

KARL MARX
and
FREDERICK ENGELS

SELECTED WORKS

in three volumes

Volume Two



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
M O S C O W

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE WORKING MEN'S INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	11
GENERAL RULES OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	19
TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	22
ON PROUDHON (Letter to J. B. Schweitzer). By <i>Karl Marx</i>	24
WAGES, PRICE AND PROFIT. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	31
[Preliminary]	31
I. [Production and Wages]	31
II. [Production, Wages, Profits]	33
III. [Wages and Currency]	41
IV. [Supply and Demand]	44
V. [Wages and Prices]	45
VI. [Value and Labour]	48
VII. Labouring Power	55
VIII. Production of Surplus Value	57
IX. Value of Labour	59
X. Profit Is Made by Selling a Commodity at Its Value	60
XI. The Different Parts into Which Surplus Value Is Decomposed	61
XII. General Relation of Profits, Wages and Prices	64
XIII. Main Cases of Attempts at Raising Wages or Resisting Their Fall	65
XIV. The Struggle Between Capital and Labour and Its Results	71
INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE DELEGATES OF THE PROVISIONAL GENERAL COUNCIL. THE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	77
1. Organisation of the International Association	77

2. International Combination of Efforts, by the Agency of the Association, in the Struggle Between Labour and Capital . . .	77
3. Limitation of the Working Day	79
4. Juvenile and Children's Labour (Both Sexes)	79
5. Co-operative Labour	81
6. Trades' Unions. Their Past, Present and Future	82
7. Direct and Indirect Taxation	83
8. International Credit	84
9. Polish Question	84
10. Armies	84
11. Religious Question	85
PREFACE TO THE FIRST GERMAN EDITION OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF <i>CAPITAL</i> . By <i>Karl Marx</i>	86
AFTERWORD TO THE SECOND GERMAN EDITION OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF <i>CAPITAL</i> . By <i>Karl Marx</i>	91
<i>CAPITAL</i> . PART VIII. THE SO-CALLED PRIMITIVE ACCUMULATION. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	100
<i>Chapter XXVI</i> .—The Secret of Primitive Accumulation	100
<i>Chapter XXVII</i> .—Expropriation of the Agricultural Population from the Land	103
<i>Chapter XXVIII</i> .—Bloody Legislation against the Expropriated, from the End of the 15th Century. Forcing Down of Wages by Acts of Parliament	118
<i>Chapter XXIX</i> .—Genesis of the Capitalist Farmer	126
<i>Chapter XXX</i> .—Reaction of the Agricultural Revolution on Industry. Creation of the Home-Market for Industrial Capital	128
<i>Chapter XXXI</i> .—Genesis of the Industrial Capitalist	132
<i>Chapter XXXII</i> .—Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation	142
MARX'S <i>CAPITAL</i> . By <i>Frederick Engels</i>	146
I	146
II	149
FROM THE PREFACE TO THE SECOND VOLUME OF <i>CAPITAL</i> . By <i>Frederick Engels</i>	153
ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL LABOUR UNION OF THE UNITED STATES. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	156

PREFACE TO <i>THE PEASANT WAR IN GERMANY</i> . By <i>Frederick Engels</i>	158
Preface to the Second Edition of 1870	158
Supplement to the Preface of 1870 for the Third Edition of 1875	165
THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS OF THE RUSSIAN SECTION IN GENEVA. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	172
CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION (Excerpt). By <i>Karl Marx</i>	174
THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	178
Introduction by <i>Frederick Engels</i>	178
First Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian War	190
Second Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian War	195
The Civil War in France. Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association	202
I.	202
II.	210
III.	217
IV.	230
Notes	241
I.	241
II.	242
APROPOS OF WORKING-CLASS POLITICAL ACTION. Reporter's Record of the Speech Made at the London Conference of the International Working Men's Association, September 21, 1871. By <i>Frederick Engels</i>	245
FICTITIOUS SPLITS IN THE INTERNATIONAL. Private Circular from the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. By <i>Karl Marx</i> and <i>Frederick Engels</i>	247
I.	247
II.	250
III.	259
IV.	266
V.	278
VI.	280
VII.	283

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MEETING HELD TO CELEBRATE THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARIS COMMUNE. By <i>Karl Marx</i> . . .	287
THE NATIONALISATION OF THE LAND. By <i>Karl Marx</i>	288
FROM THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL CONGRESS HELD IN THE HAGUE. By <i>Karl Marx</i> and <i>Frederick Engels</i>	291
THE HAGUE CONGRESS. Reporter's Record of the Speech Made at the Meeting Held in Amsterdam on September 8, 1872. By <i>Karl Marx</i> . . .	292
THE HOUSING QUESTION. By <i>Frederick Engels</i>	295
Preface to the Second Edition	295
THE HOUSING QUESTION	305
Part One. How Proudhon Solves the Housing Question	305
Part Two. How the Bourgeoisie Solves the Housing Question . . .	323
I.	323
II.	336
III.	350
Part Three. Supplement on Proudhon and the Housing Question . .	353
I.	353
II.	358
III.	366
IV.	370
ON AUTHORITY. By <i>Frederick Engels</i>	376
PROGRAMME OF THE BLANQUIST COMMUNE EMIGRANTS (Article II from <i>Flüchtlingsliteratur</i>). By <i>Frederick Engels</i>	380
ON SOCIAL RELATIONS IN RUSSIA (Article V from <i>Flüchtlingslitera- tur</i>). By <i>Frederick Engels</i>	387
Afterword to the Work, "On Social Relations in Russia". By <i>Frederick Engels</i>	398
FROM COMMENTS ON BAKUNIN'S BOOK, <i>STATEHOOD AND ANARCHY</i> . By <i>Karl Marx</i>	411
LETTERS. By <i>Karl Marx</i> and <i>Frederick Engels</i>	413
Marx to L. Kugelmann, February 23, 1865	413
Marx to L. Kugelmann. October 9, 1866	417
Marx to L. Kugelmann, July 11, 1868	418
Marx to L. Kugelmann, April 12, 1871	420
Marx to L. Kugelmann, April 17, 1871	421
Marx to F. Bolte, November 23, 1871	422

Engels to T. Cuno, January 24, 1872	424
Engels to A. Bebel, June 20, 1873	430
Engels to F. A. Sorge, September 12 [-17], 1874.	433
<i>Notes</i>	437
<i>Name Index</i>	472
<i>Index of Literary and Mythological Names</i>	493
<i>Subject Index</i>	494

KARL MARX

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE WORKING MEN'S INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

ESTABLISHED SEPTEMBER 28, 1864, AT A PUBLIC MEETING
HELD AT ST. MARTIN'S HALL, LONG ACRE, LONDON'

Working Men,

It is a great fact that the misery of the working masses has not diminished from 1848 to 1864, and yet this period is unrivalled for the development of its industry and the growth of its commerce. In 1850, a moderate organ of the British middle class, of more than average information, predicted that if the exports and imports of England were to rise 50 per cent, English pauperism would sink to zero. Alas! on April 7, 1864, the Chancellor of the Exchequer* delighted his parliamentary audience by the statement that the total import and export trade of England had grown in 1863 "to £443,955,000! that astonishing sum about three times the trade of the comparatively recent epoch of 1843!" With all that, he was eloquent upon "poverty." "Think," he exclaimed, "of those who are on the border of that region," upon "wages . . . not increased"; upon "human life . . . in nine cases out of ten but a struggle of existence!" He did not speak of the people of Ireland, gradually replaced by machinery in the north, and by sheep-walks in the south, though even the sheep in that unhappy country are decreasing, it is true, not at so rapid a rate as the men. He did not repeat what then had been just betrayed by the highest representatives of the upper ten thousand in a sudden fit of terror. When the garrotte² panic had reached a certain height, the House of Lords caused an inquiry to be made into, and a report to be published upon, transportation and penal servitude. Out came the murder in the bulky Blue Book of 1863,³ and proved it was, by official facts and figures, that the worst of the convicted criminals, the penal serfs of England and Scotland, toiled much less and fared far better than the agricultural labourers of England and Scotland. But this was not all. When, consequent upon the Civil War in America,⁴ the operatives of Lancashire and Cheshire were thrown upon the streets, the same House of Lords sent to the manu-

* William Gladstone.—Ed.

facturing districts a physician commissioned to investigate into the smallest possible amount of carbon and nitrogen, to be administered in the cheapest and plainest form, which on an average might just suffice to "avert starvation diseases." Dr. Smith, the medical deputy, ascertained that 28,000 grains of carbon, and 1,330 grains of nitrogen were the weekly allowance that would keep an average adult ... just over the level of starvation diseases, and he found furthermore that quantity pretty nearly to agree with the scanty nourishment to which the pressure of extreme distress had actually reduced the cotton operatives.* But now mark! The same learned Doctor was later on again deputed by the medical officer of the Privy Council to inquire into the nourishment of the poorer labouring classes. The results of his researches are embodied in the "Sixth Report on Public Health," published by order of Parliament in the course of the present year. What did the Doctor discover? That the silk weavers, the needle women, the kid glovers, the stocking weavers, and so forth, received, on an average, not even the distress pittance of the cotton operatives, not even the amount of carbon and nitrogen "just sufficient to avert starvation diseases."

"Moreover," we quote from the report, "as regards the examined families of the agricultural population, it appeared that more than a fifth were with less than the estimated sufficiency of carbonaceous food, that more than one-third were with less than the estimated sufficiency of nitrogenous food, and that in three counties (Berkshire, Oxfordshire and Somersetshire) insufficiency of nitrogenous food was the average local diet." "It must be remembered," adds the official report, "that privation of food is very reluctantly borne, and that, as a rule, great poorness of diet will only come when other privations have preceded it. . . . Even cleanliness will have been found costly or difficult, and if there still be self-respectful endeavours to maintain it, every such endeavour will represent additional pangs of hunger." "These are painful reflections, especially when it is remembered that the poverty to which they advert is not the deserved poverty of idleness; in all cases it is the poverty of working populations. Indeed, the work which obtains the scanty pittance of food is for the most part excessively prolonged."

The report brings out the strange, and rather unexpected fact, "That of the divisions of the United Kingdom," England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, "the agricultural population of England," the richest division, "is considerably the worst fed"; but that

* We need hardly remind the reader that, apart from the elements of water and certain inorganic substances, carbon and nitrogen form the raw materials of human food. However, to nourish the human system, those simple chemical constituents must be supplied in the form of vegetable or animal substances. Potatoes, for instance, contain mainly carbon, while wheaten bread contains carbonaceous and nitrogenous substances in a due proportion. [Note by Marx.]

even the agricultural labourers of Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Somersetshire, fare better than great numbers of skilled indoor operatives of the East of London.

Such are the official statements published by order of Parliament in 1864, during the millennium of free trade, at a time when the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House of Commons that

"the average condition of the British labourer has improved in a degree we know to be extraordinary and unexampled in the history of any country or any age".

Upon these official congratulations jars the dry remark of the official Public Health Report:

"The public health of a country means the health of its masses, and the masses will scarcely be healthy unless, to their very base, they be at least moderately prosperous."

Dazzled by the "Progress of the Nation" statistics dancing before his eyes, the Chancellor of the Exchequer exclaims in wild ecstasy:

"From 1842 to 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by 6 per cent; in the eight years from 1853 to 1861, it has increased from the basis taken in 1853 20 per cent! the fact is so astonishing as to be almost incredible!... This intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power," adds Mr. Gladstone, "is entirely confined to classes of property!"

If you want to know under what conditions of broken health, tainted morals and mental ruin, that "intoxicating augmentation of wealth and power entirely confined to classes of property" was, and is being produced by the classes of labour, look to the picture hung up in the last "Public Health Report" of the workshops of tailors, printers and dressmakers! Compare the "Report of the Children's Employment Commission" of 1863, where it is stated, for instance, that:

"The potters as a class, both men and women, represent a much degenerated population, both physically and mentally," that "the unhealthy child is an unhealthy parent in his turn," that "a progressive deterioration of the race must go on," and that "the degenerescence of the population of Staffordshire would be even greater were it not for the constant recruiting from the adjacent country, and the intermarriages with more healthy races."

Glance at Mr. Tremenheere's Blue Book on the "Grievances complained of by the Journeyman Bakers!" And who has not shuddered at the paradoxical statement made by the inspectors of factories, and illustrated by the Registrar General, that the Lancashire operatives, while put upon the distress pittance of

food, were actually improving in health, because of their temporary exclusion by the cotton famine from the cotton factory, and that the mortality of the children was decreasing, because their mothers were now at last allowed to give them, instead of Godfrey's cordial, their own breasts.

Again reverse the medal! The Income and Property Tax Returns laid before the House of Commons on July 20, 1864, teach us that the persons with yearly incomes, valued by the tax-gatherer at £50,000 and upwards, had, from April 5, 1862, to April 5, 1863, been joined by a dozen and one, their number having increased in that single year from 67 to 80. The same returns disclose the fact that about 3,000 persons divide amongst themselves a yearly income of about £25,000,000 sterling, rather more than the total revenue doled out annually to the whole mass of the agricultural labourers of England and Wales. Open the census of 1861, and you will find that the number of the male landed proprietors of England and Wales had decreased from 16,934 in 1851, to 15,066 in 1861, so that the concentration of land had grown in 10 years 11 per cent. If the concentration of the soil of the country in a few hands proceeds at the same rate, the land question will become singularly simplified, as it had become in the Roman empire, when Nero grinned at the discovery that half the Province of Africa was owned by six gentlemen.

We have dwelt so long upon these "facts so astonishing to be almost incredible," because England heads the Europe of commerce and industry. It will be remembered that some months ago one of the refugee sons of Louis Philippe publicly congratulated the English agricultural labourer on the superiority of his lot over that of his less florid comrade on the other side of the Channel. Indeed, with local colours changed, and on a scale somewhat contracted, the English facts reproduce themselves in all the industrious and progressive countries of the Continent. In all of them there has taken place, since 1848, an unheard-of development of industry, and an undreamed-of expansion of imports and exports. In all of them "the augmentation of wealth and power entirely confined to classes of property" was truly "intoxicating." In all of them, as in England, a minority of the working classes got their real wages somewhat advanced; while in most cases the monetary rise of wages denoted no more a real access of comforts than the inmate of the metropolitan poor-house or orphan asylum, for instance, was in the least benefited by his first necessaries costing £9 15s. 8d. in 1861 against £7 7s. 4d. in 1852. Everywhere the great mass of the working classes were sinking down to a lower depth, at the same rate, at least,

that those above them were rising in the social scale. In all countries of Europe it has now become a truth demonstrable to every unprejudiced mind, and only denied by those, whose interest it is to hedge other people in a fool's paradise, that no improvement of machinery, no appliance of science to production, no contrivances of communication, no new colonies, no emigration, no opening of markets, no free trade, nor all these things put together, will do away with the miseries of the industrious masses; but that, on the present false base, every fresh development of the productive powers of labour must tend to deepen social contrasts and point social antagonisms. Death of starvation rose almost to the rank of an institution, during this intoxicating epoch of economical progress, in the metropolis of the British Empire. That epoch is marked in the annals of the world by the quickened return, the widening compass, and the deadlier effect of the social pest called a commercial and industrial crisis.

After the failure of the Revolutions of 1848, all party organisations and party journals of the working classes were, on the Continent, crushed by the iron hand of force, the most advanced sons of labour fled in despair to the Transatlantic Republic, and the short-lived dreams of emancipation vanished before an epoch of industrial fever, moral marasme, and political reaction. The defeat of the Continental working classes, partly owed to the diplomacy of the English Government, acting then as now in fraternal solidarity with the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, soon spread its contagious effects to this side of the Channel. While the rout of their Continental brethren unmanned the English working classes, and broke their faith in their own cause, it restored to the landlord and the money-lord their somewhat shaken confidence. They insolently withdrew concessions already advertised. The discoveries of new goldlands led to an immense exodus, leaving an irreparable void in the ranks of the British proletariat. Others of its formerly active members were caught by the temporary bribe of greater work and wages, and turned into "political blacks." All the efforts made at keeping up, or remodelling, the Chartist Movement, failed signally; the press organs of the working class died one by one of the apathy of the masses, and, in point of fact, never before seemed the English working class so thoroughly reconciled to a state of political nullity. If, then, there had been no solidarity of action between the British and the Continental working classes, there was, at all events, a solidarity of defeat.

And yet the period passed since the Revolutions of 1848 has not been without its compensating features. We shall here only point to two great facts.

After a thirty years' struggle, fought with most admirable perseverance, the English working classes, improving a momentaneous split between the landlords and money-lords, succeeded in carrying the Ten Hours' Bill.⁵ The immense physical, moral and intellectual benefits hence accruing to the factory operatives, half-yearly chronicled in the reports of the inspectors of factories, are now acknowledged on all sides. Most of the Continental governments had to accept the English Factory Act in more or less modified forms, and the English Parliament itself is every year compelled to enlarge its sphere of action. But besides its practical import, there was something else to exalt the marvellous success of this working men's measure. Through their most notorious organs of science, such as Dr. Ure, Professor Senior, and other sages of that stamp, the middle class had predicted, and to their heart's content proved, that any legal restriction of the hours of labour must sound the death knell of British industry, which, vampyre like, could but live by sucking blood, and children's blood, too. In olden times, child murder was a mysterious rite of the religion of Moloch, but it was practised on some very solemn occasions only, once a year perhaps, and then Moloch had no exclusive bias for the children of the poor. This struggle about the legal restriction of the hours of labour raged the more fiercely since, apart from frightened avarice, it told indeed upon the great contest between the blind rule of the supply and demand laws which form the political economy of the middle class, and social production controlled by social foresight, which forms the political economy of the working class. Hence the Ten Hours' Bill was not only a great practical success; it was the victory of a principle; it was the first time that in broad daylight the political economy of the middle class succumbed to the political economy of the working class.

But there was in store a still greater victory of the political economy of labour over the political economy of property. We speak of the co-operative movement, especially the co-operative factories raised by the unassisted efforts of a few bold "hands." The value of these great social experiments cannot be overrated. By deed, instead of by argument, they have shown that production on a large scale, and in accord with the behests of modern science, may be carried on without the existence of a class of masters employing a class of hands; that to bear fruit, the means of labour need not be monopolised as a means of dominion over, and of extortion against, the labouring man himself; and that, like slave labour, like serf labour, hired labour is but a transitory and inferior form, destined to disappear be-

fore associated labour plying its toil with a willing hand, a ready mind, and a joyous heart. In England, the seeds of the co-operative system were sown by Robert Owen; the working men's experiments, tried on the Continent, were, in fact, the practical upshot of the theories, not invented, but loudly proclaimed, in 1848.

At the same time, the experience of the period from 1848 to 1864 has proved beyond doubt that, however excellent in principle, and however useful in practice, co-operative labour, if kept within the narrow circle of the casual efforts of private workmen, will never be able to arrest the growth in geometrical progression of monopoly, to free the masses, nor even to perceptibly lighten the burden of their miseries. It is perhaps for this very reason that plausible noblemen, philanthropic middle-class spouters, and even keen political economists, have all at once turned nauseously complimentary to the very co-operative labour system they had vainly tried to nip in the bud by deriding it as the Utopia of the dreamer, or stigmatising it as the sacrilege of the Socialist. To save the industrious masses, co-operative labour ought to be developed to national dimensions, and consequently, to be fostered by national means. Yet, the lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies. So far from promoting, they will continue to lay every possible impediment in the way of the emancipation of labour. Remember the sneer with which, last session, Lord Palmerston put down the advocates of the Irish Tenants' Right Bill. The House of Commons, cried he, is a house of landed proprietors.

To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes. They seem to have comprehended this, for in England, Germany, Italy, and France there have taken place simultaneous revivals, and simultaneous efforts are being made at the political reorganisation of the working men's party.

