreover, the reports of the delegates from the various countries, who know best how far their discretion may extend, will in a measure make up for this deficiency. We confine ourselves to the statement that since the Congress at Basel, and chiefly since the London Conference of September, 1871, the International has been extended to the Irish in England and to Ireland itself, to Holland, Denmark, and Portugal, that it has been firmly organised in the United States, and that it has established ramifications in Buenos Aires, Australia, and New Zealand.

The difference between a working class without an International, and a working class with an International, becomes most evident if we look back to the period of 1848. Years were required for the working class itself to recognise the Insurrection of June, 1848, as the work of its own vanguard. The Paris Commune was at once acclaimed by the universal proletariat.

You, the delegates of the working class, meet to strengthen the militant organisation of a society aiming at the emancipation of labour and the extinction of national feuds. Almost at the same moment, there meet at Berlin the crowned dignitaries of the old world in order to forge new chains and to hatch new wars.<sup>402</sup>

Long life to the International Working Men's Association!

Written by Marx  
at the end of August 1872  
Published as a leaflet:  
*Offizieller Bericht des  
Londoner Generalrats, verlesen  
in öffentlicher Sitzung des  
Internationalen Kongress,  
Braunschweig 1872, and in the  
newspapers Der Volksstaat No. 75,  
September 18, 1872; La Liberté  
No. 39, September 29, 1872;  
L'Internationale No. 195,  
October 6, 1872; La Emancipation Nos.  
68 and 69, October 5 and 13;  
The International Herald Nos. 27,  
28 and 29, October 5, 12 and 19, 1872*

Printed according  
to *The International Herald*

---

---

RAPPORT FAIT AU CONGRÈS DE LA HAYE  
AU NOM DU CONSEIL GÉNÉRAL, SUR L'ALLIANCE  
DE LA DÉMOCRATIE SOCIALISTE\*403

L'Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste fut fondée par M. Bakounine vers la fin de l'année 1868. C'était une société internationale prétendant de fonctionner, en même temps, en dehors et en dedans de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Se composant de membres de cette dernière, qui réclamaient le droit de participer dans toutes les réunions internationales, elle voulait cependant se réserver le droit d'avoir ses groupes locaux, ses fédérations nationales, ses Congrès à part à côté de ceux de l'Internationale. L'Alliance (dès son début prétendait donc de former une espèce d'aristocratie au milieu de notre Association, un corps d'élite avec un programme à elle, et avec des privilèges spéciaux.

La correspondance qui alors eut lieu entre le Comité Central de l'Alliance et notre Conseil général se trouve reproduite dans la circulaire : « *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale* », page 7 à 9\*\* pièces justificatives N°. 1). Le Conseil général refusa d'admettre l'Alliance tant qu'elle conserverait son caractère international distinct; il ne promit de l'admettre qu'à condition qu'elle dissoudrait son organisation spéciale internationale que ses sections se convertiraient en simples sections de notre Association, et

---

\* See Appendix, pp. 505-18—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 362-66 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

que le Conseil serait informé du lieu et de la force numérique de chaque nouvelle section.

Voici ce que répondit, à ces demandes, le 22 juin 1869, le Comité Central de l'Alliance, qui\*, désormais, dans ses relations avec le Conseil général, prit le nom de « Section de l'Alliance de la démocratie socialiste de Genève » :

« Conformément à ce qui a été convenu entre votre Conseil et le comité central de l'Alliance de la démocratie socialiste nous avons soumis aux différents groupes de l'Alliance la question de sa dissolution comme organisation distincte de celle de l'Association internationale des Travailleurs . . . Nous avons le plaisir de vous annoncer que la grande majorité des groupes a partagé l'avis du Comité Central tendant à prononcer la dissolution de l'Alliance internationale de la démocratie socialiste. *Aujourd'hui cette dissolution est prononcée.* En notifiant cette décision aux différents groupes de l'Alliance, nous les avons invités à se constituer, à notre exemple, en sections de l'Association internationale des Travailleurs, et à se faire reconnaître comme telles par vous ou par le Conseil fédéral de cette association dans leurs pays respectifs. Comme confirmation de la lettre que vous avez adressée à l'ex-comité central de l'Alliance, nous venons aujourd'hui, en vous soumettant les statuts de notre section, vous prier de la reconnaître officiellement comme branche de l'Association internationale des Travailleurs. . . » (signé) le Secrétaire provisoire Ch. Perron. (Pièces justificatives, N<sup>o</sup>. 2.)

Cet exemplaire des statuts de l'Alliance se trouve aux pièces justificatives N<sup>o</sup>. 3.

La section de Genève resta la seule qui demandait son affiliation. On n'entendit plus parler des autres prétendues sections de l'Alliance. Cependant, en dépit des intrigues continuelles des Alliancistes tendant à imposer leur programme spécial à toute l'Internationale, et à s'assurer la direction de notre association, on devait croire qu'elle avait tenu sa parole et qu'elle s'était dissoute. Mais\*\* le Conseil

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "pour cette occasion changeait son nom".—Ed.

\*\* Further the words "de mois de mai dernier" are crossed out in the MS.—Ed.

général reçut des indications assez précises dont il dut conclure que l'Alliance ne s'était jamais dissoute; qu'en dépit de la parole solennellement donnée, elle avait existé et existait toujours sous forme de société secrète, et qu'elle usait de cette organisations clandestine pour poursuivre toujours son but original de domination. C'était surtout en Espagne que son existence devint de plus en plus manifeste, par suite des divisions au sein même de l'Alliance, dont nous donnerons plus loin l'historique. Ici il suffit de dire que d'abord une circulaire des membres de l'ancien Conseil fédéral de ce pays, membres en même temps du Comité Central de l'Alliance en Espagne (voir *Emancipation* N° 61, page 3, 2<sup>me</sup> colonne, Pièces N° 4<sup>04</sup>), en dévoila l'existence\*. Cette circulaire est datée le 2 juin 1872. Elle annonce à toutes les sections de l'Alliance en Espagne que les signataires venaient de se dissoudre comme section de l'Alliance et invitèrent les autres à suivre leur exemple.<sup>405</sup> Elle fut publiée dans *l'Emancipacion*. (N° 59, pièces justificatives N° 5.)

Cette publication força le journal de l'Alliance, la *Federacion* de Barcelona, (N° 155, 4 août 1872) de publier lui-même les statuts de l'Alliance (pièces justificatives N° 6).

En comparant les statuts de la société secrète avec les statuts soumis par l'Alliance de Genève au Conseil général, nous trouvons d'abord que le programme en tête de la première est identique avec celui en-tête de l'autre. Il n'y a que quelques changements de rédaction de sorte que dans les statuts secrets le programme spécial de Bakouine est exprimé d'une manière plus nette.

Voici le tableau exacte:

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "mic dans l'impossibilité de mettre d'accord leurs devoirs envers l'Internationale avec leur position comme membres d'une société secrète dans son sein, le 2 juin ils adressèrent".—Ed.

Art. 1 de Genève est littéralement identique à l'art. 5 secret.

"	2	"	généralement	"	"	1	"
"	3	"	littéralement	"	"	2	"
"	4 et 5	"	sont généralement	"	"	3	"
"	6	"	est	"	"	4	"

Les statuts secrets eux-mêmes sont basés sur ceux de Genève. Ainsi l'article 4 secret correspond littéralement à l'art. 3 de Genève; les art. 8 et 9 de Genève se trouvent, abrégatifs, dans l'art. 10 secret, comme les art. 15-20 de Genève dans l'art. 3 secret.

L'art. 7 de Genève, contrairement à la pratique actuelle des Alliancistes, prêche « la forte organisation » de l'Internationale, et oblige tous les membres de l'Alliance à « soutenir... les résolutions des Congrès et le pouvoir du Conseil général ». Cet article ne se trouve pas dans les statuts secrets, mais la preuve qu'il y a figuré, en commencement, c'est qu'il se retrouve presque littéralement dans le règlement de la *seccion de oficios varios*\* de Madrid art. 15 (pièces justificatives N° 7.), où se trouve aussi le programme de l'Alliance.

Il est donc évident que nous avons à faire, non avec deux sociétés distinctes, mais avec une seule et même société. Tandis que le Comité central de Genève donna au Conseil général l'assurance de la dissolution de l'Alliance, et que, sur la foi de cette déclaration, il fut reçu comme section de l'Internationale, les meneurs de ce comité central, M. Bakounine à leur tête, renforcèrent l'organisation de cette même Alliance en le transformant en société secrète, et en lui conservant le caractère international qu'on avait promis d'abandonner. La bonne foi du Conseil général et de toute l'Internationale, à laquelle la Correspondance avait

\* section combining various types of professions.—Ed.

été soumise, fut indignement trompée. Après avoir débuté par un mensonge pareil, ces hommes n'avaient plus de raison de se gêner dans leurs machinations pour se soumettre l'Internationale, ou, en cas de non-réussite, pour la désorganiser.

Voici maintenant les articles principaux de statuts secrets :

« 1) L'Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste *se composera de membres de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*, et aura pour but la propagande et le développement des principes de son programme, et l'étude de tous les moyens propres à avancer l'émancipation directe et *immédiate* de la classe ouvrière.

« 2) Pour obtenir les meilleurs résultats possibles et pour ne pas compromettre la marche de l'organisation sociale, l'Alliance sera *éminemment secrète*.

« 4) Personne ne pourra être admis comme membre sans avoir auparavant accepté complètement et sincèrement les principes du programme, etc.

« 5) L'Alliance *influera* tant qu'elle pourra *au sein de la fédération ouvrière locale* de sorte qu'elle ne prenne une marche réactionnaire ou anti-révolutionnaire.

« 6) La majorité des associés *pourra exclure de l'Alliance* chacun de ses membres *sans indication de cause*. »

L'Alliance est donc une société secrète formée au sein même de l'Internationale avec un programme spécial qui n'est pas du tout celui de l'Internationale, et ayant pour but la propagande de ce programme qu'elle considère comme le seul révolutionnaire. Elle impose à ses membres le devoir d'agir au sein de leur fédération locale internationale de manière que cette dernière ne prenne une marche réactionnaire ou anti-révolutionnaire, c.-à-d. qu'elle ne s'éloigne aucunement du programme de l'Alliance. C'est à dire que l'Alliance a pour but d'imposer, au moyen de son organisation secrète, son programme sectaire à toute l'Internationale. Le moyen le plus efficace d'y arriver, c'est de s'emparer des conseils locaux et fédéraux et du Conseil général, en y faisant élire, usant de la puissance donnée

par l'organisation clandestine des membres de l'Alliance. C'est précisément ce qu'a fait l'Alliance là où elle a cru avoir des chances de succès ; nous le verrons plus tard.

Il est clair que personne ne saurait en vouloir aux Alliances de faire la propagande\* de leur programme. L'Internationale se compose des socialistes des nuances les plus variées. Son programme est assez large pour les comprendre toutes ; la secte bakouniniste y a été reçue aux mêmes conditions que les autres. Ce qu'on lui reproche, c'est précisément d'avoir violé ces conditions.

Quant au caractère secret de l'Alliance, c'est déjà autre chose. L'Internationale ne peut ignorer que les sociétés secrètes sont en beaucoup de pays, en Pologne, en France, en Irlande, un moyen légitime de défense contre le terrorisme gouvernemental. Mais elle a déclaré, par la Conférence de Londres, qu'elle veut rester complètement étrangère à ces sociétés, et que par conséquent elle ne le reconnaît pas comme sections. Et, ce qui est le point capital, nous nous trouvons ici en face d'une société secrète créée pour combattre, non les gouvernements, mais l'Internationale elle-même.

L'organisation d'une pareille société secrète est une violation flagrante, non seulement de l'engagement contracté envers l'Internationale, mais aussi de la lettre et de l'esprit de nos statuts\*\* généraux. Nos statuts ne connaissent qu'une seule espèce de membres de l'Internationale avec droits et devoirs égaux ; l'Alliance les divise en deux castes, initiés et profanes, aristocrates et plébéiens, ces derniers destinés à être menés par les premiers au moyen d'une organisation dont ils ignorent jusqu'à l'existence. L'Internationale demande à ses adhérents de reconnaître pour base de leur conduite la Vérité, Justice et la Morale ; l'Alliance

---

\* Further the word "publique" is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\* Further the words "et règlements" are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

impose à ses adeptes comme premier devoir le mensonge, la dissimulation et l'imposture, en leur prescrivant de tromper les internationaux profanes sur l'existence de l'organisation clandestine, sur les motifs et sur le but même de leurs paroles et de leurs actions. Les fondateurs de l'Alliance savaient parfaitement que la grande masse des internationaux profanes ne se soumettrait jamais sciemment à une organisation comme la leur, dès qu'ils en auraient connu l'existence. C'est pourquoi ils la firent « éminemment secrète ». Car il faut bien observer que le caractère secret de cette Alliance n'a pas pour objet de tromper la vigilance des gouvernements, car autrement on n'aurait pas débuté par sa constitution comme société publique ; ce caractère secret\* était uniquement destiné à tromper l'Internationale profane, comme le prouve la déception indigne dont l'Alliance a fait usage vis-à-vis du Conseil général. C'est donc une véritable conspiration contre l'Internationale. Pour la première fois dans l'histoire des luttes de la classe ouvrière, nous rencontrons une conspiration secrète ourdie au sein même de cette classe et destinée à miner non le régime exploiteur existant mais l'Association même qui le combat le plus énergiquement.

Du reste, il serait ridicule de prétendre qu'une société se soit fait secrète pour se sauvegarder contre les poursuites des gouvernements actuels, lorsque cette société prêcha partout la doctrine énervante de l'abstention absolue en matière politique et lorsqu'elle déclare dans son programme (art. 3, introduction des statuts secrets) qu'elle

« repousse toute action révolutionnaire qui n'aurait pas pour objet immédiat et direct le triomphe de la cause des ouvriers contre le capital ».

Maintenant, quelle a été l'action de cette société secrète dans l'Internationale ?

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "les faits l'ont prouvé".—Ed.

La réponse de cette question se trouve déjà, en partie, dans la circulaire privée du Conseil général sur « *les prétendues scissions* » etc. ; mais comme le Conseil général alors ne connaissait encore pas l'étendue de l'organisation secrète, et comme, depuis, il s'est passé bien des faits importants, cette réponse ne peut être que fort incomplète.

Constatons d'abord qu'il y a deux phases bien distinctes dans l'action de l'Alliance. Dans la première, elle croyait pouvoir s'emparer du Conseil général et, par cela, de la direction suprême de notre association. C'était alors qu'elle demanda à ses adhérents de soutenir la « forte organisation » de l'Internationale et

« le *pouvoir* du Conseil général d'abord, aussi, bien que celui du Conseil fédéral et du Comité central » ;

c'était alors que les hommes de l'Alliance ont demandé pour le Conseil général, au Congrès du Bâle, tous ces pouvoirs étendus qu'ils ont plus tard repoussés, avec tant d'horreur, comme *autoritaires*.

Le Congrès de Bâle mit à néant, au moins pour quelque temps, les espérances de l'Alliance.\* Depuis, elle ourdit des menées dont il est question dans les *scissions* ; dans le Jura, en Italie et en Espagne, elle ne cessait de substituer son programme spécial à celui de l'Internationale. La Conférence de Londres par ses résolutions sur la politique de la classe ouvrière et sur les sections sectaires, mit fin à ce quiproquo international. Aussitôt l'Alliance se remua de nouveau. La fédération jurasienne, /centre/ qui constitue la force de l'Alliance en Suisse, lança sa Circulaire de Sonvillier contre le Conseil général, où la forte organisation,

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "en la laissant à des intrigues locales. Elle se tint assez tranquille jusqu'à ce que la conférence de Londres rétablît, par ses résolutions sur la politique de la classe ouvrière et sur les sections sectaires, le programme original de l'Internationale vis-à-vis du programme de l'Alliance."  
—Ed.

le pouvoir du Conseil général, les résolutions de Bâle proposées et votées par les signataires de cette même circulaire furent comme *autoritaires*, désignation suffisante à ce qu'il paraît pour les faire condamner sommairement ; où l'on parlait de « la guerre, la guerre ouverte éclatée dans nos rangs » ; où l'on demandait pour l'Internationale une organisation adaptée, non aux besoins de la lutte actuelle, mais à nous ne savons pas quel idéal de société future, etc. Dès ce moment, on changea de tactique. La consigne était donnée. Partout où l'Alliance avait des ramifications, en Italie et en Espagne surtout, les résolutions autoritaires de Bâle et de la Conférence de Londres, ainsi que l'autoritarisme du Conseil général furent attaqués violemment. On ne parlait plus que de l'autonomie des sections, de groupes librement fédérés, d'anarchie, etc. Tout cela se comprend facilement. La puissance de la société secrète au sein de l'Internationale devait naturellement s'accroître à mesure que l'organisation publique de l'Internationale se relâchait et s'affaiblissait. Le grand obstacle que l'on rencontrait, c'était le Conseil général, et c'est lui qu'on attaqua en première ligne ; mais nous verrons tout à l'heure qu'on traita les Conseils fédéraux sur le même pied là où l'on crût l'occasion opportune.

La circulaire du Jura n'eut aucun effet excepté dans les pays où l'Internationale était plus ou moins sous l'influence de l'Alliance, en Italie et en Espagne. Dans ce dernier pays l'Alliance et l'Internationale avaient été fondées en même temps, immédiatement après le Congrès de Bâle. Les internationaux les plus dévoués de l'Espagne furent amenés à croire que le programme de l'Alliance était identique avec celui de l'Internationale, que l'organisation secrète existait partout, et que c'était presque un devoir d'y entrer. Cette illusion fut détruite par la Conférence de Londres où le délégué espagnol\*, lui-même membre du

---

\* Anselmo Lorenzo.—Ed.

comité central de l'alliance de son pays, put se convaincre du contraire, et par la circulaire du Jura lui-même dont les attaques violentes et les calomnies contre cette Conférence et contre le Conseil général avaient été immédiatement relevées par tous les organes de l'Alliance. La première suite en Espagne de la circulaire du Jura fut donc de créer une division, au sein même de l'Alliance espagnole, entre ceux qui étaient Internationaux avant tout et ceux qui ne voulaient pas de l'Internationale qu'en tant qu'elle était dominée par l'Alliance. La lutte, sourde d'abord, éclata bientôt dans les réunions de l'Internationale. Le Conseil fédéral élu par la Conférence de Valencia (septembre 1871)<sup>406</sup> ayant prouvé par ses actes qu'il préférerait l'Internationale à l'Alliance, la majorité de ses membres furent expulsés de la fédération locale de Madrid, dominée par l'Alliance.<sup>407</sup> Ils furent réhabilités, par le Congrès de Saragosse et deux,\* Mora et Lorenzo, furent réélus au nouveau Conseil fédéral\*\*, bien que tous les membres de l'ancien Conseil avaient d'avance déclaré de ne pas vouloir accepter.\*\*\*

Le Congrès de Saragosse<sup>408</sup> fit craindre aux meneurs de l'Alliance que l'Espagne allait s'échapper de leurs mains. Elle dirigea donc immédiatement contre le pouvoir du Conseil fédéral espagnol les mêmes attaques que la circulaire du Jura avait dirigée contre les attributions soi-disant autoritaires du Conseil général. En Espagne, une orga-

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "de ses membres les plus actifs".

\*\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: « siégeant à Valence. »—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "Le Congrès avait placé le Conseil fédéral à Valence dans l'espoir que ce serait un terrain neutre et que ces dissensions ne se reproduiraient pas. Mais sur les cinq membres du nouveau Conseil fédéral il y avait trois sustenteurs de l'Alliance, qui depuis, par des adjonctions, s'accrurent à cinq au moins."

nisation parfaitement démocratique et en même temps très complète avait été élaborée par le Congrès de Barcelone<sup>409</sup> et par la Conférence de Valence. Elle avait eu, grâce aussi à l'activité du Conseil fédéral élu à Valence (activité reconnue par un vote exprès du Congrès) les résultats brillants dont il a été question dans le rapport général.\* A Saragosse, Morago, l'âme de l'Alliance en Espagne, déclara que les attributions données dans cette organisation au Conseil fédéral étant *autoritaires*, il faut les restreindre, lui ôter le droit d'admettre ou de refuser de nouvelles sections, le droit de constater si leurs statuts sont conformés à ceux de la fédération, le réduire, enfin, au rôle d'un simple bureau de correspondance et de statistique. Le Congrès, en rejetant les propositions de Morago, résolut de maintenir l'organisation autoritaire existante. (Voir Extracto de las Actas del 2º Congreso obrero etc. p. 109 et 110. Pièces justificatives N° 8.<sup>410</sup> Sur ce point, le témoignage du citoyen Lafargue, délégué au Congrès de Saragosse, sera important.)

Pour éloigner le nouveau Conseil fédéral des dissensions surgies à Madrid, le Congrès le plaça à Valence. Mais la cause de ces dissensions, l'antagonisme qui commençait à se développer entre l'Alliance et l'Internationale, n'était pas d'un caractère local. Le Congrès, ignorant l'existence même de l'Alliance, avait composé le nouveau Conseil exclusivement de membres de cette société ; deux d'entre eux, Mora et Lorenzo, en étaient devenus les antagonistes, et Mora n'avait pas accepté. La circulaire du Conseil général sur *les prétendues scissions*, en réponse à celle du Jura, mit en demeure tous les internationaux de se déclarer, ou pour l'Internationale, ou pour l'Alliance. La polémique entre la *Emancipacion* d'un côté, et la *Federacion* de Barcelona et la *Razon* de Séville, journaux alliancistes, s'envenima de plus en plus. Enfin, le 2 juin, les membres de

\* See pp. 453-62 of the present volume.—Ed.

l'ancien Conseil fédéral, rédacteurs de la *Emancipacion* et membres du Comité central espagnol de l'Alliance, résolurent d'adresser à toutes les sections espagnoles de l'Alliance la circulaire où ils déclarèrent se dissoudre comme section de la société secrète et invitèrent les autres sections de suivre leur exemple. La vengeance ne se fit pas attendre. Ils furent immédiatement, et en violation flagrante des règlements en vigueur, expulsés de nouveau de la fédération locale de Madrid. Ils se constituèrent alors en nouvelle fédération de Madrid et demandèrent au Conseil fédéral leur récoognition.

Mais, en attendant, l'élément allianciste du Conseil, renforcé par des adjonctions, était parvenu à le dominer complètement, de sorte que Lorenzo s'en retira. La demande de la nouvelle fédération de Madrid eut pour réponse un refus net de la part du Conseil fédéral, qui, alors déjà, s'occupait d'assurer l'élection de candidats alliancistes au Congrès de La Haye. A cet effet, il adressa aux fédérations locales une circulaire privée en date du 7 juillet, où, après avoir répété les calomnies de la *Federacion* contre le Conseil général, il propose aux fédérations d'envoyer au Congrès une délégation commune à toute l'Espagne, élue à la majorité de la totalité des voix, dont le scrutin serait fait par le Conseil lui-même. (Pièces justificatives N° 9). Pour tous ceux qui connaissent l'organisation secrète au sein de l'Internationale espagnole, il est évident que c'était faire élire des hommes de l'Alliance pour les envoyer au Congrès avec l'argent des Internationaux. Dès que le Conseil général, auquel cette circulaire n'avait pas été envoyée, eut connaissance de ces faits\*, il adressa au Conseil fédéral espagnol, le 24 juillet, la lettre jointe aux pièces justifica-

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "(ce qui était au temps même où il acquit les premières preuves irrécusables de l'existence de l'organisation secrète)."—Ed.

tives\* (N° 10). Le Conseil fédéral\*\* répondit, le 1<sup>er</sup> août, qu'il lui fallait du temps pour traduire notre lettre écrite en français, et, le 3 août, il écrivit au Conseil général la réponse évasive publiée dans la *Federacion* (pièces justificatives N° 11). Dans cette réponse, il prit le parti de l'Alliance. Le Conseil général, après réception de la lettre du 1<sup>er</sup> août, avait déjà fait publier cette correspondance dans la *Emancipacion*.

Ajoutons que dès que l'organisation secrète avait été révelée, on prétendit que l'Alliance avait déjà été dissoute au Congrès de Saragosse. Le Comité central cependant n'en fut pas prévenu (pièces justificatives N° 4).

La Nouvelle fédération de Madrid nie le fait et elle devrait le connaître. Du reste il est ridicule de prétendre que la branche espagnole d'une société internationale comme l'Alliance puisse se dissoudre sans consulter les autres branches nationales.

Immédiatement après, l'Alliance tenta son coup d'Etat. Voyant qu'au Congrès de la Haye il lui serait impossible de s'assurer, par la répétition des manœuvres de Bâle et de La Chaux-de-fonds<sup>441</sup> une majorité factice, elle profita de la Conférence tenue à Rimini, par la soi-disant fédération italienne, pour faire acte de scission ouverte. Les délégués y réunis résolurent à l'unanimité : (Voir Pièces justificatives N° 12.) Voilà donc le Congrès de l'Alliance opposé à celui de l'Internationale. Cependant on s'aperçoit bientôt que ce projet ne promettait pas de succès. On le retira, on résolut d'aller à La Haye, et voilà que ces mêmes sections italiennes, sections dont *une seule* sur vingt-et-un appartient à notre association, après avoir répudié le Congrès de La Haye, ont le front d'envoyer à La Haye leurs délégués !

---

\* See pp. 446-49 of the present volume.—Ed.

\*\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "chercha à gagner du temps d'abord, prétendant".—Ed.

Considérant :

1) Que l'Alliance fondée et dirigée par M. Bakounine (et qui a pour organe principal le Comité central de la fédération Jurassienne), est une société hostile à l'Internationale, parce qu'elle doit tâcher, ou de dominer l'Internationale, ou de la désorganiser ;

2) Que par conséquent l'Internationale et l'Alliance sont incompatibles ;

Le Congrès décrète :

1) M. Bakounine et tous les membres actuels de l'Alliance de la S. d. sont exclus de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Ils ne pourront y rentrer qu'après avoir publiquement répudié toute communauté avec cette société secrète.

2) La fédération Jurassienne, comme telle, est exclue de l'Internationale.

Written by Engels  
at the end of August 1872

Published in the original for the first  
time

**APPENDIX**  
**EXPLANATORY NOTES**  
**INDEXES**

---

## APPENDIX

### MEETING OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

122, Regent's Park Road  
Friday, June 28, 1872<sup>255</sup>

Present: *Cournet, Engels, Frankel, Hales, Marx, Jung, Serrailier, Wróblewski.*

Communication was made on the report of the New York Provisional Committee for May 1872.

To be printed except the International's internal affairs.

Ditto for the resolution of the same Committee on the strike of the cabinet-makers, etc.

To be published here and on the Continent.<sup>256</sup>

Cournet was instructed to get it to Belgium and to correspond with that country.

*Serrailier* proposed not to give reports of the meetings to *The Eastern Post* any more.

Resolved to write to Keen on the subject that *The Eastern Post*, being the organ of the Universalist Council, cannot be further treated by us as that of the International.\*

Engels was to write.

*Serrailier* read correspondence from Paris in which he was threatened with being accused before the General

---

\* See pp. 235, 241 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Council for not having sent the article promised in the name of the General Council for their paper.\*

Passed that it was a French affair and that the article should be submitted the next evening to the French who were to meet at Marx's place.

*Wróblewski* proposed that this should be in letter form to the Ferré section so that the paper could publish it as such; and that *Serrailier* should write to the Ferré section saying that he had communicated the news to the Council immediately, but that the commission nominated for the purpose had to take advice before engaging the Council in such serious business.<sup>257</sup>

F. ENGELS, Secretary  
KARL MARX, Chairman of the meeting

Translated from the French

**MEETING OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON FRIDAY,  
JULY 5, 1872\*\***

*Frankel*, Chairman, *Serrailier*, Secretary.

Members present: *Engels*, *Wróblewski*, *Gournet*, *McDonnell*, *Le Moussu*.

*Marx* read a letter from *Laugrand* rebuking the Council for having sacrificed justice for convenience in the affair relative to Section 12. *J. Hales's* letter had proved this well enough and the General Council's new decision had only aggravated his mistake. In view of his incompetence, the Federal Council passed the following resolution\*\*\*:

---

\* See p. 201 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* The Minutes are in *Serrailier's* hand on three pages with the letter heading: "International Working Men's Association. 256, High Holborn, London, W.C." and the stamp: "International Working Men's Association. Central Council. London."—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Further two lines are left blank.—*Ed.*

The letter ended by accusing the General Council of having been bought by Sorge's section which had kept all the money despite the protests of the other sections.<sup>258</sup>

Engels read a letter from Turin saying that the propaganda of the Jura people was in contradiction with their circular; it also said that a so-called workers' conference should take place in the first fortnight of August.<sup>259</sup>

Engels received from Portugal a long letter giving statistical details about the working class. The Portuguese members of the International said they were in complete agreement with the General Council's ideas, which they thought indispensable.<sup>260</sup>

Bakunin replied to the General Council's pamphlet *Fictitious Splits, etc.* in a letter translated by Citizen Engels, according to which the pamphlet was nothing but a collection of all the most perverse slander that the German Jews could have thought up. He said that in Basle he voted against the Marxian policy. He intended to appeal to a Congress through a Jury of Honour provided that meanwhile the Congress offered him every guarantee for resolving the issue. Nonetheless he intended to publish before the references that he deemed necessary for his defence.<sup>261</sup>

Wróblewski said that the reading of this letter confirmed him in the view that it was useful for the General Council to publish this pamphlet and he believed that if Bakunin had any facts to reply to it he would have done better to have published them in reply than to have replied in such coarse language.

After having heard the reading of documents reporting on Spain, the Sub-Committee resolved the following:

1. That it would not reply to Bakunin's letter.

2. Citizen Engels was to write to Valencia, to the Federal Council, to ask it to account for its relations with the *Al-liance*, since the Council had at least three of its members belonging to this society.

3. The Sub-Committee was to request the General Council

to propose the expulsion of Bakunin and the members of the Alliance at the next Congress.

Citizens Marx and Engels were charged with compiling the points to be presented to the General Council.<sup>262</sup>

According to information sent to Citizen Engels by Citizen Herman, it seemed that if a vote had been taken on support for the General Council during the first meetings of the Belgian Congress, a great majority would have voted in favour.<sup>263</sup>

*Frankel* received 5 florins for stamps; he had had 100 returned. His correspondent said that during the last elections they had not yet been ready and that although the journalists had been favourable to them, they were incapable of founding anything at the moment. They proposed translating *The Civil War*. The Secretary was to write to Bude to get the workers to form workers' sections.

Several letters from France showed the movement in the country as rapidly progressing. The first batch of the Rules arrived at its destination.

The meeting adjourned at 11 o'clock.

Secretary of the meeting,  
A. SERRAILLIER

Translated from the French

### MEETING OF JULY 19, 1872\*

*The meeting opened at 9 o'clock.*

Citizens present: *Engels, Marx, Jung, Wróblewski, Serraillier, Cournet, Frankel, Dupont, Le Moussu.*

Chairman Citizen *Wróblewski*; Secretary Citizen *Cournet*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read, Citizen *Serraillier* informed the Sub-Committee about correspondence from France. The correspondence related to

---

\* The Minutes are in Cournet's hand on four pages.—Ed.

the Association's development in a certain number of departments, including Lot-et-Garonne, Aveyron, Aude, Hérault, and showed the situation in the towns of Bordeaux, Avignon, Toulouse, Lisieux, Montbart (Cote-d'Or) and Paris. At Toulouse, formation of a section of schools. Establishment of several sections in Paris.

Citizen Serrailier received the rules from the Ferré Section. The rules were being entrusted to the special Examining Commission.

#### PROPOSITIONS:

1. Citizen *Marx* proposed that the Sub-Committee examine the conduct of Citizen Hales concerning his actions as much against the General Council as against the interests of the Association. He proposed that Citizen Hales be relieved as General Secretary. He mentioned on this subject that never had Citizen Hales given information about the organisation of the English sections, and that in this respect he had taken bad will very far. In revenge he had asked the Federal Council to take up in an underhand way the proposals cast aside by the General Council and would have even pretended that the Federal Councils would have to have the power to change the General Council.

Citizen Marx succinctly described the conduct of Citizen Hales over the question of the Irish sections and his angry interference in American affairs.\*

Citizen *Wróblewski* proposed that he should ask the General Council, in the Sub-Committee's name, for the suspension of Citizen Hales as General Secretary until the Judicial Committee had gone into the matter.\*\*

Citizen *Jung* seconded the proposition that Citizen Marx had joined.

---

\* See pp. 141-42, 191, 194-99 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 236, 263-64 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Frankel* asked whether the information furnished by Citizen Marx about Citizen Hales's attitude towards the Federal Council merited complete credence

Citizen *Engels*: That isn't the question, it is enough to know whether the information is exact, and it certainly is.

Citizen *Jung* remarked that the citizen who had provided this information had in the meantime seconded Citizen Hales's proposition.

Citizen *Le Moussu* stressed the deplorable part Citizen Hales had taken over the questions relating to America.

Citizen *Marx*: Everything that has just been said confirms and proves that Citizen Hales had proposed and encouraged the proposition of resolutions absolutely contrary to the General Council or already rejected by it. Everything in his behaviour demonstrates well enough that he has been operating without the General Council and almost always against it.

Citizen *Serrailier* supported the arguments put forward by Citizen Marx.

Citizen *Dupont* recalled what had happened at Manchester concerning Citizen Hales.<sup>264</sup>

After a few words from Citizen *Engels* on the rights that Citizen Hales had arrogated to himself in respect of the Nottingham Congress,<sup>265</sup> the discussion closed and a vote was taken.

It was unanimously agreed that the Sub-Committee should propose that the General Council suspend Citizen Hales from his functions as General Secretary of the Council until the Judicial Committee had looked into the matter definitely.

The Secretary was charged to put this proposition to the General Council.<sup>266</sup>

2. The second proposition was to know whether anyone had replied to the Federal Council.

Citizen *Marx* declared that it was not up to the General Council to reply to the Federal Council which was going to

expire anyway. One might recall in addition how the Federal Council was formed; it was the work of Citizen Hales.\*

It was unanimously resolved that the General Council would not reply to the Federal Council.

3. Citizen *Engels* proposed that Citizen Dupont should be empowered to represent the General Council at the Nottingham Congress. Citizen Dupont would use his discretion in utilising his powers in the Association's best interests.

These powers were unanimously agreed upon for Citizen Dupont.<sup>267</sup>

Citizen *Jung* read correspondence from Switzerland regretting the fixing of the next General Congress at The Hague (Holland). Switzerland would have suited the correspondent better. The Hague gathering has made a bad impression on the Romance, German and Italian sections.

Citizen *Jung* also received the rules of the Swiss Regional Council. These rules will be given to the Commission specially charged with this examination.<sup>268</sup>

Citizen *Engels* took a count of delegates who wanted to be at the Congress. The outcome of the count, which was bound to be approximate, made him conclude in favour of The Hague.

Citizen *Serrailier* was in agreement with Citizen *Engels*; he took up the idea that at The Hague the success of the General Council would be general and not local, as people would inevitably have said if the Council had chosen Switzerland for the gathering. Here the war was international and not national.

Citizen *Marx* nonetheless sounded the dangers that The Hague presented.

Citizen *Engels* proposed that, things being as they were, the *status quo* had to be accepted.

---

\* See pp. 29-32 of the present volume.—Ed.

Citizen *Frankel* proposed that the General Council make a report for the Congress.

This proposition was adopted and Citizen *Marx* was unanimously nominated to make the report.\*

It was noted that there would be a general report and particular reports.

Citizen *Serrailier* proposed that, apart from the financial report, there would also be a sort of general report, or better, a general account of subscriptions since the very beginning, including the expenses made by the General Council. This will reveal the meagre resources which the General Council has had at its disposal and all that it has done, nevertheless, despite the scarcity.

This proposition was passed unanimously.

Citizen *Engels* was nominated to make the report.\*\*

The agenda being exhausted, the meeting adjourned at 11 o'clock.

WALERY WRÓBLEWSKI, Chairman  
F. COURNET, Secretary

Translated from the French

### MEETING OF JULY 27, 1872\*\*\*

The meeting began at 9 o'clock.

Present: Citizen *Cournet*, *Dupont*, *Engels*, *Frankel*, *Jung*, *Marx* and *Wróblewski*.

Absent: Citizen *Le Moussu* and *Serrailier*.

Chairman Citizen *Cournet*.

Secretary Citizen *Frankel*.

\* See pp. 453-62 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 272-73 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* The Minutes are in *Frankel's* hand on four pages with the letter heading: "International Working Men's Association. 256, High Holborn, London, W.C." and the stamp: "International Working Men's Association. Central Council. London."—*Ed.*

The Minutes of the previous meeting having been read and unanimously confirmed, Citizen *Cournet* read a letter from Holland in which it was said that that country's newspapers were reacting either in a curious or in an indifferent way in regard to the next Congress which was to be held at The Hague. The official paper was the only exception and that had not found enough spiteful words to attack our Association. In general, the letter said, there was more dread of the International than hatred. The letter further asked the General Council to make an advance necessary for the preparations of the next Congress, such as the hiring of the hall, expenses that would amount to something near 200 francs. It was impossible for them to make this advance since there were only 250 paid-up members in Holland.

It asked further whether the General Council could let them know how many delegates would be present at the Congress, so that they could prepare somewhere for them to stay.<sup>269</sup>

*Jung* said that it was not necessary to know how many delegates would be at the Congress, that the members of the International at The Hague should make an appeal for lodgings, that they should then take down addresses with indication of the price for a week's board, so that they would only have to distribute the addresses among the delegates as they arrive, just as things had been arranged in Switzerland during the last Congress.\*

*Engels* said that the hall where the Congress would take place must be booked as soon as possible telling the owner the use to which it was going to be put. "I am sure," he said, "that the owner will immediately ask the Government what he should do in this situation, etc. On this count, we shall be sure whether the Dutch Government will permit our Congress to take place at The Hague."

---

\* In Basle in 1869.—*Ed.*

*Marx* proposed that 75 francs be sent to the members of the International in Holland to cover initial expenses. (Adopted unanimously.)

Citizen Cournet was charged to send the money and pass on the advice given by the previous speakers.

*Jung* read a letter from the Jura Federation in which it said that the General Council had the right in case of urgency to change the place of the Congress but that it *should first of all consult* the various federations, that the Council had made a bad choice in deciding on The Hague, that it would have done better to have chosen a town somewhere in Switzerland and that it hoped the Council would come round to this decision.<sup>270</sup>

*Marx* said that three Congresses had already been held in Switzerland,\* that Holland had already been proposed by the Belgians in 1870, that Holland was the centre for England, Belgium, Germany and the North of France and that there was no need to come round to the first decision of the Council.

(Adopted.)

Citizen Jung was charged to communicate this to the Jura Federation.<sup>271</sup>

*Marx* proposed, in the name of the Rules Commission, to approve the rules presented by the German Swiss\*\* as there was nothing in them contrary to the General Rules.

(Adopted.)

*Marx* then proposed the acceptance of the rules of the Ferré (Paris) Section with the exception of the article concerning the Federal Council.

(Adopted with this reservation.<sup>272</sup>)

*Engels* read a letter from Spain, then a letter that he intended, as Secretary for Spain, to send to the Valencia Federal Council. He asked in this letter information on the existence and functioning of the Alliance.<sup>273</sup>

\* In Geneva, Lausanne and Basle.—*Ed.*

\*\* See p. 485 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

A letter was read from the French-language section in which it informed the General Council that Citizen Wolfers, having resigned as delegate from the said section, was therefore no longer a member of the General Council.

Having read a letter from Italy, the Council passed on to the order of the day because it was a letter from a section which had never paid its contributions owed the General Council.

*Dupont* made a report on the Nottingham Congress; he accused Hales of having had an ambiguous attitude to this Congress. He reproached him, among other things, with having put forward a resolution giving permission to the Federal Councils to correspond with them, without using the General Council as intermediary. Since the General Council had never been opposed to this manner of corresponding, it followed that Hales was only trying to sow discord between the British Federal Council and the General Council.

*Engels* proposed that this Nottingham business be submitted to the General Council's Judicial Committee.

(Adopted.)

*Frankel* read a letter from Vienna.

The meeting adjourned at half past eleven.

WALERY WRÓBLEWSKI, Chairman  
LEO FRANKEL, Secretary

Translated from the French

MEETING OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE  
ON AUGUST 4, 1872\*

*Serrailier*, Chairman, *Marx*, Secretary.

Present: *Wróblewski*, *Serrailier*, *Jung*, *Engels*, *Marx*,  
*Le Moussu*, *Cournet*.

---

\* The Minutes are in *Marx's* hand on three pages.—*Ed.*

*Marx* reported on Holland, Italy and America.

*Engels* read a letter from *Cuno*<sup>274</sup> of Liège.\*

He then read a letter from *Mesa* (Madrid). Manifesto of the new Madrid Federation (July 22). See the *Emancipación* of July 27. Revelations about the Alliance. Bakunin's letter to *Morago* in which he gives him all instructions for Spain. This letter was communicated by *Morago* in a *Mesa* café.<sup>275</sup>

*Engels* was unanimously asked by the Sub-Committee to translate the circular from the new Madrid Federation into French, English and German.\*\*

*Engels* read a letter of the 28th from *Mesa*, a communication from *Becker* in Geneva.<sup>276</sup>

A Letter from *Franca* in Lisbon, July 27 (Portuguese Federal Council).<sup>277</sup>

The *Varia* section\*\*\* expelled two members in communication with *Morago*, the Bakuninist.

*Marx* asked whether the £3 had been sent to Holland.\*\*\*\* *Engels* will send them on.

*Marx* requested that *Weiler* be cited as witness in the Judicial Committee.

Passed.

*Serraillier*: 500 agents had been sent from Paris into the provinces to uncover the agents of the International and formed sections.

*Dupont*: Story concerning *Scholl* and the neo-Bonapartist-proletarian conspiracy.

---

\* Further the following words are crossed out in the MS: "Suspension of the German section at Verviers by the Brussels Federal Council on the simple request of Mr. Hins to expel a German, delegated by the aforesaid section to the Brussels Congress. This German had dared to denounce a supporter of Hins as a policeman, and for that crime his expulsion was demanded by the Verviers section, himself not having been admitted to the Brussels Congress."—*Ed.*

\*\* Further the following words are crossed out in the MS: "*Cournet* reported on *Rappel* of August 3."—*Ed.*

\*\*\* The section of various trades.—*Ed.*

\*\*\*\* See p. 312 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

*Engels* put forward a proposition, supported by *K. Marx*: That Citizen Le Moussu work in league with Citizen Com-bault and be asked to follow Scholl's Bonapartist intrigues, discovered by Citizen Dupont, and to make a report to the Sub-Committee at each meeting.

Passed unanimously (Le Moussu did not vote).

*Wróblewski*: Preliminary returns should be made concerning the delegates at The Hague.

*Cournet* spoke in the same vein.

*Marx* proposed a publication in the name of the General Council charging the various sections to let it know the number of delegates they would send to the Congress and recalling the Basle Congress resolution relating to sections that were not in order with the General Council.<sup>278</sup>

Seconded by *Wróblewski*.

*Cournet* proposed Marx and Engels to do the wording. Adopted unanimously.

Translated from the French

### MEETING OF AUGUST 28, 1872\*

The meeting began at half past nine.

Chairman Citizen *Marx*.

Secretary *Frankel*.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were misplaced.

*Wróblewski* informed the meeting about a strike being prepared by the tailors.

*Cournet* asked whether Citizen Serraillier had received blank mandates from France, so that he could hand them over to Council members who had been provided with mandates.

*Serraillier* replied that he had received a mandate for Citizen *Ranvier*, one for *Longuet*, one for *Johannard*, one

---

\* The Minutes are in Frankel's hand on three pages.—*Ed.*

had been given to Vilmart in Manchester. Two delegates would come from France to The Hague.

He then read several letters which revealed that he had done what he could to get the mandates from France.

He gave the number of sections founded in France indicating the names of the places where they existed.

Citizen *Marx* asked the Sub-Committee to express its satisfaction at Citizen Serrailier's handling of the business.

Citizen *Cournet* said he would abstain.

Citizen *Marx* said no one should abstain and that it would be regrettable if, being confronted with the false members of the International in Italy, Spain and Switzerland, there would be also General Council members accusing each other.

*Wróblewski* voiced the same opinion.

*Frankel* said he would not vote if Serrailier did not declare that he too would not make accusations against certain French members of the General Council.

*Wróblewski* was in agreement.

*Serrailier* did not accept the vote with these conditions.

*Marx* said that his proposition had nothing to do with the discussion on attacks from one side and the other.

*Frankel* said that he knew no secretary who had worked as hard as Serrailier and that he was ready to defend him when he was attacked over his administration; nonetheless, he would not vote if Serrailier did not declare that he would desist from the attack, let members differ over their political ideas.

*Marx* said that there was a society not belonging to the International which was against Serrailier and that he would take back his proposition.

*Cournet* said that as far as the French members of the General Council were concerned, there had never been any question of Serrailier for the simple reason that the society was not concerned with the International.

*Serraillier* declared that he would not make an attack but that he was not afraid of attacking them.

*Marx* proposed that no member of the General Council should have the right to accuse another before the International Working Men's Congress until discussion of the election of members of the General Council.

Adopted unanimously.

A discussion ensued on who was to be given the blank mandate that had been sent.

*Serraillier* proposed Combault.

*Frankel, Vaillant, Cournet* seconded.

*Marx* [proposed] Arnaud.

*Frankel* said that in the event of *Vaillant* receiving a mandate, as was being said to the General Council, he would then wish it to go to Combault because he knew all the affairs concerning Malon.

*Marx* said that the letter which *Sorge*, delegated by the American Congress,<sup>279</sup> possessed and which affirmed that the San Francisco section had nominated him as delegate to the Congress, would suffice for *Vaillant* to be admitted even in the event of the mandate not arriving.

After *Marx's* declaration *Frankel* rescinded his proposition.

A vote was passed to accept Combault as recipient of a mandate.

The meeting adjourned at midnight.

LEO FRANKEL

---

ON THE FRENCH SECTION OF 1871<sup>289</sup>

RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ADOPTED AT ITS MEETING  
ON NOVEMBER 7, 1871

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The General Council considers that the ideas expressed by the French Section of 1871 about a radical change to be made in the articles of the General Rules concerning the constitution of the General Council have no bearing on the question which it ought to discuss.

With regard to the insulting references to the General Council made by that section, these will be judged for what they are worth by the councils and federal committees of the various countries.

The Council merely wishes to note:

That *three years* have not yet elapsed since the Basle Congress (which met on September 6-11, 1869), as the above-mentioned section deliberately asserts;

That in 1870, on the eve of the Franco-Prussian war, the Council addressed a general circular to all the federations, including the Paris Federal Council, proposing that the seat of the General Council be transferred from London<sup>290</sup>;

That the replies received were unanimously in favour of retaining the present seat of the Council and of prolonging its term of office;

That in 1871, as soon as the situation permitted, the General Council summoned a Conference of Delegates, this being the only action possible in the given circumstances;

That at this Conference\* delegates from the Continent gave voice to the misgivings in their respective countries that the co-option of too large a number of French refugees would destroy the international character of the General Council;

That the Conference (see its "Resolutions, etc." XV) "leaves it to the discretion of the General Council to fix, according to events, the day and place of meeting of the next Congress or Conference which might replace it".<sup>291</sup>

With regard to the said section's claim to exclusive representation of "the French revolutionary element", because its members include ex-presidents of Paris workers' societies, the Council remarks:

The fact that this or that person has in the past been president of a workers' society may well be taken into account by the General Council, but does not in itself constitute the "right" to a seat on the Council or to represent the "revolutionary element" on that body. If this were so, the Council would be obliged to grant membership to M. Gustave Durand, former President of the Paris Jewelers' Society and secretary of the French section in London. Moreover, members of the General Council are bound to represent the principles of the International Working Men's Association, rather than the opinions and interests of this or that corporation.

---

\* The second MS continues as follows: "held in London on September 17-23, 1871, as members of the French section are fully aware."  
—Ed.

II. OBJECTIONS PRESENTED BY THE FRENCH SECTION  
OF 1871 AT THE GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING  
OF OCTOBER 31 TO THE RESOLUTIONS OF OCTOBER 17\*

1) With respect to the following passage from Article 2 of the section's rules:

"In order to be admitted as member of the section, a person must provide information as to his means of sustenance, present guarantees of morality, etc."

the section remarks:

"The General Rules make the sections responsible for the morality of their members, and, as a consequence, recognise the right of sections to demand guarantees at *their own discretion*."

On this argument, a section of the International founded by *teetotalers* could include in its rules this type of article: "To be admitted as member of the section, a person must swear to abstain from all alcoholic drinks." In short, it would be always possible for individual sections to impose in their local rules the most absurd and incongruous conditions of admittance into the International, under the pretext that they "think it necessary in this way" to discharge their responsibility for the integrity of their members.

In its Resolution I of October 17, the General Council stated that there may be "cases in which the absence of any means of sustenance may well be a guarantee of morality". It is of the opinion that the section repeated this point unnecessarily when it said that "refugees" are "above suspicion by virtue of the eloquent proof of their poverty".

As to the phrase that strikers' "means of sustenance"

---

\* For the full text of the Council's resolutions see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 435-39.—Ed.

consist of "the strike fund" this might be answered by saying, first, that this "fund" is often fictitious.\*

Moreover, official English inquiries have shown that the majority of English workers who, generally speaking, enjoy better conditions than their brothers on the Continent, are forced as a result of strikes and unemployment, or because of insufficient wages or terms of payment and many other causes, to resort incessantly to pawnshops or to *borrowing money*, that is, to "means of sustenance" about which one cannot demand information without interfering in an unqualified manner in a person's private life.

There are two alternatives.

Either the section sees "means of sustenance" purely as "guarantees of morality",\*\* in which case the General Council's proposal that "to be admitted as member of the section a person must provide guarantees of morality" serves the purpose since it assumes (see Resolution I of October 17) that "in dubious cases the section may well take information about means of sustenance as *guarantee of morality*".<sup>292</sup>

Or in Article 2 of its rules the section deliberately refers to the furnishing of information about "means of sustenance" as a condition for admission, over and above the "guarantees of morality" which it is empowered to require, in which case the General Council affirms that "it is a bourgeois innovation contrary to the letter spirit and of the General Rules".

2) With respect to the General Council's rejection of the following clause of Article 11 of the section's rules:

"One or several delegates shall be sent to the General Council"

---

\* The second MS continues as follows: "and is it not the case that strikes invariably result in deprivation and suffering for the strikers, which fact appears to have been ignored by the 1871 Section."—*Ed.*

\*\* The second MS continues as follows: "in order to avoid its responsibility".—*Ed.*

the section states:

"We are not unaware . . . that the wording of the General Rules confers on it" (the General Council) "the right to accept or reject delegates."

This is a patent demonstration of the fact that\* the section is not familiar with the essence of the General Rules.

In actual fact, the General Rules, which recognise only *two* ways of election to the General Council, namely, election by the Congress or co-option by the Council itself, *nowhere* state that the Council has the right to accept or reject delegates from the sections or groups.

The admission of delegates proposed by the London sections has always been a purely *administrative measure* on the part of the General Council, which in this case only made use of its power of co-option (see Resolution II, Clause 2, of the General Council of October 17).

The exceptional circumstances which led the General Council to have recourse to co-option of this kind were explained at sufficient length in its resolution of October 17.

In the same resolutions (II, 3) the Council declared that it would admit delegates from the French Section of 1871 *on the same conditions* as those from the London sections. It cannot, however, be expected to give serious consideration to a demand that would grant this section a privileged position contrary to the General Rules.

By the inclusion of the following paragraph in Article 11 of its rules: "One or several delegates *shall be sent* to the General Council," the French Section of 1871 is claiming the right to send delegates to the General Council allegedly basing itself on the General Rules. It acted as though fully convinced that it possessed this imaginary right, and even

---

\* The second MS continues as follows: "on this point as on many others".—Ed.

before the section had been recognised by the General Council (see Article VI of the Administrative Resolutions of the Basle Congress<sup>293</sup>), it did not hesitate to send "by right" to the General Council meeting of October 17 two delegates, armed with "imperative mandates" *in the name of* the 20 full members of the section. Finally, in its latest communication it again insists on "the duty and right to send delegates to the General Council".

The section attempts to justify its claims by seeking a precedent in the position of Citizen Herman on the General Council. It pretends to be unaware of the fact that Citizen Herman was co-opted into the General Council at the recommendation of the *Belgian Congress*, and in no way represents the Liège section.\*

3) With respect to the General Council's refusal to recognise the following passage in the section's rules:

"Each member of the section should not accept any delegation to the General Council other than that of his section,"

the section states:

"In response to this, we shall limit ourselves to the observation that our rules pertain to our section alone; our agreements are of no concern or relevance to anyone but ourselves, and this claim in no way contradicts the General Rules which include no provision on this subject."

It is difficult to comprehend how the Rules which include no provision on the right of delegation to the General Council, should suddenly specify the conditions of this delegation. On the other hand, it is not so difficult to see that the section's own rules do not apply outside its field of competence. Nevertheless, it cannot be admitted that the specific rules of any section "are of no concern or relevance to anyone but that section alone".<sup>294</sup> For were

---

\* The second MS continues as follows: "although he is in fact a member of it."—*Ed.*

the General Council to approve Article 11 of the rules of the French Section of 1871, for example, it would be obliged to insert it into the rules of all the other sections, and this article, once it began to apply generally, would completely nullify the right of co-option conferred on the Council by the General Rules.<sup>295</sup>

For these reasons:

I) The General Council reaffirms in their entirety its resolutions of October 17, 1871<sup>296</sup>;

II) In the event of these resolutions not being accepted by the section before the Council's meeting on November 21, the corresponding secretaries should bring the following documents to the notice of the Federal Councils or Committees of the respective countries or, where these do not exist, to the notice of the local groups: the rules of the French Section of 1871, the mandate of that section's delegates presented to the General Council at its meeting on October 17, the General Council's resolutions of October 17, the reply of the French Section of 1871 presented to the General Council at its meeting on October 31, and the Council's final resolutions of November 7.

London, November 7, 1871

In the name and by order  
of the General Council<sup>297</sup>

Written by Marx

Translated from the French

---

TO THE EDITORS  
OF *PROLETARIO ITALIANO*<sup>300</sup>

Citizens,

In your issue No. 39 you publish an announcement by Turin workers which contains the following:

"We hereby publicly announce that the decision of the Grand Council in London to subordinate socialism to politics was communicated to us by the editors of *Proletario* immediately after it was made and that the decision was not of an official nature since it was withdrawn by the Grand Council in view of the fact that many European associations would have rejected it outright, as would we."

This assertion obliges the General Council to declare:

- 1) that it never took any decision to subordinate socialism to politics,
- 2) that it therefore could not have withdrawn such a decision,
- 3) that no European or American association could reject such a decision, or has indeed rejected any other decision of the General Council.

The position of the General Council as regards the political action of the proletariat is sufficiently well defined.

It is defined:

- 1) By the General Rules, in which the fourth paragraph of the *preamble* runs: "That the economical emancipation

of the working classes is the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means."<sup>\*</sup>

2) By the text of the Inaugural Address of the Association (1864), this official and essential commentary on the Rules, which says:

"The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies. So far from promoting, they will continue to lay every possible impediment in the way of the emancipation of labour. . . . To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes."<sup>301</sup>

3) By the resolution of the Congress of Lausanne (1867) to the effect that: "The social emancipation of the workmen is inseparable from their political emancipation."<sup>302</sup>

4) By Resolution IX of the London Conference (September 1871) which, in agreement with the above, reminds the members of the International that in the struggle of the working classes its economical movement and its political action are indissolubly united.<sup>303</sup>

The Council has always followed the line of conduct thus prescribed and will do so in future. It therefore declares the above communication made by persons unknown to the editors of *Proletario* to be false and slanderous.

By order and in the name of the General Council

Secretary for Italy,  
F. E.

P. S. I have just received *La Révolution Sociale*<sup>304</sup> from Geneva which says that a small group in the Jura has

---

\* See p. 420 of the present volume.—Ed.

---

rejected the decisions of the London Conference.\* The General Council has received no official communication as yet. As soon as it does, it will take the necessary measures.

November 29, 1871

Written by Engels

Translated from the Italian

---

\* See p. 43 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

---

CREDENTIALS FOR GIUSEPPE BORIANI<sup>305</sup>

November 30, 1871

Citizen Giuseppe Boriani is accepted member of the International Working Men's Association and is authorised to admit new members and form new sections, on condition that he, and the members and sections newly admitted, recognise as obligatory the official documents of the Association, namely:

The General Rules and Administrative Regulations,  
The Inaugural Address,  
Resolutions of the Congresses,  
The resolutions of the London Conference of September 1871.

By order and in the name of the General Council  
Secretary for Italy,

*FREDERICK ENGELS*

Written by Engels

Translated from the Italian

---

REPORT ON THE ALLIANCE  
OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY PRESENTED  
IN THE NAME OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE<sup>403</sup>

The Alliance of Socialist Democracy was founded by M. Bakunin towards the end of 1868. It was an international society claiming to function, at the same time, both within and without the International Working Men's Association. Composed of members of the Association, who demanded the right to take part in all meetings of the International's members, this society, nevertheless, wished to retain the right to organise its own local groups, national federations and congresses alongside and in addition to the Congresses of the International. Thus, right from the onset, the Alliance claimed to form a kind of aristocracy within our Association, or élite with its own programme and possessing special privileges.

The letters which were exchanged between the Central Committee of the Alliance and our General Council at that time are reproduced on pp. 7-9 of the circular "*Fictitious Splits in the International*"\* (appendix No. 1). The General Council refused to admit the Alliance as long as it retained its distinct international character; it promised to admit the Alliance only on the condition that the latter would dissolve its special international organisation, that

---

\* See pp. 362-66 of the present volume.—Ed.

its sections would become ordinary sections of our Association, and that the Council should be informed of the seat and numerical strength of each new section formed.

The following is the reply dated June 22, 1869, to these demands received from the Central Committee of the Alliance, which\* has henceforth become known as the "Geneva Section of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy" in its relations with the General Council.

"As agreed between your Council and the Central Committee of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, we have consulted the various groups of the Alliance on the question of its dissolution as an organisation outside the International Working Men's Association. . . . We are pleased to inform you that a great majority of the groups share the views of the Central Committee which intends to announce the dissolution of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy. *The question of dissolution has today been decided.* In communicating this decision to the various groups of the Alliance, we have invited them to follow our example and constitute themselves into sections of the International Working Men's Association, and seek recognition as such either from you or from the Federal Councils of the Association in their respective countries. Confirming receipt of your letter addressed to the former Central Committee of the Alliance, we are sending today for your perusal the rules of our section, and hereby request your official recognition of it as a section of the International Working Men's Association. . . ." (Signed) Acting Secretary, C. Perron (appendix No. 2.).

A copy of these rules of the Alliance may be found among appendices No. 3.

The Geneva section proved to be the only one to request admission to the International. Nothing was heard about other allegedly existing sections of the Alliance. Nevertheless, in spite of the constant intrigues of the Alliancists who sought to impose their special programme on the entire International and gain control of our Association, one was bound to accept that the Alliance had kept its word and disbanded itself. The General Council, how-

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "which changed its name for the occasion".—Ed.

ever,\* has received fairly clear indications which forced it to conclude that the Alliance was not even contemplating dissolution and that, in spite of its solemn undertaking, it existed and was continuing to function as a secret society, using this underground organisation to realise its original aim—the securing of complete control. Its existence, particularly in Spain, became increasingly apparent as a result of discord within the Alliance itself, an account of which is given below. For the moment, suffice it to say that a circular drawn up by members of the old Spanish Federal Council, who were at the same time members of the Central Committee of the Alliance in Spain (see *Emancipacion* No. 61, p. 3, column 2, appendix No. 4<sup>404</sup>), exposed the existence of the Alliance.\*\* [Earlier] the circular, dated June 2, 1872 and published in *Emancipacion* (No. 59, appendix No. 5), informed all the sections of the Alliance in Spain that the signatories had dissolved themselves as a section of the Alliance and invited other sections to follow their example.<sup>405</sup>

The publication of this circular caused the Alliance newspaper, the Barcelona *Federacion* (No. 155, August 4, 1872), to publish the rules of the Alliance (appendix No. 6), thus putting the existence of this society beyond question.

A comparison of the rules of the secret society with the rules presented by the Geneva section of the Alliance to the General Council shows, firstly, that the introductory programme to the first document is identical to that of the second. There are merely a few changes in wording, as a result of which Bakunin's special programme is given more succinct expression in the secret rules.

---

\* Further the words "from May of this year" are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "finding it impossible to reconcile their duties within the International with their position as members of a secret society within its ranks, on June 2 they addressed".—*Ed.*

Below is an exact table of:

Geneva rules		Secret Rules
Art. 1	corresponds literally to	Art. 5
Art. 2	corresponds generally to	Art. 1
Art. 3.	corresponds literally to	Art. 2
Arts. 4. & 5	correspond generally to	Art. 3
Art. 6	corresponds generally to	Art. 4

The secret rules themselves are based on the Geneva rules. Thus, Article 4 of the secret rules corresponds literally to Article 3 of the Geneva rules; Articles 8 and 9 in the Geneva rules correspond in abbreviated form to Article 10 of the secret rules, as do the Geneva Articles 15-20 to Article 3 of the secret rules.

Contrary to the actual practice of the Alliancists, the Geneva Article 7 advocates the "strong organisation" of the International and binds all members of the Alliance to "uphold. . . the decisions of the Congresses and the *authority of the General Council*". This article is not to be found in the secret rules, but evidence of its original inclusion in these rules is provided by the fact that it is reproduced almost word for word in Article 15 of the regulations of the Madrid *sección de oficios varios*\* (appendix No. 7) which also includes the programme of the Alliance.

It is, therefore, clear that we are dealing with one and the same society and not with two separate societies. At the same time as the Geneva Central Committee was assuring the General Council that the Alliance had been disbanded, and was admitted as a section of the International on the basis of this assurance, the ringleaders of this Central Committee led by Mr. Bakunin were strengthening the organisation of this same Alliance, turning it

---

\* Section combining various types of professions.—*Ed.*

into a secret society and preserving that very international character which they had undertaken to abolish. The good faith of the General Council and of the whole International, to whom the correspondence had been submitted, was betrayed in a most disgraceful manner. Having once committed such a deception, these men were no longer held back by any scruples from their machinations to subordinate the International, or, if this were unsuccessful, to disorganise it.

Below we quote the main articles of the secret rules:

"1) The Alliance of Socialist Democracy shall consist of *members of the International Working Men's Association* and has as its aim the propaganda and development of the principles of *its* programme, and the study of all means suited to advance direct and *immediate* emancipation of the working class.

"2) In order to achieve the best possible results and not to compromise the development of social organisation, the Alliance shall be *entirely secret*.

"4) No person shall be admitted to membership if he has not accepted beforehand the principles of the programme completely and sincerely.

"5) The Alliance shall do its utmost to *exert from within its influence on the local workers' federation* in order to prevent the latter from embarking on a reactionary or anti-revolutionary course.

"9) Any member may be *dismissed from membership of the Alliance* on a majority decision *without any reason being given*."

Thus, the Alliance is a secret society formed within the International itself, having a programme of its own differing widely from that of the International, a society which has as its aim the propaganda of that programme which it considers to be the only true revolutionary one. The society binds its members to act in such a way inside the local federation of the International as to prevent it from embarking on a reactionary or anti-revolutionary course, i.e., the slightest deviation from the programme of the Alliance. In other words, the aim of the Alliance is to impose its sectarian programme on the whole International by means of its secret organisation. This can be most

effectively achieved by taking over the local and Federal Councils and the General Council, using the power of a secret organisation to elect members of the Alliance to these bodies. This was precisely what the Alliance did in cases where it felt that it had a good chance of success, as we shall see below.

Clearly no one would wish to hold it against the Alliancists for propagating\* their own programme. The International is composed of socialists of the most various shades of opinion. Its programme is sufficiently broad to accommodate all of them; the Bakunin sect was admitted on the same conditions as all the others. The charge levelled against it is precisely its violation of these conditions.

The secret nature of the Alliance, however, is an entirely different matter. The International cannot ignore the fact that in many countries, Poland, France and Ireland among them, secret organisations are a legitimate means of defence against government persecution. However, at its London Conference the International stated that it wished to remain completely dissociated from these societies and would not, consequently, recognise them as sections. Moreover, and this is the crucial point, we are dealing here with a secret society created for the purpose of combating not a government, but the International itself.

The organisation of a secret society of this kind is a blatant violation, not only of the contractual obligations to the International, but also of the letter and spirit of our General Rules.\*\* Our Rules know only one kind of members of the International with equal rights and duties for all. The Alliance separates them into two castes: the initiated and the uninitiated, the aristocracy and the plebs, the latter destined to be led by the first by means of an organisa-

---

\* Further the word "openly" is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

\*\* Further the words "and Regulations" are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

tion whose very existence is unknown to them. The International demands of its members that they should acknowledge Truth, Justice and Morality as the basis of their conduct; the Alliance imposes upon its adepts, as their first duty, mendacity, dissimulation and imposture, by ordering them to deceive the uninitiated members of the International as to the existence of the secret organisation and to the motives and aims of their words and actions. The founders of the Alliance knew only too well that the vast majority of uninitiated members of the International would never consciously submit to such an organisation were they aware of its existence. This is why they made it "completely secret". For it is essential to emphasise that the secret nature of this Alliance is not aimed at eluding government vigilance, otherwise it would not have begun its existence as a public society; this secret nature\* had as its sole aim the deception of the uninitiated members of the International, proof of which is the base way in which the Alliance deceived the General Council. Thus we are dealing with a genuine conspiracy against the International. For the first time in the history of the working-class struggle, we stumble upon a secret conspiracy plotted in the midst of the working class, and intended to undermine, not the existing exploiting regime, but the very Association in which that regime finds its fiercest opponent.

Moreover, it would be ludicrous to assert that a society has made itself secret in order to protect itself from the persecution of existing governments, when that same society is everywhere advocating the emasculating doctrine of complete abstention from political action and states in its programme (Article 3, preamble to the secret rules) that it

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "as the facts have shown".—Ed.

"rejects any revolutionary action which does not have as its immediate and direct aim the triumph of the workers' cause over capital".

How then has this secret society acted within the International?

The reply to this question is already given in part in the private circular of the General Council entitled "*Fictitious Splits, etc.*". But due to the fact that the General Council was not yet at that time aware of the actual size of the secret organisation, and in view of the many important events which have taken place subsequently, this reply can be regarded only as most incomplete.

Let it be said right from the start the activities of the Alliance fall into two distinct phases. The first is characterised by the assumption that it would be successful in gaining control of the General Council and thereby securing supreme direction of our Association. It was at this stage that the Alliance urged its adherents to uphold the "strong organisation" of the International and, above all,

"the *authority* of the General Council and of the Federal Councils and Central Committees";

and it was at this stage that gentlemen of the Alliance demanded at the Basle Congress that the General Council be invested with those wide powers which they later rejected with such horror as being *authoritarian*.

The Basle Congress destroyed, for the time being at least, the hopes nourished by the Alliance.\* Since that

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "whose activities were reduced to local intrigue. It remained fairly quiet until the point... when the London Conference re-affirmed the original programme of the International as opposed to that of the Alliance with its resolutions on working-class policy and sectarian sections."—*Ed.*

time it has carried on the intrigues referred to in the "*Fictitious Splits*"; in the Jura district of Switzerland, in Italy and in Spain it has not ceased to push forward its special programme in place of that of the International. The London Conference put an end to this misunderstanding with its resolutions on working-class policy and sectarian sections. The Alliance immediately went into action again. The Jura Federation, the stronghold of the Alliance in Switzerland, issued its Sonvillier circular against the General Council, in which the strong organisation, the authority of the General Council and the Basle resolutions, both proposed and voted for by the very people who were signatories to the circular, were denounced as *authoritarian*—a definition that, apparently, sufficed to condemn them out of hand; in which mention was made of "war, the open war that has broken out in our ranks"; in which it was demanded that the International should assume the form of an organisation adapted, not to the struggle in hand, but to some vague ideal of a future society, etc. From this point onwards tactics changed. An order was issued. Wherever the Alliance had its branches, in Italy and particularly in Spain the authoritarian resolutions of the Basle Congress and the London Conference, as also the authoritarianism of the General Council, were subjected to the most violent attacks. Now there was nothing but talk of the autonomy of sections, free federated groups, anarchy, etc. This is quite understandable. The influence of the secret society within the International would naturally increase as the public organisation of the International weakened. The most serious obstacle in the path of the Alliance was the General Council, and this was consequently the body which came in for the most bitter attacks, although, as we shall see, the Federal Councils also received the same treatment whenever a suitable opportunity presented itself.

The Jura circular had no effect whatsoever, except in those countries where the International was more or less influenced by the Alliance, namely, in Italy and Spain. In the latter the Alliance and the International were founded simultaneously immediately after the Basle Congress. Even the most devoted members of the International in Spain were led to believe that the programme of the Alliance was identical to that of the International, that this secret organisation existed everywhere and that it was almost the duty of all to belong to it. This illusion was destroyed by the London Conference, where the Spanish delegate,\* himself a member of the Central Committee of the Alliance in his country, could convince himself that the contrary was the fact, and also by the Jura circular itself, whose bitter attacks and lies against the Conference and the General Council were immediately taken up by all the organs of the Alliance. The first result of the Jura circular in Spain was the emergence of disagreements within the Spanish Alliance itself between those who were first and foremost members of the International and those who would not recognise it, since it had not come under Alliance control. The struggle, at first carried on in private, soon flared up in public at meetings of the International. When the Federal Council which had been elected by the Valencia Conference (September 1871)<sup>406</sup> demonstrated by its actions that it preferred the International to the Alliance, a majority of its members was expelled from the local Madrid Federation, where the Alliance was in control.<sup>407</sup> They were reinstated by the Saragossa Congress and two of them,\*\* Mora and Lorenzo, were re-elected to the new Federal Council,\*\*\* in spite of the fact that all the members

---

\* Anselmo Lorenzo.—*Ed.*

\*\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "its most active members".—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "meeting in Valencia".—*Ed.*

of the old Council had previously announced that they would not recognise them as members.\*

The Saragossa Congress<sup>408</sup> gave rise to fears on the part of the ringleaders of the Alliance that Spain might slip out of their hands. The Alliance immediately began a campaign against the authority of the Spanish Federal Council, similar to that which the Jura circular had directed against the so-called authoritarian powers of the General Council. A thoroughly democratic and at the same time coherent form of organisation had been worked out in Spain by the Barcelona Congress<sup>409</sup> and the Valencia Conference. Thanks to the activity of the Federal Council elected in Valencia (activity which was approved by a special vote of the Congress), this organisation achieved the outstanding successes referred to in the general report.\*\* Morago, the leading light of the Alliance in Spain, declared at Saragossa that the powers conferred on the Federal Council in the Spanish organisation were *authoritarian*, that it was essential to restrict them, and to deprive the Council of the right to accept or reject new sections and decide whether their rules were in accordance with the rules of the federation, in short, to reduce its role to that of a mere correspondence and statistics bureau. After rejecting Morago's proposals, the Congress resolved to preserve the existing authoritarian form of organisation (see "Extracts from the Papers of the Second Workers' Congress", etc., pp. 109 and 110, appendix No. 8,<sup>410</sup> The evidence given by Citizen Lafargue, a delegate to the Saragossa Congress, will be of great importance in this connection).

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "The Congress had chosen Valencia for the seat of the Federal Council in the hope that it would prove to be neutral territory and that these disagreements would not break out afresh. However, three of the five members of the new Federal Council were henchmen of the Alliance and, as a result of co-option, their number increased to at least five".—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 453-62 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

In order to isolate the new Federal Council from the disagreements, which had arisen in Madrid, the Congress transferred it to Valencia. However, the cause of the disagreements, namely, the antagonism, which had begun to develop between the Alliance and the International, was not of a local nature. Unaware of the existence of the Alliance, the Congress set up a new Council composed entirely of members of that society, with the result that two of them, Mora and Lorenzo, opposed it and Mora refused a seat on the Council. The General Council's circular "*Fictitious Splits*", which was a reply to the Jura circular, obliged all members of the International to make an open statement of their allegiance either to the International or to the Alliance. The polemics between *Emancipacion* on the one hand and the Alliance newspapers, the Barcelona *Federacion* and the Seville *Razon*, on the other became increasingly virulent. Finally, on June 2 the members of the former Federal Council—the editors of *Emancipacion* and members of the Spanish Central Committee of the Alliance—decided to address a circular to all the Spanish sections of the Alliance, in which they announced their dissolution as a section of the secret society and called on other sections to follow their example. Vengeance followed swiftly. They were immediately expelled again from the local Madrid Federation in flagrant violation of the existing regulations. Following this, they reorganised themselves into a new Madrid Federation and requested recognition from the Federal Council.

However, in the meantime the Alliancist element in the Council, strengthened by co-option, had gained complete control, causing Lorenzo to resign. The request of the New Madrid Federation met with a blank refusal on the part of the Federal Council, which was already concentrating all its efforts on ensuring the election of Alliance candidates to the Congress at The Hague. To this end the Council sent a private circular to local federations dated

July 7, in which, repeating the slanderous remarks of *Federacion* concerning the General Council, it proposed that the Federations should send to the Congress a single delegation from the whole of Spain elected by a majority vote, the list of those elected to be drawn up by the Council itself. (Appendices No. 9.) It is obvious to anyone familiar with the secret society existing within the International in Spain that such a procedure would have meant the election of Alliance men to attend the Congress on funds provided by members of the International. As soon as the General Council, which was not sent a copy of the circular, got to know of these facts,\* it addressed a letter dated July 24 to the Spanish Federal Council, which is attached as an appendix (No. 10).\*\* The Federal Council\*\*\* replied on August 1 to the effect that it would require time in order to translate our letter which had been written in French, and on August 3 it addressed an evasive reply to the General Council published in *Federacion* (appendix No. 11). In this reply it sided with the Alliance. On receipt of the letter of August 1, the General Council had already published the correspondence in *Emancipacion*.

It must be added that as soon as the secret organisation was discovered it was claimed that the Alliance had already been dissolved at the Saragossa Congress. The Central Committee had not, however, been informed to this effect (appendix No. 4).

The New Madrid Federation denies this, and it should have known. In general, the claim that the Spanish section of an international society such as the Alliance could dis-

---

\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "this was the very moment when it received the first irrefutable evidence of the existence of the secret organisation".—*Ed.*

\*\* See pp. 446-49 of the present volume.—*Ed.*

\*\*\* Further the following is crossed out in the MS: "at first trying to gain time under the pretext."—*Ed.*

solve itself without first consulting the other national sections is patently absurd.