One element of success they possess—numbers; but numbers weigh only in the balance, if united by combination and led by knowledge. Past experience has shown how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries, and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggle for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts. This thought prompted the working men of different countries assembled on September 28, 1864, in public meeting at St. Martin's Hall, to found the International Association.

Another conviction swayed that meeting.

If the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfil that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices, and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure? It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes, but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England that saved the West of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic. The shameless approval, mock sympathy, or idiotic indifference, with which the upper classes of Europe have witnessed the mountain fortress of the Caucasus falling a prey to, and heroic Poland being assassinated by, Russia; the immense and unresisted encroachments of that barbarous power, whose head is at St. Petersburg, and whose hands are in every cabinet of Europe, have taught the working classes the duty to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all means in their power; when unable to prevent, to combine in simultaneous denunciations, and to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.

The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes.

Proletarians of all countries, Unite!

Written by Marx between
October 21 and 27, 1864

Published in the pamphlet
*Address and Provisional Rules
of the Working Men's
International Association,
Established September 28, 1864,
at a Public Meeting Held at
St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre,
London*, printed in London in
November 1864. The author's
translation in German was
published in the newspaper
Social-Demokrat Nos. 2 and 3,
December 21 and 30, 1864

Printed according to the text of
the English pamphlet

KARL MARX

GENERAL RULES OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION⁶

Considering,

That the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves; that the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties, and the abolition of all class-rule;

That the economical subjection of the man of labour to the monopoliser of the means of labour, that is, the sources of life, lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation, and political dependence;

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

That all efforts aiming at that great end have hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labour in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries;

That the emancipation of labour is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists, and depending for its solution on the concurrence, practical and theoretical, of the most advanced countries;

That the present revival of the working classes in the most industrious countries of Europe, while it raises a new hope, gives solemn warning against a relapse into the old errors, and calls for the immediate combination of the still disconnected movements;

For These Reasons—

The International Working Men's Association has been founded.

It declares:

That all societies and individuals adhering to it will acknowledge truth, justice, and morality, as the basis of their conduct towards each other and towards all men, without regard to colour, creed, or nationality;

That it acknowledges *no rights without duties, no duties without rights*;

And in this spirit the following Rules have been drawn up.

1. This Association is established to afford a central medium of communication and co-operation between Working Men's Societies existing in different countries and aiming at the same end, *viz.*, the protection, advancement, and complete emancipation of the working classes.

2. The name of the Society shall be "The International Working Men's Association".

3. There shall annually meet a General Working Men's Congress, consisting of delegates of the branches of the Association. The Congress will have to proclaim the common aspirations of the working class, take the measures required for the successful working of the International Association, and appoint the General Council of the Society.

4. 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.

On its annual meetings, the General Congress shall receive a public account of the annual transactions of the General Council. The latter may, in cases of emergency, convoke the General Congress before the regular yearly term.

5. The General Council shall consist of working men from the different countries represented in the International Association. It shall from its own members elect the officers necessary for the transaction of business, such as a treasurer, a general secretary, corresponding secretaries for the different countries, &c.

6. 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.

7. 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.*

8. Every section has the right to appoint its own secretary corresponding with the General Council.

9. Everybody who acknowledges and defends the principles of the International Working Men's Association is eligible to become a member. Every branch is responsible for the integrity of the members it admits.

10. Each member of the International Association, on removing his domicile from one country to another, will receive the fraternal support of the Associated Working Men.

11. While united in a perpetual bond of fraternal co-operation, the working men's societies joining the International Association will preserve their existent organisations intact.

12. The present Rules may be revised by each Congress, provided that two-thirds of the delegates present are in favour of such revision.

13. Everything not provided for in the present Rules will be supplied by special regulations, subject to the revision of every Congress.

256, High Holborn, W. C.,
London, 24th October, 1871

Published in the form of
pamphlets: in English
and French in November-
December 1871, and
in German—in February 1872

Printed according to the text of
the English pamphlet of 1871

* By decision of the Hague Congress of 1872 an additional article, 7^a, was included in the General Rules after Article 7. See p. 291 of this volume.—*Ed.*

KARL MARX

**TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN,
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA⁷**

Sir,—We congratulate the American people upon your re-election by a large majority. If resistance to the Slave Power was the reserved watchword of your first election, the triumphant war-cry of your re-election is Death to Slavery.

From the commencement of the Titanic-American strife the working men of Europe felt instinctively that the star-spangled banner carried the destiny of their class. The contest for the territories which opened the dire epopee, was it not to decide whether the virgin soil of immense tracts should be wedded to the labour of the emigrant or prostituted by the tramp of the slave-driver?

When an oligarchy of 300,000 slave-holders dared to inscribe for the first time in the annals of the world "slavery" on the banner of Armed Revolt, when on the very spots where hardly a century ago the idea of one great Democratic Republic had first sprung up, whence the first Declaration of the Rights of Man⁸ was issued, and the first impulse given to the European revolution of the eighteenth century; when on those very spots counter-revolution, with systematic thoroughness, gloried in rescinding "the ideas entertained at the time of the formation of the old constitution," and maintained "slavery to be a beneficent institution," indeed, the only solution of the great problem of "the relation of capital to labour," and cynically proclaimed property in man "the corner-stone of the new edifice,"—then the working classes of Europe understood at once, even before the fanatic partisanship of the upper classes for the Confederate gentry had given its dismal warning, that the slave-holders' rebellion was to sound the tocsin for a general holy crusade of property against labour, and that for the men of labour, with their hopes for the future, even their past conquests were at stake in that tremendous conflict on the other side of the Atlantic. Everywhere they bore therefore patiently the hardships imposed upon them by the cotton crisis,⁹ opposed enthusiastically

the pro-slavery intervention—importunities of their betters—and, from most parts of Europe, contributed their quota of blood to the good cause.

While the working men, the true political powers of the North, allowed slavery to defile their own republic, while before the Negro, mastered and sold without his concurrence, they boasted it the highest prerogative of the white-skinned labourer to sell himself and choose his own master, they were unable to attain the true freedom of labour, or to support their European brethren in their struggle for emancipation; but this barrier to progress has been swept off by the red sea of civil war.⁴

The working men of Europe feel sure that, as the American War of Independence¹⁰ initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class, so the American Anti-Slavery War will do for the working classes. They consider it an earnest of the epoch to come that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead his country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of an enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world.

Written by Marx
between November 22
and 29, 1864

Published in *The Bee-Hive*
Newspaper No. 169, November 7,
1865

Printed according to the
newspaper text

KARL MARX

ON PROUDHON

(LETTER TO J. B. SCHWEITZER)¹¹

London, January 24, 1865

Dear Sir,

Yesterday I received a letter in which you request of me a detailed judgement of *Proudhon*. Lack of time prevents me from meeting your desire. Furthermore, I have *none* of his works by me. However, in order to show you my good will I am hastily jotting down a brief sketch. You can then supplement, add, omit—in short, do anything you like with it.*

Proudhon's earliest efforts I no longer remember. His school work about a *Universal Language*¹³ shows how little he hesitated to attack problems for the solution of which he lacked even the rudiments of knowledge.

His first work, *What Is Property?*, is by all means his best work. It is epoch-making, if not for the newness of its content, then at least for the new and audacious way in which old things are said. In the works of the French Socialists and Communists whom he knew, "property" had, of course, been not only criticised in various ways but also "abolished" in the utopian manner. In this book Proudhon's relation to Saint-Simon and Fourier is about the same as that of Feuerbach to Hegel. Compared with Hegel, Feuerbach is exceedingly poor. All the same he was epoch-making *after* Hegel, because he laid stress on certain points which are disagreeable to the Christian consciousness while important for the progress of criticism, and which Hegel had left in mystic semi-obscurity.

In this book of Proudhon's there still prevails, if I may be allowed the expression, a strong muscular style. And its style is in my opinion its chief merit. One sees that even where he is only reproducing old stuff, Proudhon makes independent discoveries; that what he is saying was new to him himself and ranks as new. Provocative defiance, laying hands on the economic

* We found it better to print the letter *without any changes*. [Note by the Editorial Board of the newspaper "Social-Demokrat."¹²]

"holy of holies", superb paradox which makes a mock of bourgeois common sense, withering criticism, bitter irony, and, betrayed here and there, a deep and genuine feeling of indignation at the infamy of what exists, revolutionary earnestness—because of all this *What Is Property?* had an electrifying effect and produced a great impression upon its first appearance. In a strictly scientific history of political economy the book would hardly be worth mentioning. But sensational works of this kind play their part in the sciences just as much as in polite literature. Take, for instance, *Malthus'* book *On Population*. In its first edition it was nothing but a "sensational pamphlet" and plagiarism from beginning to end into the bargain. And yet what a stimulus was produced by this *libel on the human race!*

If I had Proudhon's book before me I could easily give a few examples to illustrate his *first manner*. In the passages which he himself regarded as the most important he imitates Kant's treatment of the *antinomies*—Kant, at that time the only German philosopher with whom he was acquainted from translations—and leaves one under the strong impression that to him, as to Kant, the resolution of the antinomies is something "beyond" the human understanding, that is, something about which his own understanding remains in the dark.

But in spite of all his sham storming of heaven, one already finds in *What Is Property?* the contradiction that Proudhon, on the one hand, criticises society from the standpoint and with the eyes of a French small-holding peasant (later petty bourgeois) and, on the other, applies the measuring rod he had inherited from the Socialists.

The deficiency of the book is indicated by its very title. The question was so erroneously posed that it could not be answered correctly. Ancient "*property relations*" found their doom in *feudal* property relations, and these in "*bourgeois*" property relations. Thus history itself had practised its criticism upon past *property relations*. With Proudhon the issue really was *modern bourgeois property* as it exists today. The question of what this is could only be answered by a critical analysis of "*political economy*", embracing these *property relations* as a whole, not in their *legal* expression as *relations of volition* but in their real form, that is, as *relations of production*. But as Proudhon entangled the whole of these economic relations in the general juristic conception of "*property*," he could not get beyond the answer which *Brissot*, in a similar work,¹⁴ had already, before 1789, given in the same words: "Property is theft."

The most that can be got out of this is that the bourgeois juristic conceptions of "*theft*" apply equally well to the "*honest*"

gains of the bourgeois himself. On the other hand, since "*theft*" as a forcible violation of property *presupposes property*, Proudhon entangled himself in all sorts of figments of the imagination, obscure even to himself, about *true bourgeois property*.

During my stay in Paris in 1844 I came into personal contact with Proudhon. I mention this here because to a certain extent I am also to blame for his "*sophistication*", as the English call the adulteration of articles of commerce. In the course of lengthy debates, often lasting all night, I infected him to his great injury with Hegelianism, which, owing to his lack of German, he could not study properly. After my expulsion from Paris Herr Karl Grün continued what I had begun. As a teacher of German philosophy he had, besides, the advantage over me that he understood nothing about it himself.

Shortly before the appearance of Proudhon's second important work, *The Philosophy of Poverty, etc.*, he announced this to me himself in a very circumstantial letter in which he said, among other things: "I await your stern criticism." This soon fell upon him (in my *Poverty of Philosophy, etc., Paris 1847*) in a fashion which ended our friendship for ever.

From what I have said here you will see that Proudhon's *Philosophy of Poverty or System of Economic Contradictions* first actually contained the answer to the question, "*What Is Property?*" In fact it was only after the publication of this work that he had begun his economic studies; he had discovered that the question he had raised could not be answered by *invective*, but only by an *analysis* of modern "*political economy*." At the same time he attempted to present the *system* of economic categories dialectically. In place of the insoluble Kantian "*antinomies*" the Hegelian "*contradiction*" was to be introduced as the means of development.

For an estimate of his book, which is in two fat tomes, I must refer you to the work I wrote as a reply. There I showed, among other things, how little he had penetrated into the secret of scientific dialectics; how, on the other hand, he shares the illusions of speculative philosophy, for *instead of* conceiving the *economic categories as theoretical expressions of historical relations of production, corresponding to a particular stage of development of material production*, he garbles them into pre-existing, *eternal ideas*; and how in this roundabout way he arrives once more at the standpoint of bourgeois economy.*

* "When they say that present-day relations—the relations of bourgeois production—are *natural*, the economists imply that these are the relations in which wealth is created and productive forces developed in conformity with

I also show further how absolutely deficient and in parts even schoolboyish his knowledge is of the "political economy" which he undertook to criticise, and how he and the utopians are hunting for a so-called "science" by which a formula for the "solution of the social question" is to be excogitated *a priori*, instead of deriving science from a critical knowledge of the historical movement, a movement which itself produces the *material conditions of emancipation*. But special mention is made of how confused, wrong and half-baked Proudhon's ideas remain with regard to the basis of the whole thing, *exchange value*, and how he even mistakes the utopian interpretation of *Ricardo's* theory of value for the basis of a new science. With regard to his general point of view I make the following comprehensive judgement:

"Every economic relation has a good and a bad side; this is the only point on which M. Proudhon does not give himself the lie. He sees the good side stressed by the economists; he sees the bad side denounced by the Socialists. From the economists he borrows the necessity of eternal relations; from the Socialists he borrows the illusion that in poverty there is nothing to be seen but poverty (instead of seeing in it the revolutionary, subversive aspect which will overthrow the old society*). He agrees with them both in his attempts to cite the authority of science in his support. Science reduces itself for him to the slender proportions of a scientific formula; he is a hunter after formulae. M. Proudhon accordingly flatters himself that he has made a criticism both of political economy and of communism—he stands below both. Below the economists, because as a philosopher who has at his elbow a magic formula he thinks he can dispense with going into purely economic details; below the Socialists, because he has neither enough courage nor enough insight to lift himself, if only speculatively, above the bourgeois horizon. He wants to soar as the man of science above the bourgeois and the proletarians; *he is nothing but the petty bourgeois* perpetually tossed about between capital and labour, between political economy and communism."**

Severe though the above judgement sounds I must still endorse every word of it today. Simultaneously, however, it must be remembered that at the time when I declared his book to be

the laws of nature. Thus these relations are themselves *natural laws* independent of the influence of time. They are *eternal laws* which must always govern society. Thus there has been history, but there is no longer any." (P. 113 of my work.) [Note by Marx.]

* The sentence in brackets has been added by Marx in this article.—Ed.

** l. c., pp. 119/20. [Note by Marx.]

the code of socialism of the petty bourgeois and proved this theoretically, Proudhon was still being branded as an ultra-arch-revolutionist alike by the political economists and by the Socialists. That is also the reason why I never joined in the outcry later on about his "treason" to the revolution. Originally misunderstood by others as well as by himself, it was not his fault if he disappointed unjustified hopes.

In *The Philosophy of Poverty* all the defects of Proudhon's method of presentation stand out very unfavourably in comparison with *What Is Property?* The style is often what the French call *ampoulé*.^{*} High-sounding speculative jargon, supposed to be German-philosophical, appears regularly on the scene when his Gallic acumen fails him. A puffing, self-glorifying, boastful tone, and especially the twaddle about "science" and sham display of it, which are always so unedifying, are continually dinning in one's ears. Instead of the genuine warmth which glowed in his first piece of writing, here certain passages are systematically worked up by rhetoric into a momentary fever heat. Add to this the clumsy, repellent display of erudition of the self-taught, whose innate pride in original, independent thought has already been broken and who now, as a *parvenu* of science, deems it necessary to flaunt what he neither is nor has. Then the mentality of the petty bourgeois, who in an indecently brutal way—and neither poignantly nor profoundly nor yet correctly—attacks a man like *Cabet*, to be respected for his practical attitude towards the French proletariat, while being civil, on the other hand, to a man like *Dunoyer* (a State Councillor, to be sure); and yet the whole importance of this *Dunoyer* lay in the comic seriousness with which, throughout three bulging, unbearably boring volumes,¹⁵ he preached the rigourism characterised by *Helvétius* as follows: it is demanded that the unfortunate should be perfect.

The February Revolution¹⁶ certainly came at a very inconvenient moment for Proudhon, as he had irrefutably proved only a few weeks before that "*the era of revolutions*" was past for ever. His utterances in the National Assembly, however little insight they showed into existing conditions, were worthy of every praise.¹⁷ After the June insurrection¹⁸ they were an act of great courage. In addition they had the fortunate consequence that *M. Thiers*, by his speech opposing Proudhon's proposals,¹⁹ which was then issued as a special publication, proved to the whole of Europe what infantile catechism served this spiritual pillar of the French bourgeoisie as his pedestal. Indeed, compared to

^{*} *Ampoulé*: Bombastic.—Ed.

M. Thiers, Proudhon swelled until he was the size of an antediluvian colossus.

Proudhon's discovery of "free credit" and the "*people's bank*" based upon it were his last economic "deeds." In my book, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Part I*, Berlin 1859 (pp. 59-64), may be found the proof that the theoretical basis of his idea arises from a failure to understand the first elements of bourgeois "political economy," namely, of the relation between *commodities* and *money*, while the practical superstructure was simply a reproduction of much older and far better developed schemes. That under definite economic and political circumstances the credit system can serve to hasten the emancipation of the working class, just as, for instance, at the beginning of the eighteenth, and again later, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in England, it served to transfer the wealth of one class to another, is beyond the slightest doubt self-evident. But to regard *interest-bearing capital* as the *main form of capital*, but to want to make a special application of the credit system, the alleged abolition of interest, the basis for a transformation of society, is a thoroughly *philistine* fantasy. Hence this fantasy, eked out further, is in fact already to be found among the *economic spokesmen of the English lower middle class in the seventeenth century*. Proudhon's polemic with Bastiat (1850) about interest-bearing capital²⁰ is on a far lower level than *The Philosophy of Poverty*. He contrives to get himself beaten even by Bastiat and breaks into burlesque bluster when his opponent drives his blows home.

A few years ago Proudhon—at the instance, I think, of the government of Lausanne—wrote a prize essay on "*Taxation*." Here the last flicker of genius is extinguished. Nothing remains but the petty bourgeois pure and simple.

So far as his political and philosophical writings are concerned they all show the same contradictory, dual character as his economic works. Moreover their value is local, confined to France. Nevertheless his attacks on religion, the church, etc., were of great merit locally at a time when the French Socialists deemed fit to be superior in religiosity to the bourgeois Voltairianism of the eighteenth century and the German godlessness of the nineteenth. If Peter the Great defeated Russian barbarism by barbarity, Proudhon did his best to vanquish French phrasemongering by phrases.

His work on the "*coup d'état*," in which he flirts with L. Bonaparte and, in fact, strives to make him palatable to the French workers, and his last work, written against *Poland*,²¹ in which for the greater glory of the tsar he indulges in the most imbe-

cile cynicism, must be characterised as not merely bad but base productions; of a baseness which corresponds, however, to the petty-bourgeois point of view.

Proudhon has often been compared to *Rousseau*. Nothing could be more mistaken. He is more like *Nic. Linguet*, whose *Theory of Civil Law*, by the way, is a very brilliant book.

Proudhon had a natural inclination for dialectics. But as he never grasped really scientific dialectics he never got further than sophistry. In fact this hung together with his petty-bourgeois point of view. Like the historian *Raumer*, the petty bourgeois is composed of on-the-one-hand and on-the-other-hand. This is so in his economic interests and *therefore* in his politics, in his religious, scientific and artistic views. So in his morals, in everything. He is a living contradiction. If, like *Proudhon*, he is in addition a clever man, he will soon learn to play with his own contradictions and develop them according to circumstances into striking, spectacular, now scandalous, now brilliant paradoxes. Charlatanism in science and accommodation in politics are inseparable from such a point of view. There remains only one governing motive, the *vanity* of the subject, and the only question for him, as for all vain people, is the success of the moment, the sensation of the day. Thus the simple ethical tact, which always kept a *Rousseau*, for instance, far from even the semblance of compromise with the powers-that-be, necessarily fades out of existence.