Immediately after this the Alliance attempted a coup d'état. Realising that it would not be able to secure itself an artificial majority at the Hague Congress by means of the same manoeuvres employed at Basle and La Chaux-de-Fonds,<sup>411</sup> the Alliance took advantage of the Conference held at Rimini by the self-styled Italian Federation in order to make a public announcement of the split. The Conference delegates passed a unanimous resolution (see appendix No. 12). Thus the Congress of the Alliance stood in opposition to that of the International. However, it was soon realised that this plan had no chance of success. It was abandoned, and the decision was taken to go to The Hague, with the very same Italian sections, of which *only one* out of twenty-one belongs to our Association, having the audacity to send their delegates to the Hague Congress which they had already rejected.

Considering:

1) That the Alliance (the main organ of which is the Central Committee of the Jura Federation), founded and led by M. Bakunin, is a society hostile to the International, insofar as it aims at dominating or disorganising the latter;

2) That as a consequence of the foregoing the International and the Alliance are incompatible.

The Congress resolves:

1) That M. Bakunin and all the present members of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy be expelled from the International Working Men's Association and be granted readmission to it only after a public renunciation of all connections with this secret society;

2) That the Jura Federation be expelled as such from the International.

---

## EXPLANATORY NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> The reference is to the resolutions of the *London Conference* of the International held on September 17-23, 1871.

The Conference was called because the convocation of a regular congress was impossible in view of the reaction that set in at the time and the widespread persecution of the International's members. In these conditions it was necessary to strengthen the ideological unity and organisation of the International, and to combat the anti-proletarian sectarian, anarchist and reformist elements.

The Conference was attended by 22 delegates with a right to vote and 10 without. Marx represented Germany, Engels—Italy, Dupont—France, Eccarius—the U.S.A. Nine meetings were held, all of them private. The Conference's most important decision was formulated in Resolution IX, on the "Political Action of the Working Class", which declared the need to found, in each country, an independent proletarian party as a necessary condition for the conquest of political power by the working class.

The Conference also adopted a decision to publish an official text of the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the International Association in English, French and German. A special commission (which subsequently became a standing committee for examining the rules of new sections; see p. 67 of the present volume) consisting of Marx, Jung and Serrailier was to prepare this edition. The greater part of the work, however, was done by Marx (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 289). Since conference decisions were not binding, the General Council confirmed the London Conference resolutions at its meetings held in October 1871, and instructed Marx to prepare them for the press as a circular letter to all federations and sections of the International (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 300).

In an effort to help the needy refugees in London, the General Council requested some printers from among the former Commu-

nards to publish the London Conference resolutions in French; these were printed in November and December 1871. The German version of the resolutions was published by the editorial board of *Der Volksstaat* in Leipzig. p. 27

<sup>2</sup> This committee was appointed by the London Conference to prepare an official edition of the General Rules. p. 28

<sup>3</sup> Contribution stamps of one penny each were introduced by Resolution IV of the London Conference; these were to be affixed to a special sheet of the *livret* (membership card) or to a copy of the Rules which every member was to possess. p. 28

<sup>4</sup> On September 22, 1871, the London Conference adopted a decision to issue an address to the Italian and French workers in view of the repressive measures which their governments had taken against the International.

The congress of working men's societies was held in Rome (see Note 21). p. 28

<sup>5</sup> This refers to Resolution XII, adopted by the London Conference of 1871 on Marx's proposal. It instructed the General Council to form a provisional Federal Council (Committee) in London in order to unite all the English sections into a federation. From the date of the foundation of the International and right up to the London Conference the functions of the Federal Council for England were performed by the General Council itself (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, p. 175). At a meeting at High Holborn on October 21, 1871, the London Federal Council was founded, composed of representatives of the London sections and societies affiliated with the International. At the meeting of October 27 the following were members of the Council: Hales, Keen, Barry, Elliott, Mitchell, Canham, Bradnick, Rühl, Ridsdill, McFarlane, Belliston, Seaman, Weston, De Walsche, Leclair, Lessner, Holland, Southern, Mayo, Roach, McDonnell, Foster, Delahaye, Ediro, Harris, Buttery; after its recognition by all the organisations of the International in the country, this body was to be approved by the General Council as the British Federal Council. p. 29

<sup>6</sup> A report on the High Holborn meeting of October 21, 1871, at which the London Federal Council was founded, appeared in *The Times* of October 23, 1871; Hales's reply was published in *The Times* of October 28. Hales refuted the assertions regarding the secret nature of the International, its unpopularity among the

English workers and the differences allegedly dividing British and Continental workers.

*The Bee-Hive*, a British trade union weekly, was published in London from 1861 to 1876 under various names: *The Bee-Hive*, *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, *The Penny Bee-Hive*. The newspaper was strongly influenced by bourgeois radicals and reformists. In November 1864, it was declared an organ of the International. *The Bee-Hive* published the official documents of the International Working Men's Association and the reports of the Council meetings, though frequently in a distorted or abridged form. In 1869, it became, in effect, a bourgeois-radical organ. In April 1870, the General Council, acting on Marx's suggestion, severed its connections with the newspaper. However, in August 1870, during the Franco-Prussian war, the General Council, having no paper of its own, was obliged to publish several reports of its meetings in *The Bee-Hive*. p. 29

- <sup>7</sup> On October 31, 1871, *The Times* published a letter by Baillie-Cochrane, a British Conservative M. P., who reproduced allegations regarding the International, culled from the reactionary French and British papers, and tried to slander the International by ascribing to it the documents of the Bakuninist Alliance of Socialist Democracy. Engels drew up a statement from the General Council, which the *Times* editors refused to run; whereupon it was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 163, of November 11, 1871. For the statement see pp. 335-37 of the present volume.

*The Eastern Post*, a British workers' weekly, was published in London from 1868 to 1873. In January 1871, it began publishing the reports of the General Council meetings and later was (until June 1872) the Council's press organ. p. 32

- <sup>8</sup> *The Graphic*, a British illustrated weekly, was published in London from 1869 to 1932. p. 32

- <sup>9</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 163, of November 11, 1871. p. 33

- <sup>10</sup> This refers to a letter from the English publisher Truelove to Marx, written on November 7, 1871; Truelove published the English edition of the General Rules. p. 33

- <sup>11</sup> *The Standard*—a British daily of conservative trend, founded in London in 1827.

*The Economist*—a British weekly concerned with economics and politics, organ of the big industrial bourgeoisie; has been published in London since 1843. p. 34

- <sup>12</sup> The strike of 10,000 Chemnitz engineers and ironfounders began on October 28, 1871. Though unsuccessful, the strike vividly demonstrated to the workers, as Liebknecht wrote to Sorge on November 14, 1871, the need for professional organisation. p. 36
- <sup>13</sup> In October and early November 1871, Engels, as Corresponding Secretary for Italy, received letters from Terzaghi and Caserio (Turin section), Nabruzzi, Fratelli and others (Ravenna section), Riggio (Girgenti section), etc.  
In his letter (October 21, 1871) to Giuseppe Petroni, one of Mazzini's followers and editor of *La Roma del Popolo*, Garibaldi wrote about his break with Mazzini in view of the latter's attacks on the Commune and the International. The letter was published in the Italian press. Engels translated it and included it in the report of this Council meeting printed in *The Eastern Post* No. 163, of November 11, 1871 (see pp. 287-90 of the present volume). p. 36
- <sup>14</sup> The letter referred to was from Gerhard, a member of the Dutch Federal Council, dated October 30, 1871; enclosed in it was the annual contribution of the Dutch sections in the amount of £11 4s. p. 36
- <sup>15</sup> This apparently refers to a letter from Jozewicz, to whom Marx replied on November 6, 1871. p. 37
- <sup>16</sup> *The Eastern Post* (No. 164, of November 19, 1871) report of this meeting gives the content of this letter in greater detail. p. 37
- <sup>17</sup> *The Eastern Post* No. 163, of November 11, 1871, sets forth this letter from Walker, Secretary of the Boston section, in greater detail. It also reports on a letter from the New York Federal Council giving an account of the demonstration in favour of an eight-hour working day, in which members of the International also took part. p. 37
- <sup>18</sup> *The French Section of 1871* was formed in London in September 1871 by some French refugees. Its leaders were in contact with the émigrés in Switzerland, who were influenced by the Bakuninists and supported them in their attacks against the General Council. The rules of the French section, presented to the General Council on October 14, 1871, were submitted to the Rules Committee for consideration. On October 17, the General Council adopted, on Marx's proposal, a resolution stating that the section could not be admitted to the International because its rules contradict-

ed the General Rules of the International Association (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 303-05). In its letter of October 31 the section refused to recognise this resolution. The section's reply was considered in the Rules Committee and then discussed by the General Council at its meeting of November 7, 1871.

For the text of the General Council's resolution adopted after Serraillier's report see pp. 339-45 of the present volume. p. 37

<sup>19</sup> As co-tenant, the General Council used the office of the Sunday League at 256, High Holborn, London, from June 1868 to February 1872 (see *The General Council. 1866-1868*, pp. 210, 213). On August 1, 1871, the General Council decided to find other premises, for which purpose a committee was appointed, composed of Roach, Harris and Lessner (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 246). The new premises were found only in February 1872 (see Note 109). p. 37

<sup>20</sup> The report of this meeting in *The Eastern Post* No. 164, of November 19, 1871, gives the text of a letter from Canada regarding the condition of the working class in that country. It also contains reports on Bebel's two speeches in the Reichstag against militarism and the liberals' illusions concerning constitution. p. 38

<sup>21</sup> The regular (twelfth) congress of the Italian workers' societies (mainly mutual aid societies), most of which were under the influence of Mazzini, was held in Rome on November 1-6, 1871. A split followed when the delegates from the International's sections in Naples and Girgenti (Caferio, Montel and Tucci) attacked the Mazzinist principles which were contrary to the interests of the workers.

At the end of November Caferio sent Engels a detailed report on this congress, which he had drawn up in collaboration with Tucci. p. 40

<sup>22</sup> The daily newspaper *Qui Vive!*, published in London by the French Section of 1871, printed the London Conference resolutions in its issues of November 7 and 8, 1871 (Nos. 31 and 32). On November 11, Serraillier sent a letter in the name of the General Council to Vermersch, the editor, stating that the General Council would not be responsible for this publication, based as it was on unofficial sources, and drawing attention to the distortion of Resolution XIII which declared that "the German working men have done their duty during the Franco-German war" (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 446).

In reply to Serrailier's letter (printed in *Qui Vive!* No. 39, of November 16, 1871), the fifteen members of the French Section of 1871 published their "Protestation" (in issue No. 42, of November 19-20), challenging the authority of the French delegates to the London Conference of 1871 and the French members of the General Council, and abusing Serrailier. Resolution XIII was the object of an openly chauvinist attack. p. 40

- <sup>23</sup> This committee, composed of Jung, Milner and Harris, was appointed by the General Council on October 10, 1871 (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 293) to investigate how the Liberal newspaper *Scotsman* came to print, on October 2, 1871, a report on the London Conference, whose proceedings were not meant to be made public. Engels wrote on this to Liebknecht on May 27[-28], 1872, as follows: "Some days after the Conference an article appeared in *The Scotsman* and *The Manchester Guardian* reporting in detail some of the sessions of the Conference and its resolutions, and later it went the round of the British and European press. You can imagine the general indignation. Everybody cried about betrayal and demanded that the traitor should be sternly punished. Everywhere, where the International's papers existed, they abused the General Council which, they said, let such things reach the bourgeois press whereas our own newspapers had not received any information.

"We realised at once who the traitor was. The article referred only to those sessions at which Eccarius had been present, while not a word was said about the others except for inaccurate accounts of some of the resolutions. Marx took advantage of the first opportunity when we remained tête-à-tête with Eccarius to tell him this to his face and advised him in friendly fashion to make a clean breast of it, to face the music and to be more discreet in future. Eccarius went to Jung, President of the Inquiry Commission appointed *ad hoc*, and told him that he had really given an article about the Conference to the local Office of the New York newspaper *The World*, but with the categorical reservation of not publishing it in the English press. But he surely knew that people of that kind were dishonest and had connections with the English provincial press; moreover, he should have known that he had no right to sell the American press information about the proceedings of the Conference." p. 40

- <sup>24</sup> Eccarius's manuscript of this resolution is extant: "Considering: "That at the outset of the organisation of the International Working Men's Association it was resolved to admit trade and

other working men's societies in their corporate capacity as branches of the Association, leaving their existing organisations intact;

"That on that understanding deputations were sent to trade societies to invite them to join and that many did join;

"That the Rules of the Association do not contain anything which can be so construed as make the membership of such societies doubtful;

"That moreover their membership has never been questioned by any Congress or by the General Council except in a debate on October 31, 1871;

"That if the interpretation of the relations of the affiliated trade societies to the International, expressed in the debate of October 31, 1871, should become the prevailing one, the General Council would, contrary to the Rules, turn away the great bulk of the members of the Association in this and other countries;

"It is indispensably necessary to remove all doubts by formally declaring that trade societies, having endorsed the principles of the Association and joined it by a declaration to that effect, and paying the statutory contributions, are to all intents and purposes branches, and the persons belonging to them members of the Association." p. 41

<sup>25</sup> The report of this meeting in *The Eastern Post* No. 165, of November 26, 1871, quotes a letter received by Mottershead from Denmark, informing the General Council that Copenhagen alone numbered nearly 2,000 members of the International and that sections had been formed in big provincial towns. The authors wrote also that they hoped to secure the workers' representation at the elections. p. 41

<sup>26</sup> This refers to the *French-speaking section* founded in London by proletarian refugees of the Paris Commune. Among its members were Margueritte, Le Moussu, De Wolfers. On November 13, 1871, the section adopted rules which were subsequently, in February 1872, approved by the General Council. According to these rules, any citizen who acknowledged the principles of the International Working Men's Association was eligible, regardless of his nationality, to become a member of the section. The section was headed by a Council of seven whose duty it was to be in touch with the General Council and actively to propagate the ideas of the International. The section supported the General Council in its struggle against petty-bourgeois French émigrés (Vermersch and others). p. 41

- <sup>27</sup> Hales's communication and the letter from Glasgow are given in greater detail in *The Eastern Post* (No. 165, of November 26, 1871) report of this Council meeting. p. 43
- <sup>28</sup> On November 12, 1871, the Bakuninist Jura Federation held its congress in Sonvillier, where the "Circular to All Federations of the International Working Men's Association", the so-called Sonvillier circular, was adopted. Directed against the General Council and the London Conference (1871) resolutions, the circular propounded the anarchist dogmas of political indifferentism and complete autonomy for the sections. It contained slanderous attacks against the General Council and suggested that all federations should demand the immediate convocation of a congress for the purpose of revising the Rules of the International and censuring the General Council. p. 43
- <sup>29</sup> Since the essence of the discussion at this Council meeting was not meant for publication, *The Eastern Post* (No. 166, of December 2, 1871) confined itself to an account of the report of the New York Federal Committee for October 1871. p. 46
- <sup>30</sup> Marx attended this meeting for the first time after being absent for a month for reasons of health. p. 46
- <sup>31</sup> The reference is to the publication by the newspaper *Qui Vive!*, without the knowledge of the General Council, of the London Conference resolutions subsequently reprinted by *La Emancipation*. The publication contained some distortions (see Note 22). p. 47
- <sup>32</sup> On September 5, 1870, the Brunswick Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party issued a manifesto on the war, in which it proclaimed that the German workers were loyal to the proletarian international cause and suggested organising mass meetings of protest against the annexationist plans of the Prussian Government. Included in the manifesto was part of Marx's letter to the Committee (see *The General Council, 1870-1871*, pp. 330-32). For the publication of this manifesto Committee members Bracke, Bonhorst, Spier, Kühn and Gralle were arrested on September 9, 1870 and in November 1871, after many months' imprisonment, tried for violating the laws of public order, on a charge fabricated by the police. Though the Brunswick District Tribunal sentenced them to various terms of imprisonment, the Court of Appeal was constrained to repeal the sentence as unfounded and to reduce the

term from 16 months to 3, taking into account imprisonment before trial, which in fact meant acquittal. p. 48

- <sup>33</sup> *Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt*—a daily of petty-bourgeois-democratic trend; published in Frankfort on the Main from 1856 (under this title from 1866) to 1943.

For the reply drawn up by Marx in the name of the General Council see p. 346 of the present volume. p. 48

- <sup>34</sup> On November 16 and 23, 1871, the Italian democratic paper *La Roma del Popolo* (Nos. 38 and 39) published Mazzini's articles "Documenti de l'Internazionale", containing slanderous allegations against the International. In this connection Engels wrote a declaration on behalf of the General Council, addressed to several Italian newspapers. Apart from *La Roma del Popolo* it was sent on December 5-7, 1871, according to Engels's entry, to *Motto d'Ordine, Cice-ruacchio, Eguaglianza, Plebe, Proletario Italiano, Gazzettino Rosa*.

For the text of the declaration see pp. 350-52 of the present volume. p. 48

- <sup>35</sup> No. 165, of November 26, 1871 (see Note 25). p. 48

- <sup>36</sup> Chalain was among the 15 members of the French Section of 1871 who wrote against the General Council in *Qui Vive!* No. 42, of November 19-20, 1871 (see Note 22). p. 49

- <sup>37</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 167, of December 9, 1871. Hales included in it, after Marx's criticism at the meeting, the report about the sentence passed on the Brunswick Committee members (see Note 32), read at the previous meeting. He also included in the newspaper Louis Pio's letter to Thomas Mottershead (November 3, 1871) containing the Danish Federal Council's report to the General Council about the work being done among agricultural labourers, about the necessity of their alliance with the urban proletariat, of founding producer's co-operative societies and nationalising the land. p. 49

- <sup>38</sup> This refers to a letter to the General Council signed by Carusi and dated December 4, 1871; the letter informed the Council of the formation, on November 26, 1871, of an Italian section in London by a group of refugees, and contained a request to confirm Regis as the section's delegate to the General Council. p. 50

- <sup>39</sup> At this Council meeting Serraillier read a letter from the Engineers' Committee of Roubaix (November 30, 1871), stating

that 700 engineers had declared a strike on November 16. But Hales included the report on the beginning of the strike only in the Minutes of the next Council meeting. p. 51

- <sup>40</sup> The third trial by court martial of the Paris Commune members and the Central Committee of the National Guard, held from August 7 to September 2, 1871, passed a death sentence on Ferré, member of the Committee of Public Safety and the Commune's assistant procurator. The execution of Ferré and Rossell, the Commune's former military delegate, on November 28, 1871, aroused a wave of public protest. p. 51
- <sup>41</sup> The British and German bourgeois newspapers carried a false statement to the effect that the Federal Council for London had elected Charles Dilke, a bourgeois republican, honorary member of the International. At a meeting on November 28, 1871, the General Council adopted a refutation drawn up by Marx (see p. 48 of the present volume). However, the Bethnal Green section, with the participation of Roach, a Federal Council member, passed a resolution thanking Dilke for his lectures. This fact was reported in *The Eastern Post* of December 2, 1871. p. 53
- <sup>42</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 168, of December 16; *Reynolds's Newspaper* of December 17; *L'Égalité* No. 24, of December 24, 1871, and in *Tagwacht* No. 2, of January 13, 1872.
- Reynolds's Newspaper* reported additional data on Garibaldi's talk with Trivulzio, and his attitude towards the International; it stated that, though he did not approve the International's programme as a whole, he supported the International as a society whose aim was to promote the moral and material well-being of the working classes and fight theocracy. p. 54
- <sup>43</sup> *The Nine Hours' League*, founded in Newcastle, headed the big strike of the building workers and engineers of Newcastle in May-October 1871; the strike was a success thanks to the broad participation of non-trade-union masses and active help on the part of the General Council (see *The General Council, 1870-1871*, pp. 252-55, etc.). p. 55
- <sup>44</sup> The article referred to was published in *L'Égalité* No. 23, of December 7, 1871.

On November 23, 1871, at a meeting of the Geneva members of the International, which discussed the results of the London Con-

ference, Perret made a report on his visit to London and the Conference resolutions, but under pressure from the Bakuninists no decision was taken. At a meeting on December 2, after a long debate, the delegates of thirty Geneva sections rejected the Bakuninist Sonvillier circular (see Note 28) and adopted a resolution expressing solidarity with the General Council and full approval of the London Conference decisions. p. 56

- <sup>45</sup> The reference is to the split in the Central Committee of the North-American sections (see Note 198) in December 1871.

After the London Conference (1871), the struggle between the Committee's proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements represented primarily by sections No. 12 and No. 9 increased in violence, and as a result of the split there appeared two committees: the Provisional Federal Council (Committee No. 1) supported by the proletarian sections (Sorge played an active role in it), and Committee No. 2, which united various petty-bourgeois organisations that sought to utilise the workers' movement for their own political ends. p. 58

- <sup>46</sup> Bradlaugh's lecture, with its deprecatory allusions to the Paris Commune and Marx, was read on December 11, 1871.

Marx's daughter Jenny wrote to Kugelmann on December 21-22, 1871 as follows: "Mr. Bradlaugh has resorted to the most miserable misrepresentation to calumniate 'le grand chef de ce conseil'. For weeks he secretly insinuated at private assemblies, at length he has openly proclaimed at a public meeting that Karl Marx was, and is, a Bonapartist. His assertions are based upon the passage in *The Civil War* in which it is shown that the Empire 'was the only form of government possible',—here Bradlaugh stops, omitting the concluding words 'at a time when the bourgeoisie had already lost, and the working class had not yet acquired, the faculty of ruling the nation'." p. 58

- <sup>47</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 169, of December 23, 1871; *L'Égalité* No. 1, of January 10, 1872; and *Tagwacht* No. 3, of January 20, 1872. *The Eastern Post* refuted the reports carried by some newspapers regarding the adoption of a resolution thanking Charles Dilke, M.P. p. 58

- <sup>48</sup> The letter was from César de Paepe written between November 27 and December 8, 1871, explaining why the publication of the London Conference (1871) resolution had been delayed by *L'Internationale*; he also wrote about the forthcoming congress of the

- Belgian Federation that was to discuss the split in Switzerland and the Rules of the International. p. 59
- <sup>49</sup> Thieblin wrote this letter to Marx on December 16, 1871. p. 60
- <sup>50</sup> This commercial treaty was concluded between Britain and France on January 23, 1860. France abandoned her prohibitive tariffs politics and introduced duties not to exceed 30 per cent *ad valorem*. p. 60
- <sup>51</sup> On February 8, 1858, Palmerston introduced in the House of Commons, under pressure from the French Government, a Bill on Foreigners (or Conspiracy Bill). Under this Bill anyone, Englishman or foreigner alike, living in the United Kingdom, found to be an organiser of or a participant in a conspiracy to murder an official person in Britain or in any other country, would be liable to trial by a British court and strict punishment. Thanks to mass protests, the Bill was rejected by the House and Palmerston was forced to resign. p. 60
- <sup>52</sup> The entry is not exact. The reference is to a letter from Josewicz to Marx, dated December 6 and 7, 1871, in which he informed Marx of the slanderous attacks against the London Conference and the General Council made by the Lassallean newspaper *Neuer Social-Demokrat* which Marx considered to be one of Bismarck's press organs. On December 3 and 8, 1871 (issues Nos. 67 and 69), that newspaper ran the slanderous articles by Schneider and Weber declaring that the London Conference was convoked "illegally", that its resolutions as well as the General Council's decisions were invalid, etc. p. 61
- <sup>53</sup> This refers to Sorge's letter to Marx of November 21, 1871. Concerning the split in the United States see Note 45. p. 61
- <sup>54</sup> The letter was from T. Möller to Marx (November 20, 1871); it is given in greater detail in the *Égalité* (No. 1, of January 10, 1872) report of this Council meeting. p. 61
- <sup>55</sup> In his letter Nikolai Utin (Outline) wrote about the meeting of thirty Geneva sections of the International, held on December 2, 1871 (see Note 44).  
On December 21-22, 1871, Marx's daughter Jenny wrote to Kugelmann as follows: "In Geneva, that hotbed of intrigants, a congress representing thirty sections of the International has

declared itself for the General Council, has passed a resolution to the effect that the separatist factions cannot henceforth be considered to form parts of the International, their acts having clearly shown that their object is to disorganise the Association; that these sections, who, under another name, are only a fraction of the old Alliance faction, by continuing to sow dissension, are opposed to the interests of the Federation. This resolution was voted unanimously in an assembly of 500 members. The Bakuninists who had come all the way from Neuchâtel to be present would have been seriously ill-used, had it not been for the men whom they style 'des Bismarckiens', 'des autoritaires'—Outine, Perret, etc., who rescued them and begged the assembly to allow them to speak. (Outine of course was well aware that the best means of killing them altogether was to allow them to make their speeches.)" p. 61

<sup>56</sup> This letter was published in *The National Reformer*, an English bourgeois-radical weekly, on July 16, 1871. p. 62

<sup>57</sup> *La Liberté*—a French evening daily of conservative trend, organ of the big bourgeoisie, was published in Paris from 1865 to 1944; in 1870-71, during the siege of Paris, it came out in Tours and, later, in Bordeaux. In 1866-72, it belonged to Emile Girardin, a Bonapartist notorious for his extreme lack of principles. p. 63

<sup>58</sup> In his letter published in *The Eastern Post* No. 168, of December 16, 1871, Bradlaugh continued his slanderous attacks against Marx. For Marx's reply to this and other letters by Bradlaugh see *The Eastern Post*, December 23, 1871 and January 20 and 28, 1872. p. 63

<sup>59</sup> This refers to the article "La Política de la Internationale" published in *La Emancipacion* No. 24, of November 27, 1871. In this article the editors approved the London Conference resolution on "Political Action of the Working Class", but pointed out, nevertheless, that the policy of abstaining from the political struggle was necessary in Spain temporarily for tactical reasons. The article was also published in *La Federacion* No. 120, of December 3, 1871; a large part of it was reprinted in *L'Égalité* No. 24, of December 24, 1871.

*La Emancipacion*, the Spanish workers' weekly, organ of the Madrid sections of the International, appeared in Madrid from 1871 to 1873; as the organ of the Spanish Federal Council (September 1871-April 1872) it campaigned against the anarchist influences in

Spain. In 1872-73 it published the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, certain sections of *The Poverty of Philosophy* and the first volume of *Capital*, and several articles by Engels. p. 65

<sup>60</sup> In its report of this Council meeting *The Eastern Post* (No. 171, of January 6, 1872) gives a vivid picture of the ten-thousand strong demonstration organised by the New York sections in memory of the Paris Commune's martyrs. p. 66

<sup>61</sup> The congress of the Belgian Federation, held in Brussels on December 24-25, 1871, did not support, when discussing the Sonvillier circular (see Note 28), the Swiss anarchists' demand for the immediate convocation of a general congress of the International, though it did instruct the Belgian Federal Council to draft new rules for the Association. A brief report on this congress was published in *L'Internationale* No. 155, of December 31, 1871. p. 67

<sup>62</sup> At the end of 1871 a new Polish section was formed in London, mainly from the Polish refugees who had participated in the Paris Commune. As distinct from the former Polish section that ceased to exist on the eve of the Franco-Prussian war, it was more homogeneous ideologically, and its members were better versed in socialist theory. Its leader was Walery Wróblewski, a member of the General Council. It included J. Rozwadowski, E. Pruszyński, E. Szyrma, Wierzbicki and others.

The rules of this section were examined by the Rules Committee early in January 1872 and unanimously approved by the General Council (see p. 73 of the present volume).

In 1872, on the initiative of the Polish section in London, a new society was founded, known as Lud Polski, which brought together the members of several generations of revolutionary-democratic émigrés, including the insurgents of 1830-31 and the Polish Communards T. Dombrowski, M. Krynski, L. Oborski and others. p. 67

<sup>63</sup> The letter was dated November 28, 1871, and signed by Gerhard, Secretary of the Dutch Federal Council. The latter reported on the successes of the International in Holland, mentioned the plans for translating and publishing in the nearest future the General Rules, and described the demonstrations in Amsterdam.

Enclosed in the letter was an official statement to the effect that the Federal Council adhered to the London Conference (1871) resolutions and approved the General Council's actions; and Gerhard's translation of this statement into French. p. 68

- <sup>64</sup> See Note 24. p. 71
- <sup>65</sup> The newspaper report of this Council meeting (*The Eastern Post* No. 172, of January 14, 1872) deals mainly with the achievements of the International in Spain, with the English sections, and particularly Harriet Law's lecture in Manchester for the benefit of the Communards, the formation of a section in Huddersfield and a new section in London that held its meetings in the tavern "Sir Robert Peel", and the struggle waged by the Dundee ironworkers for a 51-hour week. p. 71
- <sup>66</sup> The reference is to a letter from Keen, Secretary of the British Federal Council, dated January 9, 1872, in which he named the 26 initial members of the Council (see Note 5) and the 8 members co-opted later (Blandford, Blair, Richard, Whalley, Kirmaird, Bowtell, Stepney and Sanders); he also enumerated the branches that became affiliated with the Council (in Manchester, Middlesbrough, Limehouse, Loughboro, Liverpool and Marylebone) and the societies that were offered to affiliate—the Bootclosers, Cigar-Makers, Sailors, Bricklayers, Portmanteau-Makers, Bookbinders and Alliance Cabinet-Makers. p. 74
- <sup>67</sup> Dupont wrote to Engels on January 8, 1872. p. 74
- <sup>68</sup> Yarrow was elected to the General Council on July 3, 1866; his name appeared in the Minutes until June 1, 1869 (see *The General Council, 1868-1870*, p. 108). p. 75
- <sup>69</sup> This refers to the General Council meeting of May 4, 1869, which discussed the appeal in connection with the brutal assault upon the strikers in Seraing and Frameries (Belgium). The Secretary of the General Council was instructed to invite delegates from trade societies to this meeting (see *The General Council, 1868-1870*, pp. 88, 90, 95). p. 75
- <sup>70</sup> *The Universal Republican League*—a petty-bourgeois organisation founded in April 1871; its leadership included Odger, Bradlaugh, Le Lubez. It declared its goal to be the achievement of the intellectual, moral and material well-being of mankind by uniting republicans in all countries and spreading books, pamphlets and general information through lectures and speeches at various meetings. Besides demands for the nationalisation of the land and universal suffrage, its programme called for the abolition of titles and privileges of the clergy and aristocracy, as well as the implementation of the

federative principle in the future world republic. Its formation was connected with the growth of the republican movement in England, stimulated by the events of September 4, 1870 in France. p. 75

<sup>71</sup> This refers to the General Council's decision of December 22, 1868 refusing admission to the International Association of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, founded by Mikhail Bakunin in Geneva in October 1868, on the grounds that "the presence of a second international body operating within and outside the *International Working Men's Association* will be the most infallible means of its disorganisation" (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, p. 388). p. 76

<sup>72</sup> In his letter to Engels (January 3, 1872) Dupont wrote that the rules of the British Federation, sent to the Manchester section of the International, contained an article permitting the Federal Council to co-opt new members, which was contrary to the principle, written down in the General Rules, that Federal Councils shall be composed of delegates from sections. This information helped to expose Hales who had attempted to submit for the General Council's approval an altered text of the rules. p. 76

<sup>73</sup> The report of this meeting in *The Eastern Post* No. 173, of January 20, 1872, gives the contents of the letters from Manchester, Middlesbrough, Liverpool and Dundee in greater detail; the newspaper also reports the death of Gregory, a member of the International Association in America. Eccarius informed the Council of Gregory's death only at its next meeting, on January 23 (see p. 86 of the present volume).

The report of this meeting was reprinted by the newspaper *Russky Mir* (Russian World) No. 18, of January 20 (February 1), 1872, under the heading "England". This newspaper gave an account of Engels's communication on the strikes in Rome and emphasised that these strikes, the first ever to take place in Rome, "attest to the achievements of the working class under the influence of the International Association"; it also reported the discussion of the rules of the British Federal Council. p. 77

<sup>74</sup> *The National Reform League* was founded in London in 1849 by the Chartist Bronterre O'Brien, Reynolds and others. Its programme called for universal suffrage and social reforms. The League's affiliation with the International in 1866 strengthened the position of the socialistically-minded elements in the General Council and helped to adopt the socialist programme at the Brussels and Basle congresses of the International. p. 81

- <sup>75</sup> This seems to be a reference to Applegarth's speech at a banquet arranged by Ward, Mayor of Nottingham, on January 8, 1872, in honour of the delegates to the fifth trade union congress, the report of which appeared in *The Bee-Hive* No. 535, of January 13, 1872. p. 82
- <sup>76</sup> The report of this meeting appeared in *The Eastern Post* No. 174, of January 28, 1872, and was reprinted in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* (No. 16, of March 2, 1872)—an American newspaper published in New York in 1870-76 by the bourgeois feminists, sisters Woodhull and Claflin. p. 83
- <sup>77</sup> The congress of Saxon Social-Democrats at Chemnitz met on January 6-7, 1872, the 120 delegates representing more than 50 local organisations. At a private meeting the congress discussed the attitude to be adopted towards the Sonvillier circular (see Note 28), unanimously supported the General Council, and approved the London Conference (1871) resolutions. Liebknecht wrote to Engels on January 10, 1872 as follows: "The meeting was splendid... At a private meeting of the delegates it was unanimously decided to support you in the struggle against the Bakuninists, and I was instructed to inform you of this..." p. 86
- <sup>78</sup> Engels received this letter from the Turin workers' society L'Emancipazione del Proletario (dated January 19, 1872) which declared itself a section of the International. The *Eastern Post* report of this Council meeting quoted both extracts from the Italian papers. p. 86
- <sup>79</sup> This refers to "Algemeene Statuten van de Internationale Vereeniging van Werklieden", Amsterdam, 1872. p. 86
- <sup>80</sup> The reference is apparently to the report of the North-American Federal Council of January 7, 1872 (over Sorge's signature) and to Laugrand's letter to Le Moussu, dated December 24, 1872, describing in detail the split in the North-American Federation. p. 86
- <sup>81</sup> *The Eastern Post*, of January 28, 1872, cites the following demands put forward by this conference: nationalisation of all means of transport; housing construction on state lands and for rental at cost; permission to use school premises and town halls for meetings; installation of public gas and water supply lines; organisation of coal stores and public markets; and establishment of the people's control over municipal services. p. 87

- <sup>82</sup> Frankel had in mind a group of Lassalleans who were expelled, at the end of 1871, from the German Workers' Educational Association in London for their slanderous attacks against the General Council.

On January 18, 1872, Engels wrote to Wilhelm Liebknecht apropos of the German Workers' Association that "a comic event occurred there too. Schneider and that old ass and scoundrel Scherzer, thinking that they had a majority, concluded, together with Weber and with his help, an alliance with the French dissidents and suggested that the association *should renounce the International*. Our people were inert, missed many an opportunity, tolerated too many scoundrels; all of which proved too much, however, so that they called a meeting and rejected the proposal by 27 votes against 20. They then suggested expelling the twenty, but a scandal made voting impossible. Our people immediately took steps to save the property of the association, met elsewhere, and expelled the twenty. The latter found themselves in a ridiculous and helpless situation, yet had the impudence to send Scherzer on Tuesday as *their delegate* to the General Council! Naturally, he was not admitted."

*The German Workers' Educational Association* (Deutscher-Arbeiter-Bildungs-Verein) was founded in London in February 1840 by Karl Schapper, Joseph Moll and other leaders of the League of the Just, and existed until 1918, when it was closed down by the British Government. From 1847 on, it was a legal organisation under the auspices of the Communist League headed by Marx and Engels. When the International was founded it became the German section of the International Association in London (see *The General Council. 1864-1866*, pp. 63-64) and at the close of 1871 entered the British Federation. p. 87

- <sup>83</sup> This refers to the meetings of October 11 and 18, 1870, held by the Freundschaft, one of the nationalistic German organisations in London. These meetings put forward, allegedly in the name of the German workers, the demand to annex Alsace and Lorraine.

In reply, the London German Workers' Educational Association and the Teutonia Society issued a joint address to the German workers in London proclaiming the principles of proletarian internationalism (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 79-80). p. 87

- <sup>84</sup> This committee was appointed on October 10, 1871 to investigate the case of the publication of material relating to the London Conference of 1871 (see Note 23). p. 87

- <sup>85</sup> Such a committee, called the *Judicial Committee*, was elected at the General Council meeting of February 13, 1872. Walery Wróblewski was elected chairman. p. 89
- <sup>86</sup> The report of this meeting in *The Eastern Post* No. 175, of February 3, 1872, reprinted in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* No. 19, of March 23, 1872, also mentioned a letter from the Taunton Republican Club declaring its unconditional support of the International. p. 89
- <sup>87</sup> The Milan section, known as the *Circolo Operaio di Emancipazione del Proletario*, was set up late in December 1871, with the active participation of Cuno, a German Social-Democrat who emigrated to Italy. Cuno, Pezza, Testini and Turbeli composed the section's provisional committee. p. 90
- <sup>88</sup> Engels learned about this from Arturo Guardiolas's letter, of January 23, 1872. p. 90
- <sup>89</sup> Engels took this information on the Spanish sections from Paul Lafargue's letter to him dated January 25 and 26, 1872. Sagasta's circular was dated January 1872. p. 91
- <sup>90</sup> *Volkswille*—an Austrian workers' paper published in Vienna from January 1870 to June 1874. p. 91
- <sup>91</sup> On October 10, 1871, Le Moussu was appointed Secretary for the French-speaking sections in the United States (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 291). Marx wrote to Sorge on March 8, 1872 as follows: "The complaint about our own 'French' correspondent is altogether unjust, because the Germans, too, had their own correspondent and the Secretary for the United States, Eccarius, can, it is true, conduct correspondence in German and English, but not in French. Besides, the complaint was quite impolitic, because it seemed to prove the suspicions of the French members of the Council that Section No. 1 claimed dictatorship over the other sections. Your complaint arrived together with the one from the Counter-Committee that Section No. 1, contrary to the Rules, had more representatives in the old committee."
- In his letter to Marx, of March 8, 1872, Sorge wrote that the protest came from the Irish members of the International who objected in general to appointing secretaries for individual nationalities. p. 91
- <sup>92</sup> Resolution XVI, adopted by the London Conference on September 21, 1871 stated that "the existing branches and societies shall . . .

no longer be allowed to designate themselves by sectarian names such as Positivists, Mutualists, Collectivists . . . or to form separatist bodies under the names of sections of propaganda, Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste, etc., pretending to accomplish special missions distinct from the common purposes of the Association" (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 447-48). p. 92

<sup>93</sup> The letter mentioned was from Barry; it was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 172, of January 14, 1872. p. 93

<sup>94</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 176, of February 10, 1872, and reprinted in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* No. 19, of March 23, 1872. p. 95

<sup>95</sup> The reference is to Thomas Devy's letter to Marx, dated January 16, 1872.