Perhaps posterity will epitomise the latest phase of French development by saying that Louis Bonaparte was its Napoleon and *Proudhon* its *Rousseau-Voltaire*.

You must now assume responsibility yourself for having saddled me, so soon after the man's death, with the role of post-mortem judge.

Yours very truly,
Karl Marx

Written on January 24, 1865

Published in *Social-Demokrat*
Nos. 16, 17 and 18,
February 1, 3 and 5, 1865

Printed according to the
newspaper text, checked with
the 1885 German edition
Translated from the German

KARL MARX

WAGES, PRICE AND PROFIT²²

[PRELIMINARY]

Citizens,

Before entering into the subject-matter, allow me to make a few preliminary remarks.

There reigns now on the Continent a real epidemic of strikes, and a general clamour for a rise of wages. The question will turn up at our Congress.²³ You, as the head of the International Association, ought to have settled convictions upon this paramount question. For my own part, I considered it, therefore, my duty to enter fully into the matter, even at the peril of putting your patience to a severe test.

Another preliminary remark I have to make in regard to Citizen Weston. He has not only proposed to you, but has publicly defended, in the interest of the working class, as he thinks, opinions he knows to be most unpopular with the working class. Such an exhibition of moral courage all of us must highly honour. I hope that, despite the unvarnished style of my paper, at its conclusion he will find me agreeing with what appears to me the just idea lying at the bottom of his theses, which, however, in their present form, I cannot but consider theoretically false and practically dangerous.

I shall now at once proceed to the business before us.

I [PRODUCTION AND WAGES]

Citizen Weston's argument rested, in fact, upon two premises: firstly, that the *amount of national production* is a *fixed thing*, a *constant* quantity or magnitude, as the mathematicians would say; secondly, that the *amount of real wages*, that is to say, of wages as measured by the quantity of the commodities they can buy, is a *fixed* amount, a *constant* magnitude.

Now, his first assertion is evidently erroneous. Year after year you will find that the value and mass of production increase, that the productive powers of the national labour increase, and that the amount of money necessary to circulate this increasing

production continuously changes. What is true at the end of the year, and for different years compared with each other, is true for every average day of the year. The amount or magnitude of national production changes continuously. It is not a *constant* but a *variable* magnitude, and apart from changes in population it must be so, because of the continuous change in the *accumulation of capital* and the *productive powers of labour*. It is perfectly true that if a *rise in the general rate of wages* should take place today, that rise, whatever its ulterior effects might be, would, *by itself*, not *immediately* change the amount of production. It would, in the first instance, proceed from the existing state of things. But if *before* the rise of wages the national production was *variable*, and not *fixed*, it will continue to be *variable* and not *fixed after* the rise of wages.

But suppose the amount of national production to be *constant* instead of *variable*. Even then, what our friend Weston considers a logical conclusion would still remain a gratuitous assertion. If I have a given number, say eight, the *absolute* limits of this number do not prevent its parts from changing their *relative* limits. If profits were six and wages two, wages might increase to six and profits decrease to two, and still the total amount remain eight. Thus the fixed amount of production would by no means prove the fixed amount of wages. How then does our friend Weston prove this fixity? By asserting it.

But even conceding him his assertion, it would cut both ways, while he presses it only in one direction. If the amount of wages is a constant magnitude, then it can be neither increased nor diminished. If then, in enforcing a temporary rise of wages, the working men act foolishly, the capitalists, in enforcing a temporary fall of wages, would act not less foolishly. Our friend Weston does not deny that, under certain circumstances, the working men *can* enforce a rise of wages, but their amount being naturally fixed, there must follow a reaction. On the other hand, he knows also that the capitalists *can* enforce a fall of wages, and, indeed, continuously try to enforce it. According to the principle of the constancy of wages, a reaction ought to follow in this case not less than in the former. The working men, therefore, reacting against the attempt at, or the act of, lowering wages, would act rightly. They would, therefore, act rightly in enforcing a *rise of wages*, because every *reaction* against the lowering of wages is an *action* for raising wages. According to Citizen Weston's own principle of the *constancy of wages*, the working men ought, therefore, under certain circumstances, to combine and struggle for a rise of wages.

If he denies this conclusion, he must give up the premise

from which it flows. He must not say that the amount of wages is a *constant quantity*, but that, although it cannot and must not *rise*, it can and must *fall*, whenever capital pleases to lower it. If the capitalist pleases to feed you upon potatoes instead of upon meat, and upon oats instead of upon wheat, you must accept his will as a law of political economy, and submit to it. If in one country the rate of wages is higher than in another, in the United States, for example, than in England, you must explain this difference in the rate of wages by difference between the will of the American capitalist and the will of the English capitalist, a method which would certainly very much simplify, not only the study of economic phenomena, but of all other phenomena.

But even then, we might ask, *why* the will of the American capitalist differs from the will of the English capitalist? And to answer the question you must go beyond the domain of *will*. A parson may tell me that God wills one thing in France, and another thing in England. If I summon him to explain this duality of will, he might have the brass to answer me that God wills to have one will in France and another will in England. But our friend Weston is certainly the last man to make an argument of such a complete negation of all reasoning.

The *will* of the capitalist is certainly to take as much as possible. What we have to do is not to talk about his *will*, but to inquire into his *power*, the *limits of that power*, and the *character of those limits*.

II [PRODUCTION, WAGES, PROFITS]

The address Citizen Weston read to us might have been compressed into a nutshell.

All his reasoning amounted to this: If the working class forces the capitalist class to pay five shillings instead of four shillings in the shape of money wages, the capitalist will return in the shape of commodities four shillings' worth instead of five shillings' worth. The working class would have to pay five shillings for what, before the rise of wages, they bought with four shillings. But why is this the case? Why does the capitalist only return four shillings' worth for five shillings? Because the amount of wages is fixed. But why is it fixed at four shillings' worth of commodities? Why not at three, or two, or any other sum? If the limit of the amount of wages is settled by an economic law, independent alike of the will of the capitalist and the will of the working man, the first thing Citizen Weston had to do was to state that law and prove it. He ought then, moreover, to have

proved that the amount of wages actually paid at every given moment always corresponds exactly to the necessary amount of wages, and never deviates from it. If, on the other hand, the given limit of the amount of wages is founded on the *mere will* of the capitalist, or the limits of his avarice, it is an arbitrary limit. There is nothing necessary in it. It may be changed *by* the will of the capitalist, and may, therefore, be changed *against* his will.

Citizen Weston illustrated his theory by telling you that when a bowl contains a certain quantity of soup, to be eaten by a certain number of persons, an increase in the broadness of the spoons would not produce an increase in the amount of soup. He must allow me to find this illustration rather spoony. It reminded me somewhat of the simile employed by Menenius Agrippa. When the Roman plebeians struck against the Roman patricians, the patrician Agrippa told them that the patrician belly fed the plebeian members of the body politic. Agrippa failed to show that you feed the members of one man by filling the belly of another. Citizen Weston, on his part, has forgotten that the bowl from which the workmen eat is filled with the whole produce of the national labour, and that what prevents them fetching more out of it is neither the narrowness of the bowl nor the scantiness of its contents, but only the smallness of their spoons.

By what contrivance is the capitalist enabled to return four shillings' worth for five shillings? By raising the price of the commodity he sells. Now, does a rise and more generally a change in the prices of commodities, do the prices of commodities themselves, depend on the mere will of the capitalist? Or are, on the contrary, certain circumstances wanted to give effect to that will? If not, the ups and downs, the incessant fluctuations of market prices, become an insoluble riddle.

As we suppose that no change whatever has taken place either in the productive powers of labour, or in the amount of capital and labour employed, or in the value of the money wherein the values of products are estimated, but *only a change in the rate of wages*, how could that *rise of wages* affect the *prices of commodities*? Only by affecting the actual proportion between the demand for, and the supply of, these commodities.

It is perfectly true that, considered as a whole, the working class spends, and must spend, its income upon *necessaries*. A general rise in the rate of wages would, therefore, produce a rise in the demand for, and consequently in the *market prices of necessaries*. The capitalists who produce these necessaries would be compensated for the risen wages by the rising market prices

of their commodities. But how with the other capitalists, who do *not* produce necessaries? And you must not fancy them a small body. If you consider that two-thirds of the national produce are consumed by one-fifth of the population—a member of the House of Commons stated it recently to be but one-seventh of the population—you will understand what an immense proportion of the national produce must be produced in the shape of luxuries, or be *exchanged* for luxuries, and what an immense amount of the necessaries themselves must be wasted upon flunkies, horses, cats, and so forth, a waste we know from experience to become always much limited with the rising prices of necessaries.

Well, what would be the position of those capitalists who do *not* produce necessaries? For the *fall in the rate of profit*, consequent upon the general rise of wages, they could not compensate themselves by a *rise in the price of their commodities*, because the demand for those commodities would not have increased. Their income would have decreased, and from this decreased income they would have to pay more for the same amount of higher-priced necessaries. But this would not be all. As their income had diminished they would have less to spend upon luxuries, and therefore their mutual demand for their respective commodities would diminish. Consequent upon this diminished demand the prices of their commodities would fall. In these branches of industry, therefore, *the rate of profit would fall*, not only in simple proportion to the general rise in the rate of wages, but in the compound ratio of the general rise of wages, the rise in the prices of necessaries, and the fall in the prices of luxuries.

What would be the consequence of *this difference in the rates of profit* for capitals employed in the different branches of industry? Why, the consequence that generally obtains whenever, from whatever reason, the *average rate of profit* comes to differ in the different spheres of production. Capital and labour would be transferred from the less remunerative to the more remunerative branches; and this process of transfer would go on until the supply in the one department of industry would have risen proportionately to the increased demand, and would have sunk in the other departments according to the decreased demand. This change effected, the general rate of profit would again be *equalised* in the different branches. As the whole derangement originally arose from a mere change in the proportion of the demand for, and the supply of, different commodities, the cause ceasing, the effect would cease, and *prices* would return to their former level and equilibrium. Instead of being limited to some

branches of industry, *the fall in the rate of profit* consequent upon the rise of wages would have become general. According to our supposition, there would have taken place no change in the productive powers of labour, nor in the aggregate amount of production, but *that given amount of production would have changed its form*. A greater part of the produce would exist in the shape of necessaries, a lesser part in the shape of luxuries, or what comes to the same, a lesser part would be exchanged for foreign luxuries, and be consumed in its original form, or, what again comes to the same, a greater part of the native produce would be exchanged for foreign necessaries instead of for luxuries. The general rise in the rate of wages would, therefore, after a temporary disturbance of market prices, only result in a general fall of the rate of profit without any permanent change in the prices of commodities.

If I am told that in the previous argument I assume the whole surplus wages to be spent upon necessaries, I answer that I have made the supposition most advantageous to the opinion of Citizen Weston. If the surplus wages were spent upon articles formerly not entering into the consumption of the working men, the real increase of their purchasing power would need no proof. Being, however, only derived from an advance of wages, that increase of their purchasing power must exactly correspond to the decrease of the purchasing power of the capitalists. The *aggregate demand* for commodities would, therefore, not *increase*, but the constituent parts of that demand would *change*. The increasing demand on the one side would be counterbalanced by the decreasing demand on the other side. Thus the aggregate demand remaining stationary, no change whatever could take place in the market prices of commodities.

You arrive, therefore, at this dilemma: Either the surplus wages are equally spent upon all articles of consumption—then the expansion of demand on the part of the working class must be compensated by the contraction of demand on the part of the capitalist class—or the surplus wages are only spent upon some articles whose market prices will temporarily rise. Then the consequent rise in the rate of profit in some, and the consequent fall in the rate of profit in other branches of industry will produce a change in the distribution of capital and labour, going on until the supply is brought up to the increased demand in the one department of industry, and brought down to the diminished demand in the other departments of industry. On the one supposition there will occur no change in the prices of commodities. On the other supposition, after some fluctuations of market prices, the exchangeable values of commodities will sub-

side to the former level. On both suppositions the general rise in the rate of wages will ultimately result in nothing else but a general fall in the rate of profit.

To stir up your powers of imagination Citizen Weston requested you to think of the difficulties which a general rise of English agricultural wages from nine shillings to eighteen shillings would produce. Think, he exclaimed, of the immense rise in the demand for necessaries, and the consequent fearful rise in their prices! Now, all of you know that the average wages of the American agricultural labourer amount to more than double that of the English agricultural labourer, although the prices of agricultural produce are lower in the United States than in the United Kingdom, although the general relations of capital and labour obtain in the United States the same as in England, and although the annual amount of production is much smaller in the United States than in England. Why, then, does our friend ring this alarum bell? Simply to shift the real question before us. A sudden rise of wages from nine shillings to eighteen shillings would be a sudden rise to the amount of 100 per cent. Now, we are not at all discussing the question whether the general rate of wages in England could be suddenly increased by 100 per cent. We have nothing at all to do with the *magnitude* of the rise, which in every practical instance must depend on, and be suited to, given circumstances. We have only to inquire how a general rise in the rate of wages, even if restricted to one per cent., will act.

Dismissing friend Weston's fancy rise of 100 per cent., I propose calling your attention to the real rise of wages that took place in Great Britain from 1849 to 1859.

You are all aware of the Ten Hours' Bill, or rather Ten-and-a-Half Hours' Bill,⁵ introduced since 1848. This was one of the greatest economic changes we have witnessed. It was a sudden and compulsory rise of wages, not in some local trades, but in the leading industrial branches by which England sways the markets of the world. It was a rise of wages under circumstances singularly unpropitious. Dr. Ure, Professor Senior, and all the other official economical mouthpieces of the middle class, *proved*, and I must say upon much stronger grounds than those of our friend Weston, that it would sound the death-knell of English industry. They proved that it not only amounted to a simple rise of wages, but to a rise of wages initiated by, and based upon, a diminution of the quantity of labour employed. They asserted that the twelfth hour you wanted to take from the capitalist was exactly the only hour from which he derived his profit. They threatened a decrease of accumulation, rise of prices, loss

of markets, stinting of production, consequent reaction upon wages, ultimate ruin. In fact, they declared Maximilian Robespierre's Maximum Laws²⁴ to be a small affair compared to it; and they were right in a certain sense. Well, what was the result? A rise in the money wages of the factory operatives, despite the curtailing of the working day, a great increase in the number of factory hands employed, a continuous fall in the prices of their products, a marvellous development in the productive powers of their labour, an unheard-of progressive expansion of the markets for their commodities. In Manchester, at the meeting, in 1861, of the Society for the Advancement of Science, I myself heard Mr. Newman confess that he, Dr. Ure, Senior, and all other official propounders of economic science had been wrong, while the instinct of the people had been right. I mention Mr. W. Newman,²⁵ not Professor Francis Newman, because he occupies an eminent position in economic science, as the contributor to, and editor of, Mr. Thomas Tooke's *History of Prices*, that magnificent work which traces the history of prices from 1793 to 1856. If our friend Weston's fixed idea of a fixed amount of wages, a fixed amount of production, a fixed degree of the productive power of labour, a fixed and permanent will of the capitalists, and all his other fixedness and finality were correct, Professor Senior's woeful forebodings would have been right, and Robert Owen, who already in 1815 proclaimed a general limitation of the working day the first preparatory step to the emancipation of the working class²⁶ and actually in the teeth of the general prejudice inaugurated it on his own hook in his cotton factory at New Lanark, would have been wrong.

In the very same period during which the introduction of the Ten Hours' Bill, and the rise of wages consequent upon it, occurred, there took place in Great Britain, for reasons which it would be out of place to enumerate here, a *general rise in agricultural wages*.

Although it is not required for my immediate purpose, in order not to mislead you, I shall make some preliminary remarks.

If a man got two shillings weekly wages, and if his wages rose to four shillings, the *rate of wages* would have risen by 100 per cent. This would seem a very magnificent thing if expressed as a rise in the *rate of wages*, although the *actual amount of wages*, four shillings weekly, would still remain a wretchedly small, a starvation pittance. You must not, therefore, allow yourselves to be carried away by the high-sounding per cents in the *rate of wages*. You must always ask, What was the *original amount*?

Moreover, you will understand, that if there were ten men receiving each 2s. per week, five men receiving each 5s. and five men receiving 11s. weekly, the twenty men together would receive 100s., or £5, weekly. If then a rise, say by 20 per cent., upon the *aggregate* sum of their weekly wages took place, there would be an advance from £5 to £6. Taking the average, we might say that the *general rate of wages* had risen by 20 per cent., although, in fact, the wages of the ten men had remained stationary, the wages of the one lot of five men had risen from 5s. to 6s. only, and the wages of the other lot of five men from 55s. to 70s. One-half of the men would not have improved at all their position, one-quarter would have improved it in an imperceptible degree, and only one-quarter would have bettered it really. Still, reckoning by the *average*, the total amount of the wages of those twenty men would have increased by 20 per cent., and as far as the aggregate capital that employs them, and the prices of the commodities they produce, are concerned, it would be exactly the same as if all of them had equally shared in the average rise of wages. In the case of agricultural labour, the standard wages being very different in the different counties of England and Scotland, the rise affected them very unequally.

Lastly, during the period when that rise of wages took place counteracting influences were at work, such as the new taxes consequent upon the Russian war,²⁷ the extensive demolition of the dwelling-houses of the agricultural labourers,²⁸ and so forth.

Having premised so much, I proceed to state that from 1849 to 1859 there took place a *rise of about 40 per cent.* in the average rate of the agricultural wages of Great Britain. I could give you ample details in proof of my assertion, but for the present purpose think it sufficient to refer you to the conscientious and critical paper read in 1859 by the late Mr. John C. Morton at the London Society of Arts²⁹ on *The Forces Used in Agriculture*. Mr. Morton gives the returns, from bills and other authentic documents, which he had collected from about one hundred farmers, residing in twelve Scotch and thirty-five English counties.

According to our friend Weston's opinion, and taken together with the simultaneous rise in the wages of the factory operatives, there ought to have occurred a tremendous rise in the prices of agricultural produce during the period 1849 to 1859. But what is the fact? Despite the Russian war, and the consecutive unfavourable harvests from 1854 to 1856, the average price of wheat, which is the leading agricultural produce of England, fell from about £3 per quarter for the years 1838 to 1848 to about £2 10s. per quarter for the years 1849 to 1859. This constitutes a fall in

the price of wheat of more than 16 per cent. simultaneously with an average rise of agricultural wages of 40 per cent. During the same period, if we compare its end with its beginning, 1859 with 1849, there was a decrease of official pauperism from 934,419 to 860,470, the difference being 73,949; a very small decrease, I grant, and which in the following years was again lost, but still a decrease.

It might be said that, consequent upon the abolition of the Corn Laws,³⁰ the import of foreign corn was more than doubled during the period from 1849 to 1859, as compared with the period from 1838 to 1848. And what of that? From Citizen Weston's standpoint one would have expected that this sudden, immense, and continuously increasing demand upon foreign markets must have sent up the prices of agricultural produce there to a frightful height, the effect of increased demand remaining the same, whether it comes from without or from within. What was the fact? Apart from some years of failing harvests, during all that period the ruinous fall in the price of corn formed a standing theme of declamation in France; the Americans were again and again compelled to burn their surplus of produce; and Russia, if we are to believe Mr. Urquhart, prompted the Civil War in the United States⁴ because her agricultural exports were crippled by the Yankee competition in the markets of Europe.

Reduced to its abstract form, Citizen Weston's argument would come to this: Every rise in demand occurs always on the basis of a given amount of production. It can, therefore, *never increase the supply of the articles demanded, but can only enhance their money prices*. Now the most common observation shows that an increased demand will, in some instances, leave the market prices of commodities altogether unchanged, and will, in other instances, cause a temporary rise of market prices followed by an increased supply, followed by a reduction of the prices to their original level, and in many cases *below* their original level. Whether the rise of demand springs from surplus wages, or from any other cause, does not at all change the conditions of the problem. From Citizen Weston's standpoint the general phenomenon was as difficult to explain as the phenomenon occurring under the exceptional circumstances of a rise of wages. His argument had, therefore, no peculiar bearing whatever upon the subject we treat. It only expressed his perplexity at accounting for the laws by which an increase of demand produces an increase of supply, instead of an ultimate rise of market prices.

III [WAGES AND CURRENCY]

On the second day of the debate our friend Weston clothed his old assertions in new forms. He said: Consequent upon a general rise in money wages, more currency will be wanted to pay the same wages. The currency being *fixed*, how can you pay with this fixed currency increased money wages? First the difficulty arose from the fixed amount of commodities accruing to the working man, despite his increase of money wages; now it arises from the increased money wages, despite the fixed amount of commodities. Of course, if you reject his original dogma, his secondary grievance will disappear.

However, I shall show that this currency question has nothing at all to do with the subject before us.

In your country the mechanism of payments is much more perfected than in any other country of Europe. Thanks to the extent and concentration of the banking system, much less currency is wanted to circulate the same amount of values, and to transact the same or a greater amount of business. For example, as far as wages are concerned, the English factory operative pays his wages weekly to the shopkeeper, who sends them weekly to the banker, who returns them weekly to the manufacturer, who again pays them away to his working men, and so forth. By this contrivance the yearly wages of an operative, say of £52, may be paid by one single sovereign turning round every week in the same circle. Even in England the mechanism is less perfect than in Scotland, and is not everywhere equally perfect; and therefore we find, for example, that in some agricultural districts, as compared with the mere factory districts, much more currency is wanted to circulate a much smaller amount of values.

If you cross the Channel, you will find that the *money wages* are much lower than in England, but that they are circulated in Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and France by a *much larger amount of currency*. The same sovereign will not be so quickly intercepted by the banker or returned to the industrial capitalist; and, therefore, instead of one sovereign circulating £52 yearly, you want, perhaps, three sovereigns to circulate yearly wages to the amount of £25. Thus, by comparing continental countries with England, you will see at once that low money wages may require a much larger currency for their circulation than high money wages, and that this is, in fact, a merely technical point, quite foreign to our subject.

According to the best calculations I know, the yearly income of the working class of this country may be estimated at

£250,000,000. This immense sum is circulated by about £3,000,000. Suppose a rise of wages of 50 per cent. to take place. Then, instead of £3,000,000 of currency, £4,500,000 would be wanted. As a very considerable part of the working man's daily expenses is laid out in silver and copper, that is to say, in mere tokens, whose relative value to gold is arbitrarily fixed by law, like that of inconvertible money paper, a rise of money wages by 50 per cent. would, in the extreme case, require an additional circulation of sovereigns, say to the amount of one million. One million, now dormant, in the shape of bullion or coin, in the cellars of the Bank of England, or of private bankers, would circulate. But even the trifling expense resulting from the additional minting or the additional wear and tear of that million might be spared, and would actually be spared, if any friction should arise from the want of the additional currency. All of you know that the currency of this country is divided into two great departments. One sort, supplied by bank-notes of different descriptions, is used in the transactions between dealers and dealers, and the larger payments from consumers to dealers, while another sort of currency, metallic coin, circulates in the retail trade. Although distinct, these two sorts of currency interwork with each other. Thus gold coin, to a very great extent, circulates even in larger payments for all the odd sums under £5. If tomorrow £4 notes, or £3 notes, or £2 notes were issued, the gold filling these channels of circulation would at once be driven out of them, and flow into those channels where it would be needed from the increase of money wages. Thus the additional million required by an advance of wages by 50 per cent. would be supplied without the addition of one single sovereign. The same effect might be produced, without one additional bank-note, by an additional bill circulation, as was the case in Lancashire for a very considerable time.

If a general rise in the rate of wages, for example, of 100 per cent., as Citizen Weston supposed it to take place in agricultural wages, would produce a great rise in the prices of necessaries, and, according to his views, require an additional amount of currency not to be procured, *a general fall in wages* must produce the same effect, on the same scale, in an opposite direction. Well! All of you know that the years 1858 to 1860 were the most prosperous years for the cotton industry, and that peculiarly the year 1860 stands in that respect unrivalled in the annals of commerce, while at the same time all other branches of industry were most flourishing. The wages of the cotton operatives and of all the other working men connected with their trade stood, in 1860, higher than ever before. The American

crisis came, and those aggregate wages were suddenly reduced to about one-fourth of their former amount. This would have been in the opposite direction a rise of 300 per cent. If wages rise from five to twenty, we say that they rise by 300 per cent.; if they fall from twenty to five, we say that they fall by 75 per cent., but the amount of rise in the one and the amount of fall in the other case would be the same, namely, fifteen shillings. This, then, was a sudden change in the rate of wages unprecedented, and at the same time extending over a number of operatives which, if we count all the operatives not only directly engaged in but indirectly dependent upon the cotton trade, was larger by one-half than the number of agricultural labourers. Did the price of wheat fall? It rose from the annual average of 47s. 8d. per quarter during the three years of 1858-60 to the annual average of 55s. 10d. per quarter during the three years 1861-63. As to the currency, there were coined in the mint in 1861 £8,673,232, against £3,378,102 in 1860. That is to say, there were coined £5,295,130 more in 1861 than in 1860. It is true the bank-note circulation was in 1861 less by £1,319,000 than in 1860. Take this off. There remains still an overplus of currency for the year 1861, as compared with the prosperity year, 1860, to the amount of £3,976,130, or about £4,000,000; but the bullion reserve in the Bank of England had simultaneously decreased, not quite to the same, but in an approximating proportion.

Compare the year 1862 with 1842. Apart from the immense increase in the value and amount of commodities circulated, in 1862 the capital paid in regular transactions for shares, loans, etc., for the railways in England and Wales amounted alone to £320,000,000, a sum that would have appeared fabulous in 1842. Still, the aggregate amounts in currency in 1862 and 1842 were pretty nearly equal, and generally you will find a tendency to a progressive diminution of currency in the face of an enormously increasing value, not only of commodities, but of monetary transactions generally. From our friend Weston's standpoint this is an unsolvable riddle.

Looking somewhat deeper into this matter, he would have found that, quite apart from wages, and supposing them to be fixed, the value and mass of the commodities to be circulated, and generally the amount of monetary transactions to be settled, vary daily; that the amount of bank-notes issued varies daily; that the amount of payments realised without the intervention of any money, by the instrumentality of bills, checks, book-credits, clearing houses, varies daily; that, as far as actual metallic currency is required, the proportion between the coin in

circulation and the coin and bullion in reserve or sleeping in the cellars of banks varies daily; that the amount of bullion absorbed by the national circulation and the amount being sent abroad for international circulation vary daily. He would have found that his dogma of a fixed currency is a monstrous error, incompatible with the everyday movement. He would have inquired into the laws which enable a currency to adapt itself to circumstances so continually changing, instead of turning his misconception of the laws of currency into an argument against a rise of wages.

IV [SUPPLY AND DEMAND]

Our friend Weston accepts the Latin proverb that *repetitio est mater studiorum*, that is to say, that repetition is the mother of study, and consequently he repeated his original dogma again under the new form that the contraction of currency, resulting from an enhancement of wages, would produce a diminution of capital, and so forth. Having already dealt with his currency crotchet, I consider it quite useless to enter upon the imaginary consequences he fancies to flow from his imaginary currency mishap. I shall proceed to at once reduce his *one and the same dogma*, repeated in so many different shapes, to its simplest theoretical form.

The uncritical way in which he has treated his subject will become evident from one single remark. He pleads against a rise of wages or against high wages as the result of such a rise. Now, I ask him, What are high wages and what are low wages? Why constitute, for example, five shillings weekly low, and twenty shillings weekly high wages? If five is low as compared with twenty, twenty is still lower as compared with two hundred. If a man was to lecture on the thermometer, and commenced by declaiming on high and low degrees, he would impart no knowledge whatever. He must first tell me how the freezing-point is found out, and how the boiling-point, and how these standard points are settled by natural laws, not by the fancy of the sellers or makers of thermometers. Now, in regard to wages and profits, Citizen Weston has not only failed to deduce such standard points from economical laws, but he has not even felt the necessity to look after them. He satisfied himself with the acceptance of the popular slang terms of low and high as something having a fixed meaning, although it is self-evident that wages can only be said to be high or low as compared with a standard by which to measure their magnitudes.

He will be unable to tell me why a certain amount of money is given for a certain amount of labour. If he should answer me, "This was settled by the law of supply and demand," I should ask him, in the first instance, by what law supply and demand are themselves regulated. And such an answer would at once put him out of court. The relations between the supply and demand of labour undergo perpetual change, and with them the market prices of labour. If the demand overshoots the supply wages rise; if the supply overshoots the demand wages sink, although it might in such circumstances be necessary to *test* the real state of demand and supply by a strike, for example, or any other method. But if you accept supply and demand as the law regulating wages, it would be as childish as useless to declaim against a rise of wages, because, according to the supreme law you appeal to, a periodical rise of wages is quite as necessary and legitimate as a periodical fall of wages. If you do *not* accept supply and demand as the law regulating wages, I again repeat the question, why a certain amount of money is given for a certain amount of labour?

But to consider matters more broadly: You would be altogether mistaken in fancying that the value of labour or any other commodity whatever is ultimately fixed by supply and demand. Supply and demand regulate nothing but the temporary *fluctuations* of market prices. They will explain to you why the market price of a commodity rises above or sinks below its *value*, but they can never account for that *value* itself. Suppose supply and demand to equilibrate, or, as the economists call it, to cover each other. Why, the very moment these opposite forces become equal they paralyse each other, and cease to work in the one or the other direction. At the moment when supply and demand equilibrate each other, and therefore cease to act, the *market* price of a commodity coincides with its *real value*, with the standard price round which its market prices oscillate. In inquiring into the nature of that *value*, we have, therefore, nothing at all to do with the temporary effects on market prices of supply and demand. The same holds true of wages and of the prices of all other commodities.

V [WAGES AND PRICES]

Reduced to their simplest theoretical expression, all our friend's arguments resolve themselves into this one single dogma: "*The prices of commodities are determined or regulated by wages.*"

I might appeal to practical observation to bear witness against

this antiquated and exploded fallacy. I might tell you that the English factory operatives, miners, shipbuilders, and so forth, whose labour is relatively high-priced, undersell by the cheapness of their produce all other nations; while the English agricultural labourer, for example, whose labour is relatively low-priced, is undersold by almost every other nation because of the dearness of his produce. By comparing article with article in the same country, and the commodities of different countries, I might show, apart from some exceptions more apparent than real, that on an average the high-priced labour produces the low-priced, and the low-priced labour produces the high-priced commodities. This, of course, would not prove that the high price of labour in the one, and its low price in the other instance, are the respective causes of those diametrically opposed effects, but at all events it would prove that the prices of commodities are not ruled by the prices of labour. However, it is quite superfluous for us to employ this empirical method.

It might, perhaps, be denied that Citizen Weston has put forward the dogma: "*The prices of commodities are determined or regulated by wages.*" In point of fact, he has never formulated it. He said, on the contrary, that profit and rent form also constituent parts of the prices of commodities, because it is out of the prices of commodities that not only the working man's wages, but also the capitalist's profits and the landlord's rents must be paid. But how, in his idea, are prices formed? First by wages. Then an additional percentage is joined to the price on behalf of the capitalist, and another additional percentage on behalf of the landlord. Suppose the wages of the labour employed in the production of a commodity to be ten. If the rate of profit was 100 per cent., to the wages advanced the capitalist would add ten, and if the rate of rent was also 100 per cent. upon the wages, there would be added ten more, and the aggregate price of the commodity would amount to thirty. But such a determination of prices would be simply their determination by wages. If wages in the above case rose to twenty, the price of the commodity would rise to sixty, and so forth. Consequently all the superannuated writers on political economy who propounded the dogma that wages regulate prices, have tried to prove it by treating profit and rent *as mere additional percentages upon wages*. None of them were, of course, able to reduce the limits of those percentages to any economic law. They seem, on the contrary, to think profits settled by tradition, custom, the will of the capitalist, or by some other equally arbitrary and inexplicable method. If they

assert that they are settled by the competition between the capitalists, they say nothing. That competition is sure to equalise the different rates of profit in different trades, or reduce them to one average level, but it can never determine the level itself, or the general rate of profit.

What do we mean by saying that the prices of the commodities are determined by wages? Wages being but a name for the price of labour, we mean that the prices of commodities are regulated by the price of labour. As "*price*" is exchangeable value—and in speaking of value I speak always of exchangeable value—is exchangeable *value expressed in money*, the proposition comes to this, that "*the value of commodities is determined by the value of labour,*" or that "*the value of labour is the general measure of value.*"

But how, then, is the "*value of labour*" itself determined? Here we come to a standstill. Of course, to a standstill if we try reasoning logically. Yet the propounders of that doctrine make short work of logical scruples. Take our friend Weston, for example. First he told us that wages regulate the price of commodities and that consequently when wages rise prices must rise. Then he turned round to shew us that a rise of wages will be no good because the prices of commodities had risen, and because wages were indeed measured by the prices of the commodities upon which they are spent. Thus we begin by saying that the value of labour determines the value of commodities, and we wind up by saying that the value of commodities determines the value of labour. Thus we move to and fro in the most vicious circle, and arrive at no conclusion at all.

On the whole it is evident that by making the value of one commodity, say labour, corn, or any other commodity, the general measure and regulator of value, we only shift the difficulty, since we determine one value by another, which on its side wants to be determined.

The dogma that "wages determine the prices of commodities," expressed in its most abstract terms, comes to this, that "value is determined by value," and this tautology means that, in fact, we know nothing at all about value. Accepting this premise, all reasoning about the general laws of political economy turns into mere twaddle. It was, therefore, the great merit of Ricardo that in his work on *The Principles of Political Economy*, published in 1817, he fundamentally destroyed the old, popular, and worn-out fallacy that "wages determine prices," a fallacy which Adam Smith and his French predecessors had spurned in the really scientific parts of their researches, but which they reproduced in their more exoterical and vulgarising chapters.

VI [VALUE AND LABOUR]

Citizens, I have now arrived at a point where I must enter upon the real development of the question. I cannot promise to do this in a very satisfactory way, because to do so I should be obliged to go over the whole field of political economy. I can, as the French would say, but *effleurer la question*, touch upon the main points.

The first question we have to put is: What is the *value* of a commodity? How is it determined?

At first sight it would seem that the value of a commodity is a thing quite *relative*, and not to be settled without considering one commodity in its relations to all other commodities. In fact, in speaking of the value, the value in exchange of a commodity, we mean the proportional quantities in which it exchanges with all other commodities. But then arises the question: How are the proportions in which commodities exchange with each other regulated?

We know from experience that these proportions vary infinitely. Taking one single commodity, wheat, for instance, we shall find that a quarter of wheat exchanges in almost countless variations of proportion with different commodities. Yet, *its value remaining always the same*, whether expressed in silk, gold, or any other commodity, it must be something distinct from, and independent of, these *different rates of exchange* with different articles. It must be possible to express, in a very different form, these various equations with various commodities.

Besides, if I say a quarter of wheat exchanges with iron in a certain proportion, or the value of a quarter of wheat is expressed in a certain amount of iron, I say that the value of wheat and its equivalent in iron are equal to *some third thing*, which is neither wheat nor iron, because I suppose them to express the same magnitude in two different shapes. Either of them, the wheat or the iron, must, therefore, independently of the other, be reducible to this third thing which is their common measure.

To elucidate this point I shall recur to a very simple geometrical illustration. In comparing the areas of triangles of all possible forms and magnitudes, or comparing triangles with rectangles, or any other rectilinear figure, how do we proceed? We reduce the area of any triangle whatever to an expression quite different from its visible form. Having found from the nature of the triangle that its area is equal to half the product of its base by its height, we can then compare the different values of all sorts of triangles, and of all rectilinear figures whatever, because

all of them may be resolved into a certain number of triangles.

The same mode of procedure must obtain with the values of commodities. We must be able to reduce all of them to an expression common to all, distinguishing them only by the proportions in which they contain that identical measure.

As the *exchangeable values* of commodities are only *social functions* of those things, and have nothing at all to do with their *natural* qualities, we must first ask, What is the common *social substance* of all commodities? It is *Labour*. To produce a commodity a certain amount of labour must be bestowed upon it, or worked up in it. And I say not only *Labour*, but *social Labour*. A man who produces an article for his own immediate use, to consume it himself, creates a *product*, but not a *commodity*. As a self-sustaining producer he has nothing to do with society. But to produce a *commodity*, a man must not only produce an article satisfying some *social* want, but his labour itself must form part and parcel of the total sum of labour expended by society. It must be subordinate to the *Division of Labour within Society*. It is nothing without the other divisions of labour, and on its part is required to *integrate* them.

If we consider *commodities as values*, we consider them exclusively under the single aspect of *realised, fixed*, or, if you like, *crystallised social labour*. In this respect they can *differ* only by representing greater or smaller quantities of labour, as, for example, a greater amount of labour may be worked up in a silken handkerchief than in a brick. But how does one measure *quantities of labour*? By the *time the labour lasts*, in measuring the labour by the hour, the day, etc. Of course, to apply this measure, all sorts of labour are reduced to average or simple labour as their unit.

We arrive, therefore, at this conclusion. A commodity has a *value*, because it is a *crystallisation of social labour*. The *greatness* of its value, of its *relative* value, depends upon the greater or less amount of that social substance contained in it; that is to say, on the relative mass of labour necessary for its production. The *relative values of commodities* are, therefore, determined by the *respective quantities or amounts of labour, worked up, realised, fixed in them*. The *correlative* quantities of commodities which can be produced in the *same time of labour* are *equal*. Or the value of one commodity is to the value of another commodity as the quantity of labour fixed in the one is to the quantity of labour fixed in the other.

I suspect that many of you will ask, Does then, indeed, there exist such a vast, or any difference whatever, between determining the values of commodities by *wages*, and determining them

by the *relative quantities of labour* necessary for their production? You must, however, be aware that the *reward* for labour, and *quantity* of labour, are quite disparate things. Suppose, for example, *equal quantities of labour* to be fixed in one quarter of wheat and one ounce of gold. I resort to the example because it was used by Benjamin Franklin in his first Essay published in 1729, and entitled, *A Modest Enquiry into the Nature and Necessity of a Paper Currency*, where he, one of the first, hit upon the true nature of value. Well. We suppose, then, that one quarter of wheat and one ounce of gold are *equal values* or *equivalents*, because they are *crystallisations of equal amounts of average labour*, of so many days' or so many weeks' labour respectively fixed in them. In thus determining the relative values of gold and corn, do we refer in any way whatever to the *wages* of the agricultural labourer and the miner? Not a bit. We leave it quite *indeterminate how* their day's or week's labour was paid, or even whether wages labour was employed at all. If it was, wages may have been very unequal. The labourer whose labour is realised in the quarter of wheat may receive two bushels only, and the labourer employed in mining may receive one-half of the ounce of gold. Or, supposing their wages to be equal, they may deviate in all possible proportions from the values of the commodities produced by them. They may amount to one-half, one-third, one-fourth, one-fifth, or any other proportional part of the one quarter of corn or the one ounce of gold. Their *wages* can, of course, not *exceed*, not be *more* than the values of the commodities they produced, but they can be *less* in every possible degree. Their *wages* will be *limited* by the *values* of the products, but the *values of their products* will not be limited by the wages. And above all, the values, the relative values of corn and gold, for example, will have been settled without any regard whatever to the value of the labour employed, that is to say, to *wages*. To determine the values of commodities by the *relative quantities of labour fixed in them*, is, therefore, a thing quite different from the tautological method of determining the values of commodities by the value of labour, or by *wages*. This point, however, will be further elucidated in the progress of our inquiry.