*The World*—an American daily paper of the Democratic Party, published in New York from 1860 to 1931. p. 95

<sup>96</sup> A. Richard et G. Blanc, "L'Empire et la France nouvelle. Appel du peuple et de la jeunesse à la conscience française", Bruxelles, 1872. p. 96

<sup>97</sup> This refers to the section formed after the dissolution of the French Section of 1871 (see Note 18) and headed by Vermersch. It called itself *Section Fédéraliste de Retraite*. The General Council refused to admit this section into the International because its rules contradicted the principles laid down in the General Rules of the International Association. p. 96

<sup>98</sup> The Versailles government demanded extradition of the Communards by the European powers. The Federal Council of Switzerland adopted an evasive stand on this question because it dared not ignore openly the workers' demands for the right of asylum for the Communards. It decided to act in accordance with the Franco-Swiss Convention of 1869, i.e., to grant asylum to political emigrants and to extradite common criminals.

Early in June 1871, the French Ambassador in Switzerland handed the federal government a list of Communards wanted by the Thiers government. The Swiss authorities were on the point of fulfilling this demand, but most of the refugees managed to hide; the police arrested only one Communard—Eugène Razoua, a former member of the Tribunal of the Paris Commune. Swiss workers rose in defence of him and mass meetings of protest swept over

the country. Two months later the Swiss Government was obliged to release Razoua, thus incidentally solving the general problem of the right of asylum. p. 97

<sup>99</sup> An appeal to the American sections to raise funds for the Paris refugees was written by Marx in the autumn of 1871; the text of the appeal is not available. p. 98

<sup>100</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 177, of February 17, 1872. p. 103

<sup>101</sup> The secretaries of the sections in Hinckley, Woolwich and Sunderland were Taylor, Maddox and Lemon, respectively. p. 103

<sup>102</sup> The letter was from William Riley to John Hales, dated February 9, 1872. The same day Riley addressed Marx and on February 10—Engels, inviting them to contribute to the newspaper *International Herald*. The matter was soon arranged.

*The International Herald*—a British republican weekly published in London from March 2, 1872 to October 1873; from May 1872 to May 1873 (with intervals) it was the organ of the British Federal Council of the International; the newspaper published reports on the General Council and British Council meetings, documents of the International and articles by Marx and Engels. In June 1873 Marx and Engels stopped contributing to the paper because its publisher and editor, Riley, had broken with the working-class movement. p. 104

<sup>103</sup> The letter from Franz Jozewicz, Secretary of the Berlin section of the International, was dated February 10, 1872. By the Federal Council Marx meant the Central Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party, the latter being a branch of the International.

Marx replied to this letter on February 24, 1872. p. 104

<sup>104</sup> *La Liberté*—a Belgian democratic paper published in Brussels from 1865 to 1873; in 1871-73 it was published weekly; from 1867 on, it was in effect one of the organs of the International Association in Belgium. p. 106

<sup>105</sup> Serraillier refers to the so-called French branch in London, founded in the autumn of 1865. The petty-bourgeois émigrés, former members of the branch, had lost their ties with the International but continued to act on its behalf and supported anti-proletarian elements in their struggle against the General Council. p. 107

- <sup>106</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 178, of February 24, and in *The International Herald* No. 1, of March 2, 1872; it was reprinted in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* No. 21, of April 6, 1872. p. 109
- <sup>107</sup> Among the documents sent was the report of the Provisional Federal Council (No. 2), signed by Elliott (February 1, 1872), which was given in detail in the newspaper account of this Council meeting. p. 110
- <sup>108</sup> *The Standing Committee*, or *Sub-Committee*, included Corresponding Secretaries for different countries, the General Council's Secretary and Treasurer. Headed by Marx, it exercised daily leadership of the International's activities, prepared documents which were then submitted for consideration to the General Council (see Note 255). p. 110
- <sup>109</sup> From March 5 on, the General Council held its meetings at 33, Rathbone Place, Oxford Street. In the report of this meeting in *The Eastern Post* No. 180, of March 9, 1872, and *The International Herald* No. 2, of March 16, 1872, the address was erroneously given as 23, Rathbone Place. p. 116
- <sup>110</sup> The General Council did not hold its regular meeting on February 27, 1872, because many of its members, including Marx, could not arrive at the place owing to the public procession arranged on the occasion of the Prince of Wales's recovery from his illness. The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 180, of March 9, *La Liberté* No. 11, of March 17, *The International Herald* No. 2, of March 16, and *Sovremenniy Izvestia* (Contemporary News) No. 66, of March 8, 1872. p. 116
- <sup>111</sup> The so-called *Section Fédéraliste de Retraite* (see Note 97) sent this letter to the General Council early in March 1872. p. 117
- <sup>112</sup> This refers to a letter from Regis sent to Engels on March 1, 1872; in the latter half of February 1872, Regis made a tour of several Italian towns to investigate the situation in the relative sections. At the following Council meeting Engels registered a protest against the distorted account of his communication in *The Eastern Post* of March 9, 1872 (see pp. 121-24 of the present volume). p. 117
- <sup>113</sup> This refers to the laws passed in 1794 by Pitt's government against the radical societies sympathising with the French Republic. p. 119

- <sup>114</sup> In *The Eastern Post* and *The International Herald* Jung's report was given in greater detail, including information on the decision to hold a meeting in honour of March 18 under the direction of the International members, London democrats and French Communards; speeches were to be made in both English and French.  
p. 119
- <sup>115</sup> In the report of this Council meeting in *The Eastern Post* and *The International Herald* Marx's words were given as follows: "It [the manifesto] was a vigorous defence of the policy of the Association, and showed most conclusively that the doctrine 'That the working class ought to abstain from Politics' was both absurd and dangerous."  
p. 119
- <sup>116</sup> Marx and Engels worked on the General Council's private circular *Fictitious Splits in the International* from the middle of January to the beginning of March 1872. The circular made public the splitting activities of the Bakuninist Alliance of Socialist Democracy within the International and marked a definite stage in the General Council's struggle against anarchism; it revealed to the workers of all countries the sectarian character of the Alliance and its contacts with the anti-proletarian elements.  
The circular was published as a pamphlet in French at the close of May 1872, over the signature of all General Council members, and sent out to all federations of the Association (see pp. 356-409 of the present volume).  
p. 119
- <sup>117</sup> In December 1870, in New York, representatives of several sections formed a Central Committee as the leading organ of the International in the United States. In July 1871, Sections No. 9 and 12, headed by the bourgeois feminists Woodhull and Claflin, joined these sections and began campaigning, in the name of the International, for bourgeois reforms. Challenging the "foreign sections" (German, French, Irish), particularly the German Section No. 1 in New York, headed by Sorge, the supporters of Woodhull and Claflin attempted to use the International organisations for their own purposes. On September 27, 1871, without the knowledge of the New York Central Committee, Section No. 12 demanded that the General Council recognise it as the leading section in the United States. At the same time it conducted a campaign in the newspapers against those sections which fought to maintain the proletarian character of the organisation. In its resolution of November 5, 1871 (see p. 338 of the present volume) the General Council rejected Section No. 12's claims and confirmed the powers of the

New York Central Committee. Nevertheless Section No. 12 continued its activities, which led to the consolidation of the petty-bourgeois elements in certain organisations of the International in the U.S.A. and then to a split, in December 1871, between the proletarian and petty-bourgeois sections (see Note 45).

In its resolutions adopted, on the basis of Marx's report, on March 5 and 12, 1872 (see pp. 410-13 of the present volume), the General Council expressed its firm support of the proletarian wing of the North-American Federation, and Section No. 12 was suspended from the International pending the next congress. On March 8, 1872, Marx wrote to Sorge as follows: "As the General Council has finally instructed me to report on the split in America (because of the difficulties within the International in Europe we have had to postpone this from meeting to meeting), I have looked attentively through all correspondence from New York, and everything published in the newspapers, and have come to the conclusion that the information about the factors responsible for the split had been reaching us belatedly and inaccurately. Some of the resolutions proposed by me have already been adopted, others will be considered this coming Tuesday, and the final decision will be then forwarded to New York." For Marx's manuscript, containing notes for his speeches on the split in the U.S.A., see pp. 323-32 of the present volume. p. 120

<sup>118</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 181, of March 17, 1872. p. 120

<sup>119</sup> Engels's report on Italy was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 181, of March 17, 1872, and included in the Minutes. The report on Denmark was never printed in the press. p. 123

<sup>120</sup> Marx wrote to Sorge on March 15, 1872 as follows: "Eccarius, at the end of the sitting of March 12 told me privately that he would not send the Resolutions to New York and that, at next sitting, he would tender his resignation as Secretary for the U. St. . . . During the discussion Eccarius spoke in a spirit most hostile to your Council. He spoke and voted against Resolution III, 2. He was moreover offended, because in order to save time, I had not submitted the Resolutions to the Sub-Committee of which he forms part, but laid them at once before the General Council. As the latter fully approved this proceeding after my statement of the reasons, which had induced me to act as I have done, Eccarius ought to have dropped his personal spleen." p. 124

<sup>121</sup> Marx's letter to James M'Pherson is not available. p. 126

- <sup>122</sup> *South-Sea Bubble*—an ironical name of a series of financial projects of the South-Sea Company founded in 1711 in England to carry on monopoly trade with South America. In 1721 a parliamentary commission investigated the company's activities and discovered facts of monstrous abuses and corruption. p. 128
- <sup>123</sup> The reference is apparently to a letter from Richard and Blanc, written to the General Council on March 7, 1872, explaining why they had joined the Bonapartists. p. 128
- <sup>124</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The International Herald* No 3, of March 30, 1872. p. 129
- <sup>125</sup> The letter from the Spanish Federal Council, signed by Mesa, was written on March 11, 1872. p. 129
- <sup>126</sup> The letter from the Lisbon section of the International was written on March 10, 1872; it was signed by its secretary, Nobre-Franca, and Tedeschj.  
*O Pensamento Social*—a Portuguese socialist weekly published in Lisbon from February 1872 to April 1873; as the newspaper of the Portuguese sections of the International, it published the latter's documents and articles by Marx and Engels. p. 130
- <sup>127</sup> Engels's reply to the Lisbon section has not been preserved. p. 130
- <sup>128</sup> Engels sent his reply to the Ferrara society on April 16, 1872. His letter, as well as the International's documents forwarded by him to the society, helped its members to overcome the anarchist influence, and on May 7, acting on Engels's proposal, the General Council admitted the society into the International as a section (see pp. 180-81 of the present volume), of which Engels notified the Ferrara Worker's Society on May 10, 1872. p. 130
- <sup>129</sup> This letter, under date March 13, 1872, came from Bruno Geiser. p. 130
- <sup>130</sup> During the coach-makers' strike in Cork in March 1872 McDonnell, as Corresponding Secretary for Ireland, organised aid for the strikers, conducted meetings and arranged collection of funds in Ireland and England. On March 26 a special appeal was issued, addressed to the Irish sections and the working class as a whole and calling for action in support of the strikers (see p. 213 of the present volume). p. 132

- <sup>131</sup> The reference is to the so-called Dufaure law, passed by the National Assembly of France on March 14, 1872, under which affiliation with the International was punishable by imprisonment. p. 132
- <sup>132</sup> *Section Ferré* was one of the first sections to appear in Paris after the defeat of the Commune. It was so named in memory of Theophile Ferré, a follower of Blanqui and active participant in the Commune, who was executed by the Versailles government. Formally established in April 1872, it served the General Council as an intermediary in maintaining contact with the resurgent French working-class organisations. The section was confirmed by the General Council, on Marx's proposal, on July 27, 1872, after its rules were examined by the Rules Committee (see p. 313 of the present volume). p. 132
- <sup>133</sup> The *Cercle d'Études Sociales* was founded in London by Communard refugees on January 20, 1872. It united those groups of French refugees who professed the "principles of the Commune". Besides discussing issues of common interest to all French refugees and studying social problems it sought to maintain relations with revolutionaries in other countries. Among its active participants were the International's members Ranvier, Lissagaray, and Hubert. On their proposal Marx was unanimously elected member of the circle on February 3, 1872, with which he collaborated until the autumn of 1872. p. 134
- <sup>134</sup> The text of the three resolutions, drawn up by Marx and submitted by Theisz, Camélinat and Milner, was published, unsigned, in *The Eastern Post* No. 182, of March 23, *La Liberté* No. 12, of March 24, and *The International Herald* No. 3, of March 30, 1872 (see p. 414 of the present volume). p. 134
- <sup>135</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 183, of March 31, 1872. p. 136
- <sup>136</sup> The letter from the Spanish Federal Council was dated March 15, 1872 and signed by Mora. p. 137
- <sup>137</sup> In fulfilment of this decision, Engels drew up on April 3, 1872 a message of greetings addressed to the "Delegates of the National Spanish Congress Assembled at Saragossa", and sent on April 6 a telegram greeting the congress (see pp. 414-17 of the present

volume). The letter was read at the congress on April 7 and published in *La Emancipacion*.

Concerning the Saragossa Congress see Note 162. p. 138

<sup>138</sup> The Toulouse newspaper *Emancipation* published an account of the incident in Cavendish Square (London), which occurred on March 18, 1872, when a small group of French petty-bourgeois refugees (Vésinier, Richard and others) attempted to counter a meeting in St. George's Hall (see pp. 133-34 of the present volume) with a meeting of their own and adopt a resolution condemning the General Council. p. 139

<sup>139</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The International Herald* on April 13, 1872 (No. 4). p. 139

<sup>140</sup> *The Irishman*—an Irish weekly of bourgeois-nationalist orientation published from 1858 to 1885, first in Belfast, later in Dublin. p. 141

<sup>141</sup> Hales wrote this letter to McDonnell on March 29, 1872. p. 142

<sup>142</sup> Hales's chauvinistic attitude towards the problem of relations between the Irish sections formed in England and Ireland, on the one hand, and the British Federal Council, on the other, was discussed by the General Council on May 14, 1872 (see pp. 194-99 of the present volume). p. 142

<sup>143</sup> On December 17, 1870, Bebel, Liebknecht and Hepner were arrested, charged with preliminary actions to high treason, and on March 11-26, 1872 tried in Leipzig. Attempts of the German ruling circles to make short work of these working-class leaders met with the courageous behaviour of the accused who openly defended their views.

Though the charges could not be proved, Bebel and Liebknecht were sentenced to two-years' imprisonment (the two months' preliminary imprisonment being taken into account), while Hepner was acquitted. p. 143

<sup>144</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 185, of April 14, 1872. p. 145

<sup>145</sup> The letter was from Louis Pio, dated March 24, 1872. p. 146

<sup>146</sup> Under the Treaty of Prague, concluded on October 30, 1864, between Denmark, on the one hand, Prussia and Austria, on

- the other, the duchy of Schleswig was temporarily handed over to the joint possession of Austria and Prussia. But after the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 both Schleswig and Holstein were simply annexed by Prussia. p. 146
- <sup>147</sup> Liebknecht's letter of April 2, 1872, refuting the lies spread by the bourgeois newspapers in connection with the Leipzig trial (see Note 143), was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 185, of April 14, 1872, under the heading "The Leipzig Trial". p. 146
- <sup>148</sup> The text of the repudiation, published in *La Emancipation*, was reprinted in the *Eastern Post* report of this Council meeting. The report regretted the fact that Vésinier's article contained attacks against the General Council. p. 147
- <sup>149</sup> The French translation of *The Civil War in France*, edited by Marx, came out in pamphlet form in Brussels in June 1872. p. 147
- <sup>150</sup> This refers to Article 5 of Section II of the Administrative Regulations (see p. 430 of the present volume). p. 147
- <sup>151</sup> De Morgan's two letters on the persecution he was subjected to in Cork were published in *The International Herald* No. 5, of April 27, 1872; one of them was an open letter to Canon Maguire. p. 148
- <sup>152</sup> *The Dublin Castle*, built by the English conquerors in the thirteenth century as a stronghold in their war against the Irish people, was the residence of the English rulers in Ireland and embodied the oppression and violence practised by the English colonialists against the Irish. p. 149
- <sup>153</sup> Cournet refers to the General Council's declaration "The Fenian Prisoners at Manchester and the International Working Men's Association", drawn up by Marx on November 20, 1867 (see *The General Council. 1866-1868*, pp. 179-80, 312-13); the resolution of November 16, 1869, on the British Government's policy towards the Irish prisoners; and Section 5 of the circular letter of January 1, 1870 (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, pp. 183-84, 403-06) p. 151
- <sup>154</sup> The General Council's declaration "Police Terrorism in Ireland", drawn up by a special committee of which Marx was a member (see pp. 142-43 of the present volume), was also published at the time in London as a handbill entitled "Declaration by the General Coun-

- cil of the International Working Men's Association. Police Terrorism in Ireland" and reproduced in several newspapers of the Association: *The Eastern Post* No. 185, of April 13; *L'Égalité* No. 13, of June 23; *La Emancipacion* No. 49, of May 18, *Pensamento Social* No. 10, of April 1872. p. 151
- <sup>155</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 186, of April 20, and *The International Herald* No. 5, of April 27, 1872. p. 152
- <sup>156</sup> This declaration, written by Marx in accordance with the General Council's decision, was published as a leaflet entitled "The International Working Men's Association" [London, 1872], and in *The Eastern Post* No. 186, of April 20, 1872. p. 155
- <sup>157</sup> The preamble to the "Provisional Rules of the Association", containing the basic programmatic principles of the first international organisation of the working class, was incorporated unchanged in the General Rules approved by the Geneva Congress of 1866. The tasks of the political struggle of the proletariat were formulated in Paragraph 3, reading, in part, as follows: "... The economical emancipation of the working classes is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means" (see *The General Council. 1864-1866*, p. 288). The "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association", drawn up simultaneously with the "Provisional Rules", demonstrated the proposition that "to conquer political power has ... become the great duty of the working classes" (*ibid.*, p. 286); the International called upon the proletariat "to master the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power" (*ibid.*, p. 287). p. 156
- <sup>158</sup> The pamphlet in question was *Risposta d'un Internationale a Giuseppe Mazzini*, Milano, 1871, published as a supplement to *Gazzettino Rosa* No. 227, of August 16, 1871. p. 156
- <sup>159</sup> *Le Père Duchêne*—satiric daily published by Vermersch in Paris from March 6 to May 21, 1871; was close to the Blanquist papers. p. 159
- <sup>160</sup> The quotations here and below are from Fawcett's speech in the House of Commons on April 12, 1872, published the next day in *The Times*. p. 159

- <sup>161</sup> This Bill passed by the U.S. House of Representatives was later rejected by the Senate and never enacted. p. 161
- <sup>162</sup> The congress of the Spanish Federation of the International at Saragossa was held on April 4-11, 1872. A sharp struggle developed at this congress between the followers of Bakunin and those of the General Council. The congress rejected the Swiss Bakuninists' demand for an immediate convocation of a general congress but, under pressure from the anarchists, it adopted a resolution to support the Belgian Federation's proposal for a revision of the General Rules in order to strengthen the autonomy of the local organisations. The congress also rejected the proposal of some Bakuninist delegates to revise the Spanish Federation's rules in an anarchist spirit. When a new Federal Council was being elected, however, they managed to secure a preponderance for members of the Alliance. After Mora's refusal of membership in the Council and Lorenzo's withdrawal therefrom, the Spanish Federal Council found itself entirely in the hands of the Bakuninists. p. 162
- <sup>163</sup> The reference is apparently to the General Council's draft declaration on the *Conseil fédéraliste universel* (see Note 172) approved at the meeting of May 21, 1872. p. 162
- <sup>164</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 187, of April 27, 1872. p. 163
- <sup>165</sup> In its resolution on the composition of the General Council the London Conference of 1871 invited the General Council to ensure that it was "not made too exclusively from citizens belonging to the same nationality" (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 440). p. 164
- <sup>166</sup> In view of the rumours from the U.S.A. about McDonnell's improper conduct, the General Council investigated the matter before electing him a member of the Council; the results of its investigation disproved the allegations (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 226-27). p. 164
- <sup>167</sup> See Note 51. p. 165
- <sup>168</sup> On March 15, 1872, Marx wrote to Sorge the following regarding the expulsion of the Hulecks from the General Council: "For the *private* information of your Council I add that M. and Madame Huleck—he is an imbecile and she is 'une intrigante de bas état'—

had for a moment slipped into the General Council at a time when most of us were absent, but that, soon after, this worthy couple was forced to withdraw consequent upon the intrigues with the *soi-disant Branche française* which was excluded from the *International* and denounced by us, in the *Marseillaise* and the *Réveil* on the eve of the Plébiscite as 'une section policière'. Moreover, these two persons, after their arrival at New York, co-operated in the foundation of a Society, hostile to the *International*, and were in constant connection with *les beaux restes de la Branche française* at London."

Hales's reply was published in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* on June 15, 1872. p. 168

- <sup>169</sup> Engels learned about the police persecution of Cuno from his letter of April 17, 1872 and from the Italian newspapers. He regarded this persecution as a concrete manifestation of the conspiracy of Europe's reactionary governments against the *International* and considered it very important to expose it. He wrote an account of the persecution of Cuno, which was published in the report of this Council meeting in *The Eastern Post* No. 187, of April 27, and in *Gazzettino Rosa* No. 127, of May 7, 1872. A report on this subject was also printed in *L'Égalité* on May 7. On Engels's advice, Cuno himself wrote a letter to the editors of *Der Volksstaat*, which was published on May 11, 1872 (No. 38).

Informing Cuno of the forthcoming discussion by the General Council of this "first valiant deed of the international police conspiracy between Prussia, Austria and Italy", Engels wrote on April 22-[23], 1872 as follows: "Tomorrow night I shall bring this question before the General Council, and then the whole story will be included in the official report which will be published in the *Eastern Post* and sent out all over the world. Meanwhile write a report in your own name and send it to the *Volksstaat*, the *Geneva Égalité* and *Cazzettino Rosa*. England, America and Spain, as well as France, will be our concern. These scoundrels must finally realise that this sort of thing won't go on any longer and that the *International's* arm is still longer than that of the king of Italy. As soon as the whole matter is published, I shall send you a copy, and also the newspapers I shall be able to collect for you; they will not be many." p. 169

- <sup>170</sup> The first section of the *International* in *Buenos Aires* was formed, in January 1872, of French émigrés: Its organisers were Auguste Monnot, a former member of the Paris section of the *International*, and Emile Flaesch. Between February 10 and March 15, 1872, the

section wrote a letter to the General Council requesting admission into the International. By July 1872, the section numbered 273 members. The Buenos Aires organisation of the International intensified its activities when the Paris Commune's refugees arrived in Buenos Aires, in particular Vilmart, a delegate to the Hague Congress who corresponded with Marx and Engels. Vilmart undertook the distribution in the Buenos Aires sections of the works of Marx and Engels, such as *Capital*, *The Civil War in France*, etc. In 1873, a number of new sections, mainly among the émigrés, sprang up in Buenos Aires. p. 169

<sup>171</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 188, of May 4, and *The International Herald* No. 6, of May 11, 1872. p. 169

<sup>172</sup> In April 1872, there appeared a pamphlet entitled *Conseil fédéraliste universel de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs et des Sociétés républicaines socialistes adhérentes*, London, 1872; it was published simultaneously in French, English and German.

The pamphlet was issued by the so-called *Universal Federalist Council* that was set up early in 1872 and included former members of the French Section of 1871, some Lassalleans expelled from the German Workers' Educational Association in London, and other people who strove to worm their way into the leadership of the International. They concentrated their attacks on the London Conference resolutions relating to the political action by the working class and to the struggle against sectarianism. Marx exposed the intrigues of this self-appointed organisation in the General Council's declaration of May 20 (see pp. 202-04 of the present volume). p. 170

<sup>173</sup> The information given by Engels on the Italian Government's attempts to accuse members of the International of the setting fire to the Milan Agricultural Academy was based on Cuno's letter to him of April 25, 1872. Dealing with the report of this Council meeting in *The Eastern Post* of May 4, Engels wrote to Cuno on May 7-8: "I have also spoken about the arson plot, but it is reflected very poorly in the report, as is usually the case when such things are not drawn up by myself." p. 173

<sup>174</sup> In his letter to Johann Philipp Becker (May 9, 1872), Engels wrote the following on the subject: "There is much to be said in favour of your proposal to hold the Congress in Geneva, and here they like it very much, but, naturally . . . to adopt a final decision on

this, we must know how things are going there and whether you can *be sure* that the Swiss delegates have a single-minded and reliable majority. The people from the Alliance will do everything in order, with the help of their usual subterfuges( as in Basle), to secure a majority. The Jurassians will represent fictitious sections; the Italians, except Turin, will send *only* Bakunin's friends; so will even Milan, where after Cuno's expulsion these people have again taken the upper hand; the Spanish will split, and it is too early to predict in what ratios. Germany, as usual, will be poorly represented, as will England, too; France will be represented only by several émigrés living in Switzerland and perhaps by some from here; the Belgians are very unreliable; so we must make a great effort to secure an *impressive* majority, because an insignificant majority would be no better than none, and squabbles would begin again from the start. Therefore write to us quite frankly how things are with you and in German Switzerland so that we should not make any slip." p. 177

<sup>175</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 189, of May 12, and *The International Herald* No. 7, of May 18, 1872. p. 180

<sup>176</sup> For the Milan section see Note 87.

*Il Martello*—organ of the Milan section of the International published in February-March 1872; influenced by Cuno, who was on the editorial board, it published several anti-Bakuninist articles. p. 180

<sup>177</sup> During the night of May 4, 1872, following the dispersal of a workers' demonstration in Copenhagen, the police arrested four members of the Danish Federal Council (Central Committee) of the International, including Louis Pio, editor of the newspaper *Socialisten*. p. 181

<sup>178</sup> *The Land and Labour League* was founded, with the participation of General Council members, in London in October 1869. Besides bourgeois-radical demands, the League's programme contained demands for land nationalisation and reduction of working hours, and Chartist demands for universal suffrage and home colonisation. The League, however, soon began to lose contact with the International, owing to the increased influence of bourgeois elements in it. p. 183

<sup>179</sup> The leaders of the General Working Men's Union (see Note 399) in Hungary were arrested in July 1871 for the organisation of a

- demonstration of solidarity with the Paris Commune; they were charged with high treason but were acquitted for lack of evidence and under pressure from the public opinion. p. 184
- <sup>180</sup> The reference is to the two letters written on May 5, 1872: one from the Romance Federal Committee (signed by Perret) to the General Council, and the other from Perret to Jung. p. 188
- <sup>181</sup> As it became known soon after, the idea to form an "Irish propaganda fund" belonged to McDonnell, Corresponding Secretary for Ireland, who published a special leaflet under that title (see p. 211 of the present volume). p. 188
- <sup>182</sup> This refers to Marx's letter to Sorge, dated November 6, 1871. p. 189
- <sup>183</sup> This refers to Cristenet's letter to Jung, dated April 19, 1872. p. 191
- <sup>184</sup> The report of this Council meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 190, of May 18, and *The International Herald* No. 8, of May 25, 1872. p. 193
- <sup>185</sup> This letter was from the Spanish Federal Council (signed by its secretary, Lorenzo), dated May 4, 1872. p. 194
- <sup>186</sup> Besides this short entry in the Minute Book, the full text of Engels's report is extant as the author's MS prepared for publication in *The Eastern Post* (see pp. 297-300 of the present volume). The report was not printed in the newspaper in view of the General Council's decision not to publish debates on the Irish question. p. 197
- <sup>187</sup> *Fenians*—Irish revolutionaries whose first organisations sprang up in 1857 in Ireland and the U.S.A. Their programme and activities reflected the Irish people's protest against British colonial oppression. But their conspiratorial activities fell through in 1867; the Fenians were persecuted, their leaders arrested and tried, their newspapers closed down and the Habeas Corpus Act suspended. The campaign started in England in defence of the indicted Fenians was supported by the General Council of the International. p. 199
- <sup>188</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 191, of May 26, and *The International Herald* No. 9, of June 1, 1872; it reproduced the General Council's declaration on the Universal Federalist Council. p. 201

- <sup>189</sup> Printed below is the text of the General Council's declaration on the Universal Federalist Council drawn up by Marx (see Note 172). It was published in practically all the International's newspapers: *The Eastern Post* No. 191, of May 26; *The International Herald* No. 9, of June 1; *Der Volksstaat* No. 44, of June 1; *La Emancipación* No. 52, of June 8; *Pensamento Social* No. 16, of June, and *L'Égalité* No. 13, of June 23, 1872.
- The *Emancipación* editors added the following concluding paragraph to it: "This important document, exposing as it does the intrigues of the bourgeois parties, reveals their desire to achieve a split within the International and paralyse its activities. In all countries, in Britain and Germany, in Belgium and Switzerland, in America and Italy, the bourgeoisie strive to distort the principles of workers' solidarity so as to work havoc in our Association. Let it serve us as a lesson." p. 202
- <sup>190</sup> For the *Universal Republican League* see Note 70. p. 203
- <sup>191</sup> For the *Land and Labour League* see Note 178. p. 203
- <sup>192</sup> In view of the protests in connection with Vésinier's slanders against the French members of the International, the Brussels Congress of 1868 instructed the Brussels section to demand of Vésinier proofs of his accusations and, if they appeared to be insufficient, to expell him from the International. On October 26, 1868, the Brussels section decided to exclude Vésinier from the International. p. 203
- <sup>193</sup> *Troisième procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs à Paris*, Paris, 1870, p. 4. p. 203
- <sup>194</sup> Here, as in his reports of March 5 and 12, 1872 on the American question, Marx based himself on extracts made by himself from the various documents of the American sections (see pp. 323-32 of the present volume). p. 205
- <sup>195</sup> The congress of the North-American sections of the International was held on July 6-8, 1872 (see Note 279). p. 205
- <sup>196</sup> The reference is to the appeal of Section No. 12, dated August 30, 1871, published in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* No. 71, of September 23, 1871 (see pp. 323-24 of the present volume). p. 205
- <sup>197</sup> This refers to the memorandum of the Central Committee of the North-American sections to the London Conference of Delegates

- of the International Working Men's Association, issued on August 20, 1871; among those who signed the document were H. Theodore Banks, R. Debuche, E. Grosse, T. Millot, G. Stiebeling, W. West and B. Hubert. p. 206
- <sup>198</sup> The Central Council (Committee) of the North-American sections was formed on December 1, 1870 of delegates from several sections, for a term of one year. German Section No. 1, the oldest in the U.S.A. (see Note 117), played an important role therein. Marx found it more expedient to elect the leading body for the North-American Federation at a congress of its sections, fearing that otherwise people hostile to the working-class movement might worm their way into the committee as the sections' representatives. p. 206
- <sup>199</sup> *The New Democracy of New York or Political Commonwealth*—an American reformist organisation which was founded in 1869 and existed no more than a year. On October 11, 1869, it sent the General Council a special communication, sharply criticising the activities of the National Labour Union and its programme. For the General Council's reply see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, pp. 352-53. p. 206
- <sup>200</sup> This refers to the execution of Georges Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, and Gaspard Dequerry, curé of the church of Madeleine, in May 1871 (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 407-08). p. 208
- <sup>201</sup> Hales's letter criticising the General Council's decision on the split in the U.S.A. was printed in *Le Socialiste* on March 2, 1872. Published in New York from October 1871 to May 1873, this weekly was the paper of the French sections in the U.S.A., and as such, it supported bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements in the North-American Federation, and after the Hague Congress broke with the International. p. 208
- <sup>202</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 192, of June 2, and *The International Herald* No. 10, of June 8, 1872. p. 209
- <sup>203</sup> Hales read the report on the work of the Provisional Federal Council of the North-American sections for April 1872, signed by its secretary, Charles Pretsching, and a letter from a German section in St. Louis, dated May 9, 1872 and signed by Gustav Wendt. In this connection Marx wrote to Sorge on May 29, 1872: "At last night's meeting of the General Council, at which almost all

members of the Commune were present, Hales read Pretsching's letter.

"Then I reported, partly on the basis of your letter, partly on the basis of the *World* sent by you, on the adventures of the Couter-Council and emphasised that these facts confirmed the necessity of the resolution adopted on my proposal. Eccarius was thunderstruck.

"Then a fortunate incident occurred, which I immediately made use of.

"Eccarius had received a letter from St. Louis, where the German section, which had been formed there, asked which of the two Federal Councils it should join. I said naturally the old Council, which is going along with us. Hales and Eccarius (deadly enemies, by the way) opposed this. I replied, and at this rather crowded meeting the resolution was adopted, only three voting against (Hales, Eccarius and Delahaye, of whom the rest of the Commune's members have a poor opinion)." p. 209

<sup>204</sup> Marx received all this information from Sorge's letter of May 7, 1872. On the basis of Marx's report the Council adopted a resolution, which Hales did not record in the Minutes (see p. 332 of the present volume). p. 210

<sup>205</sup> The congress of the Belgian Federation held in Brussels on May 19-20, 1872 considered the draft rules drawn up by Hins, a follower of Bakunin, in accordance with the decision of the preceding congress (December 24-25, 1871). p. 210

<sup>206</sup> See Note 181. p. 211

<sup>207</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 193, of June 8, and *The International Herald* No. 11, of June 15, 1872. p. 214

<sup>208</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 194, of June 16, and *The International Herald* No. 12, of June 22, 1872. p. 217

<sup>209</sup> This letter under date June 1, 1872 (signed by Schwitzguebel) was from the Jura Federation. Jung wrote down the decision adopted by the General Council on the letter itself as follows: "The sum of 37 f. 20 c. received; refused to accept 6 f. 20 c., the contributions of the section of propaganda and revolutionary action in Geneva." p. 219

- <sup>210</sup> At its meeting of August 2, 1870, the General Council discussed the Belgians' proposal to convene the next Congress in Amsterdam; it was decided that because of the war the convocation was impossible (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 38-40). p. 221
- <sup>211</sup> This decision was published in the newspaper report of this Council meeting in *The Eastern Post* No. 194, of June 16, and *The International Herald* No. 13, of June 29, 1872. p. 221
- <sup>212</sup> By decision of the Geneva Congress of 1866, the Federal Councils were required to send the General Council statistics on the economic struggle of the proletariat, in conformity with the questionnaire drafted by Marx (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 461-62); this resolution was included in the Association's Administrative Regulations as Article 3 in Section II (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 457). p. 222
- <sup>213</sup> On June 8 and 15, 1872, *La Emancipacion* (Nos. 52 and 53) carried an article sharply criticising the draft General Rules proposed by the Belgian Federal Council. p. 222
- <sup>214</sup> Criticising the Belgian Congress proposal to revise the Rules, Marx wrote to De Paepé on May 28, 1872: "It is very characteristic of the tactics of the Alliance: in Spain, where it has a strong organisation, though it has lost the support of the Spanish Federal Council, it attacked in the Council of Barcelona all elements of organisation, both the Federal Council, etc., and the General Council. In Belgium, where one has to take 'prejudices' into account, it was proposed to suppress the General Council and transfer its functions to the Federal Councils (against which a struggle was waged in Barcelona), even in an expanded form." p. 222
- <sup>215</sup> The report of this meeting was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 195, of June 22, and *The International Herald* No. 13, of June 29, 1872. p. 225
- <sup>216</sup> *The Democratic Association of Victoria* was founded on June 8, 1872. The Association published the newspaper *Internationaliste* and declared its adhesion to the International, thus laying the beginning of an organised working-class movement in Australia. p. 225
- <sup>217</sup> This was a letter from the Spanish Federal Council (signed by Anselmo Lorenzo), dated June 15, 1872. p. 226
- <sup>218</sup> The Sub-Committee discussed the stand taken by *The Eastern Post*, and at its meeting of June 28, 1872 adopted a decision to

- stop publishing in it the reports of the General Council meetings (see p. 303 of the present volume). p. 236
- 219 The Judicial Committee (see Note 85) began consideration of Hales's conduct in July 1872. p. 236
- 220 Article 2 (Section II, "The General Council") in the 1871 edition read: "The General Council is bound to execute the Congress Resolutions" (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 457). For the new text approved at this Council meeting see p. 430 of the present volume. p. 236
- 221 Article 3 (Section II) dealt with the regular publication of a bulletin (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 457). For the new text see p. 430 of the present volume. p. 237
- 222 Article 5 (Section II) remained unchanged since the word "group" had already been included in the old text (see p. 430 of the present volume). p. 237
- 223 Article 6 (Section II) read: "The General Council has also the right of suspending, till the meeting of next Congress, any branch of the International" (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 458). p. 237
- 224 This refers to the Basle Congress (1869) resolution on the admission of new sections to the International Working Men's Association. The French edition of the report of this congress said about the right to admit or reject not only sections but also entire federations (see *Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Comptes-rendu du IV<sup>e</sup> Congrès International tenu à Bâle, en septembre 1869*, Bruxelles, 1869). p. 237
- 225 The decision to sever connections with *The Eastern Post* was taken by the Sub-Committee on June 28, 1872.  
The official notice relative to the forthcoming Congress was written by Engels and published in 1872 in *The International Herald* No. 13, of June 29; *Der Volksstaat* No. 53, of July 3; *L'Égalité* No. 14, of July 7; *La Emancipacion* No. 57, of July 13; *La Liberté* No. 28, of July 14.  
Engels's rough manuscript in English and French is available. p. 241
- 226 Further, space has been left in the Minute Book for the text of Article 6, Section II, proposed by Engels; this text, written in English by Engels, has been preserved on a separate sheet of paper:

"6. The General Council has also the right of suspending, till the meeting of next Congress, any branch, section, Federal Council, or Federation of the International.