In calculating the exchangeable value of a commodity we must add to the quantity of labour *last* employed the quantity of labour *previously* worked up in the raw material of the commodity, and the labour bestowed on the implements, tools, machinery, and buildings, with which such labour is assisted. For example, the value of a certain amount of cotton-yarn is the crystallisation of the quantity of labour added to the cotton

during the spinning process, the quantity of labour previously realised in the cotton itself, the quantity of labour realised in the coal, oil, and other auxiliary substances used, the quantity of labour fixed in the steam engine, the spindles, the factory building, and so forth. Instruments of production properly so-called, such as tools, machinery, buildings, serve again and again for a longer or shorter period during repeated processes of production. If they were used up at once, like the raw material, their whole value would at once be transferred to the commodities they assist in producing. But as a spindle, for example, is but gradually used up, an average calculation is made, based upon the average time it lasts, and its average waste of wear and tear during a certain period, say a day. In this way we calculate how much of the value of the spindle is transferred to the yarn daily spun, and how much, therefore, of the total amount of labour realised in a pound of yarn, for example, is due to the quantity of labour previously realised in the spindle. For our present purpose it is not necessary to dwell any longer upon this point.

It might seem that if the value of a commodity is determined by the *quantity of labour bestowed upon its production*, the lazier a man, or the clumsier a man, the more valuable his commodity, because the greater the time of labour required for finishing the commodity. This, however, would be a sad mistake. You will recollect that I used the word "*Social labour*," and many points are involved in this qualification of "*Social*." In saying that the value of a commodity is determined by the *quantity of labour worked up or crystallised in it*, we mean *the quantity of labour necessary* for its production in a given state of society, under certain social average conditions of production, with a given social average intensity, and average skill of the labour employed. When, in England, the power-loom came to compete with the hand-loom, only one half of the former time of labour was wanted to convert a given amount of yarn into a yard of cotton or cloth. The poor hand-loom weaver now worked seventeen or eighteen hours daily, instead of the nine or ten hours he had worked before. Still the product of twenty hours of his labour represented now only ten social hours of labour, or ten hours of labour socially necessary for the conversion of a certain amount of yarn into textile stuffs. His product of twenty hours had, therefore, no more value than his former product of ten hours.

If then the quantity of socially necessary labour realised in commodities regulates their exchangeable values, every increase in the quantity of labour wanted for the production of a com-

modity must augment its value, as every diminution must lower it.

If the respective quantities of labour necessary for the production of the respective commodities remained constant, their relative values also would be constant. But such is not the case. The quantity of labour necessary for the production of a commodity changes continuously with the changes in the productive powers of the labour employed. The greater the productive powers of labour, the more produce is finished in a given time of labour: and the smaller the productive powers of labour, the less produce is finished in the same time. If, for example, in the progress of population it should become necessary to cultivate less fertile soils, the same amount of produce would be only attainable by a greater amount of labour spent, and the value of agricultural produce would consequently rise. On the other hand, if with the modern means of production, a single spinner converts into yarn, during one working day, many thousand times the amount of cotton which he could have spun during the same time with the spinning wheel, it is evident that every single pound of cotton will absorb many thousand times less of spinning labour than it did before, and, consequently, the value added by spinning to every single pound of cotton will be a thousand times less than before. The value of yarn will sink accordingly.

Apart from the different natural energies and acquired working abilities of different peoples, the productive powers of labour must principally depend:

Firstly. Upon the *natural* conditions of labour, such as fertility of soil, mines, and so forth;

Secondly. Upon the progressive improvement of the *Social Powers of Labour*, such as are derived from production on a grand scale, concentration of capital and combination of labour, subdivision of labour, machinery, improved methods, appliance of chemical and other natural agencies, shortening of time and space by means of communication and transport, and every other contrivance by which science presses natural agencies into the service of labour, and by which the social or co-operative character of labour is developed. The greater the productive powers of labour, the less labour is bestowed upon a given amount of produce; hence the smaller the value of this produce. The smaller the productive powers of labour, the more labour is bestowed upon the same amount of produce; hence the greater its value. As a general law we may, therefore, set it down that:—

The values of commodities are directly as the times of labour employed in their production, and are inversely as the productive powers of the labour employed.

Having till now only spoken of *Value*, I shall add a few words about *Price*, which is a peculiar form assumed by value.

Price, taken by itself, is nothing but the *monetary expression of value*. The values of all commodities of this country, for example, are expressed in gold prices, while on the Continent they are mainly expressed in silver prices. The value of gold or silver, like that of all other commodities, is regulated by the quantity of labour necessary for getting them. You exchange a certain amount of your national products, in which a certain amount of your national labour is crystallised, for the produce of the gold and silver producing countries, in which a certain quantity of *their* labour is crystallised. It is in this way, in fact by barter, that you learn to express in gold and silver the values of all commodities, that is, the respective quantities of labour bestowed upon them. Looking somewhat closer into the *monetary expression of value*, or what comes to the same, the conversion of value into price, you will find that it is a process by which you give to the *values* of all commodities an *independent and homogeneous form*, or by which you express them as quantities of equal social labour. So far as it is but the monetary expression of value, price has been called *natural price* by Adam Smith, "*prix nécessaire*" by the French physiocrats.

What then is the relation between *value* and *market prices*, or between *natural prices* and *market prices*? You all know that the *market price* is the same for all commodities of the same kind, however the conditions of production may differ for the individual producers. The market price expresses only the *average amount of social labour* necessary, under the average conditions of production, to supply the market with a certain mass of a certain article. It is calculated upon the whole lot of a commodity of a certain description.

So far the *market price* of a commodity coincides with its *value*. On the other hand, the oscillations of market prices, rising now over, sinking now under the value or natural price, depend upon the fluctuations of supply and demand. The deviations of market prices from values are continual, but as Adam Smith says:

"The natural price . . . is the central price, to which the prices of all commodities are continually gravitating. Different accidents may sometimes keep them suspended a good deal above it, and sometimes force them down even somewhat below it. But whatever may be the obstacles which hinder them from settling in this centre of repose and continuance they are constantly tending towards it."³¹

I cannot now sift this matter. It suffices to say that *if* supply and demand equilibrate each other, the market prices of com-

modities will correspond with their natural prices, that is to say, with their values, as determined by the respective quantities of labour required for their production. But supply and demand *must* constantly tend to equilibrate each other, although they do so only by compensating one fluctuation by another, a rise by a fall, and *vice versa*. If instead of considering only the daily fluctuations you analyse the movement of market prices for longer periods, as Mr. Tooke, for example, has done in his *History of Prices*, you will find that the fluctuations of market prices, their deviations from values, their ups and downs, paralyse and compensate each other; so that, apart from the effect of monopolies and some other modifications I must now pass by, all descriptions of commodities are, on the average, sold at their respective *values* or natural prices. The average periods during which the fluctuations of market prices compensate each other are different for different kinds of commodities, because with one kind it is easier to adapt supply to demand than with the other.

If then, speaking broadly, and embracing somewhat longer periods, all descriptions of commodities sell at their respective values, it is nonsense to suppose that profit, not in individual cases, but that the constant and usual profits of different trades spring from *surcharging* the prices of commodities, or selling them at a price over and above their *value*. The absurdity of this notion becomes evident if it is generalised. What a man would constantly win as a seller he would as constantly lose as a purchaser. It would not do to say that there are men who are buyers without being sellers, or consumers without being producers. What these people pay to the producers, they must first get from them for nothing. If a man first takes your money and afterwards returns that money in buying your commodities, you will never enrich yourselves by selling your commodities too dear to that same man. This sort of transaction might diminish a loss, but would never help in realising a profit.

To explain, therefore, the *general nature of profits*, you must start from the theorem that, on an average, commodities are *sold at their real value*, and that *profits are derived from selling them at their values*, that is, in proportion to the quantity of labour realised in them. If you cannot explain profit upon this supposition, you cannot explain it at all. This seems paradox and contrary to everyday observation. It is also paradox that the earth moves round the sun, and that water consists of two highly inflammable gases. Scientific truth is always paradox, if judged by everyday experience, which catches only the delusive appearance of things.

VII LABOURING POWER

Having now, as far as it could be done in such a cursory manner, analysed the nature of *Value*, of the *Value of any commodity whatever*, we must turn our attention to the specific *Value of Labour*. And here, again, I must startle you by a seeming paradox. All of you feel sure that what they daily sell is their Labour; that, therefore, Labour has a Price, and that, the price of a commodity being only the monetary expression of its value, there must certainly exist such a thing as the *Value of Labour*. However, there exists no such thing as the *Value of Labour* in the common acceptance of the word. We have seen that the amount of necessary labour crystallised in a commodity constitutes its value. Now, applying this notion of value, how could we define, say, the value of a ten hours' working day? How much labour is contained in that day? Ten hours' labour. To say that the value of a ten hours' working day is equal to ten hours' labour, or the quantity of labour contained in it, would be a tautological and, moreover, a nonsensical expression. Of course, having once found out the true but hidden sense of the expression "*Value of Labour*," we shall be able to interpret this irrational, and seemingly impossible application of value, in the same way that, having once made sure of the real movement of the celestial bodies, we shall be able to explain their apparent or merely phenomenal movements.

What the working man sells is not directly his *Labour*, but his *Labouring Power*, the temporary disposal of which he makes over to the capitalist. This is so much the case that I do not know whether by the English laws, but certainly by some Continental Laws, the *maximum time* is fixed for which a man is allowed to sell his labouring power. If allowed to do so for any indefinite period whatever, slavery would be immediately restored. Such a sale, if it comprised his lifetime, for example, would make him at once the lifelong slave of his employer.

One of the oldest economists and most original philosophers of England—Thomas Hobbes—has already, in his *Leviathan*, instinctively hit upon this point overlooked by all his successors. He says:

"The value or worth of a man is, as in all other things, his price: that is, so much as would be given for the *Use of his Power*."

Proceeding from this basis, we shall be able to determine the *Value of Labour* as that of all other commodities.

But before doing so, we might ask, how does this strange phenomenon arise, that we find on the market a set of buyers,

possessed of land, machinery, raw material, and the means of subsistence, all of them, save land in its crude state, the *products of labour*, and on the other hand, a set of sellers who have nothing to sell except their labouring power, their working arms and brains? That the one set buys continually in order to make a profit and enrich themselves, while the other set continually sells in order to earn their livelihood? The inquiry into this question would be an inquiry into what the economists call "*Previous, or Original Accumulation*," but which ought to be called *Original Expropriation*. We should find that this so-called *Original Accumulation* means nothing but a series of historical processes, resulting in a *Decomposition of the Original Union* existing between the Labouring Man and his Instruments of Labour. Such an inquiry, however, lies beyond the pale of my present subject. The *Separation* between the Man of Labour and the Instruments of Labour once established, such a state of things will maintain itself and reproduce itself upon a constantly increasing scale, until a new and fundamental revolution in the mode of production should again overturn it, and restore the original union in a new historical form.

What, then, is the *Value of Labouring Power*?

Like that of every other commodity, its value is determined by the quantity of labour necessary to produce it. The labouring power of a man exists only in his living individuality. A certain mass of necessaries must be consumed by a man to grow up and maintain his life. But the man, like the machine, will wear out, and must be replaced by another man. Beside the mass of necessaries required for *his own* maintenance, he wants another amount of necessaries to bring up a certain quota of children that are to replace him on the labour market and to perpetuate the race of labourers. Moreover, to develop his labouring power, and acquire a given skill, another amount of values must be spent. For our purpose it suffices to consider only *average* labour, the costs of whose education and development are vanishing magnitudes. Still I must seize upon this occasion to state that, as the costs of producing labouring powers of different quality differ, so must differ the values of the labouring powers employed in different trades. The cry for an *equality of wages* rests, therefore, upon a mistake, is an *insane* wish never to be fulfilled. It is an offspring of that false and superficial radicalism that accepts premises and tries to evade conclusions. Upon the basis of the wages system the value of labouring power is settled like that of every other commodity; and as different kinds of labouring power have different values, or require different quantities of labour for their production, they *must* fetch

different prices in the labour market. To clamour for *equal or even equitable retribution* on the basis of the wages system is the same as to clamour for *freedom* on the basis of the slavery system. What you think just or equitable is out of the question. The question is: What is necessary and unavoidable with a given system of production?

After what has been said, it will be seen that the *value of labouring power* is determined by the *value of the necessaries* required to produce, develop, maintain, and perpetuate the labouring power.

VIII PRODUCTION OF SURPLUS VALUE

Now suppose that the average amount of the daily necessaries of a labouring man require *six hours of average labour* for their production. Suppose, moreover, six hours of average labour to be also realised in a quantity of gold equal to 3s. Then 3s. would be the *Price*, or the monetary expression of the *Daily Value* of that man's *Labouring Power*. If he worked daily six hours he would daily produce a value sufficient to buy the average amount of his daily necessaries, or to maintain himself as a labouring man.

But our man is a wages labourer. He must, therefore, sell his labouring power to a capitalist. If he sells it at 3s. daily, or 18s. weekly, he sells it at its value. Suppose him to be a spinner. If he works six hours daily he will add to the cotton a value of 3s. daily. This value, daily added by him, would be an exact equivalent for the wages, or the price of his labouring power, received daily. But in that case *no surplus value* or *surplus produce* whatever would go to the capitalist. Here, then, we come to the rub.

In buying the labouring power of the workman, and paying its value, the capitalist, like every other purchaser, has acquired the right to consume or use the commodity bought. You consume or use the labouring power of a man by making him work as you consume or use a machine by making it run. By paying the daily or weekly value of the labouring power of the workman, the capitalist has, therefore, acquired the right to use or make that labouring power work during the *whole day or week*. The working day or the working week has, of course, certain limits, but those we shall afterwards look more closely at.

For the present I want to turn your attention to one decisive point.

The *value* of the labouring power is determined by the quantity of labour necessary to maintain or reproduce it, but the *use*

of that labouring power is only limited by the active energies and physical strength of the labourer. The daily or weekly *value* of the labouring power is quite distinct from the daily or weekly exercise of that power, the same as the food a horse wants and the time it can carry the horseman are quite distinct. The quantity of labour by which the *value* of the workman's labouring power is limited forms by no means a limit to the quantity of labour which his labouring power is apt to perform. Take the example of our spinner. We have seen that, to daily reproduce his labouring power, he must daily reproduce a value of three shillings, which he will do by working six hours daily. But this does not disable him from working ten or twelve or more hours a day. But by paying the daily or weekly *value* of the spinner's labouring power, the capitalist has acquired the right of using that labouring power during *the whole day or week*. He will, therefore, make him work say, daily, *twelve* hours. *Over and above* the six hours required to replace his wages, or the value of his labouring power, he will, therefore, have to work *six other hours*, which I shall call hours of *surplus labour*, which surplus labour will realise itself in a *surplus value* and a *surplus produce*. If our spinner, for example, by his daily labour of six hours, added three shillings' value to the cotton, a value forming an exact equivalent to his wages, he will, in twelve hours, add six shillings' worth to the cotton, and produce a *proportional surplus of yarn*. As he has sold his labouring power to the capitalist, the whole value or produce created by him belongs to the capitalist, the owner *pro tem.* of his labouring power. By advancing three shillings, the capitalist will, therefore, realise a value of six shillings, because, advancing a value in which six hours of labour are crystallised, he will receive in return a value in which twelve hours of labour are crystallised. By repeating this same process daily, the capitalist will daily advance three shillings and daily pocket six shillings, one-half of which will go to pay wages anew, and the other half of which will form *surplus value*, for which the capitalist pays no equivalent. It is this *sort of exchange between capital and labour* upon which capitalistic production, or the wages system, is founded, and which must constantly result in reproducing the working man as a working man, and the capitalist as a capitalist.

The rate of surplus value, all other circumstances remaining the same, will depend on the proportion between that part of the working day necessary to reproduce the value of the labouring power and the *surplus time* or *surplus labour* performed for the capitalist. It will, therefore, depend on the *ratio in which*

the working day is prolonged over and above that extent, by working which the working man would only reproduce the value of his labouring power, or replace his wages.

IX VALUE OF LABOUR

We must now return to the expression, "*Value, or Price of Labour.*"

We have seen that, in fact, it is only the value of the labouring power, measured by the values of commodities necessary for its maintenance. But since the workman receives his wages *after* his labour is performed, and knows, moreover, that what he actually gives to the capitalist is his labour, the value or price of his labouring power necessarily appears to him as the *price or value of his labour itself*. If the price of his labouring power is three shillings, in which six hours of labour are realised, and if he works twelve hours, he necessarily considers these three shillings as the value or price of twelve hours of labour, although these twelve hours of labour realise themselves in a value of six shillings. A double consequence flows from this.

Firstly. *The value or price of the labouring power* takes the semblance of the *price or value of labour itself*, although, strictly speaking, value and price of labour are senseless terms.

Secondly. Although one part only of the workman's daily labour is *paid*, while the other part is *unpaid*, and while that unpaid or surplus labour constitutes exactly the fund out of which *surplus value* or *profit* is formed, it seems as if the aggregate labour was paid labour.

This false appearance distinguishes *wages labour* from other *historical* forms of labour. On the basis of the wages system even the *unpaid* labour seems to be *paid* labour. With the *slave*, on the contrary, even that part of his labour which is paid appears to be unpaid. Of course, in order to work the slave must live, and one part of his working day goes to replace the value of his own maintenance. But since no bargain is struck between him and his master, and no acts of selling and buying are going on between the two parties, all his labour seems to be given away for nothing.

Take, on the other hand, the peasant serf, such as he, I might say, until yesterday existed in the whole East of Europe. This peasant worked, for example, three days for himself on his own field or the field allotted to him, and the three subsequent days he performed compulsory and gratuitous labour on the estate of his lord. Here, then, the paid and unpaid parts of labour were sensibly separated, separated in time and space; and our

Liberals overflowed with moral indignation at the preposterous notion of making a man work for nothing.

In point of fact, however, whether a man works three days of the week for himself on his own field and three days for nothing on the estate of his lord, or whether he works in the factory or the workshop six hours daily for himself and six for his employer, comes to the same, although in the latter case the paid and unpaid portions of labour are inseparably mixed up with each other, and the nature of the whole transaction is completely masked by the *intervention of a contract* and the *pay* received at the end of the week. The gratuitous labour appears to be voluntarily given in the one instance, and to be compulsory in the other. That makes all the difference.

In using the expression "*value of labour*," I shall only use it as a popular slang term for "*value of labouring power*."

X PROFIT IS MADE BY SELLING A COMMODITY At ITS VALUE

Suppose an average hour of labour to be realised in a value equal to sixpence, or twelve average hours of labour to be realised in six shillings. Suppose, further, the value of labour to be three shillings or the produce of six hours' labour. If, then, in the raw material, machinery, and so forth, used up in a commodity, twenty-four hours of average labour were realised, its value would amount to twelve shillings. If, moreover, the workman employed by the capitalist added twelve hours of labour to those means of production, these twelve hours would be realised in an additional value of six shillings. The *total value of the product* would, therefore, amount to thirty-six hours of realised labour, and be equal to eighteen shillings. But as the value of labour, or the wages paid to the workman, would be three shillings only, no equivalent would have been paid by the capitalist for the six hours of surplus labour worked by the workman, and realised in the value of the commodity. By selling this commodity at its value for eighteen shillings, the capitalist would, therefore, realise a value of three shillings, for which he had paid no equivalent. These three shillings would constitute the surplus value or profit pocketed by him. The capitalist would consequently realise the profit of three shillings, not by selling his commodity at a price *over and above* its value, but by selling it *at its real value*.