"Nevertheless, with regard to branches belonging to a federation, it will exercise this right only after having consulted the respective Federal Council.

"In case of the dissolution of a Federal Council, the General Council shall, at the same time, call upon the branches composing such federation to elect a new Federal Council within thirty days.

"In the case of the suspension of a whole federation, the General Council is bound to inform thereof immediately all the remaining federations. If the majority of the federations should demand it, the General Council shall convoke an extraordinary Conference composed of one delegate for each federation, which Conference shall meet within a month and decide finally on the matter. It is well understood that the countries where the International may be prohibited, shall have the same rights as the regular federations."

This text was confirmed and included in the draft Rules (see pp. 430-31 of the present volume). p. 241

- 227 Concerning the statistics of labour see Note 212. p. 248
- 228 The report of this meeting was published in *The International Herald* No. 17, of July 27, 1872. p. 255
- 229 This refers to the sectarian view, characteristic of some French Proudhonists, that only a worker could hold an official post in a workers' organisation. p. 258
- 230 Article 4 of the Rules read: "Each Congress appoints the time and place of meeting for the next Congress. The delegates assemble at the appointed time and place without any special invitation. The General Council may, in case of need, change the place, but has no power to postpone the time of meeting. The Congress appoints the seat and elects the members of the General Council annually. The General Council thus elected shall have power to add to the number of its members" (*The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 453). p. 258
- 231 Article 6 of the Rules read: "The General Council shall form an international agency between the different national and local groups of the Association, so that the working men in one country be constantly informed of the movements of their class in every other

country; that an inquiry into the social state of the different countries of Europe be made simultaneously, and under a common direction; that the questions of general interest mooted in one society be ventilated by all; and that when immediate practical steps should be needed—as, for instance, in case of international quarrels—the action of the associated societies be simultaneous and uniform. Whenever it seems opportune, the General Council shall take the initiative of proposals to be laid before the different national or local societies. To facilitate the communications, the General Council shall publish periodical reports” (*The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 453).  
p. 261

<sup>232</sup> Article 7 of the Rules read: “Since the success of the working men’s movement in each country cannot be secured but by the power of union and combination, while, on the other hand, the usefulness of the International General Council must greatly depend on the circumstance whether it has to deal with a few national centres of working men’s associations, or with a great number of small and disconnected local societies; the members of the International Association shall use their utmost efforts to combine the disconnected working men’s societies of their respective countries into national bodies, represented by central national organs. It is self-understood, however, that the appliance of this rule will depend upon the peculiar laws of each country, and that, apart from legal obstacles, no independent local society shall be precluded from directly corresponding with the General Council” (*The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 454).  
p. 262

<sup>233</sup> For the full text of the London resolution see pp. 387-88 of the present volume. In the draft Rules this text was included as Article 8 (see p. 426 of the present volume).  
p. 263

<sup>234</sup> Articles 8 and 9 of the Rules read: “Every section has the right to appoint its own secretary corresponding with the General Council.”

“Everybody who acknowledges and defends the principles of the International Working Men’s Association is eligible to become a member. Every branch is responsible for the integrity of the members it admits” (*The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 454).  
p. 265

<sup>235</sup> On July 21-22, 1872, the British Federation held its first congress in Nottingham. Hales, whose reformist stand was fully revealed during the discussion of the American and Irish affairs (see pp. 191, 192, 194-99 of the present volume), sought to turn the British Federation

into a kind of Liberal Labour party, extricate it from the General Council's leadership and oppose it to the proletarian-revolutionary policy of Marx and his adherents in the International. At the congress Hales moved resolutions which at first glance seemed to accord with the International's programme, but were calculated to secure a vote of censure for the General Council. He proposed, for example, a draft resolution allowing the Federal Councils of the different countries to maintain direct relations, in circumvention of the General Council, whereas such relations were not prohibited by the Rules. The draft resolution was meant to set the sections' representatives against the General Council.

The congress, however, approved the London Conference resolutions and expressed confidence in the General Council. Hales had to make concessions and avoid sharp statements that could disaffect his supporters and prevent his re-election to the Federal Council.

p. 267

<sup>236</sup> The reference is to the address "The General Council to All the Members of the International Working Men's Association" (see pp. 439-45 of the present volume), drawn up by Engels on the Sub-Committee's instructions. In support of this address, Engels read the circular of the New Madrid Federation of July 22, 1872 ("Asociación Internacional de los Trabajadores. Nueva Federación Madrileña. Circular. Madrid, 22 Julio de 1872") exposing the Alliance's splitting activities in Spain. At its meeting of August 4, 1872, the Sub-Committee charged Engels with translating this document into French, English and German (see p. 316 of the present volume).

The *New Madrid Federation* was formed on July 8, 1872 by the editors of *La Emancipación* expelled by an anarchist majority from the Madrid Federation for having exposed the Alliance's activities in Spain. Paul Lafargue was instrumental in organising it. After the Spanish Federal Council refused to admit the New Madrid Federation, the latter addressed the General Council, which, on August 15, 1872, recognised it as a federation of the International (see p. 450 of the present volume). The New Madrid Federation waged a vigorous struggle against anarchist influences in Spain, propagated the ideas of scientific socialism and fought for an independent workers' party in Spain.

p. 270

<sup>237</sup> After the exposures made by Lafargue in April and early May 1872, Engels, in his correspondence with Lafargue, Mesa, Mora and other former members of the Spanish Federal Council and the

*Emancipacion* editors, insisted that the documents proving the existence of the secret Alliance be sent to him as soon as possible. Early in August 1872, Engels received from Spain, besides Lafargue's articles and speeches exposing the Alliance, a copy of Bakunin's letter to Mora dated April 5, 1872, the statutes of the organisation of the Alliance in Spain and the circular of the Madrid section of the Alliance of June 2, 1872, containing a proposal to dissolve the Alliance's groups, etc. p. 271

<sup>238</sup> The question of members' dues was discussed at the Hague Congress, which adopted a decision to leave them unchanged. p. 278

<sup>239</sup> On March 12, 1872, the General Council adopted a resolution suspending Section No. 12 till the next Congress (see pp. 126, 411-12 of the present volume). The expulsion was finally decided by the Hague Congress, which did not approve West's credentials. p. 280

<sup>240</sup> Engels attended the Hague Congress with credentials from the Breslau section and the New York Section No. 6. p. 282

<sup>241</sup> What is meant here is the General Council's report to the Congress; Marx was instructed to draw it up at the Sub-Committee's meeting of July 19, 1872 (see pp. 453-62 of the present volume and Note 388). p. 282

<sup>242</sup> This report by Engels was included in the account of the Council meeting of November 7, 1871 published in *The Eastern Post* No. 163, of November 11, 1871. The Minutes of this meeting noted that Engels had promised, as soon as he received a letter from Garibaldi, to give his report on the situation in Italy to the Council Secretary for publication in *The Eastern Post* (see p. 36 of the present volume). p. 287

<sup>243</sup> This refers to Mazzini's articles in *Roma del Popolo* No. 20, of July 13; No. 28, of September 7; No. 29, of September 14; and Nos. 30-31, of September 21-22, 1871. The articles were written in connection with the coming congress of Italian workers' societies and contained sharp statements against the International Association. p. 287

<sup>244</sup> Garibaldi has in mind his comrades-in-arms of the national liberation struggle in South America (1830s), the 1848-49 Revolution in

- Italy, in particular the heroic defence of Rome in 1849, the revolutionary actions in 1859 and the famous "expedition of the Thousand" to Sicily in 1860, which led to the actual unification of Italy. p. 287
- <sup>245</sup> On April 26, 1871, *Roma del Popolo* printed Mazzini's first article against the Paris Commune. Since then Mazzini often came out with articles against the Commune and the International. At the close of 1871, his articles were published in Rome as a pamphlet. p. 288
- <sup>246</sup> The full report of the Roman Congress (see Note 21) was published in *The Eastern Post* No. 164, of November 19, 1871. p. 290
- <sup>247</sup> This report, apparently made on December 5, 1871, was not recorded in the Minutes. Engels used for his report the Danish Federal Council's report and Louis Pio's article in *Socialisten*; it appeared in the report of this Council meeting in *The Eastern Post* No. 167, of December 9, 1871. p. 291
- <sup>248</sup> On September 10, 1869, the Basle Congress of the International adopted the following resolution, confirming the one already adopted by the Brussels Congress (1868), in favour of the collective ownership of land: "(1) That society has a right to abolish private property in land, and to convert it into common property. (2) That it is necessary to abolish private property in land, and convert it into common property" (see "Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland. From the 6th to the 11th September, 1869". Published by the General Council. London 1869, p. 26). p. 292
- <sup>249</sup> This report was not recorded in the Minutes of this meeting; the Minute Book has a blank space left for the printed text from the report in *The Eastern Post*. Engels based his information concerning the situation in the Spanish sections as at the opening of the Saragossa Congress (April 4-11, 1872) on the material sent him by Lafargue from Madrid; this information did not fully reflect the true balance of forces in the struggle against the anarchist influences in the Spanish Federation. In his letter to Liebknecht, of May 15[-22], 1872, Engels wrote as follows: "Please do not publish the enclosed report from *The Eastern Post* on Spain, which you have probably not yet received. It is based on Lafargue's letters, but since the Jurassians interpret another decision of the congress

in their own favour and Lafargue's first reports on the victory have been, in any case, somewhat exaggerated, it is desirable that they should *not* be disseminated as coming from the General Council; I am sending them neither to Italy nor to Spain."

Concerning the Saragossa Congress see Note 162. p. 293

<sup>250</sup> This refers to the Sonvillier circular (see Note 28). p. 293

<sup>251</sup> *Carlists*—a reactionary, clerical-absolutist group in Spain in the nineteenth century. p. 294

<sup>252</sup> This congress of working men's societies, mainly of mutual aid societies influenced by the liberal bourgeoisie (the so-called moderate bourgeoisie), was held in Rome on April 17, 1872. Its organisers—government officials and liberal politicians—sought to utilise it to strengthen their influence and prevent the International's ideas from being spread among the workers. The claims of its participants to represent the workers of the whole of Italy were opposed by some workers' organisations in Rome, who tried to convene their own, genuinely workers', congress. But because of police persecution they only managed to organise a protest meeting on April 21. On a proposal by Luciani, a member of the International, the meeting adopted a resolution emphatically protesting against bourgeois attempts to speak in the name of the workers. p. 296

<sup>253</sup> This record is extant in the form of Engels's MS in English and is much fuller than the one made by the Secretary in the *Minute Book*. See Note 186. p. 297

<sup>254</sup> On March 8, 1842, in Manchester, there was a clash between the Chartists and the Irish, provoked by the bourgeois nationalists, leaders of the Irish National Association of Repealers (advocates of the abrogation of the Union of 1801), who were hostile to the working-class movement in England. O'Connor and a group of Chartists were driven by the Repealers from the Hall of Science where O'Connor was to deliver a lecture. p. 299

<sup>255</sup> In view of its intensive preparations for the coming congress, the General Council decided, on June 18, 1872, to transfer all organisational matters to the Sub-Committee. The latter thus received the right to issue documents in its own name (see pp. 446-50 of the present volume). p. 303

<sup>256</sup> The report of the Provisional Federal Council for May 1872 was enclosed in Sorge's letter to Marx, dated June 7, 1872.

On June 11, the following resolution, signed by C. Speyer, was sent to the General Council:

"Whereas the Cabinet-Makers, Piano-Makers, Upholsterers, Varnishers, Machinists and kindred trades in New York and vicinity are on strike to obtain the lawful normal workday of 8 hours;

"Whereas several of the largest manufacturers and bosses have closed their factories to starve the working men into submission and to gain time for drawing working men from Europe;

"Resolved:

"The G[eneral] C[ouncil] of the I.W.A. is hereby requested to use its best efforts for preventing European working men from making engagements for New York and vicinity during the 8 hours' strike.

"By order of the Provisional Federal Council of the I.W.A.,  
"C. SPEYER, Secretary"

p. 303

- <sup>257</sup> In the spring and summer of 1872 a number of French refugees, including several Blanquists, regularly met at Marx's.

Serraillier's article has never been found.

p. 304

- <sup>258</sup> Marx gives account of a letter from Laugrand to Le Moussu, dated December 24, 1871.

p. 304

- <sup>259</sup> The letter (dated July 1, 1871) was from the Turin society *Emancipazione del Proletario* to Engels. It informed the Council about the convocation at Rimini on August 4-6, 1872, of a conference of Italian anarchist groups which arbitrarily assumed the name of the Italian Federation of the International. In a special resolution adopted on August 6, 1872, the conference called upon the sections of the International to send its delegates, not to the regular congress at The Hague, but to a separate congress of Bakuninists scheduled to be held on September 2, 1872 at Neuchâtel. This proposal was not supported by any section, not even the Bakuninist organisations. Having received the Rimini resolutions, Engels addressed the Italian sections, in the name of the International, exposing this Bakuninist manoeuvre (see pp. 451-52 of the present volume).

The letter from Turin also mentioned the Sonvillier circular of the Jura Federation (see Note 28).

p. 306

- <sup>260</sup> This refers to a letter from the Lisbon Federal Council (signed by Nobre-Franca) to Engels, dated June 24, 1872.

p. 306

- <sup>261</sup> Bakunin's letter was published in a special issue of *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* No. 10-11, of June 15, 1872, and as a separate edition. p. 306
- <sup>262</sup> In fulfilment of this decision of the Sub-Committee, Engels drew up the text of an address to all members of the International Association, which was discussed at a General Council meeting on August 6, 1872. For the address see pp. 439-45 of the present volume. p. 307
- <sup>263</sup> The reference is to Herman's letter to Engels, dated June 18, 1872. For the Belgian Congress see Note 205. p. 307
- <sup>264</sup> As Secretary of the British Council, Hales pursued a double-dealing policy hindering the formation of local sections and the final shaping of the British Federation. In particular, he wrote to the members of the Manchester section, warning them to adopt no measures until the formation of the Federal Council. p. 309
- <sup>265</sup> What is apparently meant here is Hales's intention to pass, at the Nottingham Congress (see Note 235), the decision granting the Federal Councils the right to change the composition of the General Council. p. 309
- <sup>266</sup> On July 23, 1872, the General Council adopted a decision on the suspension of Hales as Council Secretary until the final investigation of his case by the Judicial Committee. p. 309
- <sup>267</sup> At the Nottingham Congress Dupont ardently advocated the proletarian-revolutionary line. On July 21, 1872, he wrote to Engels: "Since last night we began to *work on* the delegates. It is possible that the resolution on the Federal Councils, proposed by Hales, will be withdrawn. . . . We offered the vote of confidence in the General Council and of the approval of the Conference decisions. We shall demand a *vote by roll call* on these two points; there will be a hard battle."  
Concerning the Nottingham Congress see Note 235. p. 310
- <sup>268</sup> The reference is to Perret's letter to Jung of July 7, 1872, and to the draft rules of the Swiss Regional Federation adopted at the fourth congress of the Romance Federation, held at Vevey on June 2-3, 1872. p. 310
- <sup>269</sup> Cournet read a letter to him from Gerhard, Secretary of the Dutch Council, written on July 21, 1872. p. 312

- <sup>270</sup> The letter was sent to the General Council in the name of the Jura Federation by Schwitzguebel on July 15, 1872. It was published in a supplement to issue No. 13 of the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*, of July 27, 1872. p. 313
- <sup>271</sup> Jung's reply to the protest by the Jura Federation was published in the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* on August 1, 1872 (see pp. 437-38 of the present volume). p. 313
- <sup>272</sup> In April 1872, the Ferré section (see Note 132) adopted rules, which were later sent to the General Council for approval. According to these rules, the number of members in the section could not exceed twenty. Persons were to be accepted into the International upon presentation of two recommendations. In accordance with Article 23, the office of president was abolished and business was to be conducted entirely by the corresponding secretary (whose duty was to maintain contact with other sections), the secretary for internal affairs (preparation of the agenda etc.), the treasurer and the delegate to the Federal Council; these officials were to be elected for a term of three months. What Marx had evidently in mind was Article 21, which reads: "The section's delegate represents it in the Federal Council. He draws up a report on each meeting of the Council and reads it at the beginning of the next section meeting." p. 313
- <sup>273</sup> Engels wrote this letter on July 24, 1872 (see pp. 446-49 of the present volume). p. 313
- <sup>274</sup> In his letter of July 26, 1872, Cuno wrote that when the rules drafted by the Belgian Federal Council were discussed at a meeting of the International's members in Verviers on July 21, 1872, the members of the German section came out in support of the General Council, for which the Belgian Council expelled this section from the federation. On Cuno's advice (who at that time conducted propaganda among the German sections in Belgium) the Verviers section requested the General Council to examine the conflict. On August 4, 1872, Engels wrote to Cuno: "The Belgian Federal Council could not render a greater service to us than by its actions against the German section in Verviers. It proves thereby the importance of the General Council for assuring the independence of the sections from the *Federal Councils*." p. 316
- <sup>275</sup> In his letter to Morago, written in January 1872, Bakunin set forth his secret plan for seizure of power within the International

by the Alliance. On September 1, 1872, Mesa sent to the delegates of the Hague Congress a statement recounting Bakunin's letter.  
p. 316

- <sup>276</sup> This refers to Mesa's letter of July 28, 1872, enclosing the circular of the New Madrid Federation of July 22 (see Note 236), published in *La Emancipacion* No. 59, of July 27, 1872.

In his letter Becker expressed his disapproval of The Hague as the site of the Congress. Engels replied to him on August 5, 1872.  
p. 316

- <sup>277</sup> As Secretary of the Portuguese Federal Council Nobre-Franca wrote in this letter to Engels about the federation and its struggle against the Bakuninist Alliance of Socialist Democracy.  
p. 316

- <sup>278</sup> Point 8 of the Basle Congress administrative resolutions provided that only the delegates of such societies, sections or groups which had sent in their adhesion to the International and paid contributions, would be allowed to take their seats and vote at congresses, exception being made for such countries where the International's organisations existed illegally. Point 10 of the same resolution dealt with the timely submission by the local sections of their reports to the General Council to ensure their incorporation in a single general report.

The Sub-Committee's decision to publish an announcement to the International's sections seemingly failed to be implemented.  
p. 317

- <sup>279</sup> The Congress of the North-American Federation was held in New York on July 6-8, 1872. The Congress adopted the following major resolutions: it set the numerical composition of the Federal Council (9 members); ruled that the section membership must be at least three-fourths proletarian; defined the attitude towards the trade unions; defined, in accordance with Resolution IX of the London Conference (1871), the Federation's attitude towards the bourgeois political parties existing in the country; confirmed and approved all the General Council resolutions relative to the state of affairs in the North-American Federation, as well as the resolutions of the London Conference of 1871.

Sorge and the Communeard Simon Dereure were elected delegates to the Hague Congress.  
p. 319

- <sup>280</sup> These notes were taken by Marx, between the end of February and the end of May 1872, when he studied the reports and letters of

- the Central Committee and the Federal Council for North America, as well as American newspapers, in connection with the split in the North-American Federation. Marx used these notes for his report on the question in the Sub-Committee, and later in the General Council (see p. 120 of the present volume). They were also used by Engels for his work *Die Internationale in Amerika*.  
p. 323
- 281 *Shakers*—members of a religious sect in the U.S.A. p. 324
- 282 This refers to the protest by German Section No. 1, of October 15, 1871, against the appeal of Section No. 12. p. 325
- 283 The text of the resolution of May 28, 1872, which confirmed the Council's previous resolution on the split, can be found in these notes by Marx as well as in the official letter sent to Le Moussu in the U.S.A. and published in the newspaper *The New York Union* on June 17, 1872. p. 332
- 284 See Note 7. p. 335
- 285 The reference is to the General Council's letter to the editor of *The Times* (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 417-18). p. 336
- 286 *Journal de Genève*—conservative daily published since 1826. p. 336
- 287 The excerpt referred to was from the General Council's circular letter to the Federal Council of French Switzerland (January 1, 1870) written in connection with the Bakuninists' attacks in *L'Égalité* against the leadership of the International (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, pp. 354-63). Written by Marx, this circular letter was signed by the corresponding secretaries of the relevant countries and transmitted to all sections. The excerpt published by O. Testut in the police collection of documents of the International (issued by him in 1871) had been taken from the copy seized by the French police; this copy was signed by Eugène Dupont as Corresponding Secretary for France (see O. Testut, *L'Internationale*, 3 édition, Paris-Versailles, 1871, pp. 237-38). p. 336
- 288 This resolution was drawn up by the Standing Committee (see Note 108), with Marx's participation, and adopted by the General Council on November 5, 1871.

The text of the resolution has been preserved as recorded by Eccarius, with corrections made by Marx. It was published in French on November 25, 1871 in *Le Socialiste*, the newspaper of the French republican societies (from December 1871, the organ of the French sections of the International in America); it was published in English on December 2 in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* with comments that misrepresented its purport. p. 338

<sup>280</sup> The text of these resolutions, adopted by the General Council on the basis of Serrailier's report (see Notes 18 and 22), has been preserved in two manuscripts: one in Marx's hand and the other in an unknown hand but signed by Serrailier. The resolutions published here are based on Marx's manuscript. The most important differing versions in the two manuscripts are given in the editorial notes at the end of the present volume, the less important—in the footnotes. p. 339

<sup>290</sup> See "Communication Confidentielle aux différentes Sections" (*The General Council. 1868-1870*, p. 375). p. 339

<sup>291</sup> See *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 447. p. 340

<sup>292</sup> See *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 436. p. 342

<sup>293</sup> *Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte-rendu du IV<sup>e</sup> Congrès International tenu à Bâle en septembre 1869*, Bruxelles, 1869, p. 172. p. 343

<sup>294</sup> In the second MS this phrase is developed as follows: "Un tel raisonnement serait en premier lieu la négation de l'homogénéité et du principe de solidarité qui unit les groupes et Comités Internationaux et en deuxième lieu une entrave jetée aussi bien aux Conseils fédéraux qu'au Conseil Général." ("Such reasoning would be, in the first place, a negation of unity and the solidarity principle which unites the groups and International Committees, and, in the second place, a monkey wrench thrown as much into the works of the Federal Councils as into those of the General Council.") p. 344

<sup>295</sup> In the second MS this phrase is supplemented by the following: "Enfin les Conseils fédéraux, voire même les Congrès nationaux, si cet article était admis, se trouveraient en présence d'une mesure restrictive au plus haut degré par suite de l'option où seraient placés les délégués proposés entre le titre de membre d'une section et la délégation. Tel eût été le cas du Congrès national Belge et de la

section Liégeoise à laquelle appartient le Cit. Herman si cet article s'était trouvé inclu dans ses règlements comme paraît l'exiger la Section française de 1871." ("Finally, if this article were to be accepted, the Federal Councils and even the national Congresses would find themselves up against a restrictive measure of the highest degree as a result of the option that would be put before the nominated delegates to choose between the title of member of a section or of a delegation. Such would have been the case of the Belgian national congress and the Liège section to which Citizen Herman belongs if this article had been included in its regulations—as the French Section of 1871 would appear to demand.") p. 344

- <sup>296</sup> In the second MS the whole of paragraph II is deleted and in Paragraph I the words "purement et simplement" ("pure and simple") are replaced by the words "et déclare finales" ("and declares final"). p. 344
- <sup>297</sup> The second MS here has the following: "le Secrétaire Correspondant pour la France AUGUSTE SERRAILLIER. Aux Citoyens membres de la 'Section française de 1871'." p. 345
- <sup>298</sup> At the meeting of November 28, 1871 (see p. 48 of the present volume), Marx informed the General Council that he had sent a reply to the newspaper; in addition to the text published in the *Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt* (No. 333, of November 28, 1871), there has been preserved Marx's manuscript on the letter-head of the International Association. p. 346
- <sup>299</sup> For the *Universal Republican League* see Note 70. p. 346
- <sup>300</sup> Engels wrote this letter in reply to the publication by *Il Proletario Italiano*, of November 23, 1871, of the anarchists' charges against the General Council and the London Conference decisions, allegedly made by the Turin workers.  
*Il Proletario Italiano* was published twice a week in Turin in 1871, under the editorship of Terzaghi, who later proved to be a secret police agent. It supported the Bakuninists against the General Council and the London Conference decisions. Between 1872 and 1874 the newspaper appeared under the title *Il Proletario* (see Note 366). p. 347
- <sup>301</sup> See *The General Council. 1864-1866*, p. 286. p. 348

- <sup>302</sup> *Procès-verbaux du Congrès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs réuni à Lausanne du 2 au 8 septembre 1867*, Chaux-de-Fonds, 1867, p. 19. p. 348
- <sup>303</sup> See *The General Council, 1870-1871*, p. 445. p. 348
- <sup>304</sup> *La Révolution Sociale*—French weekly published in Geneva from October 1871 to January 1872; as from November 1871, it became the organ of the Jura Federation. p. 348
- <sup>305</sup> This document was drawn up by Engels in reply to a letter from Enrico Bignami, one of the leaders of a section in Lodi, dated November 14, 1871. The latter informed the Council about the formation of sections in Ferrara and other Italian towns and asked it to send the necessary documents to certain citizens of Romagna. This fact was not reflected in the General Council Minutes. p. 349
- <sup>306</sup> Engels wrote this declaration in reply to Mazzini's slanderous articles (see Note 34) published by *La Roma del Popolo*. p. 350
- <sup>307</sup> By this decision the Brussels Congress declined the invitation of the League of Peace and Freedom to take official part in its congress, scheduled for September in Berne; it recommended members of the International to attend it only in an individual capacity (see *Troisième Congrès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte-rendu officiel*, Bruxelles, 1868, p. 40, and also *The General Council. 1868-1870*, p. 297-98).  
*The League of Peace and Freedom*—an international organisation founded in Switzerland in 1867 by bourgeois democrats and liberals. p. 351
- <sup>308</sup> This letter was written by Engels following a campaign of slander against the International in the newspaper *Liberio Pensiero*, published in Florence from 1866 to 1876 and edited by Luigi Stefanoni, bourgeois democrat and member of the Bakuninist Alliance of Socialist Democracy.  
 To undermine the influence of the International, Stefanoni presented himself, in November 1871, as the initiator of the Universal Rationalist Society allegedly destined to put into practice the principles of the International but without "its negative features". His programme was rejected by the Italian workers and his scheme for founding the Rationalist Society was never implemented.  
 Engels nicknamed the rationalists "prebendaries" (from the Latin word "praebenda"—possessions of the Catholic Church

accumulated through gifts and legacies), alluding to their plan of solving the social problem by creating a land fund out of donations.

Engels's letter, which first appeared in the *Gazzettino Rosa*, was also published (but without the introductory part) in the journal *Liberio Pensiero*, of February 22, 1872.

*Gazzettino Rosa*—Italian daily published in Milan from 1867 to 1873; in 1871-72 it came out in support of the Paris Commune, published reports and documents of the International Association; in 1872 it fell under the Bakuninist influence. p. 353

<sup>309</sup> *Neuer Social-Demokrat*—German newspaper published in Berlin from 1871 to 1876 three times a week. Being the organ of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers, it fully reflected the Lassalleans' policy of adaptation to the Bismarck regime and flirting with the ruling classes, and the opportunism and nationalism of the Lassallean leaders. The newspaper supported the Bakuninists and other sectarians and carried on a campaign against the International, its Marxist leaders and against the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party. p. 354

<sup>310</sup> The reference is to the *Communist League* (1847-52)—first international communist organisation headed by Marx and Engels. It was a school of proletarian revolutionaries, the embryo of a proletarian party, and the predecessor of the International Working Men's Association. p. 354

<sup>311</sup> *Wiesbadener Zeitung*—German conservative newspaper published in 1872-81. p. 355

<sup>312</sup> *The Cologne Communist trial* (October 4-November 12, 1852)—the trial of eleven members of the Communist League, organised by the Prussian Government. Documents forged by Prussian police agents served as incriminatory material. Marx (in his pamphlet *Revelations about the Cologne Communist Trial*) and Engels (in his article "The Recent Process in Cologne") exposed the provocative actions of the organisers of the trial and the base methods employed by the Prussian police state against the international working-class movement. p. 355

<sup>313</sup> This circular, *Fictitious Splits in the International*, was drawn up by Marx and Engels and approved by the General Council on March 5, 1872. First published late in May 1872, in pamphlet form in French, it was transmitted to all the federations of the International. p. 356

- <sup>314</sup> In reply to the slanders against the International spread by the bourgeois press following the publication of the General Council's address *The Civil War in France*, Marx and Engels wrote to *The Times*, *The Standard*, *The Daily News* and other English papers a number of letters, on behalf of the General Council, defending the Paris Commune and explaining the stand taken by the International (see *The General Council, 1870-1871*, pp. 419-20, 423). p. 357
- <sup>315</sup> In June 1871, on Marx's initiative, the General Council started a campaign in aid of the Communards who had fled from France to England to escape persecution by the Versailles government; it raised funds, which were distributed among the refugees, and found jobs for them. In July, a special Refugees' Committee was formed composed of Marx, Engels, Jung and other Council members. On September 5, 1871, Marx and Engels left the Committee because of heavy work connected with preparations for the London Conference of 1871 (see *The General Council, 1870-1871*, p. 267). In the course of 1871 and 1872, the General Council continued to promote aid to the Communards (see pp. 97-98 of the present volume). p. 357
- <sup>316</sup> This refers to a big strike of building workers and engineers in Newcastle in May-October 1871 (see Note 43). p. 357
- <sup>317</sup> On November 21, 1871, the General Council co-opted Ranvier, Cournet and Arnaud. p. 358
- <sup>318</sup> This refers to the London Conference of 1871 (held on September 17-23). p. 358
- <sup>319</sup> The General Council's decision to hold the next Congress in Mainz was adopted on May 17, 1870. On July 12, acting on Marx's proposal, the General Council approved the draft agenda of the Mainz Congress (see *The General Council, 1868-1870*, pp. 238, 268-70, 374). p. 358
- <sup>320</sup> At the General Council meeting of June 28, 1870, Marx suggested that the sections should discuss the question whether the General Council should change its seat; a "Confidential Communication to All Sections" was drawn up for this purpose (*The General Council, 1868-1870*, p. 375). All sections were against this change, considering London to be the most suitable location for the General Council's activities. p. 358

- <sup>321</sup> On September 25-29, 1865, a preliminary conference was held in London in lieu of a scheduled congress in Brussels. The General Council's decision to postpone the congress and convene the preliminary conference was taken at Marx's insistence, who held that local organisations of the International were not yet strong enough either ideologically or organisationally. p. 358
- <sup>322</sup> See Note 131. p. 359
- <sup>323</sup> In the summer of 1871, Bismarck and Beust, the Austro-Hungarian Chancellor, initiated a joint struggle against the working-class movement. On June 7, 1871, Bismarck sent a message to Schweinitz, German Ambassador in Vienna, recommending that he co-ordinate with the Austrian Government joint action against the workers' organisations; on June 17, he sent Beust a memorandum on the measures taken in Germany and France against the International. In August 1871, the German and Austrian emperors met in Gastein, and in September in Salzburg, for a special discussion of measures to be adopted against the International.
- The Italian Government joined the general anti-International campaign: in August 1871, it banned the Naples section and began persecuting members of the International, Th. Cuno in particular (see p. 169 of the present volume).
- The Spanish Government, too, adopted repressive measures against the workers' organisations and the International's sections in the spring and summer of 1871; this forced Mora, Morago and Lorenzo, members of the Spanish Federal Council, to move to Lisbon. p. 359
- <sup>324</sup> In Austria-Hungary, Oberwinder, A. Scheu, Most and Papst, active members of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party, were arrested and brought to trial for high treason in July 1870; some workers' societies were likewise persecuted.
- Concerning the persecution of the members of the Brunswick Committee see Note 32; for the arrest of Bebel and Liebknecht see Note 143. p. 359
- <sup>325</sup> For the Memorandum see Note 197. p. 359
- <sup>326</sup> Concerning the formation of the British Federal Council see Note 5. p. 360
- <sup>327</sup> This refers to Resolution IX of the London Conference of 1871—"Political Action of the Working Class"—which argued the necessity of organising a workers' political party as an indispensable condition

for the victory of a socialist revolution and the attainment of its ultimate aim: a classless society (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 444-45). p. 360

<sup>328</sup> This refers to Resolution II of the London Conference of 1871—"Designations of National Councils, etc."—which barred various sectarian groups from the International (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 440-41). p. 360

<sup>329</sup> This refers to Bakunin's manifesto "To the Russian, Polish and All Slav Friends" published in a supplement to *Kolokol* No. 122-23, February 15, 1862.

*Kolokol* (The Bell)—Russian revolutionary-democratic newspaper published first in London (from 1857 to 1865), and later in Geneva (until 1867). p. 360

<sup>330</sup> The reference is to the resolution submitted by Bakunin, on September 23, 1868, at the Berne Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom (see Note 307). His two speeches in support of his draft resolution were published in *Kolokol* No. 14-15, of December 1, 1868. p. 361

<sup>331</sup> The circular was drawn up by Marx on December 22, 1868, following discussion in the General Council of the question of admitting the Alliance into the International (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, p. 56). p. 361

<sup>332</sup> This circular was a reply to the second address of the Alliance's Central Bureau (made on February 27, 1869) to the General Council, expressing its readiness to dissolve the international Alliance, provided the Council approved its programme and admitted its local sections into the International. Written by Marx, this circular letter was unanimously adopted by the General Council at its meeting of March 9, 1869 (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, p. 75). p. 364

<sup>333</sup> This refers to the trial of students charged with secret revolutionary activities, held in St. Petersburg in July-August 1871.

The London Conference of 1871 instructed the General Council to officially disavow Nechayev's activities (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 434). p. 367

<sup>334</sup> *Le Progrès*—Bakunist newspaper that openly opposed the General Council; it came out in French in Locle, under the editorship of Guillaume, from December 1868 to April 1870. p. 367

- 335 This refers to the circular letter "Le Conseil Général au Conseil Fédéral de la Suisse Romande" drawn up by Marx (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, pp. 354-63). p. 367
- 336 *Le Travail*—weekly paper of the Paris sections; published in Paris from October 3 to December 12, 1869; one of its chief contributors was Eugène Varlin, a bookbinder and an active participant in the French working-class movement. p. 368
- 337 This association of feudal gentry had been founded in France late in 1464 and was directed against the policy of Louis XI designed to unite France in a single centralised state. The League members acted for the "common good" of France. p. 368
- 338 *La Solidarité*—Bakunist weekly newspaper published in Neuchâtel from April to September 1870, and in Geneva from March to May 1871. p. 369
- 339 That is, the workers engaged in the production of watches and jewellery carried on in large and small manufactory-type workshops; also home-workers in these trades. p. 369
- 340 The resolution supporting the Romance Federal Council, Geneva, was adopted by the General Council, on Marx's proposal, on June 28, 1870, and communicated to the sides concerned by Jung, Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland, on June 29, 1870 (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, pp. 256 and 368). p. 370
- 341 This refers to the General Council's second address in connection with the Franco-Prussian war, written by Marx and adopted by the Council on September 9, 1870 (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 333-42). p. 370
- 342 This refers to the manifesto of September 5, 1870 to the sections of the International, written by James Guillaume and Gaspard Blanc and published in Neuchâtel as a supplement to the newspaper *Solidarité*. p. 370
- 343 The Lyons uprising began on September 4, 1870, on receipt of the news of the defeat at Sedan. Bakunin arrived at Lyons on September 15. He made an attempt to take over the leadership of the movement and to implement his anarchistic programme. On September 28, his followers attempted a coup d'état, which failed because they were not supported by the workers and had no definite plan of action. p. 370

- <sup>344</sup> On August 10, 1871, N. Joukowsky, Secretary of the Bakunist section in Geneva named "The Alliance of Socialist Democracy, Central Section", wrote a letter to Jung, Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland, with which he enclosed the resolution of August 6 on the voluntary dissolution of the section. p. 371
- <sup>345</sup> See Note 224. p. 371
- <sup>346</sup> In April 1870, Paul Robin, a follower of Bakunin, addressed the Paris Federal Council, suggesting that it should recognise the Federal Committee formed by the anarchists at a congress in La Chaux-de-Fonds, as the Romance Federal Committee and announce in *La Marseillaise* that only its supporters were bona fide members of the International. The Paris Council refused to examine the matter as coming within the competence of the General Council. p. 372
- <sup>347</sup> The reference is to Resolution XVII of the London Conference of 1871—"Split in the French-Speaking Part of Switzerland" (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 448-49). *L'Égalité* No. 20, of October 21, 1871, published this resolution formulated at greater length. p. 372
- <sup>348</sup> B. Malon, "La troisième défaite du prolétariat français", Neuchâtel, 1871. p. 372
- <sup>349</sup> This section was founded in Geneva on September 6, 1871, by the former members of the Bakunist section "Alliance of Socialist Democracy", recently dissolved (see Note 344). Jules Guesde, Benoît Malon and other French refugees were among the section's members. p. 373
- <sup>350</sup> See Note 304. p. 373
- <sup>351</sup> A. Léo, "La guerre sociale. Discours prononcé au Congrès de la paix à Lausanne 1871", Neuchâtel, 1871, p. 7. p. 373
- <sup>352</sup> *Le Figaro*—French reactionary newspaper; appearing in Paris since 1826; was connected with the government of the Second Empire.  
*Le Gaulois*—daily newspaper of a conservative-monarchist trend, organ of the big bourgeoisie and aristocracy; came out in Paris from 1867 to 1929.  
*Paris-Journal*—reactionary daily connected with the police; published by Henri de Pène in Paris from 1868 to 1874. It came out in support of the policy of the Second Empire and, after its

fall, that of the Government of National Defence and Thiers's government, sparing no effort to spread slanders against the International and the Paris Commune.

p. 374

- <sup>353</sup> This refers to the resolution adopted by the General Council, on Marx's proposal, on July 7, 1868 (see *The General Council. 1866-1868*, p. 224); for the resolution of May 10, 1870, drawn up by Marx, see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, p. 236).

*La Marseillaise*—Left-republican daily published in Paris between December 1869 and September 1870; it ran reports on the International's activities and the working-class movement.

*Le Réveil*—French weekly (daily as from May 1869), organ of the Left republicans; appeared, under the editorship of Charles Delescluze, in Paris from July 1868 to January 1871. It published documents of the International and various reports on the working-class movement.

p. 376

- <sup>354</sup> The General Council discussed this question at its special meeting of October 7, 1871 (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 288-89).

p. 376

- <sup>355</sup> *Déclaration de la Section française fédéraliste de 1871 siégeant à Londres*, Londres, 1871. Although the General Council refused to admit the section, the latter prefaced the title of the pamphlet with the words "The International Working Men's Association".

p. 380

- <sup>356</sup> The reference is to Resolution 2 in the section "Special Votes of the Conference" declaring that "the German working men did their duty during the Franco-German war"; it was based on conclusions contained in Marx's speech on the situation of the International in Germany and England (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 446).

p. 380

- <sup>357</sup> The letter referred to was from Auguste Serrailier, Corresponding Secretary for France, to the editor of *Qui Vive!* (see Note 22).

p. 380

- <sup>358</sup> "Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866", Genève, 1866, p. 27, note.

p. 381

- <sup>359</sup> See Note 193.

p. 381

- <sup>360</sup> This refers to Resolution XVII of the London Conference, "Split in the French-Speaking Part of Switzerland", suggesting that the anarchist sections that had split away from the Romance Federa-

tion should "henceforth name themselves the *Jurassian Federation*" (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 448). p. 382

- <sup>361</sup> At a meeting of the Geneva sections on December 2, 1871, Malon, Lefrançais and Ostyn proposed a resolution directed against the General Council and the London Conference decisions and based on the French translation of the International's Rules that had been distorted in a Proudhonist spirit (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, pp. 361-63). The meeting, however, rejected the proposal, approved the London Conference decisions and expressed full confidence in the General Council. Malon's resolution was published in *La Révolution Sociale* No. 7, of December 7, 1871. p. 384
- <sup>362</sup> See *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 449. p. 385
- <sup>363</sup> This refers to the Foreign Minister's circular letter to the diplomatic representatives of France (of June 6, 1871), in which Jules Favre called upon all governments to join forces in the struggle against the International, as well as to the Sacase report. (For the General Council's statement apropos of this circular see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 417-18.) Sacase made his report on February 5, 1872, on behalf of the commission engaged in the examination of the Dufaure law (see Note 131). p. 389
- <sup>364</sup> Here and elsewhere below Marx quotes the International's Rules as approved by the Geneva Congress and published in pamphlet form: *Rules of the International Working Men's Association*, London, 1867. p. 391
- <sup>365</sup> This is an error: Article 6 of the General Rules was adopted at the Geneva Congress of the International in 1866. See *Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866*, Genève, 1866, pp. 13-14. p. 394
- <sup>366</sup> The Workers' Federation, was founded in Turin in the autumn of 1871 and was influenced by the Mazzinists. In January 1872, the proletarian elements split away from the Federation and formed a society called *L'Emancipazione del Proletario*, later admitted to the International as a section. Carlo Terzaghi headed this society until February 1872.
- Il Proletario*—Italian newspaper published in Turin from 1872 to 1874; it came out in support of the Bakuninists and against the General Council and the London Conference resolutions. p. 394

- <sup>367</sup> *Troisième Congrès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte-rendu officiel*, Bruxelles, 1868. Supplément au journal *Le Peuple Belge*, p. 50. p. 395
- <sup>368</sup> The programme of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy was drawn up by Bakunin and published as a leaflet in French and German in Geneva in 1868. Its text is given in full by Marx and Engels in their work *The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association*. For Marx's remarks on this programme see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, pp. 273-78. p. 398
- <sup>369</sup> This refers to Bakunin's article "The Organisation of the International", published in the anarchists' *Almanach du Peuple pour 1872*. p. 400
- <sup>370</sup> In the polemics started over the publication of the draft programme of the Universal Rationalist Society (see Note 308), Stefanoni joined the Bakuninists and wrote slanderous articles against the General Council, Marx and Engels. Engels's letter to the editor of *Gazzettino Rosa* (see p. 353 of the present volume) and Marx's article "Once More Stefanoni and the International" exposed Stefanoni's true aims and contacts with the anarchists, and helped to frustrate his attempts to subject the Italian working-class movement to bourgeois influence. p. 403
- <sup>371</sup> This refers to the bands organised by the police of the Second Empire. Composed of declassed elements claiming to be workers, they organised provocative demonstrations and disturbances, in order to furnish the authorities with pretexts for persecuting genuine workers' organisations. p. 404
- <sup>372</sup> See Note 61. p. 404
- <sup>373</sup> Concerning the split in the North-American Federation see Note 45. The text of these resolutions was published in the official organs of the International in different countries: *Der Volksstaat* No. 37, of May 8, *La Emancipacion* No. 43, of April 6, *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* No. 103, of May 4, 1872.
- There are also extant two MS texts—Marx's rough MS in English and the French translation of these resolutions written in Charles Rochat's hand on a letter-head marked "International Working Men's Association" and containing Marx's corrections. p. 410

- <sup>374</sup> The Basle resolution (VI) on the order of expelling sections from the International authorised the General Council to suspend separate sections from the International till the next congress. See *Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte-rendu du IV<sup>e</sup> Congrès International, tenu à Bâle, en septembre 1869*, Bruxelles, 1869. p. 412
- <sup>375</sup> The reference is to some Serbian and Bulgarian students in Zurich who, under the direct influence of anarchists, organised themselves into a group of the Alliance named "Slovenski Zaves" (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 305). p. 412
- <sup>376</sup> These resolutions were published in *La Liberté* No. 12, of March 24, and in *The International Herald* No. 3, of March 30, 1872. Besides, there is extant the French MS copied by Marx's daughter Jenny and corrected by the author. p. 414
- <sup>377</sup> Engels wrote this letter on the General Council's instructions (see Note 137). It was published in *La Emancipacion*, *La Liberté* and *Der Volksstaat* in April and May 1872. There has also been preserved Engels's rough copy in Spanish.  
For the Saragossa Congress see Note 162. p. 415
- <sup>378</sup> See Note 225. p. 418
- <sup>379</sup> This document is the official edition of the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of 1871 in French (*Statuts Généraux et Règlements Administratifs de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Édition officielle, révisée par le Conseil Général*, Londres, 1871) with the corrections (in Paul Lafargue's hand) adopted by the General Council between June and August 1872. Minor corrections were introduced by Lafargue into the printed text while more serious changes were pasted into the pamphlet in lieu of the printed text that had been clipped out. The whole work was done by Lafargue in conformity with the other extant copy of the 1871 edition into which these changes were introduced by Marx. Lafargue's copy was then reread by Marx, who gave a more precise definition of some points.  
In this form, the draft Rules and Regulations were supposed to be submitted to the Hague Congress (September 1872) for approval. But Marx and his associates limited themselves to introducing for the Congress's consideration only the major points: Article 8 (under number 7a) was introduced into the General Rules, and Articles 2 and 6 (Section II) on strengthening discipline and centralism within

the International's organisations were included in the Administrative Regulations.

All changes adopted by the General Council are given in bold type in this volume and translated into English in footnotes. For the official English edition of the General Rules and Administrative Regulations see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 420, 451-69. p. 420

<sup>380</sup> This reply to a letter from the Jura Federation (dated July 15, 1872) protesting against the convocation of the International's congress at The Hague was written by Hermann Jung, Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland, who was instructed to do so by the Executive Committee of the General Council at its meeting of July 27, 1872. (See p. 313 of the present volume.) p. 432

<sup>381</sup> In view of the preparations for the Hague Congress, the exposure of the splitting activities of the secret Alliance of Socialist Democracy acquired first-rate importance.

At its meeting of July 5, 1872, the Executive Committee examined documents on the secret activities of the Alliance, which it had received from Spain, and decided to ask the General Council to propose at the next congress that Bakunin and the other members of the Alliance should be expelled from the International. Marx and Engels were instructed to edit the proposals and submit them to the General Council (see pp. 306-07 of the present volume). On August 6, Engels submitted to the General Council the above-mentioned draft address to all members of the Association. During the lively discussion of the draft, some General Council members came out against its publication until the Alliance's case was examined. By a majority vote the draft was taken under advisement. The draft is extant in the form of Engels's manuscripts in French and English. p. 439

<sup>382</sup> The reference is to the General Council's reply to the first request of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy for admission into the International (see pp. 362-64 of the present volume). Below, Engels sets forth the Council's second letter dated March 9, 1869 (see pp. 364-66 of the present volume). p. 440

<sup>383</sup> See Note 236. p. 442

<sup>384</sup> This document was adopted at the Executive Committee's meeting of August 8, 1872 (the Minutes of the meeting are not extant). As will be seen from the manuscript, the first paragraph was written by Marx. p. 446

<sup>385</sup> *La Razon*—anarchist weekly published in Seville in 1871-72. p. 446

<sup>386</sup> The New Madrid Federation published this address of the Executive Committee in *La Emancipacion* No. 63, August 24, 1872, having included it in the announcement about the recognition of the federation by the General Council. p. 450

<sup>387</sup> The General Council's appeal to the Italian sections concerning the anarchists' conference in Rimini (see Note 259) was sent by Engels to Milan, Turin, Ferrara and Rome, where the sections were officially recognised by the General Council and were in constant contact with it.

The editors of *Il Popolino*, the official weekly of the Turin section published in April-October 1872, issued this appeal having prefaced it with the following note: "Printing this appeal we inform the reader that we could not do so earlier since the editorial board of the newspaper *Emancipazione del Proletario*, to whom it was addressed, had been imprisoned because of a strike; the interrupted contacts with them have been resumed only recently." p. 451

<sup>388</sup> At its meeting of July 19, 1872 (see p. 310 of the present volume), the Sub-Committee instructed Marx to write the General Council's report to the fifth congress of the International Working Men's Association and to read it at the Hague Congress. The report was confirmed by the General Council (see p. 282 of the present volume). Marx read it in German at the open session of September 5. Before reading the report Marx warned those present that he had been obliged to touch upon the work of the International in general outline, since the report was to be published in the press. The report was next read by the Congress secretaries in French, English and Dutch and adopted by all delegates except Spanish delegates—members of the Alliance—who abstained from voting. The report was published in the English, German, Belgian, Spanish and Swiss journals of the International, and as a leaflet in German. p. 453

<sup>389</sup> In an attempt to strengthen its shaky position, Napoleon III's government started, in April 1870, preparations for the so-called plebiscite, and on April 23 it issued a decree thereon. The French people were to indicate whether they approved the liberal reforms which were being introduced by the emperor into the 1860 Constitution and whether they ratified the text of the new Constitution published on April 20, 1870. The questions were so worded that it was impossible to express one's disapproval of the Empire's policy without at the same time declaring themselves against all democratic reforms. The plebiscite took place on May 8, 1870; nearly 3.5 million citizens expressed opposition to the empire (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, pp. 228, 231-32).

The Paris Federation issued, on April 24, a protest against the plebiscite in the form of a leaflet entitled: "Manifeste antiplébiscitaire des Sections parisiennes fédérées de l'Internationale et de la Chambre fédérale des Sociétés ouvrières", Paris, 1870.

The quotation is from the General Council's declaration of May 3, 1870, on the persecution of members of the French sections, written by Marx (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, p. 232). p. 453

- <sup>390</sup> Marx refers to the two-volume edition of *Papiers et correspondance de la Famille impériale*, published in Paris at the end of 1870 and the beginning of 1871, the first volume of which contained Minister Ollivier's orders for the arrests of members of the International. p. 454
- <sup>391</sup> The reference is to the third trial of the Paris organisation of the International held in Paris from June 22 to July 8, 1870. Thirty-eight people active in the working-class movement were involved, including Varlin (who managed to flee), Frankel, Johannard, Avrial, Chalaïn. They were sentenced to from two months to one year in prison and fined. p. 454
- <sup>392</sup> See *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 324. p. 454
- <sup>393</sup> This manifesto, written in the name of 150 members of the International, was published in the French newspaper *Réveil* No. 409, July 12, 1870, and was reprinted by several of the International's journals. p. 454
- <sup>394</sup> See *The General Council. 1870-1871*, p. 328. p. 455
- <sup>395</sup> See Note 32. p. 456
- <sup>396</sup> *Wilhelmshöhe* (near Kassel)—castle of the Prussian Kings where Napoleon III, former Emperor of France, was held prisoner by the Prussians from September 5, 1870 to March 19, 1871. p. 456
- <sup>397</sup> On November 26, 1870, when the question of fresh loans for the war with France was discussed in the German Reichstag, Bebel and Liebknecht refused to vote in favour of them and demanded that a peace treaty without annexations should be concluded with the French Republic as soon as possible.  
Despite this Bebel was again elected deputy of the Reichstag during the general elections in March 1871. p. 457
- <sup>398</sup> See Note 363. p. 457

- <sup>399</sup> *The General Working Men's Union*—the first socialist organisation in Hungary whose activities spread to Pesth, the capital, and major industrial towns. Its leaders (Károly Farkas, Antal Ihrlinger) were also members of the Hungarian section of the International Association and had contacts with Austrian and German Social-Democrats and directly with Marx. On June 11, 1871, the Union organised a demonstration of solidarity with the Paris Commune. The government dispersed the demonstration and dissolved the Union. The Union's leaders and representatives of the Austrian working-class movement who had come from Vienna were arrested on charge of high treason. But they were acquitted for lack of evidence and under the pressure of the public opinion. p. 458
- <sup>400</sup> *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*—a conservative daily; semi-official organ of Bismarck's government in the 1860-1880s; came out in Berlin from 1861 to 1918. p. 460
- <sup>401</sup> By his circular of August 14, 1871 Lanza, Home Minister of Italy, ordered the dissolution of the International's sections. On August 20, the government disbanded the Naples section, the only one of importance in Italy.  
In January 1872, Sagasta, Home Minister of Spain, issued a circular ordering the dissolution of the International's organisations. Lanza's and Sagasta's circulars may be viewed as the Italian and Spanish Governments' answer to Jules Favre's call for a joint struggle against the International. p. 460
- <sup>402</sup> The reference is to the meeting of the emperors of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia in Berlin in September 1872 where an attempt was made to resurrect the reactionary alliance of these countries. The emperors also discussed the question of a joint struggle against the revolutionary movement. p. 462
- <sup>403</sup> The report was drawn up by Engels on the General Council's instructions. The Council approved it and on September 5, 1872, submitted it to a special commission of the Hague Congress elected to investigate the secret activities of the Alliance. The documents mentioned in the text were also submitted by Engels to the commission. There have been preserved the rough manuscript of the report and an inventory of the appended documents, the numbering of the documents in Engels's inventory and that in the report coinciding. p. 463
- <sup>404</sup> This refers to the circular to members of the Spanish federations, written by Pagés in the name of the New Madrid Federation. It was published in *La Emancipacion* No. 61, of August 10, 1872. p. 465

- <sup>405</sup> The circular of June 2, 1872 was drawn up by Mesa, Pagés, F. Mora, Iglésias and other editors of *La Emancipacion* who were at the same time members of the Alliance. p. 465
- <sup>406</sup> The conference of the Spanish Federation in Valencia was held illegally from September 9 to 17, 1871. It gave the final touches to and approved the rules of the Spanish Federation and the bye-laws of local federations and sections which united workers according to their trade. p. 472
- <sup>407</sup> In March 1872, F. Mora, Mesa, Iglésias, Pagés, Calleja and Pauly, who were members of the *Emancipacion* editorial board and, concurrently, of the Spanish Federal Council, elected by the Valencia Conference, were expelled from the local Madrid Federation by its anarchist majority. p. 472
- <sup>408</sup> Concerning the Saragossa Congress see Note 162. p. 472
- <sup>409</sup> In June 1870, Barcelona was the scene of the first national congress of the Spanish sections of the International; it was attended by 90 delegates representing 150 workers' societies. The congress founded the Spanish Federation, elected the Federal Council and declared its recognition of the General Rules of the International Association. However, influenced by the anarchist members of the Spanish secret organisation of the Alliance, the congress adopted a resolution recommending abstention from political struggle. p. 472
- <sup>410</sup> *Estracto de las actas del segundo congreso obrero de la Federacion regional Española, celebrado en Zaragoza en los dias 4 al 11 de Abril de 1872, segun las actas y las notes tomadas par la comision nombrada al efecto en el mismo*, pp. 109-10.  
There has been preserved a copy of the pamphlet, with Engels's remarks, which Engels submitted to the Hague Congress. p. 473
- <sup>411</sup> By sending delegates from small, and very often non-existing, sections the anarchists tried to create a fictitious majority and take over the leadership of the International (at the Basle Congress in 1869) and the Romance Federation (at its congress in Chaux-de-Fonds on April 4-6, 1870) (see pp. 366-71 of the present volume). p. 475

---

## NAME INDEX

### A

*Albarracin, Severino*—Spanish teacher; anarchist, member of the Spanish Federal Council (1872-73); one of the leaders of an uprising in Alcoy in 1873; after the suppression of the revolution emigrated to Switzerland—442.

*Allan, William* (1813-1874)—British worker, mechanic; trade union leader, reformist; one of the organisers and the General Secretary of the Amalgamated Engineers (1851-74); in the 1860s, one of the leaders of the London Trades Council, opposed affiliation with the International; prominent in the Labour Representation League—55.

*Allen, George R.*—American painter; petty-bourgeois radical, member of the New Democracy of New York—206, 329.

*Allsop, Thomas* (1795-1880)—English democrat, publicist, former Chartist; actively worked with Marx to aid Paris refugees; was on friendly terms with Marx's family—97.

*Amberny*—Swiss lawyer—112.

*Applegarth, Robert* (1833-1925)—British worker, cabinet-maker; one of the reformist leaders of the trade union movement, General Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (1862-71); member of the London Trades Council; member of the General Council of the International (1865, 1868-72), delegate to the Basle Congress of the International (1869); one of the Reform League leaders; subsequently, left the working-class movement—49, 82, 83, 85, 150, 161, 169, 235, 272, 408.

*Arnaud, Antoine* (1831-1885)—French railwayman; Blanquist; was on the staff of the *Marseillaise* editorial board; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and of the Paris Commune, was sentenced to death in his absence; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72), delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); withdrew from the

International in view of the Congress decision to transfer the General Council to New York—42, 46, 49, 66, 71, 103, 109, 121, 129, 152, 161, 169, 180, 193, 201, 209, 214, 217, 224, 225, 235, 236, 237, 238, 241, 243, 244, 247, 253, 255, 261, 262, 277, 278, 279, 282, 283, 319, 408.

*Avrial, Augustin* (1840-1904)

—French worker, mechanic; active participant in the French working-class movement; Left-wing Proudhonist; organiser of the mechanics' union; member of the Paris Federal Chamber of Workers' Societies; was involved in the second trial of the International in Paris (1868); member of the Paris Commune, the Labour and Exchange Commission and the Executive and the War Commission of the Commune; after the Commune's defeat emigrated to England where he was, for some time, a member of the French Section of 1871 that came out against the General Council—381.

## B

*Baillie-Cochrane*. See *Cochrane-Baillie*.

*Bakunin, Mikhail* (Bakounine, Michael) (1814-1876)—Russian revolutionary and publicist, Narodnik, one of the ideologists of anarchism; participant in the revolution of 1848-49 in Germany; behaved within the International as a rabid enemy of Marxism; at the Hague Congress (1872) was expelled from the Internation-

al for splitting activities—48, 156, 157, 222, 270, 272, 293, 295, 306, 316, 336, 351, 352, 360, 361, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 375, 386, 394, 396, 399, 403, 405, 406, 407, 439, 440, 441, 442, 444, 463, 466, 475, 476.

*Banks, Theodore*—member of the Central Committee of the North-American sections of the International (1871); painter by trade; bourgeois radical—328, 329.

*Barrère, Camille* (1851-1940)—French diplomat and journalist, participant in the Paris Commune; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to London; editor of *The Graphic* (an illustrated weekly) and contributor to *Qui Vive!*—32, 34.

*Barry, Maltman* (1842-1909)—British journalist, socialist, member of the International, delegate to the Hague Congress (1872), member of the General Council (1872) and the British Federal Council (1871-73); supported Marx and Engels in their struggle against the Bakuninists and the British liberal trade union leaders; contributed to *The Standard* (a conservative newspaper); in the 1890s, supported the so-called socialist wing of the Conservatives—27, 33, 37, 38, 41, 44, 45, 46, 49, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 66, 69, 71, 73, 83, 89, 92, 94, 95, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 109, 112, 114, 116, 120, 121, 126, 129, 132, 134, 136, 139, 146, 150, 151, 152, 161, 163-66, 169-72, 180, 182, 184, 186, 187, 190, 192, 193, 194, 201, 202, 217, 235, 240, 241, 243, 245, 247, 252, 253, 254, 255, 257, 258, 260, 261, 262,

- 264, 265, 267, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 279, 280.
- Bassi, Ugo* (1801-1849)—Italian revolutionary and bourgeois democrat; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; shot by the Austrians—289.
- Bastelica, André* (1845-1884)—French printer; active in the working-class movement; member of the International, Bakunist; took part in the revolutionary actions in Marseilles in October and November 1870; participant in the Paris Commune; member of the General Council of the International (1871), delegate to the London Conference of 1871—96, 118, 369, 370, 376, 382.
- Bebel, August* (1840-1913)—leading figure in the German and international working-class movement; turner by trade; from 1867, President of the League of German Workers' Unions; member of the International, deputy of the Reichstag (from 1867); one of the founders (1869) and leaders of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Eisenachers); fought Lassalleanism; took a proletarian internationalist stand during the Franco-Prussian war; came out in support of the Paris Commune; friend and associate of Marx and Engels—130, 143, 457, 459.
- Becker, Hermann Heinrich* (1820-1885)—German lawyer and publicist, member of the Communist League (from 1850); was involved in the Cologne Communist trial (1852), sentenced to five years' imprisonment; in the 1860s, Progressist, and, later, National-Liberal—355.
- Becker, Johann Philipp* (1809-1886)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; brush-maker by trade; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; organiser of sections of the International in Switzerland and Germany; delegate to the London Conference (1865) and to all the congresses of the International; editor of the journal *Der Vorbote* (1866-71); friend and associate of Marx and Engels—316.
- Bertin, G.*—participant in the Paris Commune; a refugee in London; member of the so-called French-language section—46.
- Beust, Friedrich, Count* (1809-1886)—Saxon and Austrian reactionary statesman and diplomat, Austro-Hungarian Chancellor (1867-71), Ambassador at London (1871-78)—359, 458, 460.
- Bismarck, Otto, Prince* (1815-1898)—Prussian statesman and diplomat, Prime Minister of Prussia (1862-71), Chancellor of the German Empire (1871-90); carried through the unification of Germany by counter-revolutionary means; bitter enemy of the working-class movement; author of the Anti-Socialist Law (1878)—60, 61, 130, 150, 354, 359, 400, 457, 460.
- Blair, J. Talfourd*—Scotchman, Secretary of the International's section in Glasgow (1872), member of the British Federal Council (1871-72)—42, 55.
- Blanc, Gaspard*—French road-builder; Bakunist, partici-

pant in the Lyons rising of 1870; after the suppression of the Paris Commune sided with the Bonapartists—96, 117, 128, 368-70, 375, 404-07.

*Blandford, William*—member of the British Federal Council of the International (1871-72)—74.

*Blood, James*—American bourgeois radical, husband of Victoria Woodhull—329.

*Bonaparte, Joseph Charles Paul, Prince Napoleon (Plon-Plon)* (1822-1891)—cousin of Napoleon III; conducted the Bonapartist demagogic policy of flirting with the working-class and the bourgeois-democratic movement—95.

*Bonaparte, Louis.* See *Napoleon III.*

*Bonhorst, Leonhard* (b. 1840)—German technician; Social-Democrat; member of the Brunswick Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party—48.

*Boon, Martin James*—British worker, mechanic; active in the British working-class movement, follower of the social-reformist views of the Chartist Bronterre O'Brien; member of the General Council of the International (1869-72), Secretary of the Land and Labour League, member of the British Federal Council (1872)—33, 36, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 54, 57, 58, 66, 69, 74, 75, 77, 80, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 92, 94, 95, 103, 108, 109, 113, 114, 115, 116, 121, 129, 134, 136, 139, 150, 152, 161, 169, 171, 172, 174, 193, 197, 212, 213, 214, 225, 227, 232, 234, 241, 272, 273, 274, 275,

276, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 408.

*Borioni, Giuseppe*—participant in the Italian working-class movement, member of the International—349.

*Bracke, Wilhelm* (1842-1880)—German Social-Democrat, publisher of socialist literature in Brunswick and member of the Brunswick Committee; one of the founders (1869) and leaders of the Social-Democratic Workers Party, member of the Social-Democratic group in Reichstag (1877-79)—48.

*Bradlaugh, Charles* (1833-1891)—British journalist and politician, bourgeois radical, atheist, editor of the weekly *National Reformer*; after the Paris Commune sharply attacked Marx and the International Working Men's Association—58, 61-64, 68-69, 95, 101-02, 171.

*Bradnick, Frederick*—British worker, elastic web-weaver; member of the General Council of the International (1870-72), delegate to the London Conference of 1871; after the Hague Congress (1872), joined the reformist wing of the British Federal Council; was expelled from the International by the General Council decision of May 30, 1873—27, 28, 32, 41, 43, 44, 53, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 95, 99, 103, 107, 109, 116, 126, 145, 150, 152, 154, 161, 163, 166, 174, 179, 187, 192, 247, 253, 255, 280, 282, 283, 408.

*Bright, John* (1811-1889)—British manufacturer and bourgeois politician, one of the Free Trade leaders and found-

ers of the Anti-Corn Law League; from the early 1860s, leader of the Left wing of the Liberal Party; held several ministerial posts in Liberal Cabinets—159.

*Brix, Harold* (1841-1881)—Danish journalist; prominent in the Danish working-class and socialist movement; one of the founders of a section of the International in Copenhagen; editor of the newspaper *Socialisten*; one of the organisers and leaders of the Danish Social-Democratic Party (1876)—459.

*Broderick, F. N.*—member of the International and of the British Federal Council (1872)—147, 148.

*Brunetti, Angelo* (nicknamed *Ciceruachio*) (1800-1849)—Italian revolutionary, participant in the revolution of 1848-49 and in the heroic defence of the Roman Republic of 1849; shot by Austrians—289.

*Bürgers, Heinrich* (1820-1878)—German radical publicist, member of the Communist League in Cologne (1848); one of the editors of *Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung*; from 1850, member of the Central Committee of the Communist League; was involved in the Cologne communist trial (1852), sentenced to six years' imprisonment; in the 1860s and 1870s, Progressist—355.

*Burke* (or *Bourke*)—Irishman, took part in the movement for the amnesty of the Irish prisoners—66, 72.

*Buttery, G. H.*—member of the General Council of the Inter-

national (1871-72) and of the British Federal Council (1871-72)—27, 31, 150, 161, 408.

## C

*Cagliostro, Alessandro* (real name *Giuseppe Balsamo*) (1743-1795)—Italian adventurer—366.

*Camélinat, Zéphyrin* (1840-1932)—French bronze-worker; prominent in the French working-class movement; one of the leaders of the Paris sections of the International; participant in the Paris Commune, Director of the Mint; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England; took an active part in the socialist movement of France; member of the French Communist Party (from 1920)—381.

*Canham, H. G.*—participant in the meeting of October 21, 1871, at which it was decided to establish a British Federal Council, member of the Universal Republican League; from June 1872, Secretary of the London Agricultural Labourers' Central Aid Committee; took part in the movement for the amnesty of the Irish prisoners—41, 75, 76.

*Caulincourt, A.*—refugee in London, Secretary of the German Workers' Educational Association—153.

*Chaddock, Joseph*—member of the International, member of the British Federal Council (1871) and of the Universal Republican League—54, 56, 57, 69, 75, 76, 80.

*Chalain, Louis* (b. 1845)—French worker, turner; active

- in the French working-class movement; Left-wing Proud-honist; was involved in the third trial of the International in Paris; participant in the Paris Commune, member of Committee of Public Safety and of the Labour and Exchange Commission; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England, where for some time he was a member of the French Section of 1871 which opposed the General Council, later joined the anarchists—48, 381.
- Chambord, Henri Charles*, Count (1820-1883)—last representative of the eldest line of the Bourbons, grandson of Charles X, pretender to the French throne under the name of Henry V—143.
- Chautard*—French police agent who found his way into workers' organisations; member of the French Section of 1871 in London—376.
- Chevalley, Henri*—Swiss tailor; anarchist—369.
- Ciceruachio*. See *Brunetti, Angelo*.
- Clafin, Tennessee* (1845-1923)—American bourgeois feminist; sought to use the International's organisation in the U.S.A. for her own ends; together with her sister, Victoria Woodhull, published *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly*—323, 326, 330.
- Cluseret, Gustave Paul* (1823-1900)—French petty-bourgeois democrat, took part in the Irish Fenian movement, in the American Civil War on the side of the North and in Garibaldi's campaigns; member of the International, sided with the Bakuninists; participated in the revolutionary risings in Lyons and Marseilles (1870); member of the Paris Commune, war delegate of the Commune (April 1871), after its suppression emigrated to Belgium; after the amnesty returned to France; member of the Chamber of Deputies (from 1888), sided with socialists, delegate to the International Socialist Labour Congress in 1889—206.
- Cochrane-Baillie, Alexander* (1816-1890)—British Conservative, M.P., man of letters—32, 147, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161, 167, 335, 337.
- Cohn* (or *Cohen*), *James*—British worker, cigar-maker; active in the British and Danish working-class movement, President of the London Association of Cigar-Makers, member of the General Council of the International (1867-71), Corresponding Secretary for Denmark (1870-71), delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868) and the London Conference (1871) of the International—54, 55.
- Coleman, Patrick John*—Secretary of an Irish section of the International in London, member of the Labour Representation League and of the Land and Labour League—66.
- Combault, Amédée Benjamin* (born c. 1838—died after 1884)—French jeweller; active in the French working-class movement; an émigré in London where he became a member of the General Council of the International (1866-67); later took an active part in the International in Paris; in

1870, founded a section and became a member of the Paris Federal Council; was involved in the third trial of the International in France; participant in the Paris Commune, Chief of the Board of Direct Taxes—317, 319.

*Cournet, Frédéric* (1839-1885)—French commercial clerk and, later, publicist; Blanquist; member of the Paris Commune; after its suppression emigrated to England; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72), delegate to the Hague Congress of the International (1872); withdrew from the International in view of the Congress decision to transfer the General Council to New York; in the 1880s, was one of the leaders of Blanquist organisations in France—42, 46, 49, 50, 54, 55, 66, 71, 77, 82, 83, 88, 89, 103, 108, 109, 113, 114, 116, 120, 129, 139, 145, 151, 161, 169, 174, 177, 180, 184, 185, 193, 201, 210, 217, 221, 225, 230, 232, 235, 240, 241, 247, 261, 263, 264, 276, 277, 279, 280, 282, 283, 303, 304, 307, 311, 313, 314, 317, 318, 319, 408, 449.

*Cremer, William Randal* (1838-1908)—active participant in the British trade union and bourgeois-pacifist movement, reformist; one of the founders and leaders of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, member of the London Trades Council, the British National League for the Independence of Poland, and the Executive Committee of the Reform League; opposed revolutionary tactics,

stroke a deal with the bourgeoisie during the reform movement; participant in the Inaugural Meeting of September 28, 1864, held in St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International and its General Secretary (1864-66); delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866) of the International; subsequently, Liberal M.P. (1885-95 and 1900-08)—259, 335.

*Cristenet, Constant*—French émigré in the U.S.A.; member of Federal Council No. 2 in New York—191.

*Crompton, Henri* (1836-1904)—British lawyer and politician, bourgeois radical, positivist; took part in the trade union movement—139.

*Cuno, Friedrich Theodor* (1846-1934)—German socialist, active in the international working-class movement; in 1871-72, regularly corresponded with Engels; actively opposed anarchists in Italy; organiser of the Milan section of the International, delegate to the Hague Congress of the International (1872); after the Congress emigrated to the U.S.A. and took part in the International's activities there; subsequently, participant in the American labour and socialist movement, one of the founders of the Knights of Labour—169, 316.

## D

*Dante, Alighieri* (1265-1321)—great Italian poet—159.

*Davis, Ira*—American petty-bour-

- geois radical, member of the New Democracy of New York and Section No. 9—206, 329.
- Delahaye, Pierre Louis* (b. 1820)—French worker, engineer; member of the International (from 1864); member of the Paris Commune, after its suppression emigrated to England; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72) and the British Federal Council (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference of 1871—27, 33, 46, 58, 71, 109, 126, 136, 145, 150, 161, 169, 193, 209, 214, 217, 241, 247, 255, 408.
- De Morgan, John*—Irish socialist, participant in the republican movement in England, member of the International; supported the revolutionary wing in the British Federation—141, 148, 170, 213.
- Détroyat, Pierre Léon* (1829-1898)—French journalist and writer, Bonapartist, participant in the Crimean war (1856); contributor to and, later, owner of *La Liberté* (Paris, Bordeaux)—63.
- De Walsche, James*—member of the International; member of the British Federal Council (1871-72) and its treasurer; reformist—41, 140.
- De Wolfers, Alfred*—member of the General Council of the International (1871-72)—77, 83, 89, 98, 103, 116, 119, 121, 129, 161, 314.
- Dilke, Charles Wentworth* (1843-1911)—British politician and writer, one of the leaders of the radical wing of the Liberal Party, M.P.—48, 53, 65, 88, 97, 346.
- Douglass, Frederick* (c. 1817-1895)—outstanding leader of the abolitionist movement; participant in J. Brown's raid in 1855 and in the American Civil War; active advocate of women's rights—210, 329.
- Dufaure, Jules Armand Stanislas* (1798-1881)—French statesman, Orleanist; Minister of Justice in Thiers's government (1871-73)—138, 358, 389, 407, 458, 460.
- Dupont, Anthime J. M.* (b. 1842)—French employee; Blanquist; member of the Paris Commune, was on the Committee of Public Safety—157.
- Dupont, Eugène* (c. 1831-1881)—prominent figure in the international working-class movement; French worker, musical instrument maker; took part in the June uprising of 1848 in Paris; from 1862, lived in London; member of the General Council of the International (November 1864-72), Corresponding Secretary for France (1865-71), participant in the London Conference (1865), the Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867—Chairman) and Brussels (1868) congresses, the London Conference (1871) and the Hague (1872) Congress of the International; in 1870, moved to Manchester where he founded a section of the International; member of the British Federal Council of the International (1872-73); in 1874, moved to the U.S.A., associate of Marx and Engels—55, 67, 74, 76, 139, 150, 156-57, 161, 189, 209, 213, 214, 215, 216, 224, 225, 226, 227, 242, 245, 247, 255, 267, 268, 270, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278,

- 279, 280, 282, 283, 307, 309, 310, 311, 314, 317, 336, 408.
- Durand, Geoffroy*—French refugee, painter, contributor to the weekly *Graphic*—32, 36.
- Durand, Gustave Paul Emile* (b. 1835)—French jeweller; after the suppression of the Paris Commune, Secretary of the French Section of 1871; in October 1871, was exposed as a police spy and expelled from the International—340, 376, 383.
- Durant, Thomas*—member of a section of the International in Washington—181.
- E**
- Eastwick, Eduard Backhouse* (1814-1883)—British orientalist and diplomat, Conservative M.P. (1868-74)—159.
- Eccarius, Johann Georg* (John George) (1818-1889)—prominent figure in the international and German working-class movement, working-class publicist; tailor; an émigré in London; member of the League of the Just and, later, of the Communist League; one of the leaders of the German Workers' Educational Association in London; member of the General Council of the International (1864-72), the Council's General Secretary (1867-May 16, 1871), Corresponding Secretary for America (1870-72); delegate to all the International's congresses and conferences; supported Marx until 1872; in the spring of 1872, joined the reformist leaders of the British trade unions—27, 30-31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 49, 51, 54, 55, 56, 58, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 77, 81, 83, 86, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 100-01, 103, 109, 110, 116, 120, 122, 124, 129, 131, 136, 139, 142, 143, 145, 150, 152, 154, 161, 163, 168, 169, 171, 174, 175, 178, 179, 180, 181, 184-86, 187, 188-92, 193, 201, 202, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 213, 214, 216, 217, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 229, 234, 235, 240, 241, 242-43, 245, 247, 249, 252, 253, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 264, 265, 267, 268, 273, 274, 276, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 335, 408.
- Elliott, John*—American petty-bourgeois democrat; member of the International; active propagator of bourgeois reforms—168, 189, 329.
- Elliott, Thomas*—English trade unionist, member of the British Federal Council of the International (1872); took part in the republican movement—41.
- Engels, Frederick* (1820-1895)—27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36, 37, 38-40, 41-45, 46, 48, 49-51, 53, 54, 58, 64, 66-67, 71, 73-74, 76, 77-78, 81, 83-84, 86, 88, 89-90, 92, 94, 96, 103-04, 107-08, 109-11, 113-15, 116-17, 120, 121-23, 129-30, 134, 136-37, 145, 146, 150, 151, 152, 153, 161, 162, 163-64, 167, 169, 171, 173, 174, 175, 177, 180, 181, 183-86, 187, 188, 191, 192, 193, 194, 197, 198, 200, 201, 202, 208, 209, 210, 212, 214, 216, 217-20, 223, 224, 225-27, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235-40, 241, 243, 245, 246, 247, 248, 250, 252, 253, 254, 255-58, 261, 263, 267, 268, 270-71, 272, 273-75, 276, 277, 279, 280, 282, 283, 284, 287,

291, 293, 297, 300, 303, 304, 306, 307, 309, 310, 311-13, 314, 316, 317, 323, 348, 349, 350, 352, 353, 355, 408, 416, 417, 419, 445, 446, 449, 450, 452.