The value of a commodity is determined by the *total quantity of labour* contained in it. But part of that quantity of labour is

realised in a value for which an equivalent has been paid in the form of wages; part of it is realised in a value for which no equivalent has been paid. Part of the labour contained in the commodity is *paid* labour; part is *unpaid* labour. By selling, therefore, the commodity *at its value*, that is, as the crystallisation of the *total quantity of labour* bestowed upon it, the capitalist must necessarily sell it at a profit. He sells not only what has cost him an equivalent, but he sells also what has cost him nothing, although it has cost his workman labour. The cost of the commodity to the capitalist and its real cost are different things. I repeat, therefore, that normal and average profits are made by selling commodities not *above* but *at their real values*.

XI THE DIFFERENT PARTS INTO WHICH SURPLUS VALUE IS DECOMPOSED

The *surplus value*, or that part of the total value of the commodity in which the *surplus labour* or *unpaid labour* of the working man is realised, I call *Profit*. The whole of that profit is not pocketed by the employing capitalist. The monopoly of land enables the landlord to take one part of that *surplus value*, under the name of *rent*, whether the land is used for agriculture, buildings or railways, or for any other productive purpose. On the other hand, the very fact that the possession of the *instruments of labour* enables the employing capitalist to produce a *surplus value*, or, what comes to the same, to *appropriate to himself a certain amount of unpaid labour*, enables the owner of the means of labour, which he lends wholly or partly to the employing capitalist—enables, in one word, the money-lending capitalist to claim for himself under the name of *interest* another part of that surplus value, so that there remains to the employing capitalist *as such* only what is called *industrial* or *commercial profit*.

By what laws this division of the total amount of surplus value amongst the three categories of people is regulated is a question quite foreign to our subject. This much, however, results from what has been stated.

Rent, Interest, and Industrial Profit are only *different names for different parts* of the *surplus value* of the commodity, or the *unpaid labour enclosed in it*, and they are *equally derived from this source, and from this source alone*. They are not derived from *land* as such or from *capital* as such, but land and capital enable their owners to get their respective shares out of the surplus value extracted by the employing capitalist from the

labourer. For the labourer himself it is a matter of subordinate importance whether that surplus value, the result of his surplus labour, or unpaid labour, is altogether pocketed by the employing capitalist, or whether the latter is obliged to pay portions of it, under the name of rent and interest, away to third parties. Suppose the employing capitalist to use only his own capital and to be his own landlord, then the whole surplus value would go into his pocket.

It is the employing capitalist who immediately extracts from the labourer this surplus value, whatever part of it he may ultimately be able to keep for himself. Upon this relation, therefore, between the employing capitalist and the wages labourer the whole wages system and the whole present system of production hinge. Some of the citizens who took part in our debate were, therefore, wrong in trying to mince matters, and to treat this fundamental relation between the employing capitalist and the working man as a secondary question, although they were right in stating that, under given circumstances, a rise of prices might affect in very unequal degrees the employing capitalist, the landlord, the moneyed capitalist, and, if you please, the tax-gatherer.

Another consequence follows from what has been stated.

That part of the value of the commodity which represents only the value of the raw materials, the machinery, in one word, the value of the means of production used up, forms *no revenue* at all, but replaces *only capital*. But, apart from this, it is false that the other part of the value of the commodity *which forms revenue*, or may be spent in the form of wages, profits, rent, interest, is *constituted* by the value of wages, the value of rent, the value of profits, and so forth. We shall, in the first instance, discard wages, and only treat industrial profits, interest, and rent. We have just seen that the *surplus value* contained in the commodity or that part of its value in which *unpaid labour* is realised, resolves itself into different fractions, bearing three different names. But it would be quite the reverse of the truth to say that its value is *composed of*, or *formed by*, the *addition of the independent values of these three constituents*.

If one hour of labour realises itself in a value of sixpence, if the working day of the labourer comprises twelve hours, if half of this time is unpaid labour, that surplus labour will add to the commodity a *surplus value* of three shillings, that is, a value for which no equivalent has been paid. This surplus value of three shillings constitutes the *whole fund* which the employing capitalist may divide, in whatever proportions, with the landlord and the money-lender. The value of these three shillings con-

stitutes the limit of the value they have to divide amongst them. But it is not the employing capitalist who adds to the value of the commodity an arbitrary value for his profit, to which another value is added for the landlord, and so forth, so that the addition of these arbitrarily fixed values would constitute the total value. You see, therefore, the fallacy of the popular notion, which confounds the *decomposition of a given value* into three parts, with the *formation* of that value by the addition of three *independent* values, thus converting the aggregate value, from which rent, profit, and interest are derived, into an arbitrary magnitude.

If the total profit realised by a capitalist be equal to £100, we call this sum, considered as *absolute* magnitude, the *amount of profit*. But if we calculate the ratio which those £100 bear to the capital advanced, we call this *relative* magnitude, the *rate of profit*. It is evident that this rate of profit may be expressed in a double way.

Suppose £100 to be the capital *advanced in wages*. If the surplus value created is also £100—and this would show us that half the working day of the labourer consists of *unpaid* labour—and if we measured this profit by the value of the capital advanced in wages, we should say that the *rate of profit* amounted to one hundred per cent, because the value advanced would be one hundred and the value realised would be two hundred.

If, on the other hand, we should not only consider the *capital advanced in wages*, but the *total capital* advanced, say, for example, £500, of which £400 represented the value of raw materials, machinery, and so forth, we should say that the *rate of profit* amounted only to twenty per cent, because the profit of one hundred would be but the fifth part of the *total capital* advanced.

The first mode of expressing the rate of profit is the only one which shows you the real ratio between paid and unpaid labour, the real degree of the *exploitation* (you must allow me this French word) *of labour*. The other mode of expression is that in common use, and is, indeed, appropriate for certain purposes. At all events, it is very useful for concealing the degree in which the capitalist extracts gratuitous labour from the workman.

In the remarks I have still to make I shall use the word *Profit* for the whole amount of the surplus value extracted by the capitalist without any regard to the division of the surplus value between different parties, and in using the words *Rate of Profit*, I shall always measure profits by the value of the capital advanced in wages.

XII GENERAL RELATION OF PROFITS, WAGES AND PRICES

Deduct from the value of a commodity the value replacing the value of the raw materials and other means of production used upon it, that is to say, deduct the value representing the *past* labour contained in it, and the remainder of its value will resolve into the quantity of labour added by the working man *last* employed. If that working man works twelve hours daily, if twelve hours of average labour crystallise themselves in an amount of gold equal to six shillings, this additional value of six shillings is the *only* value his labour will have created. This given value, determined by the time of his labour, is the only fund from which both he and the capitalist have to draw their respective shares or dividends, the only value to be divided into wages and profits. It is evident that this value itself will not be altered by the variable proportions in which it may be divided amongst the two parties. There will also be nothing changed if in the place of one working man you put the whole working population, twelve million working days, for example, instead of one.

Since the capitalist and workman have only to divide this limited value, that is, the value measured by the total labour of the working man, the more the one gets the less will the other get, and *vice versa*. Whenever a quantity is given, one part of it will increase inversely as the other decreases. If the wages change, profits will change in an opposite direction. If wages fall, profits will rise; and if wages rise, profits will fall. If the working man, on our former supposition, gets three shillings, equal to one half of the value he has created, or if his whole working day consists half of paid, half of unpaid labour, the *rate of profit* will be 100 per cent, because the capitalist would also get three shillings. If the working man receives only two shillings, or works only one-third of the whole day for himself, the capitalist will get four shillings, and the rate of profit will be 200 per cent. If the working man receives four shillings, the capitalist will only receive two, and the rate of profit would sink to 50 per cent, but all these variations will not affect the value of the commodity. A general rise of wages would, therefore, result in a fall of the general rate of profit, but not affect values.

But although the values of commodities, which must ultimately regulate their market prices, are exclusively determined by the total quantities of labour fixed in them, and not by the division of that quantity into paid and unpaid labour, it by no

means follows that the values of the single commodities, or lots of commodities, produced during twelve hours, for example, will remain constant. The *number* or mass of commodities produced in a given time of labour, or by a given quantity of labour, depends upon the *productive power* of the labour employed, and not upon its *extent* or length. With one degree of the productive power of spinning labour, for example, a working day of twelve hours may produce twelve pounds of yarn, with a lesser degree of productive power only two pounds. If then twelve hours' average labour were realised in the value of six shillings, in the one case the twelve pounds of yarn would cost six shillings, in the other case the two pounds of yarn would also cost six shillings. One pound of yarn would, therefore, cost sixpence in the one case, and three shillings in the other. This difference of price would result from the difference in the productive powers of the labour employed. One hour of labour would be realised in one pound of yarn with the greater productive power, while with the smaller productive power, six hours of labour would be realised in one pound of yarn. The price of a pound of yarn would, in the one instance, be only sixpence, although wages were relatively high and the rate of profit low; it would be three shillings in the other instance, although wages were low and the rate of profit high. This would be so because the price of the pound of yarn is regulated by the *total amount of labour worked up in it*, and not by the *proportional division of that total amount into paid and unpaid labour*. The fact I have before mentioned that high-priced labour may produce cheap, and low-priced labour may produce dear commodities, loses, therefore, its paradoxical appearance. It is only the expression of the general law that the value of a commodity is regulated by the quantity of labour worked up in it, and that the quantity of labour worked up in it depends altogether upon the productive powers of the labour employed, and will, therefore, vary with every variation in the productivity of labour.

XIII MAIN CASES OF ATTEMPTS AT RAISING WAGES OR RESISTING THEIR FALL

Let us now seriously consider the main cases in which a rise of wages is attempted or a reduction of wages resisted.

1. We have seen that the *value of the labouring power*, or in more popular parlance, the *value of labour*, is determined by the value of necessaries, or the quantity of labour required to produce them. If, then, in a given country the value of the daily average necessaries of the labourer represented six hours of

labour expressed in three shillings, the labourer would have to work six hours daily to produce an equivalent for his daily maintenance. If the whole working day was twelve hours, the capitalist would pay him the value of his labour by paying him three shillings. Half the working day would be unpaid labour, and the rate of profit would amount to 100 per cent. But now suppose that, consequent upon a decrease of productivity, more labour should be wanted to produce, say, the same amount of agricultural produce, so that the price of the average daily necessaries should rise from three to four shillings. In that case the *value of labour* would rise by one-third, or $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. Eight hours of the working day would be required to produce an equivalent for the daily maintenance of the labourer, according to his old standard of living. The surplus labour would therefore sink from six hours to four, and the rate of profit from 100 to 50 per cent. But in insisting upon a rise of wages, the labourer would only insist upon getting the *increased value of his labour*, like every other seller of a commodity, who, the costs of his commodities having increased, tries to get its increased value paid. If wages did not rise, or not sufficiently rise, to compensate for the increased values of necessaries, the *price of labour* would sink below the *value of labour*, and the labourer's standard of life would deteriorate.

But a change might also take place in an opposite direction. By virtue of the increased productivity of labour, the same amount of the average daily necessaries might sink from three to two shillings, or only four hours out of the working day, instead of six, be wanted to reproduce an equivalent for the value of the daily necessaries. The working man would now be able to buy with two shillings as many necessaries as he did before with three shillings. Indeed, the *value of labour* would have sunk, but that diminished value would command the same amount of commodities as before. Then profits would rise from three to four shillings, and, the rate of profit from 100 to 200 per cent. Although the labourer's absolute standard of life would have remained the same, his *relative wages*, and therewith his *relative social position*, as compared with that of the capitalist, would have been lowered. If the working man should resist that reduction of relative wages, he would only try to get some share in the increased productive powers of his own labour, and to maintain his former relative position in the social scale. Thus, after the abolition of the Corn Laws, and in flagrant violation of the most solemn pledges given during the anti-corn law agitation, the English factory lords generally reduced wages ten per cent. The resistance of the workmen was at first baffled,

but, consequent upon circumstances I cannot now enter upon, the ten per cent lost were afterwards regained.

2. The *values* of necessaries, and consequently the *value of labour*, might remain the same, but a change might occur in their *money prices*, consequent upon a previous change in the *value of money*.

By the discovery of more fertile mines and so forth, two ounces of gold might, for example, cost no more labour to produce than one ounce did before. The *value* of gold would then be depreciated by one half, or fifty per cent. As the *values* of all other commodities would then be expressed in twice their former *money prices*, so also the same with the *value of labour*. Twelve hours of labour, formerly expressed in six shillings, would now be expressed in twelve shillings. If the working man's wages should remain three shillings, instead of rising to six shillings, the *money price of his labour* would only be equal to *half the value of his labour*, and his standard of life would fearfully deteriorate. This would also happen in a greater or lesser degree if his wages should rise, but not proportionately to the fall in the value of gold. In such a case nothing would have been changed, either in the productive powers of labour, or in supply and demand, or in values. Nothing could have changed except the *money names* of those values. To say that in such a case the workman ought not to insist upon a proportionate rise of wages, is to say that he must be content to be paid with names, instead of with things. All past history proves that whenever such a depreciation of money occurs the capitalists are on the alert to seize this opportunity for defrauding the workman. A very large school of political economists assert that, consequent upon the new discoveries of gold lands, the better working of silver mines, and the cheaper supply of quicksilver, the value of precious metals has been again depreciated. This would explain the general and simultaneous attempts on the Continent at a rise of wages.

3. We have till now supposed that the *working day* has given limits. The working day, however, has, by itself, no constant limits. It is the constant tendency of capital to stretch it to its utmost physically possible length, because in the same degree surplus labour, and consequently the profit resulting therefrom, will be increased. The more capital succeeds in prolonging the working day, the greater the amount of other people's labour it will appropriate. During the seventeenth and even the first two-thirds of the eighteenth century a ten hours' working day was the normal working day all over England. During the anti-Jacobin war, which was in fact a war waged by the British barons against the British working masses³² capital celebrated its bac,

chanalia, and prolonged the working day from ten to twelve, fourteen, eighteen hours. Malthus, by no means a man whom you would suspect of a maudlin sentimentalism, declared in a pamphlet, published about 1815, that if this sort of thing was to go on the life of the nation would be attacked at its very source.³³ A few years before the general introduction of the newly-invented machinery, about 1765, a pamphlet appeared in England under the title, *An Essay on Trade*. The anonymous author, an avowed enemy of the working classes, declaims on the necessity of expanding the limits of the working day. Amongst other means to this end, he proposes *working houses*,³⁴ which, he says, ought to be "Houses of Terror." And what is the length of the working day he prescribes for these "Houses of Terror"? *Twelve hours*, the very same time which in 1832 was declared by capitalists, political economists, and ministers to be not only the existing but the necessary time of labour for a child under twelve years.

By selling his labouring power, and he must do so under the present system, the working man makes over to the capitalist the consumption of that power, but within certain rational limits. He sells his labouring power in order to maintain it, apart from its natural wear and tear, but not to destroy it. In selling his labouring power at its daily or weekly value, it is understood that in one day or one week that labouring power shall not be submitted to two days' or two weeks' waste or wear and tear. Take a machine worth £1,000. If it is used up in ten years it will add to the value of the commodities in whose production it assists £100 yearly. If it be used up in five years it would add £200 yearly, or the value of its annual wear and tear is in inverse ratio to the time in which it is consumed. But this distinguishes the working man from the machine. Machinery does not wear out exactly in the same ratio in which it is used. Man, on the contrary, decays in a greater ratio than would be visible from the mere numerical addition of work.

In their attempts at reducing the working day to its former rational dimensions, or, where they cannot enforce a legal fixation of a normal working day, at checking overwork by a rise of wages, a rise not only in proportion to the surplus time exacted, but in a greater proportion, working men fulfil only a duty to themselves and their race. They only set limits to the tyrannical usurpations of capital. Time is the room of human development. A man who has no free time to dispose of, whose whole lifetime, apart from the mere physical interruptions by sleep, meals, and so forth, is absorbed by his labour for the capitalist, is less than a beast of burden. He is a mere machine

for producing Foreign Wealth, broken in body and brutalised in mind. Yet the whole history of modern industry shows that capital, if not checked, will recklessly and ruthlessly work to cast down the whole working class to the utmost state of degradation.

In prolonging the working day the capitalist may pay *higher wages* and still lower the *value of labour*, if the rise of wages does not correspond to the greater amount of labour extracted, and the quicker decay of the labouring power thus caused. This may be done in another way. Your middle-class statisticians will tell you, for instance, that the average wages of factory families in Lancashire have risen. They forget that instead of the labour of the man, the head of the family, his wife and perhaps three or four children are now thrown under the Juggernaut wheels³⁵ of capital, and that the rise of the aggregate wages does not correspond to the aggregate surplus labour extracted from the family.

Even with given limits of the working day, such as now exist in all branches of industry subjected to the factory laws, a rise of wages may become necessary, if only to keep up the old standard *value of labour*. By increasing the *intensity* of labour, a man may be made to expend as much vital force in one hour as he formerly did in two. This has, to a certain degree, been effected in the trades, placed under the Factory Acts, by the acceleration of machinery, and the greater number of working machines which a single individual has now to superintend. If the increase in the intensity of labour or the mass of labour spent in an hour keeps some fair proportion to the decrease in the extent of the working day, the working man will still be the winner. If this limit is overshot, he loses in one form what he has gained in another, and ten hours of labour may then become as ruinous as twelve hours were before. In checking this tendency of capital, by struggling for a rise of wages corresponding to the rising intensity of labour, the working man only resists the depreciation of his labour and the deterioration of his race.

4. All of you know that, from reasons I have not now to explain, capitalistic production moves through certain periodical cycles. It moves through a state of quiescence, growing animation, prosperity, overtrade, crisis, and stagnation. The market prices of commodities, and the market rates of profit, follow these phases, now sinking below their averages, now rising above them. Considering the whole cycle, you will find that one deviation of the market price is being compensated by the other, and that, taking the average of the cycle, the market prices of

commodities are regulated by their values. Well! During the phase of sinking market prices and the phases of crisis and stagnation, the working man, if not thrown out of employment altogether, is sure to have his wages lowered. Not to be defrauded, he must, even with such a fall of market prices, debate with the capitalist in what proportional degree a fall of wages has become necessary. If, during the phases of prosperity, when extra profits are made, he did not battle for a rise of wages, he would, taking the average of one industrial cycle, not even receive his *average wages*, or the *value* of his labour. It is the utmost height of folly to demand that while his wages are necessarily affected by the adverse phases of the cycle, he should exclude himself from compensation during the prosperous phases of the cycle. Generally, the *values* of all commodities are only realised by the compensation of the continuously changing market prices, springing from the continuous fluctuations of demand and supply. On the basis of the present system labour is only a commodity like others. It must, therefore, pass through the same fluctuations to fetch an average price corresponding to its value. It would be absurd to treat it on the one hand as a commodity, and to want on the other hand to exempt it from the laws which regulate the prices of commodities. The slave receives a permanent and fixed amount of maintenance; the wages labourer does not. He must try to get a rise of wages in the one instance, if only to compensate for a fall of wages in the other. If he resigned himself to accept the will, the dictates of the capitalist as a permanent economical law, he would share in all the miseries of the slave, without the security of the slave.

5. In all the cases I have considered, and they form ninety-nine out of a hundred, you have seen that a struggle for a rise of wages follows only in the track of *previous changes*, and is the necessary offspring of previous changes in the amount of production, the productive powers of labour, the value of labour, the value of money, the extent or the intensity of labour extracted, the fluctuations of market prices, dependent upon the fluctuations of demand and supply, and consistent with the different phases of the industrial cycle; in one word, as reactions of labour against the previous action of capital. By treating the struggle for a rise of wages independently of all these circumstances, by looking only upon the change of wages, and overlooking all the other changes from which they emanate, you proceed from a false premise in order to arrive at false conclusions.