## F

*Favre, Jules* (1809-1880)—French lawyer and politician; from the late 1850s, one of the leaders of the bourgeois-republican opposition; Foreign Minister (1870-71) in Trochu's government; one of the initiators of the campaign against the International—143-44, 290, 336, 358, 389, 457, 458, 460.

*Fawcett, Henry* (1833-1884)—British vulgar economist, follower of John Stuart Mill, Liberal M.P. (from 1865)—159, 160, 161.

*Ferré, Theophile* (1845-1871)—French journalist, Blanquist; in the 1860s, active participant in the French republican movement; member of the Paris Commune, leader of the Committee of Public Safety and Deputy-Procurator of the Commune; shot by the Versailles—51, 134, 145, 373.

*Franca*. See *Nobre-Franca*.

*Frankel, Leo* (1844-1896)—prominent figure in the Hungarian and international working-class movement; jeweller; was involved in the third trial of the International in Paris; member of the Paris Commune and of the General Council of the International (1871-72), delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; one of the founders of the General Worker's Party of

Hungary; delegate to several congresses of the Second International; associate of Marx and Engels—27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 36, 38, 41, 46, 49, 52, 54, 55, 58, 66, 68, 71, 77, 83, 87, 89, 91, 95, 98, 103, 107, 109, 116, 120, 129, 136, 138, 139, 145, 147, 150, 152, 153, 154, 161, 163, 169, 172, 173, 174, 177, 179, 180, 184, 187, 192, 193, 201, 209, 211, 214-16, 223, 225-27, 230, 234, 235-37, 239, 241, 247, 248, 253, 254, 255, 256, 259, 261, 262, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 271, 272, 274, 275, 277, 279, 280, 282, 284, 303, 304, 307, 309, 310, 311, 314, 317, 318, 319, 408, 449.

## G

*Garibaldi, Giuseppe* (1807-1882)—Italian revolutionary democrat, leader of the Italian national liberation movement; came out in defence of the Paris Commune; welcomed the establishment of sections of the International in Italy—36, 287, 288, 290.

*Geleff, Paul Johansen* (1842-1921)—prominent figure in the Danish working-class and socialist movement, one of the organisers of the International's sections in Denmark (1871), one of the founders and leaders of the Danish Social-Democratic Party (1876); in 1877, emigrated to America; subsequently, left the working-class movement—458.

*Gerard*—English journalist—94.

*Gerhard, Hendrik* (c. 1829-1886)—Dutch tailor; participant in the Dutch working-class movement, member of the Dutch

- Federal Council, delegate to the Hague Congress (1872), sided with the Bakuninists—86.
- Gilroy-Holland, George*—Secretary of the Liverpool section of the International, member of the British Federal Council (1871-72)—50, 195.
- Girardin, Emile de* (1806-1881)—French publicist and politician, editor of the newspaper *Presse* (1836-66, with intervals) and *La Liberté* (1866-70); known for his unprincipled attitude in politics; representative of so-called bourgeois socialism—63.
- Gladstone, Robert* (1811-1872)—British businessman, bourgeois philanthropist; cousin of William Gladstone—160.
- Gladstone, William Ewart* (1809-1898)—British statesman, Tory, then Peelite; in the latter half of the nineteenth century, leader of the Liberal Party; Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55 and 1859-66) and Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886 and 1892-94)—60, 68, 130, 134, 150, 461.
- Glaser de Willebrord, E.*—active in the Belgian working-class movement, member of the Brussels section of the International—235.
- Gomez, Santiago*—Spanish engineer; member of the International, delegate to the Saragossa Congress (1872)—162.
- Granville, George Leveson-Gower, Earl* (1815-1891)—British statesman, Whig; afterwards, Liberal; Foreign Secretary (1851-52, 1870-74 and 1880-85), Secretary of State for the Colonies (1868-70, 1886)—99.
- Gregory, J. W.* (died January 1, 1872)—American petty-bourgeois democrat, member of the reformist society called the New Democracy of New York and of the Cosmopolitan Society—86, 110, 189.
- Grosse, Eduard*—German émigré in the U.S.A., Lassallean, member of Section No. 6 and the Central Committee of the North-American sections of the International, supported bourgeois reformers—189, 210, 330.
- Guillaume, James* (1844-1916)—Swiss teacher, anarchist, Bakuninist; member of the International, delegate to the Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867), Basle (1869) and Hague (1872) congresses of the International; editor of the newspapers *Progrès, Solidarité* and *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*; at the Hague Congress was expelled from the International for splitting activities—369, 370, 382, 396, 403.

## H

- Hales, John* (b. 1839)—British worker, weaver; trade union leader; member of the Reform League and of the Land and Labour League; member of the General Council of the International (1866-72) and its Secretary (May 1871-July 1872); delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; waged a struggle against Marx for the leadership of the International's organisations in England; headed the reformist wing of

- the British Federal Council; expelled from the International by the General Council decision of May 30, 1873—27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 64, 66, 67, 69-70, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 81, 82, 83-85, 86, 88, 89, 95, 98-99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 109, 111, 113-14, 116, 120, 122, 126, 128, 129, 131, 132, 134, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 145, 147, 150, 151, 152, 154, 161, 163, 164-65, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 178, 179, 180, 182, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189-91, 192, 193, 194-99, 200, 201, 202, 208, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216, 217, 219, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228-30, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 240, 241, 243-47, 248, 251-53, 255, 257, 258, 259, 260, 263, 264, 265, 267-68, 270, 271, 272-73, 274-75, 276-77, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 297, 303, 304, 308, 309, 314, 337, 409.
- Hales, William*—member of the General Council of the International (1867, 1869-72)—75, 150, 161, 408.
- Harcourt, W. E.*—miner, one of the organisers of the Federation of the International in Australia, delegate to the Hague Congress of the International (1872)—225.
- Harney, George Julian* (1817-1897)—prominent figure in the British revolutionary working-class movement of the 1840s and 1850s, one of the leaders of the Chartist Left wing; editor of *The Northern Star*, the weekly *Red Republican*, and other periodicals; member of the Communist League; early in the 1850s, became connected with the petty-bourgeois circles and temporarily departed from the revolutionary movement; an émigré in the U.S.A.; member of the International; was associated with Marx and Engels—68.
- Harris, George*—active in the British working-class movement, follower of the Chartist Bronterre O'Brien; member of the National Reform League, member of the General Council of the International (1869-72), Financial Secretary of the Council (1870-71)—27, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41, 45, 46, 47, 49, 51, 54, 58, 62, 63, 66, 71, 77, 81, 83, 88, 89, 94, 95, 99, 101, 102, 103, 106, 108, 113, 115, 116, 119, 120, 150, 152-53, 162, 164, 167.
- Harrison, Frederick* (1831-1923)—British bourgeois radical, jurist and historian, Positivist; took an active part in the democratic movement of the 1860s and 1870s; co-operated with Marx in rendering assistance to the Commune's refugees—97.
- Hasenclever, Wilhelm* (1837-1889)—German Social-Democrat, follower of Lassalle, President of the General German Workers' Union (1871-75)—146.
- Herman, Alfred*—one of the organisers of the International's sections 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 (1872) Congress of the International; at the Hague Congress joined the anarchist

minority—150, 161, 307, 343, 408.

*Hins, Eugène* (1839-1923)—Belgian teacher, Proudhonist, subsequently Bakuninist; one of the founders of the Belgian sections of the International; delegate to the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International—316.

*Hubert, B.*—member of a section of the International in New York—189, 206, 236, 255.

*Huleck, Maria*—member of the General Council of the International (1868), emigrated to the U.S.A.—167-68, 173, 329.

*Hume, Robert William*—American petty-bourgeois radical; journalist; one of the leaders of the National Labour Union, member of the International—206, 328, 329.

*Hurliman*—member of the General Council of the International (1871-72), delegate from the Swiss Society in London—150, 161, 408.

## J

*Jessup, William J.*—American worker., carpenter; active participant in the American labour movement; Vice-President (1866) and Corresponding Secretary (1867) of the U.S. National Labour Union for the State of New York, one of the leaders of the Workers' Union of New York; favoured affiliation with the International, the General Council's correspondent in the U.S.A.—206.

*Johannard, Jules* (1843-1888)—French worker; member of the General Council of the

International (1868-69, 1871-72) and Corresponding Secretary for Italy (1868-69); in 1870, founded a section of the International at St. Denis; member of the Paris Federal Council of the International (1870) and the Paris Commune, sided with the Blanquists; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to London; delegate to the Hague Congress (1872)—27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 38, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 54, 55, 58, 66, 67, 71, 118, 150, 161, 214, 217, 221, 222, 224, 225, 227, 232, 235, 237, 241, 247, 255, 267, 268, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 318, 408.

*Jones, Edward*—Secretary of the Manchester section of the International and, from the autumn of 1872, of the Manchester District Committee; supported the General Council against reformists—188.

*Jones, Ernest Charles* (1819-1869)—outstanding figure in the British working-class movement, proletarian poet and publicist; one of the leaders of revolutionary Chartism; member of the International; friend of Marx and Engels—165.

*Joukowsky.* See *Zhukovsky, Nikolai.*

*Jung, Hermann* (1830-1901)—prominent figure in the international working-class movement; watchmaker; participant in the 1846-49 revolution in Germany; an émigré in London; member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for Switzerland

(November 1864-72); Treasurer of the General Council (1871-72); Vice-Chairman of the London Conference (1865), Chairman of the Geneva (1866), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses and of the London Conference (1871) of the International; member of the British Federal Council (1872); until the Hague Congress of 1872, pursued Marx's line in the International; in the autumn of 1872, joined the reformist wing of the British Federal Council; after 1877 departed from the working-class movement—27, 29, 33, 38-40, 41, 46, 49, 51, 54, 56, 58, 65, 66, 67, 71, 73, 75, 77, 82, 83, 86, 87, 89, 92, 93, 95, 97-99, 100, 102, 103, 108, 109-11, 112, 113, 116, 117-19, 129, 132, 134, 139, 142, 143, 145, 150, 151, 152, 154, 161, 163, 165, 167, 169, 174, 177, 179, 180, 183, 187, 188, 190, 191, 193, 200, 201, 204, 209, 210, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 225, 227, 228, 232, 233, 235, 238, 240, 241, 247, 249, 250, 255, 256, 261, 265, 266, 267, 268, 272, 273, 274, 276, 277, 279, 282, 283, 284, 303, 307, 309, 310, 311-13, 314, 409, 437-38, 449.

### K

*Kahn*—English physician—164, 170.

*Kamensky, Gavriil* (1824-1898)—Russian bourgeois economist, agent of the tsarist government abroad; in 1872, was, in his absence, sentenced to imprisonment by the Swiss court for the forgery of Russian bank-notes—105, 111.

*Keen, Charles*—participant in the British working-class movement, member of the General Council of the International (1871-72) and of the British Federal Council (1871-72)—33, 41, 44, 49, 56, 58, 66, 71, 74, 77, 89, 93, 94, 101, 102, 109, 120, 136, 139, 150, 152, 153, 161, 163, 209, 212, 303.

*Kératry, Emile de* (1832-1905)—French reactionary politician, Orleanist, prefect of the Paris police (September-October 1871); later supervised the formation of territorial armed forces in Brittany; in 1871, prefect of Upper Garonne (dept.); in April 1871, suppressed the Commune in Toulouse—138.

*Klein, Johann Jakob* (born c. 1818)—Cologne physician, member of the Communist League, was involved in the Cologne Communist trial (1852) but acquitted by the jury; early in the 1860s, took part in the German working-class movement—355.

*Kossuth, Lajos* (Ludwig) (1802-1894)—leader of the Hungarian national liberation movement, headed bourgeois-democratic elements in the revolution of 1848-49; head of the Hungarian revolutionary government; left Hungary after the suppression of the revolution; in the 1850s, found support among the Bonapartist circles—346.

*Kühn, Johann August Karl* (born c. 1829)—German tailor; Chairman of the Brunswick Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party (1870)—48.

## L

- La Cecilia, Napoleon* (1835-1878)—French revolutionary (Italian by birth), professor of mathematics; participant in Garibaldi's campaign in 1860; member of the Paris organisation of the International; one of the editors of the newspaper *Rappel*; general of the Paris Commune; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England; kept in contact with Marx and Engels—50.
- Lafargue, Paul* (1842-1911)—outstanding propagator of Marxism; prominent in the French and international working-class movement; member of the General Council of the International, Corresponding Secretary for Spain (1866-69); helped to organise the International's sections in France (1869-70), Spain and Portugal (1871-72), delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); one of the founders of the Workers' Party of France; disciple and associate of Marx and Engels—473.
- Landeck, Bernard* (b. 1832)—French jeweller, Commune's delegate in Marseilles; member of the International and of the French Section of 1871, which opposed the General Council—203, 381.
- Lanza, Giovanni* (1815-1882)—Italian statesman, bourgeois liberal; in 1869-73, Prime Minister and Home Minister—150, 460.
- Lassalle, Ferdinand* (1825-1864)—German petty-bourgeois publicist, lawyer; in 1848-49, took part in the democratic movement of Rhenish Province; early in the 1860s, joined the working-class movement, one of the founders of the General Association of German Workers (1863); supported the policy of Germany's unification under the hegemony of Prussia; representative of the opportunist trend in the German working-class movement—160.
- Latham, Robert Masden*—British trade unionist, President of the Labour Representation League, member of the *Bee-Hive* shareholders' committee; member of the International—49.
- Laugrand, R.*—French émigré in the U.S.A., member of the Provisional Federal Council No. 2—173, 189, 304, 330.
- Law, Harriet* (1832-1897)—one of the leading figures in the atheist movement in England, member of the General Council (1867-72) and of the Manchester section of the International (1872)—46, 58, 67, 83, 150, 161, 408.
- Lecomte, Claude Martin* (1817-1871)—French general, during the Franco-Prussian war commanded a brigade; on March 18, 1871 was shot by the insurgent soldiers—144.
- Lefrançais, Gustave* (1826-1901)—French teacher; Left-wing Proudhonist; participant in the 1848 revolution; from the late 1860s, member of the International, member of the Paris Commune; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to Switzerland where he joined anarchists—61, 384-85, 404.

*Le Lubez, Victor* (born c. 1834)

—French émigré in London, was connected with bourgeois-republican and radical elements in France and Britain; took part in the Inaugural Meeting of September 28, 1864, held in St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-66), Corresponding Secretary for France (1864-66); participant in the London Conference of 1865; expelled from the General Council by the Geneva Congress (1866) for intrigue and slander—63.

*Lemon, John*—English worker, secretary of a section of the International in Sunderland—167.

*Le Moussu, Benjamin*—French worker, engraver; member of the Paris Commune, after its suppression emigrated to London; member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for the French-speaking sections in America (1871-72), delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); supported Marx and Engels in their struggle against the Bakuninists—27, 28, 41, 46, 49, 54, 66, 71, 77, 83, 89, 93, 94, 95, 103, 116, 120-21, 136, 150, 152, 161, 163, 169, 173, 184, 187, 189, 192, 193, 208, 209, 214, 218, 225, 235, 236, 241, 247, 255, 261, 264, 277, 279, 282, 284, 304, 307, 309, 311, 314, 317, 408, 449.

*Léo, André* (real name *Léodile Champseix*) (1829-1900)—French authoress and journalist; participant in the Paris Commune, after its suppression emigrated to Switzerland,

supported Bakuninists; wife of Benoît Malon—373.

*Lessner, Friedrich* (1825-1910)

—prominent in the German and international working-class movement; tailor; member of the Communist League; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; at the Cologne Communist trial was sentenced to three years' imprisonment; from 1856, an émigré in London; member of the London German Workers' Educational Association and the General Council of the International (November 1864-72); delegate to the London Conference (1865), the Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868), Basle (1869) and Hague (1872) congresses of the International; member of the British Federal Council; actively advocated Marx's line in the International; later, one of the founders of the British Independent Labour Party; friend and associate of Marx and Engels—27, 33, 37, 38, 39, 41, 44, 45, 46, 49, 54, 58, 65, 66, 71, 75, 77, 83, 88, 89, 92, 95, 98, 103, 109, 116, 120, 129, 136, 137, 139, 145, 147, 150, 152, 161, 163, 169, 172, 174, 180, 187, 192, 193, 200, 201, 209, 214, 218, 225, 235, 237, 241, 247, 255, 261, 267, 268, 273, 276, 279, 280, 282, 283, 355, 408.

*Liebknecht, Wilhelm* (1826-1900)

—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement; participant in the revolution of 1848-49; member of the Communist League; member of the International, active fighter against Lassalleanism for the princi-

ples of the International in the German working-class movement; delegate to the Basle Congress of the International (1869); from 1867, Reichstag deputy; a founder and leader of German Social-Democracy; editor of *Der Volksstaat* (1869-76) and *Vorwärts* (1890-1900); during the Franco-Prussian war and the Paris Commune came out against the predatory plans of Prussia; friend and associate of Marx and Engels—130, 143, 147, 354, 457, 459.

*Lochner, Georg* (born c. 1824)—German worker, joiner; active in the German working-class movement; member of the Communist League and of the London German Workers' Educational Association; member of the General Council of the International (November 1864-67 and 1871-72), delegate to its conferences of 1865 and 1871 held in London; friend and follower of Marx and Engels—33, 41, 54, 66, 71, 75, 77, 89, 95, 116, 121, 136, 145, 152, 161, 163, 169, 180, 201, 209, 218, 227, 235, 241, 255, 261, 267, 268, 282, 284, 408.

*Longuet, Charles* (1833-1903)—French journalist; one of the leaders of the French working-class movement, Proudhonist; member of the General Council of the International (1866-67 and 1871-72); Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (1866), delegate to the Lausanne (1867) and Brussels (1868) congresses, the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; member of the Paris Commune, after its sup-

pression emigrated to England; subsequently, joined the Possibilists—an opportunist trend in the socialist movement of France—38, 40, 41, 72, 83, 85, 89, 95, 99, 109, 116, 121, 150, 152, 161, 225, 229, 235, 240, 261, 266, 267, 268, 273, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279, 284, 318, 409.

*Lord*—English worker, member of the International—119.

*Lorenzo, Anselmo* (1841-1915)—Spanish typographer; prominent in the Spanish working-class movement; an organiser of sections of the International in Spain, member of the Spanish Federal Council (1870-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871) of the International—129, 194, 225, 442, 471-74.

*Louis Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon*. See *Napoleon III*.

*Louis XIV* (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715)—373.

*Lucraft, Benjamin* (1809-1897)—British worker, furniture-maker; one of the reformist leaders of the British trade unions; participant in the Inaugural Meeting of September 28, 1864, held in St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-71), delegate to the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International; member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League, member of the Labour Representation League; in 1871, came out against the Paris Commune and the General Council's address *The Civil War in France*, withdrew from the General Council—357.

## M

- McCarthy*—active member of the International in Ireland, member of the Ennis section—176.
- McDonnell, J. Patrick* (c. 1845-1906)—active in the Irish working-class movement; member of the General Council and Corresponding Secretary for Ireland (1871-72), delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; member of the British Federal Council (1872); in December 1872, emigrated to the U.S.A., took an active part in the American labour movement—27, 54, 58, 66, 72, 73, 77, 109, 113, 121, 131, 140, 141, 142, 143, 146, 148, 150, 152, 161, 163, 164, 169, 174, 176, 180, 193, 194, 195, 196, 200, 201, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, 225, 232, 235, 247, 304, 408, 449.
- McKeon* (or *McKeen*)—Irish cigar-maker, member of a section of the International in Dublin—176.
- M'Pherson, James*—agricultural worker from New Zealand, founder of a workers' mutual protection society in Canterbury—128.
- Maddox* (*Maddock*, *Maddoss*, *G. W.*)—American bourgeois radical, member of Section No. 9 and the New York Committee No. 2 of the International in the U.S.A.—207, 329, 331.
- Maguire, John Francis*—Irish politician, journalist and writer, publisher of the newspaper *Cork Examiner*, M. P. (1865-72)—131.
- Maguire*—Irish canon in Cork, brother of John Maguire—131, 141.
- Malon, Benoît* (1841-1893)—French worker, dyer; publicist, socialist, Left-wing Proudhonist, member of the International, delegate to the Geneva Congress (1866); was elected to the National Assembly of 1871, but resigned his commission; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and the Paris Commune; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to Italy and then to Switzerland where he joined the anarchists; subsequently, one of the leaders and ideologists of the Possibilists—an opportunist trend in the socialist movement of France—61, 319, 372, 373, 381, 384, 385, 401, 404.
- Malou, Jules* (1810-1886)—Belgian statesman, Catholic, Finance Minister (1844-47, 1870-78) and Chairman of the Council of Ministers (1871-78)—359, 460.
- Margueritte*—French revolutionary, Blanquist; participant in the Paris Commune, after its suppression emigrated to London, member of the General Council of the International (1871-72)—41, 77, 83, 89, 103, 109, 115, 116, 118, 121, 126, 139, 146, 152, 161, 163, 166, 209, 214, 218, 247, 152, 261, 265, 272, 273, 274, 277, 279, 280, 282, 284, 408.
- Martin, Constant*—French revolutionary, Blanquist, Secretary of the Central Committee of 20 arrondissements of Paris during its siege, Communard; after the suppression of the

- Commune emigrated to London, member of the General Council of the International (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference of 1871—27, 41, 46, 49, 54, 55, 58, 63, 66, 72, 83, 89, 92, 95, 98, 99, 103, 109, 116, 121, 126, 129, 136, 139, 146, 150, 152, 161, 163, 166, 169, 171, 180, 183, 186, 193, 201, 202, 209, 214, 218, 225, 227, 228, 229, 241, 242, 247, 255, 261, 265, 266, 268, 271, 272, 273, 276, 277, 279, 280, 282, 283, 408.
- Martinez, Franco*—Spanish worker, dyer; anarchist; member of the Spanish Federal Council of the International (1872-73)—442.
- Marx, Karl* (1818-1883)—35, 46-48, 49-50, 52, 56, 58-63, 66-68, 70-71, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 83-86, 88, 89, 93, 95-98, 103-04, 106, 109, 116, 118-20, 121, 122, 124, 126, 129, 130, 140, 142-43, 146, 150, 152, 154-55, 161, 163-64, 166, 167, 168, 169, 172, 185, 188, 191, 201, 202, 205, 207-08, 209-12, 214-17, 218-21, 223, 225-27, 230, 231, 235-39, 241, 242, 245, 255, 257, 258, 260, 261, 263-66, 267, 268, 269, 272, 273-75, 276-79, 280, 282, 284, 303, 304, 307, 308-10, 311-13, 314, 316, 317-19, 321, 332, 345, 354, 355, 383, 408, 413, 414, 425, 449, 462.
- Matthews, Robert*—active member of the International in Ireland, Corresponding Secretary of the Middlesbrough section—212, 220.
- Maujean*—French refugee in London—49.
- Maurice, Zévy*—member of the General Council of the International (1866-72), Corresponding Secretary for Hungary (1870-71)—150, 161, 187, 408.
- Maurice*—wife of Zévy Maurice—187.
- Marse, Friedrich Augustus* (1833-1900)—English publicist and captain, took part in the democratic movement in support of the French Republic, member of the Land Reform Association—132.
- Mayo, Henry*—active in the English working-class movement, member of the General Council of the International (1871-72) and the British Federal Council (1871-72) where he joined the reformist wing, opposed the decisions of the Hague Congress of the International; expelled from the International by the General Council decision of May 30, 1873—27, 33, 41, 46, 49, 54, 66, 72, 77, 83, 89, 95, 103, 109, 115, 116, 121, 129, 140, 146, 148, 150, 151, 152, 161, 163, 164, 169, 180, 187, 193, 196, 200, 201, 202, 214, 218, 225, 227, 228, 235, 241, 244, 255, 273, 277, 282, 283, 408.
- Mazzini, Giuseppe* (1805-1872)—Italian revolutionary, bourgeois democrat, one of the leaders of the Italian national liberation movement; active in the 1848-49 revolution in Italy; one of the organisers of the Central Committee of European Democracy in London (1850); when the International was founded in 1864, tried to bring it under his influence; in 1871, opposed the Paris Commune and the International, stood in the way of developing an independent working-class movement in Italy—36, 40, 48, 156, 287-90, 350-52.

- Mesa y Leompart, José* (1840-1904)—Spanish printer; prominent figure in the Spanish working-class and socialist movement; one of the organisers of sections of the International in Spain; member of the Spanish Federal Council (1871-72), the *Emancipacion* editorial board (1871-73) and the New Madrid Federation (1872-73); actively opposed anarchists; one of the first propagators of Marxism in Spain; one of the founders of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (1879); translator of several works by Marx and Engels into Spanish—316.
- Michel, Louise* (1830-1905)—prominent French revolutionary, member of the Paris Commune (1871); teacher; during the Second Empire sided with the Blanquists; after the suppression of the Commune was exiled to New Caledonia; following amnesty in 1880 took part in the working-class movement in France, Belgium and Holland, joined the anarchists—91.
- Mill, John Stuart* (1806-1873)—British vulgar economist and positivist philosopher—159, 160.
- Millot, T.*—French bookbinder; a refugee in the U.S.A.; member of the Central Committee of the North-American sections of the International; adopted the standpoint of bourgeois radicalism—210, 329, 330.
- Milner, George*—Irishman, tailor; active participant in the British working-class movement, follower of the Chartist O'Brien, member of the National Reform League founded in 1849 and of the Land and Labour League; member of the General Council of the International (1868-72), delegate to the London Conference of 1871; member of the British Federal Council (1872-73), fought the reformist wing in the Council—44, 66, 72, 77, 81, 85, 89, 94, 95, 99, 103, 108, 109, 113, 115, 116, 121, 126, 129, 134, 136, 140, 143, 146, 150, 151, 152, 161, 163, 166, 167, 180, 184, 186, 193, 201, 214, 218, 228, 229, 232, 235, 247, 253, 254, 261, 265, 266, 267, 268, 271, 272, 274, 275, 277, 279, 280, 282, 283, 408.
- Mitchell, James*—member of the British Federal Council (1871-73), came out against its reformist wing—66, 72.
- Moltke, Helmuth Karl Bernhard* (1800-1891)—Prussian General-Fieldmarshal; during the Franco-Prussian war (1870-71) was actually the Commander-in-Chief—456.
- Montoro, Peregrin* (pseudonym *Damon*)—Spanish weaver; anarchist, member of the Spanish Federal Council of the International (1872-73)—442.
- Mora, Francisco* (1842-1924)—prominent figure in the Spanish working-class and socialist movement; shoemaker; one of the organisers of the International's sections in Spain and Portugal; member of the Spanish Federal Council of the International (1870-72), member of the *Emancipacion* editorial board (1871-73) and the New Madrid Federation (1872-73); actively fought against the anarchist influence, corresponded with Marx and Engels; one of the organisers

- of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (1879)—162, 473.
- Morago Gonzales, Tomás*—Spanish worker, engraver; anarchist, one of the founders and leaders of the Alliance in Spain, was among the leaders of the secret Alliance; member of the Spanish Federal Council of the International (1870-71); delegate to the Hague Congress of the International (1872); expelled from the International by the General Council decision of May 30, 1873—316, 473.
- Moran, Benjamin* (1820-1886)—American diplomat, journalist and writer, official and later secretary of the U.S. Embassy in London (1853-74)—65, 66.
- Mottershead, Thomas G.* (c. 1825-1884)—English worker, weaver; member of the General Council of the International (1869-72); Corresponding Secretary for Denmark (1871-72); delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872); after the Hague Congress supported the reformist wing of the British Federal Council; expelled from the International by the General Council decision of May 30, 1873—27, 30, 32, 37, 38, 40, 41-45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 55, 58-60, 64, 65, 66, 69-71, 77, 80, 82, 83-85, 89, 93, 94, 99, 106, 150, 161, 172-73, 174, 178, 180, 182-83, 185-86, 193, 196, 272, 273, 278, 279, 280, 282, 408.
- Mullins*—English basket-maker—59.
- Murray, Charles*—English shoemaker; Chartist; one of the leaders of trade unions; one of the National Reform League leaders; member of the General Council of the International (1870-72) and of the British Federal Council (1872-73); follower of Marx and Engels; in the 1880s, active member of the Social-Democratic Federation—95, 103, 108, 109, 136, 139, 150, 152, 161, 163, 166, 169, 171, 172, 180, 193, 198, 201, 209, 214, 230, 234, 235, 241, 247, 267, 268, 270, 273, 275, 276, 278, 279, 280, 282, 284, 408.

## N

- Naas* (Naze)—French Communist, refugee in London—96.
- Napoleon, Prince*. See *Bonaparte, Joseph*.
- Napoleon III* (Louis Napoleon Bonaparte) (1808-1873)—nephew of Napoleon I, President of the Second Republic (1848-51), Emperor of the French (1852-70)—96, 351, 370, 375, 405, 453, 454.
- Nechayev, Sergei* (Netchayeff) (1847-1882)—Russian revolutionary conspirator, participant in the student movement in St. Petersburg in 1868-69; in 1869-71, while in Switzerland, was closely connected with Bakunin; founded a secret society called the "People's Retribution" (1869); in 1872, was extradited by the Swiss authorities to the Russian Government, died in prison—112, 367.
- Neumayer, Ludwig*—Austrian Social-Democrat, publicist; delegate to the Basle Congress (1869); editor of the newspapers *Wiener Neustädter*

- Wochenblatt* and *Volkswille*—91, 211, 226.
- Nicholson, W. J.*—member of the Irish section of the International in New York; treasurer of the Provisional Federal Council (until June 1872)—131, 189, 207.
- Nobre-Franca, José*—participant in the Portuguese working-class movement, one of the organisers of the first sections of the International in Lisbon; in 1872-73, conducted correspondence with Marx and Engels—129, 316.

## O

- O'Connor, Feargus* (1794-1855)—one of the Chartist leaders, founder and editor of *The Northern Star*; after 1848, reformist—119, 299.
- O'Connor*—66.
- Odger, George* (1820-1877)—one of the reformist leaders of the British trade unions; shoemaker; took part in founding the London Trades Council and was its Secretary (1862-72); 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; during the electoral reform movement in England compromised with the bourgeoisie; participant in the Inaugural Meeting of September 28, 1864, held in St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-71), its President (1864-67); took part in the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva Congress (1866); in 1871, came out against the Paris Commune and the General Council's address *The Civil War in France*, withdrew from the Council—335, 357, 364.
- Ogilvy, Gabriel*—95.
- Ollivier, Emile* (1825-1913)—French statesman; from 1857, member of the Legislative Corps; Premier (January-August 1870)—454.
- Orleans*—French dynasty of kings (1830-48)—143.
- Ory*—English journalist—58, 92, 94.
- Ostyn, François Charles* (1823-1912)—Belgian turner and later commercial clerk; Proud-honist; member of the Federal Council of the Paris sections of the International; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and the Paris Commune; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to Switzerland where he joined Bakuninists, delegate to the anarchists' congress in Geneva (1873)—61.
- Outine*. See *Utin, Nikolai*.
- Owen, Robert* (1771-1858)—great British utopian socialist—33, 165.

## P

- Palmerston, Henry John Temple, Viscount* (1784-1865)—British statesman, Tory at the beginning of his career; from 1830 on, one of the Whig leaders relying on the Right-wing elements of that party; Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41 and 1846-51), Home Secretary

- (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58 and 1859-65)—60, 165.
- Pamias, José*—Spanish shoemaker; member of the International, delegate to the Saragossa Congress (1872) from Barcelona—162.
- Perron, Charles Eugène* (1837-1919)—enamel painter, then cartographer; active in the Swiss working-class movement; Bakuninist; delegate to the Lausanne (1867) and Brussels (1868) congresses of the International; member of the Central Bureau of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; editor of *L'Égalité* (1869) and *La Solidarité* and one of the leaders of the Jura Federation; subsequently left the working-class movement—464.
- Perron*—manufacturer—373.
- Petroni, Giuseppe* (1812-1888)—Italian bourgeois revolutionary, journalist and politician; follower of Mazzini; participant in the 1848-49 Revolution; in 1853, was sentenced to life imprisonment but was released in 1870; editor of the newspaper *Roma del Popolo*—287, 288.
- Pfänder, Karl* (1818-1876)—one of the leaders of the German and international working-class movement; artist; an émigré in London from 1845; member of the London German Workers' Educational Association, the Central Committee of the Communist League and of the General Council of the International (1864-67 and 1870-72); friend and associate of Marx and Engels—33, 46, 54, 66, 72, 77, 83, 89, 95, 103, 109, 116, 146, 150, 161, 408.
- Pietri, Joseph Marie* (1820-1902)—French politician, Bonapartist, prefect of the Paris police (1866-70)—381.
- Pino, Miguel*—Spanish mechanic, anarchist, founder of the Alliance's group in Malaga—162.
- Pio, Louis* (1841-1894)—prominent figure in the Danish working-class and socialist movement, propagator of Marxism; one of the founders of the Danish sections of the International (1871); editor of the newspaper *Socialisten*; one of the founders of the Danish Social-Democratic Party (1876); in 1877, left for America—106, 459.
- Pirro, Matteo*—member of the International in Constantinople—35.
- Pius IX* (1792-1878)—Pope of Rome (1864-78)—460.
- Politzer, Gigmont* (died after 1880)—Hungarian journalist, member of the General Working Men's Union—184.
- Pyat, Félix* (1810-1889)—French publicist, dramatist and politician, petty-bourgeois democrat; took part in the revolution of 1848; from 1849, an émigré in Switzerland, Belgium and England; was against an independent working-class movement; for a number of years carried on a slanderous campaign against Marx and the International using for this end the French branch in London; deputy of the National Assembly of 1871; member of the Paris Commune, after suppression of the Commune emigrated to England—375, 376.

## R

*Ranvier, Gabriel* (1828-1879)—French revolutionary, Blanquist; scene-painter; participant in the Paris Commune, member of the War Commission and the Committee of Public Safety; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72), delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); withdrew from the International in view of the Congress decision to transfer the General Council to New York—42, 58, 64, 65, 66, 72, 83, 85, 89, 103, 109, 118, 121, 129, 140, 152, 161, 209, 218, 225, 229, 230, 235, 247, 261, 277, 279, 283, 318, 408.

*Regis, Vitale* (pseudonym *Etienne Pecharde*)—Italian revolutionary, member of the Italian section of the International in London; participant in the Paris Commune; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72); took part in the revolutionary events in Spain in 1873—49, 50, 54, 58, 64, 66, 77, 83, 89, 90, 161, 408

*Richard, Albert* (1846-1925)—French journalist; one of the leaders of the Lyons section of the International; member of the secret Alliance; took part in the Lyons rising of 1870; after the suppression of the Paris Commune became a Bonapartist; in the 1880s, joined the Allemanists—an opportunist trend in the French socialist movement—74, 96, 117, 128, 368, 369, 370, 375, 404-07.

*Richard*—French refugee in London, member of the British Federal Council (1871-72) of the International—65.

*Rigault, Raoul* (1846-1871)—French revolutionary, Blanquist; member of the Paris Commune, delegate of the Committee of Public Safety, Procurator of the Commune (from April 26); on May 24, 1871, was shot by Versaillists—373.

*Riley, William Harrison* (b. 1835)—English journalist; republican, socialist; editor and publisher of *The International Herald*; member of the British Federal Council of the International (1872-73), opposed the Council's reformist wing; in 1873, left the working-class movement—103, 111, 167.

*Ritchie*—English cabinet-maker—147.

*Roach, John*—active in the British working-class movement, member of the General Council of the International (1871-72), delegate to the Hague Congress (1872), Corresponding Secretary of the British Federal Council (1872) where he headed the reformist wing; expelled from the International by the General Council decision of May 30, 1873—33, 49, 54, 56, 83, 84, 95, 98, 121, 136, 137, 139, 140, 142, 150, 152, 154, 161, 163, 169, 193, 195, 200, 201, 209, 211, 212, 218, 224, 241, 243-45, 276, 279, 280, 282, 284, 408.

*Robert, Fritz*—Swiss teacher, follower of Bakunin; delegate to the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the

- International; was on the staff of the *Solidarité* editorial board—369, 396.
- Robin, Paul* (b. 1837)—French teacher, follower of Bakunin; one of the leaders of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy; member of the General Council (1870-71); delegate to the Basle Congress (1869) and the London Conference (1871) of the International; in October 1871, expelled from the General Council—371, 382.
- Rochat, Charles* (b. 1844)—active in the French working-class movement; member of the Paris Federal Council of the International; participant in the Paris Commune; member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for Holland (1871-72), delegate to the London Conference of 1871—27, 37, 41, 46, 49, 54, 58, 66, 68, 72, 77, 83, 89, 103, 106, 109, 116, 129, 130, 136, 150, 161, 210, 408.
- Roscoe*—English lawyer, legal adviser of big trade unions—178, 194.
- Rossell, Louis* (1844-1871)—French officer, participant in the Franco-Prussian war and the Paris Commune; shot on November 28, 1871—51.
- Rossell, Vicente*—Spanish weaver; anarchist; member of the Spanish Federal Council (1872-73); expelled from the International by the General Council decision of May 30, 1873—442.
- Rozwadowski, Josef* (b. 1846)—Polish revolutionary, took part in the national insurrection of 1863-64; active member of the Paris Commune, after its suppression emigrated to England; member of the General Council of the International (1872)—146, 147, 152, 161, 169, 174, 177, 180, 187, 201, 225, 235, 241, 243, 247, 254, 255, 261, 262, 272, 278, 279, 408.
- Rüder*—police chief in Leipzig—118.
- Rühl, J.*—German worker; member of the London German Workers' Educational Association; member of the General Council of the International (1870-72)—27, 33, 49, 54, 66, 72, 77, 87, 89, 95, 109, 116, 121, 129, 136, 146, 150, 152, 161, 163, 169, 193, 201, 214, 218, 225, 241, 408.

## S

- Sacase, François* (1808-1884)—French judge, monarchist; from 1871, deputy of the National Assembly—158, 389, 407.
- Sadler, Thomas*—participant in the British working-class movement, member of the General Council of the International (1871-72)—150, 161, 408.
- Sagasta, Práxedes Mateo* (1825-1903)—Spanish statesman, leader of the Liberal Party, Home Minister (1871-72)—90, 107, 110, 150, 460.
- Sanders, Thomas*—member of the British Federal Council (1872)—72.
- Schenck, Robert Kamming* (1809-1890)—American politician and diplomat; belonged to the Republican Party, envoy in London (1871-76)—65.

- Scheu, Andreas* (1844-1927)—prominent figure in the Austrian (1868-74) and British socialist movement; editor of the newspaper *Gleichheit*; member of the International; in 1874, emigrated to England; one of the founders of the Social-Democratic Federation in England and its active member—184.
- Schneider, Josef*—German worker, follower of Lassalle, member of the German Workers' Educational Association in London; late in 1871, was expelled from this association for splitting activities and slanderous attacks against the General Council—354.
- Scholl*—French worker, member of the Lyons section of the International, refugee in London; in 1872, supported the Bonapartist plans for the restoration of the Empire—41, 317.
- Schweitzer, Johann Baptist* (1833-1875)—one of the prominent representatives of the Lassallean movement in Germany; editor of *Social-Demokrat* (1864-67); President of the General Association of German Workers (1867-71); supported Bismarck's policy of unifying Germany under Prussia's hegemony; prevented German workers from joining the International; opposed the Social-Democratic Workers' Party; in 1872, was expelled from the General Association because of his contacts with the Prussian authorities—330.
- Schwitzguebel, Adhémar* (1844-1895)—Swiss engraver; prominent figure in the Swiss working-class movement; member of the International; follower of Bakunin, one of the leaders of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the Jura Federation; delegate to the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; expelled from the International, as a member of the Jura Federation, by the General Council decision of January 5, 1873—396, 437.
- Serrailier, Auguste* (b. 1840)—took an active part in the French and international working-class movement; last-maker; member of the General Council of the International (1869-72), Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (1870) and France (1871-72); in September 1870, after the fall of the Second Empire, was sent to Paris as the General Council's representative; member of the Paris Commune, was on the Labour and Exchange Commission; delegate to the London Conference (1871) and the Hague Congress (1872) of the International; member of the British Federal Council (1873-74); associate of Marx—27, 29, 31, 33, 37, 38-40, 41, 42, 45, 46-48, 49-51, 53, 54-55, 58-59, 65, 66, 68, 72, 73, 77, 78, 81, 86, 88, 89, 91, 95, 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 115, 116, 117, 121, 129, 132 136-38, 140, 143, 146, 147, 150, 152, 161, 163, 164, 165, 169-71, 173, 174, 175, 180, 181, 186, 187, 192, 193, 200, 201, 209, 210, 212, 214-16, 218, 220, 221, 222-24, 225, 228, 230, 235, 238, 239, 240, 247, 253, 255, 258, 260, 261, 264, 266, 267, 268, 270, 271, 272, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 282, 284, 303, 304, 307.

- Sexton, George*—English physician; socialist; member of the General Council of the International (May-August 1872), delegate to the Hague Congress (1872); member of the British Federal Council (1872-73), opposed its reformist elements—139, 154, 163-66, 170, 174, 182, 282.
- Shaen, Wm.*—British lawyer, legal adviser of big trade unions—178, 194.
- Shakespeare, William* (1564-1616)—great English poet and playwright—158.
- Shaw, Robert* (d. 1869)—English worker, painter; active in the British and international working-class movement; participant in the Inaugural Meeting of September 28, 1864, held in St. Martin's Hall, London; member of the General Council of the International (1864-69), in which he took an active part, propagating the International's ideas in local trade union organisations; Treasurer of the Council (1867-68), Corresponding Secretary for America (1867-69), delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Brussels Congress (1868) of the International—364.
- Sicard, Auguste Alexandre* (b. 1829)—French shoemaker; member of the Central Committee of 20 arrondissements and the Paris Commune, member of the War Commission and of the Food Commission; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to London—27.
- Smith*—member of the International in San Francisco—61.
- Smith, Adolph* (Headingley)—English journalist; socialist; sided with the French Section of 1871 in London which was hostile to the General Council of the International; in the 1880s, became member of the Social-Democratic Federation; was close to the French Possibilists; wrote slanderous articles against Marx and his supporters—63.
- Smith, J.*—English worker, cabinet-maker; member of the International; secretary of the Alliance Cabinet-Makers' Society; took part in the Nottingham Congress of Trade Unions (1872)—75.
- Sorge, Friedrich Adolf* (1828-1906)—prominent figure in the international and American labour and socialist movement; took part in the 1848 Revolution in Germany; in 1852, emigrated to the U.S.A.; active member of the International, organiser of American sections of the International, Secretary of the Federal Council; delegate to the Hague Congress (1872), member of the General Council in New York and its General Secretary (1872-74), active propagator of Marxism; friend and associate of Marx and Engels—91, 110, 168, 180, 190, 206, 207, 210, 304, 319.
- Spier, Samuel*—German Social-Democrat, member of the International, delegate to the Basle Congress (1869); member of the Brunswick Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (1870)—48.
- Stainsby, William*—English tailor; trade unionist; partici-

- pant in the Inaugural Meeting of September 28, 1864, held in St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-68); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League and the Labour Representation League—49.
- Stefanoni, Luigi* (1842-1905)—Italian writer and publicist, bourgeois democrat, rationalist; took part in Garibaldi's campaigns; founder and editor of the journal *Libero pensiero*; supported Bakuninists—353-55, 403.
- Stepney, Cowell William Frederick* (1820-1872)—English socialist, member of the Reform League and the League of Peace and Freedom; member of the General Council of the International (1866-72) and its Treasurer (1868-70), delegate to the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses and of the London Conference (1871) of the International, member of the British Federal Council (1872)—27, 33, 38, 41, 46, 54, 58, 66, 74, 97, 150, 161, 408.
- Stieber, Wilhelm* (1818-1882)—Prussian police official, director of the Prussian political police (1850-60); during the Franco-Prussian war, chief of the military police and Prussian Intelligence Office—460.
- Sylvis, William* (1828-1869)—prominent figure in the American labour movement, one of the founders of the International Ironmoulders' Union (1859) and its President (1863-69); took part in the American Civil War (1861-65) on the side of the North; one of the founders of the National Labour Union of the United States (1866) and its President (1868-69), favoured affiliation with the International—206.

## T

*Tapley Marc*—member of the British Federal Council of the International (1872)—139.

*Taylor, Alfred*—British worker; member of the General Council of the International (1871-72) and the British Federal Council (1872-73)—27, 33, 36, 41, 46, 49, 54, 58, 72, 73, 89, 92, 95, 98, 99, 103, 109, 113, 116, 119, 121, 124, 134, 136, 139, 140, 146, 148, 150, 151, 152, 161, 163, 164, 169, 178, 408.

*Teano*—296.

*Terzaghi, Carlo* (born c. 1845)—Italian lawyer, secretary of the workers' society *Emancipazione del proletario* in Turin; in 1872 became a police agent—394.

*Testut, Oscar*—French jurist, was associated with the police; wrote several books on the organisation and history of the International published for the information of the police—336.

*Thaisz*—inspector of police in Vienna—108.

*Theisz, Albert Félix* (1839-1880)—French worker, metal-cutter; active in the French working-class movement; Proudhonist; participant in the Brussels Congress (1868) of the International; member of the Paris Commune, after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England, member of the General Council of the

- International (1871) and its Treasurer—119, 376, 381.
- Thieblin, Nicolas Léon* (1834-1888)—English journalist; Italian by birth; studied in the St. Petersburg Military Academy (Russia); participant in the Crimean war; contributed to several newspapers in London and, from 1874, in New York—60.
- Thiers, Adolphe* (1797-1877)—French bourgeois historian and statesman, Orleanist, Home Minister (1832, 1834), Prime Minister (1836, 1840), Head of Government (1871-73)—97, 143, 150, 289, 377, 404, 407, 414, 458, 461.
- Thomas, Clément* (1809-1871)—French politician, general, moderate bourgeois republican; during the Second Republic, deputy of the Constituent Assembly, took part in the suppression of the Paris rising in 1848; Commander of the Paris National Guard (November 1870-February 1871), sabotaged the city's defence; on March 18, 1871 was shot by the insurgent soldiers—144.
- Tibaldi, Paolo* (1825-1901)—Italian revolutionary, follower of Garibaldi; from 1857 to 1870, served penal servitude at Cayenne for his attempt on Napoleon's life; member of the International, participant in the Paris Commune—27.
- Tolain, Henri* (1828-1897)—French worker, engraver; Right-wing Proudhonist; took part in the Inaugural Meeting of September 28, 1864, held in St. Martin's Hall; one of the leaders of the Paris section of the International; delegate to the London Conference (1865) and the Geneva (1866), Lausanne (1867), Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International; deputy of the National Assembly of 1871; during the Paris Commune went over to the Versaillists and in 1871 was expelled from the International; subsequently Senator—157.
- Tomas, Francisco* (c. 1850-1903)—Spanish bricklayer; anarchist, member of the Spanish Federal Council of the International (1872-73), one of the leaders of the anarchist organisation in Spain; expelled from the International by the General Council decision of May 30, 1873—442.
- Townshend, William*—British worker; member of the General Council of the International (1869-72); participated in the British socialist movement of the 1880s—27, 40, 41, 46, 49, 54, 58, 66, 72, 77, 83, 89, 95, 103, 109, 116, 121, 129, 136, 140, 142, 150, 152, 161, 163, 169, 173, 180, 193, 201, 209, 214, 217, 225, 235, 241, 247, 267, 268, 273, 282, 283, 408.
- Trochu, Louis Jules* (1815-1896)—French general and politician, Orleanist, took part in conquering Algeria (1830s-1840s), in the Crimean (1853-56) and Italian (1859) wars. Head of the Government of National Defence, Commander-in-Chief of the Paris Armed Forces (September 1870-January 1871), sabotaged the city's defence; deputy of the National Assembly of 1871—290.

*Truelove, Edward* (1809-1899)—London publisher, former Chartist, follower of Owen; member of the Reform League and of the Sunday League; published the General Council's two addresses on the Franco-Prussian war, *The Civil War in France, Resolutions of the London Conference* and *The General Rules*—33, 72, 73, 192, 210, 211, 217.

## U

*Utin, Nikolai* (Outine) (1845-1883)—Russian revolutionary, disciple of Nikolai Chernyshevsky, participant in the student movement, member of the Land and Freedom society; in 1863, emigrated to England and then to Switzerland; one of the organisers of the Russian section of the International; member of the *Narodnoye Dyelo* (People's Cause) (1868-70) and the *Égalité* (1870-71) editorial board; actively opposed Bakunin and his followers; delegate to the London Conference (1871) of the International; in the mid-1870s, left the revolutionary movement—61, 104, 105, 106, 111, 112, 380, 461.

## V

*Vaillant, Edouard* (1840-1915)—French socialist, follower of Blanqui; physician and engineer; member of the Paris Commune and of the General Council of the International (1871-72), delegate to the London Conference (1871)

and the Hague Congress (1872), withdrew from the International following the Congress decision to transfer the General Council to New York; subsequently, one of the founders of the Socialist Party of France (1901)—41, 46, 58, 64, 65, 66, 129, 136, 146, 150, 152, 161, 163, 169, 171, 172, 174, 180, 182, 193, 201, 209, 214, 216, 218, 221, 223, 225, 228, 229, 232, 235, 236, 238, 239, 240, 241, 247, 249, 251, 252, 253, 255, 256, 258, 260, 261, 262, 264, 267, 268, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 319, 408.

*Varlin, Eugène* (1839-1871)—prominent in the French working-class movement; bookbinder; Left-wing Proudhonist; organiser of trade societies and leader of the International's sections in France; delegate to the London Conference (1865), the Geneva (1866) and Basle (1869) congresses of the International; member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and the Paris Commune; shot by the Versailles on May 28, 1871—381.

*Vermersch, Eugène* (1845-1878) French petty-bourgeois journalist, participant in the republican movement; during the Paris Commune published the newspaper *Père Duchêne*; after the suppression of the Commune left for England, there he published the newspaper *Qui Vive!* in which slandered the International and its General Council—159.

*Vésinier, Pierre* (1826-1902)—French petty-bourgeois public-

ist, anti-Bonapartist; an émigré; conducted a slanderous campaign against the General Council of the International, was expelled from it in 1866, and in 1868 was expelled from the International; member of the Paris Commune, after its suppression emigrated to England; Secretary of the French Section of 1871, published the Newspaper *Fédération* and was a member of the Universal Federalist Council; opposed Marx and the General Council—63, 138, 147, 203, 381.

*Victor-Emmanuel II* (1820-1878)  
—King of Sardinia (1849-61)  
and Italy (1861-78)—290, 359.

*Vilmart, Raimont* (pseudonym *Wilmot*)—French revolutionary, participant in the Paris Commune, delegate to the Hague Congress of the International (1872) from the Bordeaux sections; in 1873, emigrated to Buenos Aires where he conducted propaganda of the International's ideas—318.

*Vinoy, Joseph* (1800-1880)—French general, Bonapartist, participant in the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Governor of Paris (from January 22, 1871); was in command of the Versailles reserve army—144.

*Vogel von Falckenstein, Eduard* (1797-1885)—German general—455, 456, 457.

*Vogt, Gustav* (1829-1901)—Swiss economist; German by birth; bourgeois pacifist, one of the organisers of the League of Peace and Freedom.—361.

## W

*Walker*—member of the International in Boston (U.S.A.)—37.

*Ward, W. G.*—Mayor of Nottingham—82.

*Weber, Josef Valentin* (1814-1895)—German watchmaker, participant in the 1848 revolution; an émigré in London; Lassallean; in December 1871, was expelled from the German Workers' Educational Association in London for slandering the General Council and conducting splitting activities—133.

*Weiler, Adam* (d. 1894)—German cabinet-maker; émigré in London, member of the British Federal Council of the International (1872-73), supported Marx and Engels in their struggle against British reformers; subsequently, became a member of the Social-Democratic Federation—316.

*West, William*—bourgeois American radical; clerk in the Bank of Woodhull; member of the Central Committee of the North-American Federation of the International, Secretary of Section No. 12 (New York) which was expelled from the International by the Hague Congress (1872)—61, 207, 280, 323, 324, 326, 327, 329.

*Weston, John*—British worker, carpenter; prominent in the British working-class movement; follower of Owen; participant in the Inaugural Meeting of September 28, 1864, held in St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Coun-

- cil of the International (1864-72), delegate to the London Conference of 1865, member of the British Federal Council (1871-72), member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League, one of the leaders of the Land and Labour League—150, 161, 170, 172, 176, 183, 187, 193, 202, 408.
- Whalley, Thomas* (1850-1924)—British smelter; founder of a section of the International in Middlesbrough and member of the British Federal Council; contributor to *The International Herald*; after the Paris Commune's defeat came out in active support of its refugees—79, 212, 220.
- Wheeler, George William*—prominent in the British working-class movement, participant in the Inaugural Meeting of September 28, 1864, held in St. Martin's Hall; member of the General Council of the International (1864-67), Treasurer of the Council (1864-65, 1865-67); participant in the London Conference of the International (1865); member of the Executive Committee of the Reform League—335.
- Wilhelm I* (William) (1797-1888)—King of Prussia (1861-88), German Emperor (1871-88)—414, 457.
- Wilkinson*—proprietor of St. George's Hall in London—132, 133, 194.
- Williams, Hugh*—English joiner, member of the General Council of the International (1864-68), participant in the reform movement in England—77.
- Wolffers*. See *De Wolffers*.
- Woodhull, Victoria* (1838-1927)—bourgeois American feminist; in 1871-72, attempted to seize over the leadership of the North-American Federation of the International by organising sections of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements; headed Section No. 12 which was expelled from the International by the General Council and the Hague Congress (1872)—210, 251, 323, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331.
- Wróblewski, Walery* (1836-1908)—Polish revolutionary democrat, one of the leaders of the Polish insurrection of 1863-64; general of the Paris Commune; member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for Poland (1871-72), delegate to the Hague Congress (1872), active in the struggle against the Bakuninists.—27, 67, 95, 109, 140, 150, 161, 214, 217, 225, 235, 241, 247, 255, 261, 274, 276, 277, 279, 280, 303, 304, 306, 307, 308, 311, 314, 317, 318, 408.

## Y

- Yarrow, F. J.*—British worker, cabinet-maker; trade unionist, member of the General Council of the International (1866-68 and 1872)—46, 72, 74, 75, 77, 83, 85, 89, 94, 95, 99, 103, 108, 109, 116, 129, 136, 140, 146, 147, 150, 152, 153, 161, 163, 166, 169, 170, 172, 179, 180, 183, 184, 193, 201, 209, 218, 219, 223, 225, 235, 241, 247, 250, 254, 255, 257, 408.

**Z**

*Zhukovsky* (Joukowsky), *Nikolai* (1833-1895)—Russian anarchist; in 1862, emigrated to Switzerland, Secretary of the Geneva section called the

Alliance of Socialist Democracy, one of the leaders of the secret Alliance; in 1872, withdrew from the International in token of protest against Bakunin's expulsion from the International—373.

---

## INDEX OF PERIODICALS

- Almanach du Peuple* (Geneva)—400.
- The Bee-Hive Newspaper* (London)—29.
- Berliner Börsen-Courier*—90.
- Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs* (Sonvillier, Le Locle, La Chaux-de-Fonds)—438.
- La Constitution* (Paris)—380.
- The Eastern Post* (London)—34, 36, 48, 49, 50, 63, 68, 93, 94, 101, 104, 111, 121, 123, 126, 132, 136, 138, 143, 146, 155, 180, 202, 235, 241, 290, 292, 303, 335, 336.
- The Economist* (London)—34
- L'Égalité* (Geneva)—56, 105, 112, 118, 367-69, 371-72, 384, 385, 405, 419, 461.
- La Emancipacion* (Madrid)—64, 222, 316, 413, 416, 417, 419, 449, 450, 462, 465, 473, 475.
- La Emancipation* (Toulouse)—47, 138, 146, 380.
- Europe*—380.
- La Federacion* (Barcelona)—465, 473-75.
- Le Figaro* (Paris)—354, 374.
- Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt*—48, 346.
- Le Gaulois* (Paris)—354, 374.
- Gazzettino Rosa* (Milan)—352, 353, 355.
- The Graphic* (London)—32, 36.
- Herald*. See *The New-York Herald*.
- The International Herald* (London)—104, 111, 241, 414, 419, 462.
- L'Internationale* (Brussels)—462.
- The Irishman* (Dublin)—141.
- Journal de Genève*—336, 354, 385.
- Kolokol* (The Bell) (London, Geneva)—360.
- Il Libero Pensiero* (Florence)—353.
- La Liberté* (Brussels)—106, 131, 414, 416, 419, 462.
- La Liberté* (Paris)—63.
- La Marseillaise* (Paris)—376.
- Il Martello* (Milan)—180.
- Moskovskiye Vedomosti* (Moscow News)—354.
- The National Reformer* (London)—62.

- Neuer Social-Demokrat* (Berlin)—354, 403-04.  
*New Yorker Democrat*—326.  
*The New York Herald*—331.  
*Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* (Berlin)—460.  
*Paris-Journal*—374.  
*O Pensamento Social* (Lisbon)—129.  
*Le Père Duchêne* (Paris)—159.  
*Le Petit-Journal* (Paris)—354.  
*La Plebe* (Lodi)—352, 452.  
*Il Popolino* (Turin)—452.  
*Le Progrès* (Le Locle)—367, 368, 384.  
*Le Progrès de Lyon*—385.  
*Il Proletario* (Turin)—394.  
*Il Proletario Italiano* (Turin)—347, 348.  
*Qui Vive!* (London)—40, 47, 380.  
*Le Radical* (Paris)—380.  
*Le Rappel* (Paris)—316.  
*Le Razon* (Seville)—446, 473.  
*Le Réveil* (Paris)—376.  
*La Révolution Sociale* (Geneva)—348, 373, 374, 400, 404, 406, 407.  
*Reynolds's Weekly Newspaper* (London)—88, 122.  
*La Roma del Popolo*—48, 350, 352.  
*The Scotsman* (Edinburgh)—40, 43, 44, 48, 58, 93.  
*Le Socialiste* (New York)—330, 331, 338.  
*Socialisten* (Copenhagen)—106, 146, 292.  
*Le Soir* (Paris)—68.  
*La Solidarité* (Neuchâtel—Geneva)—369, 370, 373, 384, 406.  
*The Standard* (London)—34, 43, 51, 59, 199, 354.  
*Die Tages-Presse* (Vienna)—354.  
*The Times* (London)—29, 32, 34, 59, 155, 158, 335, 336, 360, 385.  
*Le Travail* (Paris)—368.  
*La Voix du Peuple* (Marseilles)—50.  
*Der Volksstaat* (Leipzig)—413, 416, 419, 462.  
*Die Volksstimme* (Vienna)—157.  
*Volkswille* (Vienna)—91, 108, 184, 211.  
*Wiesbadener Zeitung*—355.  
*Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* (New York)—323-29, 338, 411, 412, 413.  
*The World* (New York)—92, 95, 330, 331.

---

---

## INDEX OF ADDRESSES AND GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

### A

*Algeria*—107, 138.  
*Alsace*—47, 198, 298, 456.  
*America*. See *South America*.  
*America*. See *United States of America*.  
*Amsterdam*—86.  
*Ancoats*. See *Manchester*.  
*Apollo*. See *New York*.  
*Aude*, dept.—308.  
*Australia*—91, 128, 360, 462.  
*Austria*—221, 357, 359, 394, 416, 457, 458, 459, 460.  
*Aveyron*, dept.—308.  
*Avignon*—107, 118, 138, 225, 308.

### B

*Barcelona*—90, 136, 368, 472.  
*Basle*—306, 312, 313, 391, 419, 437, 453, 475.  
*Batignolles*—372.  
*Bavaria*—169.  
*Belfast*—141.  
*Belgium*—59, 67, 130, 131, 179, 210, 215, 216, 218, 221, 233, 239, 303, 313, 357, 383, 386, 441.  
*Belleville*. See *Paris*.  
*Berlin*. 37, 60, 89, 90, 104, 198, 298, 462.  
*Berne*—351, 361.  
*Bienne*—401,

*Bohemia* (Czechia)—211.  
*Bolton*—141.  
*Bordeaux*—72, 107, 175, 201, 225, 308.  
*Boston*—37, 68.  
*Bradford*—140, 177.  
*Brazil*—254.  
*Bremen*—455.  
*Breslau* (Wroclaw)—130.  
*Brest*—107, 371, 453.  
*Bristol*—141.  
*Brunswick* (Braunschweig)—47, 455, 462.  
*Brussels* (Bruxelles)—215, 216, 316, 351, 361, 363, 404, 405.  
*Bude* (right-bank part of modern Budapest)—307.  
*Buenos Aires*—169, 462.

### C

*Canterbury*, province in New Zealand—37, 127, 128.  
*Catèbat*—401.  
*Cavendish Square*. See *London*.  
*Charles Street, Northampton Square, Clerkenwell*. See *London*.  
*Chaux-de-Fonds*. See *La Chaux-de-Fonds*.  
*Chelsea*. See *London*.  
*Chemnitz* (Karl-Marx-Stadt)—36, 86.  
*Chicago*—207, 209, 461,

China—254.  
 Christchurch—128.  
 Cologne—354.  
 Cootehill—140, 176.  
 Copenhagen—146, 181, 459.  
 Corgémont—402.  
 Cork—131, 140, 141, 142, 148,  
 149, 152, 176, 194, 213, 214.  
 Corsica—72, 118.  
 Côte-d'Or—308.  
 Courtelary—220, 401, 402.  
 Cracow—67.  
 Cuba—254.

**D**

Denmark—48, 69, 123, 128, 146,  
 291-92, 462.  
 Dortmund—355.  
 Dublin—140, 149, 176, 194, 198,  
 299.  
 Dundee—103.

**E**

East End. See London.  
 Eisenach—459.  
 England. See Great Britain.  
 Ennis—176.  
 Europe—70, 105, 108, 124, 128,  
 156, 204, 225, 252, 336, 360,  
 398, 405, 414, 421, 435, 445,  
 453, 454, 457, 458, 460, 461.

**F**

Ferrara—130, 175.  
 Fitzroy Street, Fitzroy Square.  
 See London.  
 France—59, 63, 78, 86, 92, 96,  
 117, 138, 147, 158, 173, 175,  
 188, 202, 203, 216, 276, 289,  
 290, 297, 307, 313, 317, 318,  
 335, 359, 361, 368, 370, 372,  
 375, 381, 388, 395, 400, 405,  
 406-07, 416, 418, 441, 453,  
 454, 455, 456, 457, 468.

Francis Street, Barnsbury Road,  
 Tottenham Court Road. See  
 London.

**G**

Galicia—78.  
 Geneva—67, 104, 105, 106, 111,  
 151, 157, 177, 188, 220, 313,  
 316, 348, 362, 366, 367, 369,  
 371, 372, 373, 381, 382, 400,  
 405, 409, 447.  
 Germany—75, 87, 128, 221, 313,  
 354, 357, 359, 370, 380, 388,  
 395, 400, 403, 406, 416, 418,  
 454-57.  
 Girgenti (Agrigentum)—287.  
 Glasgow—42-43.  
 Grange—402.  
 Great Britain (England)—30, 81,  
 87, 92, 96, 127, 133, 142, 148,  
 149, 152, 154, 155, 156, 162,  
 164, 166, 170, 178, 179, 194-98,  
 220, 245, 249, 250, 256, 263,  
 297-300, 313, 355, 357, 358,  
 360, 370, 387, 388, 391, 400,  
 403, 406, 461, 462.

**H**

Hague, the (Haye)—230, 310,  
 312, 313, 317, 318, 418, 437,  
 443, 447, 451, 452, 453, 474,  
 475.  
 Hall of Science. See London.  
 Hall of Science. See Manchester.  
 Hamburg—146, 455.  
 Hanover—455.  
 Hérault, dept.—308.  
 High Holborn. See London.  
 Hinckley—103.  
 Holland. See Netherlands.  
 Hungary—108, 221, 359, 416,  
 457, 458.

## I

- India*—254, 360.  
*Ireland*—131, 143, 149, 151, 176,  
 194-99, 297-300, 462, 468.  
*Italy*—28, 36, 65, 107, 117, 123,  
 173, 175, 221, 287-90, 295,  
 314, 318, 354, 359, 361, 368,  
 386, 403, 441, 460, 470, 471.  
*Iverdun*—105, 111.

## J

- Jura*, mnt. and region.—293,  
 295, 348, 470.

## L

- La Chaux-de-Fonds*—220, 368-72,  
 374, 402, 403, 475.  
*Lausanne*—313.  
*Leicestershire*—103.  
*Leipzig*—118, 221, 459.  
*Le Locle*—220, 367, 401, 402.  
*Liège*—316.  
*Limburg*—177.  
*Limehouse*. See *London*.  
*Limoges*—91.  
*Limerick*—176.  
*Lisbon*—30, 129, 130, 316.  
*Lisieux*—308.  
*Liverpool*—50, 77, 148, 195.  
*Locle*. See *Le Locle*.  
*Lötzen*—456.  
*Lombardy*—289.  
*London*—35, 39, 42, 45, 50, 51,  
 63, 74, 75, 96, 117, 140, 146,  
 156, 158, 161, 201, 202, 203,  
 249, 250, 304, 311, 335, 336,  
 339, 340, 343, 345, 346, 349,  
 350, 353, 354, 355, 357, 358,  
 359, 360, 364, 375, 376, 378,  
 381, 382, 404, 409, 415, 417,  
 437, 446, 448, 450, 451.  
 —*Cavendish Square*—138.  
 —*Charles Street, Northampton*  
*Square, Clerkenwell*—204.  
 —*Chelsea*—140.

- East End*—38, 39, 194.  
 —*Fitzroy Street, Fitzroy*  
*Square*, —37, 38.  
 —*Francis Street, Barnsbury*  
*Road, Tottenham Court Road*  
 —132, 134.  
 —*Hall of Science*—63.  
 —*High Holborn, Western Cen-*  
*tral*—228, 229, 304, 311, 337,  
 349, 350, 353.  
 —*Limehouse*—50.  
 —*Marylebone*—140.  
 —*Middlesex Hospital*—47.  
 —*National Gallery*—92.  
 —*Rathbone Place, Oxford*  
*Street*—92, 99, 116, 187, 193,  
 200, 209, 214, 217, 225, 409,  
 437, 448, 451.  
 —*Regent's Park Road*—303.  
 —*St. George's Hall, Langham*  
*Place*—119, 124, 128, 132-34,  
 138, 143, 194.  
 —*St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre*  
 —335.  
 —“*Sir Robert Peel*”, *James*  
*Street, Oxford Street, tavern*  
 —119.  
 —*Soho*—140, 177, 211, 212,  
 —*Trafalgar Square*—92.

*Lorraine*—47, 456.

*Lot-et-Garonne*, dept.—308.

*Lyons*—368, 369, 370, 375, 385,  
 388, 405, 453.

## M

- Madrid*—61, 90, 107, 316, 359,  
 474.  
*Mainz*—358, 418.  
*Mallorca*. See *Majorca*.  
*Marylebone*. See *London*.  
*Majorca*, isl.—295.  
*Manchester*—50, 66, 77, 212, 213,  
 226, 299, 318.  
 —*Ancoats*—226.  
 —*Hall of Science*—299.  
*Marseilles*—50, 72, 369, 383.  
*Mecklenburg*—455.

Melbourne—128.

Mexico—61.

Middlesbrough—77, 79, 97, 140,  
177, 195, 200, 211, 212, 213,  
217, 220.

Middlesex Hospital. See London.

Milan—180, 287, 288, 296.

Mincio, river—288.

Montbart—308.

Montmartre. See Paris.

Montpellier—201.

Moscow—360.

Moutier—220, 402.

## N

Naples—48.

Narbonne—225.

National Gallery. See London.

Netherlands—36, 68, 221, 230,  
310, 312, 313, 314, 316, 418,  
437, 462.

Neuchâtel—220, 369, 370, 381,  
382, 401, 402, 451.

New Caledonia—144.

Newcastle—55, 110, 357.

New Orleans—207, 332.

New York—61, 173, 175, 209,  
236, 255, 303, 326, 329, 330,  
360, 410, 411.  
—Apollo (music hall)—209-10,  
329, 330, 331.  
—Prince Street—209.  
—Ward Hotel—325.

New Zealand—37, 126, 127, 462.

Nice—288.

North Island—127.

Norway—128.

Nottingham—69, 82, 217, 256,  
310, 314.

## O

Oldenburg—455.

## P

Palma—295.

Paris—42, 51, 63, 66, 72, 106,  
117, 132, 133, 145, 156, 157,  
158, 175, 181, 203, 215, 225,  
289, 303, 308, 313, 316, 357,  
358, 360, 371, 372, 381, 388,  
418, 455, 460.  
—Belleville, workers' district  
—42.  
—Montmartre—51.  
—Père-la-Chaise, cemetery—  
72.  
—Place Vendôme—72, 158,  
289.

Peckham—177.

Père-la-Chaise. See Paris.

Pesth, capital of Hungary, left-  
bank part of modern Budapest  
—177, 184, 458, 459.

Petersburg. See St. Petersburg.

Place Vendôme. See Paris

Poland—75, 78, 198, 265, 298,  
468.

Pomerania—455.

Portugal—306, 359, 462.

Prince Street. See New York.

Prussia—112, 143, 146, 289, 370,  
455, 456, 457.

## R

Rathbone Place, Oxford Street.  
See London.

Ravenna—287.

Regent's Park Road. See London.

Reichenberg (Liberec)—211.

Rhine, river—454.

Rimini—451, 475.

Rome—40, 78, 287-90, 296, 403.

Roubaix—51, 55, 67.

Rouen—215, 453.

Russia—105, 112, 198, 298, 366,  
460.

Ryde—147.

## S

- Saint-Blaise*—401.  
*St. George's Hall, Langham*  
*Place. See London.*  
*Saint-Imier*—402.  
*St. Louis*—209, 332.  
*St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre.*  
*See London.*  
*St. Petersburg (now Leningrad)*  
 —105, 198, 298.  
*Salzburg*—460.  
*San Francisco*—61, 143, 207, 208,  
 319.  
*Saragossa*—136, 137, 162, 180,  
 293-96, 415, 417, 472, 473, 475.  
*Sardinian Kingdom*—287.  
*Satory*—145.  
*Saxony*—36, 86.  
*Schleswig-Holstein*—146, 198,  
 298, 455.  
*Sedan*—370, 455.  
*Sheffield*—177.  
*Siberia*—360.  
*Sicily*—288.  
*Silesia*—130.  
*Sinai*—266.  
*"Sir Robert Peel". See London.*  
*Soho. See London.*  
*Sonvillier*—43, 382, 383, 384, 402,  
 403, 404.  
*South America*—287, 290.  
*Spain*—64, 65, 90, 110, 124, 129,  
 136, 162, 270, 293-96, 306, 313,  
 316, 318, 357, 361, 368, 386,  
 399, 415, 442, 443, 446-48, 450,  
 460, 465, 470, 471, 472, 474.  
*Sunderland*—103.  
*Sweden*—69.  
*Switzerland*—43, 51, 56, 61, 97,  
 105, 106, 112, 143, 155, 160,  
 187, 215, 219, 221, 249, 252,  
 276, 310, 312, 313, 318, 357,  
 359, 360, 361, 367, 368, 372,  
 375, 376, 386, 437, 442, 445,  
 446, 451, 461, 470.

## T

- Taunton*—66.  
*Tipperary*—176.  
*Toulouse*—138, 175, 225, 308.  
*Trafalgar Square. See London.*  
*Turin*—86, 287, 306, 394.

## U

- United States of America*—37,  
 61, 86, 95, 98, 109, 124, 131,  
 142, 156, 160, 168, 184, 206,  
 209, 221, 223, 243, 249, 250,  
 252, 263, 265, 309, 314, 323-32,  
 338, 360, 387, 395, 398, 400,  
 410-13, 435, 462.

## V

- Val-de-Ruz*—401.  
*Valencia*—136, 194, 293, 294, 306,  
 313, 444, 446, 448, 472, 473.  
*Venice*—289.  
*Versailles*—144, 158, 457.  
*Verviers*—316, 437.  
*Victoria*—225.  
*Vienna*—68, 107, 157, 314, 458-  
 60.

## W

- Ward Hotel. See New York*  
*Washington*—181.  
*Wellington (England)*—141.  
*Wellington (New Zealand)*—127.  
*West Indies*—462.  
*Wight, island*—147.  
*Wilhelmshöne*—456.  
*Woolwich*—103.

## Z

- Zurich*—86, 143.

*REQUEST TO READERS*

*Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book. Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.*

ДОКУМЕНТЫ  
ПЕРВОГО ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛА

*На английском языке*

27