XIV THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOUR AND ITS RESULTS

1. Having shown that the periodical resistance on the part of the working men against a reduction of wages, and their periodical attempts at getting a rise of wages, are inseparable from the wages system, and dictated by the very fact of labour being assimilated to commodities, and therefore subject to the laws regulating the general movement of prices; having, furthermore, shown that a general rise of wages would result in a fall in the general rate of profit, but not affect the average prices of commodities, or their values, the question now ultimately arises, how far, in this incessant struggle between capital and labour, the latter is likely to prove successful.

I might answer by a generalisation, and say that, as with all other commodities, so with labour, its *market price* will, in the long run, adapt itself to its *value*; that, therefore, despite all the ups and downs, and do what he may, the working man will, on an average, only receive the value of his labour, which resolves into the value of his labouring power, which is determined by the value of the necessaries required for its maintenance and reproduction, which value of necessaries finally is regulated by the quantity of labour wanted to produce them.

But there are some peculiar features which distinguish the *value of the labouring power, or the value of labour*, from the values of all other commodities. The value of the labouring power is formed by two elements—the one merely physical, the other historical or social. Its *ultimate limit* is determined by the *physical* element, that is to say, to maintain and reproduce itself, to perpetuate its physical existence, the working class must receive the necessaries absolutely indispensable for living and multiplying. The *value* of those indispensable necessaries forms, therefore, the ultimate limit of the *value of labour*. On the other hand, the length of the working day is also limited by ultimate, although very elastic boundaries. Its ultimate limit is given by the physical force of the labouring man. If the daily exhaustion of his vital forces exceeds a certain degree, it cannot be exerted anew, day by day. However, as I said, this limit is very elastic. A quick succession of unhealthy and short-lived generations will keep the labour market as well supplied as a series of vigorous and long-lived generations.

Besides this mere physical element, the value of labour is in every country determined by a *traditional standard of life*. It is not mere physical life, but it is the satisfaction of certain wants springing from the social conditions in which people are placed

and reared up. The English standard of life may be reduced to the Irish standard; the standard of life of a German peasant to that of a Livonian peasant. The important part which historical tradition and social habitude play in this respect, you may learn from Mr. Thornton's work on *Over-population*, where he shows that the average wages in different agricultural districts of England still nowadays differ more or less according to the more or less favourable circumstances under which the districts have emerged from the state of serfdom.

This historical or social element, entering into the value of labour, may be expanded, or contracted, or altogether extinguished, so that nothing remains but the *physical limit*. During the time of the anti-Jacobin war, undertaken, as the incorrigible tax-eater and sinecurist, old George Rose, used to say, to save the comforts of our holy religion from the inroads of the French infidels, the honest English farmers, so tenderly handled in a former chapter of ours, depressed the wages of the agricultural labourers even beneath that *mere physical minimum*, but made up by Poor Laws³⁶ the remainder necessary for the physical perpetuation of the race. This was a glorious way to convert the wages labourer into a slave, and Shakespeare's proud yeoman into a pauper.

By comparing the standard wages or values of labour in different countries, and by comparing them in different historical epochs of the same country, you will find that the *value of labour* itself is not a fixed but a variable magnitude, even supposing the values of all other commodities to remain constant.

A similar comparison would prove that not only the *market rates of profit* change but its *average rates*.

But as to *profits*, there exists no law which determines their *minimum*. We cannot say what is the ultimate limit of their decrease. And why cannot we fix that limit? Because, although we can fix the *minimum of wages*, we cannot fix their *maximum*. We can only say that, the limits of the working day being given, the *maximum of profit* corresponds to the *physical minimum of wages*; and that wages being given, the *maximum of profit* corresponds to such a prolongation of the working day as is compatible with the physical forces of the labourer. The maximum of profit is, therefore, limited by the physical minimum of wages and the physical maximum of the working day. It is evident that between the two limits of this *maximum rate of profit* an immense scale of variations is possible. The fixation of its actual degree is only settled by the continuous struggle between capital and labour, the capitalist constantly tending to reduce wages to their physical minimum, and to extend the working day to its

physical maximum, while the working man constantly presses in the opposite direction.

The matter resolves itself into a question of the respective powers of the combatants.

2. As to the *limitation of the working day* in England, as in all other countries, it has never been settled except by *legislative interference*. Without the working men's continuous pressure from without that interference would never have taken place. But at all events, the result was not to be attained by private settlement between the working men and the capitalists. This very necessity of *general political action* affords the proof that in its merely economic action capital is the stronger side.

As to the *limits of the value of labour*, its actual settlement always depends upon supply and demand, I mean the demand for labour on the part of capital, and the supply of labour by the working men. In colonial countries the law of supply and demand favours the working man. Hence the relatively high standard of wages in the United States. Capital may there try its utmost. It cannot prevent the labour market from being continuously emptied by the continuous conversion of wages labourers into independent, self-sustaining peasants. The position of wages labourer is for a very large part of the American people but a probational state, which they are sure to leave within a longer or shorter term. To mend this colonial state of things, the paternal British Government accepted for some time what is called the modern colonisation theory, which consists in putting an artificial high price upon colonial land, in order to prevent the too quick conversion of the wages labourer into the independent peasant.

But let us now come to old civilised countries, in which capital domineers over the whole process of production. Take, for example, the rise in England of agricultural wages from 1849 to 1859. What was its consequence? The farmers could not, as our friend Weston would have advised them, raise the value of wheat, nor even its market prices. They had, on the contrary, to submit to their fall. But during these eleven years they introduced machinery of all sorts, adopted more scientific methods, converted part of arable land into pasture, increased the size of farms, and with this the scale of production, and by these and other processes diminishing the demand for labour by increasing its productive power, made the agricultural population again relatively redundant. This is the general method in which a reaction, quicker or slower, of capital against a rise of wages takes place in old, settled countries. Ricardo has justly remarked

that machinery is in constant competition with labour, and can often be only introduced when the price of labour has reached a certain height,³⁷ but the appliance of machinery is but one of the many methods for increasing the productive powers of labour. This very same development which makes common labour relatively redundant simplifies on the other hand skilled labour, and thus depreciates it.

The same law obtains in another form. With the development of the productive powers of labour the accumulation of capital will be accelerated, even despite a relatively high rate of wages. Hence, one might infer, as Adam Smith, in whose days modern industry was still in its infancy, did infer, that the accelerated accumulation of capital must turn the balance in favour of the working man, by securing a growing demand for his labour. From this same standpoint many contemporary writers have wondered that English capital having grown in the last twenty years so much quicker than English population, wages should not have been more enhanced. But simultaneously with the progress of accumulation there takes place a *progressive change* in the *composition of capital*. That part of the aggregate capital which consists of fixed capital, machinery, raw materials, means of production in all possible forms, progressively increases as compared with the other part of capital, which is laid out in wages or in the purchase of labour. This law has been stated in a more or less accurate manner by Mr. Barton, Ricardo, Sismondi, Professor Richard Jones, Professor Ramsay, Cherbuliez, and others.

If the proportion of these two elements of capital was originally one to one, it will, in the progress of industry, become five to one, and so forth. If of a total capital of 600, 300 is laid out in instruments, raw materials, and so forth, and 300 in wages, the total capital wants only to be doubled to create a demand for 600 working men instead of for 300. But if of a capital of 600, 500 is laid out in machinery, materials, and so forth, and 100 only in wages, the same capital must increase from 600 to 3,600 in order to create a demand for 600 workmen instead of 300. In the progress of industry the demand for labour keeps, therefore, no pace with accumulation of capital. It will still increase, but increase in a constantly diminishing ratio as compared with the increase of capital.

These few hints will suffice to show that the very development of modern industry must progressively turn the scale in favour of the capitalist against the working man, and that consequently the general tendency of capitalistic production is not to raise, but to sink the average standard of wages, or to push the *value*

of labour more or less to its *minimum limit*. Such being the tendency of *things* in this system, is this saying that the working class ought to renounce their resistance against the encroachments of capital, and abandon their attempts at making the best of the occasional chances for their temporary improvement? If they did, they would be degraded to one level mass of broken wretches past salvation. I think I have shown that their struggles for the standard of wages are incidents inseparable from the whole wages system, that in 99 cases out of 100 their efforts at raising wages are only efforts at maintaining the given value of labour, and that the necessity of debating their price with the capitalist is inherent in their condition of having to sell themselves as commodities. By cowardly giving way in their everyday conflict with capital, they would certainly disqualify themselves for the initiating of any larger movement.

At the same time, and quite apart from the general servitude involved in the wages system, the working class ought not to exaggerate to themselves the ultimate working of these everyday struggles. They ought not to forget that they are fighting with effects, but not with the causes of those effects; that they are retarding the downward movement, but not changing its direction; that they are applying palliatives, not curing the malady. They ought, therefore, not to be exclusively absorbed in these unavoidable guerilla fights incessantly springing up from the never-ceasing encroachments of capital or changes of the market. They ought to understand that, with all the miseries it imposes upon them, the present system simultaneously engenders the *material conditions* and the *social forms* necessary for an economical reconstruction of society. Instead of the *conservative* motto, "*A fair day's wage for a fair day's work!*" they ought to inscribe on their banner the *revolutionary* watchword, "*Abolition of the wages system!*"

After this very long and, I fear, tedious exposition which I was obliged to enter into to do some justice to the subject-matter, I shall conclude by proposing the following resolutions:

Firstly. A general rise in the rate of wages would result in a fall of the general rate of profit, but, broadly speaking, not affect the prices of commodities.

Secondly. The general tendency of capitalist production is not to raise, but to sink the average standard of wages.

Thirdly. Trades Unions work well as centres of resistance against the encroachments of capital. They fail partially from an injudicious use of their power. They fail generally from limiting themselves to a guerilla war against the effects of the existing

system, instead of simultaneously trying to change it, instead of using their organised forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class, that is to say, the ultimate abolition of the wages system.

Written by Marx between
the end of May and June
27, 1865

Printed according to the
English pamphlet

First published as a separate
pamphlet in London in 1898

KARL MARX

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE DELEGATES OF THE PROVISIONAL GENERAL COUNCIL. THE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS³⁸

1. ORGANISATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Upon the whole, the Provisional Central Council recommend the *plan of organisation* as traced in the Provisional Statutes. Its soundness and facilities of adaptation to different countries without prejudice to unity of action have been proved by two years' experience. For the next year we recommend London as the seat of the Central Council, the Continental situation looking unfavourable for change.

The members of the Central Council will of course be elected by Congress (5 of the Provisional Statutes) with power to add to their number.

The *General Secretary* to be chosen by Congress for one year and to be the only paid officer of the Association. We propose £2 for his weekly salary.

The *uniform annual contribution of each individual member of the Association* to be *one half penny* (perhaps one penny). The cost price of cards of membership (carnets) to be charged extra.

While calling upon the members of the Association to form benefit societies and connect them by an international link, we leave the initiation of this question (*établissement des sociétés de secours mutuels. Appui moral et matériel accordé aux orphelins de l'association*) to the Swiss who originally proposed it at the conference of September last.³⁹

2. INTERNATIONAL COMBINATION OF EFFORTS, BY THE AGENCY OF THE ASSOCIATION, IN THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN LABOUR AND CAPITAL

(a) From a general point of view, this question embraces the whole activity of the International Association which aims at combining and generalising the till now disconnected efforts for emancipation by the working classes in different countries.

(b) To counteract the intrigues of capitalists always ready, in cases of strikes and lockouts, to misuse the foreign workman as a tool against the native workman, is one of the particular functions which our Society has hitherto performed with success. It is one of the great purposes of the Association to make the workmen of different countries not only *feel* but *act* as brethren and comrades in the army of emancipation.

(c) One great "International combination of efforts" which we suggest is a *statistical inquiry into the situation of the working classes of all countries to be instituted by the working classes themselves*. To act with any success, the materials to be acted upon must be known. By initiating so great a work, the workmen will prove their ability to take their own fate into their own hands. We propose therefore:

That in each locality, where branches of our Association exist, the work be immediately commenced, and evidence collected on the different points specified in the subjoined scheme of inquiry.

That the Congress invite all workmen of Europe and the United States of America to collaborate in gathering the elements of the statistics of the working class; that reports and evidence be forwarded to the Central Council. That the Central Council elaborate them into a general report, adding the evidence as an appendix.

That this report together with its appendix be laid before the next annual Congress, and after having received its sanction, be printed at the expense of the Association.

GENERAL SCHEME OF INQUIRY,
WHICH MAY OF COURSE BE MODIFIED
BY EACH LOCALITY

1. Industry, name of.
2. Age and sex of the employed.
3. Number of the employed.
4. Salaries and wages: (a) apprentices; (b) wages by the day or piece work; scale paid by middlemen. Weekly, yearly average.
5. (a) Hours of work in factories. (b) The hours of work with small employers and in homework, if the business be carried on in those different modes. (c) Nightwork and daywork.
6. Mealtimes and treatment.
7. Sort of workshop and work: overcrowding, defective ventilation, want of sunlight, use of gaslight. Cleanliness, etc.
8. Nature of occupation.
9. Effect of employment upon the physical condition.
10. Moral condition. Education.

11. State of trade: whether season trade, or more or less uniformly distributed over year, whether greatly fluctuating, whether exposed to foreign competition, whether destined principally for home or foreign competition, etc.

3. LIMITATION OF THE WORKING DAY

A preliminary condition, without which all further attempts at improvement and emancipation must prove abortive, is the *limitation of the working day*.

It is needed to restore the health and physical energies of the working class, that is, the great body of every nation, as well as to secure them the possibility of intellectual development, sociable intercourse, social and political action.

We propose *8 hours work* as the *legal limit* of the working day. This limitation being generally claimed by the workmen of the United States of America,⁴⁰ the vote of the Congress will raise it to the common platform of the working classes all over the world.

For the information of Continental members, whose experience of factory law is comparatively short-dated, we add that all legal restrictions will fail and be broken through by Capital if the *period of the day* during which the 8 working hours must be taken, be not fixed. The length of that period ought to be determined by the 8 working hours and the additional pauses for meals. For instance, if the different interruptions for meals amount to *one hour*, the legal period of the day ought to embrace 9 hours, say from 7 a.m. to 4 p.m., or from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., etc. Nightwork to be but exceptionally permitted, in trades or branches of trades specified by law. The tendency must be to suppress all nightwork.

This paragraph refers only to adult persons, male or female, the latter, however, to be rigorously excluded from all *nightwork whatever*, and all sort of work hurtful to the delicacy of the sex, or exposing their bodies to poisonous and otherwise deleterious agencies. By adult persons we understand all persons having reached or passed the age of 18 years.

4. JUVENILE AND CHILDREN'S LABOUR (BOTH SEXES)

We consider the tendency of modern industry to make children and juvenile persons of both sexes co-operate in the great work of social production, as a progressive, sound and legitimate tendency, although under capital it was distorted into an abomination. In a rational state of society *every child whatever*,

from the age of 9 years, ought to become a productive labourer in the same way that no able-bodied adult person ought to be exempted from the general law of nature, viz.: to work in order to be able to eat, and work not only with the brain but with the hands too.

However, for the present, we have only to deal with the children and young persons of both sexes [belonging to the working people. They ought to be divided]* into *three classes*, to be treated differently; the first class to range from 9 to 12; the second, from 13 to 15 years; and the third, to comprise the ages of 16 and 17 years. We propose that the employment of the first class in any workshop or housework be legally restricted to *two*; that of the second, to *four*; and that of the third, to *six* hours. For the third class, there must be a break of at least one hour for meals or relaxation.

It may be desirable to begin elementary school instruction before the age of 9 years; but we deal here only with the most indispensable antidotes against the tendencies of a social system which degrades the working man into a mere instrument for the accumulation of capital, and transforms parents by their necessities into slave-holders, sellers of their own children. The *right* of children and juvenile persons must be vindicated. They are unable to act for themselves. It is, therefore, the duty of society to act on their behalf.

If the middle and higher classes neglect their duties toward their offspring, it is their own fault. Sharing the privileges of these classes, the child is condemned to suffer from their prejudices.

The case of the working class stands quite different. The working man is no free agent. In too many cases, he is even too ignorant to understand the true interest of his child, or the normal conditions of human development. However, the more enlightened part of the working class fully understands that the future of its class, and, therefore, of mankind, altogether depends upon the formation of the rising working generation. They know that, before everything else, the children and juvenile workers must be saved from the crushing effects of the present system. This can only be effected by converting *social reason* into *social force*, and, under given circumstances, there exists no other method of doing so, than through *general laws*, enforced by the power of the state. In enforcing such laws, the working class do not fortify governmental power. On the contrary, they transform that

*An omission in the newspaper text. Corrected according to a later edition.—Ed.

power, now used against them, into their own agency. They effect by a general act what they would vainly attempt by a multitude of isolated individual efforts.

Proceeding from this standpoint, we say that no parent and no employer ought to be allowed to use juvenile labour, except when combined with education.

By education we understand three things.

Firstly: *Mental education*.

Secondly: *Bodily education*, such as is given in schools of gymnastics, and by military exercise.

Thirdly: *Technological training*, which imparts the general principles of all processes of production, and, simultaneously, initiates the child and young person in the practical use and handling of the elementary instruments of all trades.

A gradual and progressive course of mental, gymnastic, and technological training ought to correspond to the classification of the juvenile labourers. The costs of the technological schools ought to be partly met by the sale of their products.

The combination of paid productive labour, mental education, bodily exercise and polytechnic training, will raise the working class far above the level of the higher and middle classes.

It is self-understood that the employment of all persons from [9] and to 17 years (inclusively) in nightwork and all health-injuring trades must be strictly prohibited by law.

5. CO-OPERATIVE LABOUR

It is the business of the International Working Men's Association to combine and generalise the *spontaneous movements* of the working classes, but not to dictate or impose any doctrinary system whatever. The Congress should, therefore, proclaim no *special system* of co-operation, but limit itself to the enunciation of a few general principles.

(a) We acknowledge the co-operative movement as one of the transforming forces of the present society based upon class antagonism. Its great merit is to practically show, that the present pauperising, and despotic system of the *subordination of labour* to capital can be superseded by the republican and beneficent system of the *association of free and equal producers*.

(b) Restricted, however, to the dwarfish forms into which individual wages slaves can elaborate it by their private efforts, the co-operative system will never transform capitalistic society. To convert social production into one large and harmonious system of free and co-operative labour, *general social changes* are wanted, *changes of the general conditions of society*, never to be

realised save by the transfer of the organised forces of society, viz., the state power, from capitalists and landlords to the producers themselves.

(c) We recommend to the working men to embark in *co-operative production* rather than in *co-operative stores*. The latter touch but the surface of the present economical system, the former attacks its groundwork.

(d) We recommend to all co-operative societies to convert one part of their joint income into a fund for propagating their principles by example as well as by precept, in other words, by promoting the establishment of new co-operative fabrics, as well as by teaching and preaching.

(e) In order to prevent co-operative societies from degenerating into ordinary middle-class joint stock companies (*sociétés par actions*), all workmen employed, whether shareholders or not, ought to share alike. As a mere temporary expedient, we are willing to allow shareholders a low rate of interest.

6. TRADES' UNIONS. THEIR PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

(a) Their past.

Capital is concentrated social force, while the workman has only to dispose of his working force. The *contract* between capital and labour can therefore never be struck on equitable terms, equitable even in the sense of a society which places the ownership of the material means of life and labour on one side and the vital productive energies on the opposite side. The only social power of the workmen is their number. The force of numbers, however, is broken by disunion. The disunion of the workmen is created and perpetuated by their *unavoidable competition amongst themselves*.

Trades' Unions originally sprang up from the *spontaneous* attempts of workmen at removing or at least checking that competition, in order to conquer such terms of contract as might raise them at least above the condition of mere slaves. The immediate object of Trades' Unions was therefore confined to everyday necessities, to expedencies for the obstruction of the incessant encroachments of capital, in one word, to questions of wages and time of labour. This activity of the Trades' Unions is not only legitimate, it is necessary. It cannot be dispensed with so long as the present system of production lasts. On the contrary, it must be generalised by the formation and the combination of Trades' Unions throughout all countries. On the other hand, unconsciously to themselves, the Trades' Unions were forming

centres of organisation of the working class, as the medieval municipalities and communes did for the middle class. If the Trades' Unions are required for the guerilla fights between capital and labour, they are still more important as *organised agencies for superseding the very system of wages labour and capital rule*.

(b) Their present.

Too exclusively bent upon the local and immediate struggles with capital, the Trades' Unions have not yet fully understood their power of acting against the system of wages slavery itself. They therefore kept too much aloof from general social and political movements. Of late, however, they seem to awaken to some sense of their great historical mission, as appears, for instance, from their participation, in England, in the recent political movement,⁴¹ from the enlarged views taken of their function in the United States,⁴² and from the following resolution passed at the recent great conference of Trades' delegates at Sheffield⁴³:

"That this conference, fully appreciating the efforts made by the International Association to unite in one common bond of brotherhood the working men of all countries, most earnestly recommend to the various societies here represented, the advisability of becoming affiliated to that body, believing that it is essential to the progress and prosperity of the entire working community."

(c) Their future.

Apart from their original purposes, they must now learn to act deliberately as organising centres of the working class in the broad interest of its *complete emancipation*. They must aid every social and political movement tending in that direction. Considering themselves and acting as the champions and representatives of the whole working class, they cannot fail to enlist the non-society men into their ranks. They must look carefully after the interests of the worst paid trades, such as the agricultural labourers, rendered powerless by exceptional circumstances. They must convince the world at large that their efforts, far from being narrow and selfish, aim at the emancipation of the downtrodden millions.

7. DIRECT AND INDIRECT TAXATION

(a) No modification of the form of taxation can produce any important change in the relations of labour and capital.

(b) Nevertheless, having to choose between two systems of taxation, we recommend the *total abolition of indirect taxes*, and the *general substitution of direct taxes*.

Because indirect taxes enhance the prices of commodities, the

tradesmen adding to those prices not only the amount of the indirect taxes, but the interest and profit upon the capital advanced in their payment;

Because indirect taxes conceal from an individual what he is paying to the state, whereas a direct tax is undisguised, unsophisticated, and not to be misunderstood by the meanest capacity. Direct taxation prompts therefore every individual to control the governing powers while indirect taxation destroys all tendency to self-government.

8. INTERNATIONAL CREDIT

Initiative to be left to the French.

9. POLISH QUESTION

(a) Why do the workmen of Europe take up this question? In the first instance, because the middle-class writers and agitators conspire to suppress it, although they patronise all sorts of nationalities, on the Continent, even Ireland. Whence this reticence? Because both, aristocrats and bourgeois, look upon the dark Asiatic power in the background as a last resource against the advancing tide of working class ascendancy. That power can only be effectually put down by the restoration of Poland upon a democratic basis.

(b) In the present changed state of Central Europe, and especially Germany, it is more than ever necessary to have a democratic Poland. Without it, Germany will become the outwork of the Holy Alliance,⁴⁴ with it, the co-operator with republican France. The working-class movement will continuously be interrupted, checked, and retarded, until this great European question be set at rest.

(c) It is especially the duty of the German working class to take the initiative in this matter, because Germany is one of the partitioners of Poland.

10. ARMIES

(a) The deleterious influence of large standing armies upon *production*, has been sufficiently exposed at middle-class congresses of all denominations, at peace congresses, economical congresses, statistical congresses, philanthropical congresses, sociological congresses. We think it, therefore, quite superfluous to expatiate upon this point.

(b) We propose the general armament of the people and their general instruction in the use of arms.

(c) We accept as a transitory necessity small standing armies to form schools for the officers of the militia; every male citizen to serve for a very limited time in those armies.

11. RELIGIOUS QUESTION

To be left to the initiative of the French.

Written by K. Marx
at the end of August 1866

Published in the newspapers
The International Courier
Nos. 6-7, February 20, and
Nos. 8-10,
March 13, 1867, and *Le Courier*
international Nos. 10 and 11,
March 9 and 16, 1867, as well as
in the journal *Der Vorbote*
Nos. 10 and 11, October and
November 1866

Printed according to
The International
Courier

KARL MARX

PREFACE TO THE FIRST GERMAN EDITION OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF *CAPITAL*⁴⁵

The work, the first volume of which I now submit to the public, forms the continuation of my *Zur Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie* (*A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*) published in 1859. The long pause between the first part and the continuation is due to an illness of many years' duration that again and again interrupted my work.

The substance of that earlier work is summarised in the first three chapters of this volume.⁴⁶ This is done not merely for the sake of connection and completeness. The presentation of the subject-matter is improved. As far as circumstances in any way permit, many points only hinted at in the earlier book are here worked out more fully, whilst, conversely, points worked out fully there are only touched upon in this volume. The sections on the history of the theories of value and of money are now, of course, left out altogether. The reader of the earlier work will find, however, in the notes to the first chapter additional sources of reference relative to the history of those theories.

Every beginning is difficult, holds in all sciences. To understand the first chapter, especially the section that contains the analysis of commodities, will, therefore, present the greatest difficulty. That which concerns more especially the analysis of the substance of value and the magnitude of value, I have, as much as it was possible, popularised.* The value-form, whose fully developed shape is the money-form, is very elementary and simple. Nevertheless, the human mind has for more than 2,000

* This is the more necessary, as even the section of Ferdinand Lassalle's work against Schulze-Delitzsch, in which he professes to give "the intellectual quintessence" of my explanations on these subjects,⁴⁷ contains important mistakes. If Ferdinand Lassalle has borrowed almost literally from my writings, and without any acknowledgement, all the general theoretical propositions in his economic works, *e.g.*, those on the historical character of capital, on connection between the conditions of production and the mode of production, &c., &c., even to the terminology created by me, this may perhaps be due to purposes of propaganda. I am here, of course, not speaking of his detailed working-out and application of these propositions, with which I have nothing to do. [*Note by Marx.*]

years sought in vain to get to the bottom of it, whilst on the other hand, to the successful analysis of much more composite and complex forms, there has been at least an approximation. Why? Because the body, as an organic whole, is more easy of study than are the cells of that body. In the analysis of economic forms, moreover, neither microscopes nor chemical reagents are of use. The force of abstraction must replace both. But in bourgeois society the commodity-form of the product of labour—or the value-form of the commodity—is the economic cell-form. To the superficial observer, the analysis of these forms seems to turn upon minutiae. It does in fact deal with minutiae, but they are of the same order as those dealt with in microscopic anatomy.

With the exception of the section on value-form, therefore, this volume cannot stand accused on the score of difficulty. I presuppose, of course, a reader who is willing to learn something new and therefore to think for himself.

The physicist either observes physical phenomena where they occur in their most typical form and most free from disturbing influence, or, wherever possible, he makes experiments under conditions that assure the occurrence of the phenomenon in its normality. In this work I have to examine the capitalist mode of production, and the conditions of production and exchange corresponding to that mode. Up to the present time, their classic ground is England. That is the reason why England is used as the chief illustration in the development of my theoretical ideas. If, however, the German reader shrugs his shoulders at the condition of the English industrial and agricultural labourers, or in optimist fashion comforts himself with the thought that in Germany things are not nearly so bad, I must plainly tell him: "*De te fabula narratur!*"*

Intrinsically, it is not a question of the higher or lower degree of development of the social antagonisms that result from the natural laws of capitalist production. It is a question of these laws themselves, of these tendencies working with iron necessity towards inevitable results. The country that is more developed industrially only shows, to the less developed, the image of its own future.

But apart from this. Where capitalist production is fully naturalised among the Germans (for instance, in the factories proper) the condition of things is much worse than in England, because the counterpoise of the Factory Acts is wanting. In all other spheres, we, like all the rest of Continental Western Eu-

* "It is of you that the story is told!" (Horace, *Satires*, Book One, Sat. I.)—*Ed.*

rope, suffer not only from the development of capitalist production, but also from the incompleteness of that development. Alongside of modern evils, a whole series of inherited evils oppress us, arising from the passive survival of antiquated modes of production, with their inevitable train of social and political anachronisms. We suffer not only from the living, but from the dead. *Le mort saisit le vif!**

The social statistics of Germany and the rest of Continental Western Europe are, in comparison with those of England, wretchedly compiled. But they raise the veil just enough to let us catch a glimpse of the Medusa head behind it. We should be appalled at the state of things at home, if, as in England, our governments and parliaments appointed periodically commissions of enquiry into economic conditions; if these commissions were armed with the same plenary powers to get at the truth; if it was possible to find for this purpose men as competent, as free from partisanship and respect of persons as are the English factory-inspectors, her medical reporters on public health, her commissioners of enquiry into the exploitation of women and children, into housing and food. Perseus wore a magic cap that the monsters he hunted down might not see him. We draw the magic cap down over eyes and ears as a make-believe that there are no monsters.

Let us not deceive ourselves on this. As in the 18th century, the American War of Independence¹⁰ sounded the tocsin for the European middle class, so in the 19th century, the American civil war sounded it for the European working-class.⁴ In England the progress of social disintegration is palpable. When it has reached a certain point, it must react on the continent. There it will take a form more brutal or more humane, according to the degree of development of the working-class itself. Apart from higher motives, therefore, their own most important interests dictate to the classes that are for the nonce the ruling ones, the removal of all legally removable hindrances to the free development of the working-class. For this reason, as well as others, I have given so large a space in this volume to the history, the details, and the results of English factory legislation. One nation can and should learn from others. And even when a society has got upon the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement—and it is the ultimate aim of this work to lay bare the economic law of motion of modern society—it can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles

* "The dead holds the living in his grasp!"—*Ed.*

offered by successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth-pangs.

To prevent possible misunderstanding, a word. I paint the capitalist and the landlord in no sense *couleur de rose*. But here individuals are dealt with only in so far as they are the personifications of economic categories, embodiments of particular class-relations and class-interests. My standpoint, from which the evolution of the economic formation of society is viewed as a process of natural history, can less than any other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he socially remains, however much he may subjectively raise himself above them.

In the domain of Political Economy, free scientific enquiry meets not merely the same enemies as in all other domains. The peculiar nature of the material it deals with, summons as foes into the field of battle the most violent, mean and malignant passions of the human breast, the Furies of private interest. The English Established Church,⁴⁸ *e.g.*, will more readily pardon an attack on 38 of its 39 articles than on 1/39 of its income. Nowadays atheism itself is *culpa levis*,* as compared with criticism of existing property relations. Nevertheless, there is an unmistakable advance. I refer, *e.g.*, to the Blue Book published within the last few weeks: "Correspondence with Her Majesty's Missions Abroad, regarding Industrial Questions and Trades Unions."³ The representatives of the English Crown in foreign countries there declare in so many words that in Germany, in France, to be brief, in all the civilised states of the European continent, a radical change in the existing relations between capital and labour is as evident and inevitable as in England. At the same time, on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, Mr. Wade, Vice-President of the United States, declared in public meetings that, after the abolition of slavery, a radical change of the relations of capital and of property in land is next upon the order of the day. These are signs of the times, not to be hidden by purple mantles or black cassocks. They do not signify that to-morrow a miracle will happen. They show that, within the ruling-classes themselves, a foreboding is dawning, that the present society is no solid crystal, but an organism capable of change, and is constantly changing.

The second volume of this work will treat of the process of the circulation of capital (Book II.), and of the varied forms assumed by capital in the course of its development (Book III.), the-third and last volume (Book IV.), the history of the theory.

* Light offence.—Ed.

Every opinion based on scientific criticism I welcome. As to the prejudices of so-called public opinion, to which I have never made concessions, now as aforesaid the maxim of the great Florentine is mine:

*"Segui il tuo corso, e lascia dir le genti."**

Karl Marx

London, July 25, 1867

First published in the book:
K. Marx. *Das Kapital. Kritik
der politischen Oekonomie.*
Erster Band. Hamburg, 1867

Printed according to the
English edition,
London 1887
Edited by Engels

* "Follow your own course, and let people talk" (Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, Purgatory, Canto V, paraphrased).—*Ed.*

KARL MARX

AFTERWORD TO THE SECOND GERMAN EDITION OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF *CAPITAL* *

I must start by informing the readers of the first edition about the alterations made in the second edition. One is struck at once by the clearer arrangement of the book. Additional notes are everywhere marked as notes to the second edition. The following are the most important points with regard to the text itself:

In Chapter I, Section 1, the derivation of value from an analysis of the equations by which every exchange-value is expressed has been carried out with greater scientific strictness; likewise the connexion between the substance of value and the determination of the magnitude of value by socially necessary labour-time, which was only alluded to in the first edition, is now expressly emphasised. Chapter I, Section 3 (The Form of Value), has been completely revised, a task which was made necessary by the double exposition in the first edition, if nothing else.—Let me remark, in passing, that that double exposition had been occasioned by my friend, Dr. L. Kugelmann in Hanover. I was visiting him in the spring of 1867 when the first proofsheets arrived from Hamburg, and he convinced me that most readers needed a supplementary, more didactic explanation of the form of value.—The last section of the first chapter, “The Fetishism of Commodities, etc.,” has largely been altered. Chapter III, Section 1 (The Measure of Value), has been carefully revised, because in the first edition this section had been treated negligently, the reader having been referred to the explanation already given in “Zur Kritik der Politischen Oekonomie,” Berlin 1859. Chapter VII, particularly Part 2,** has been re-written to a great extent.

It would be a waste of time to go into all the partial textual changes, which were often purely stylistic. They occur throughout the book. Nevertheless I find now, on revising the French translation appearing in Paris, that several parts of the German

* This afterword was given as a preface to the English edition of 1887.—*Ed.*

** In the English edition it corresponds to Chapter IX, Section 2.—*Ed.*

original stand in need of rather thorough remoulding, other parts require rather heavy stylistic editing, and still others painstaking elimination of occasional slips. But there was no time for that. For I had been informed only in the autumn of 1871, when in the midst of other urgent work, that the book was sold out and that the printing of the second edition was to begin in January of 1872.

The appreciation which "Das Kapital" rapidly gained in wide circles of the German working-class is the best reward of my labours. Herr Mayer, a Vienna manufacturer, who in economic matters represents the bourgeois point of view, in a pamphlet⁴⁹ published during the Franco-German War aptly expounded the idea that the great capacity for theory, which used to be considered a hereditary German possession, had almost completely disappeared amongst the so-called educated classes in Germany, but that amongst its working-class, on the contrary, that capacity was celebrating its revival.⁵⁰

To the present moment Political Economy, in Germany, is a foreign science. Gustav von Gülich in his "Historical Description of Commerce, Industry," &c.,* especially in the two first volumes published in 1830, has examined at length the historical circumstances that prevented, in Germany, the development of the capitalist mode of production, and consequently the development, in that country, of modern bourgeois society. Thus the soil whence Political Economy springs was wanting. This "science" had to be imported from England and France as a ready-made article; its German professors remained schoolboys. The theoretical expression of a foreign reality was turned, in their hands, into a collection of dogmas, interpreted by them in terms of the petty trading world around them, and therefore misinterpreted. The feeling of scientific impotence, a feeling not wholly to be repressed, and the uneasy consciousness of having to touch a subject in reality foreign to them, was but imperfectly concealed, either under a parade of literary and historical erudition, or by an admixture of extraneous material, borrowed from the so-called "Kameral" sciences, a medley of smatterings, through whose purgatory the hopeless candidate for the German bureaucracy has to pass.

Since 1848 capitalist production has developed rapidly in Germany, and at the present time it is in the full bloom of speculation and swindling. But fate is still unpropitious to our professional economists. At the time when they were able to deal with Political Economy in a straightforward fashion, modern eco-

* *Geschichtliche Darstellung des Handels, der Gewerbe und des Ackerbaus, &c.*, von Gustav von Gülich. 5 vols., Jena. 1830-45.

conomic conditions did not actually exist in Germany. And as soon as these conditions did come into existence, they did so under circumstances that no longer allowed of their being really and impartially investigated within the bounds of the bourgeois horizon. In so far as Political Economy remains within that horizon, in so far, *i.e.*, as the capitalist régime is looked upon as the absolutely final form of social production, instead of as a passing historical phase of its evolution, Political Economy can remain a science only so long as the class-struggle is latent or manifests itself only in isolated and sporadic phenomena.

Let us take England. Its Political Economy belongs to the period in which the class-struggle was as yet undeveloped. Its last great representative, Ricardo, in the end, consciously makes the antagonism of class-interests, of wages and profits, of profits and rent, the starting-point of his investigations, naively taking this antagonism for a social law of Nature. But by this start the science of bourgeois economy had reached the limits beyond which it could not pass. Already in the lifetime of Ricardo, and in opposition to him, it was met by criticism, in the person of Sismondi.*

The succeeding period, from 1820 to 1830, was notable in England for scientific activity in the domain of Political Economy. It was the time as well of the vulgarising and extending of Ricardo's theory, as of the contest of that theory with the old school. Splendid tournaments were held. What was done then, is little known to the Continent generally, because the polemic is for the most part scattered through articles in reviews, occasional literature and pamphlets. The unprejudiced character of this polemic—although the theory of Ricardo already serves, in exceptional cases, as a weapon of attack upon bourgeois economy—is explained by the circumstances of the time. On the one hand, modern industry itself was only just emerging from the age of childhood, as is shown by the fact that with the crisis of 1825 it for the first time opens the periodic cycle of its modern life. On the other hand, the class-struggle between capital and labour is forced into the background, politically by the discord between the governments and the feudal aristocracy gathered around the Holy Alliance⁴⁴ on the one hand, and the popular masses, led by the bourgeoisie, on the other; economically by the quarrel between industrial capital and aristocratic landed property—a quarrel that in France was concealed by the opposition between small and large landed property, and that in England broke out openly after the Corn Laws.³⁰ The literature of Politi-

* See my work "Zur Kritik, &c.," p. 39.

cal Economy in England at this time calls to mind the stormy forward movement in France after Dr. Quesnay's death, but only as a Saint Martin's summer reminds us of spring. With the year 1830 came the decisive crisis.

In France and in England the bourgeoisie had conquered political power. Thenceforth, the class struggle, practically as well as theoretically, took on more and more outspoken and threatening forms. It sounded the knell of scientific bourgeois economy. It was thenceforth no longer a question, whether this theorem or that was true, but whether it was useful to capital or harmful, expedient or inexpedient, politically dangerous or not. In place of disinterested inquirers, there were hired prize-fighters; in place of genuine scientific research, the bad conscience and the evil intent of apologetic. Still, even the obtrusive pamphlets with which the Anti-Corn Law League, led by the manufacturers Cobden and Bright, deluged the world, have a historic interest, if no scientific one, on account of their polemic against the landed aristocracy. But since then the Free-trade legislation, inaugurated by Sir Robert Peel, has deprived vulgar economy of this its last sting.

The Continental revolution of 1848 also had its reaction in England. Men who still claimed some scientific standing and aspired to be something more than mere sophists and sycophants of the ruling-classes, tried to harmonise the Political Economy of capital with the claims, no longer to be ignored, of the proletariat. Hence a shallow syncretism, of which John Stuart Mill is the best representative. It is a declaration of bankruptcy by bourgeois economy, an event on which the great Russian scholar and critic, N. Tschernyschewsky, has thrown the light of a master mind in his "Outlines of Political Economy according to Mill."

In Germany, therefore, the capitalist mode of production came to a head, after its antagonistic character had already, in France and England, shown itself in a fierce strife of classes. And meanwhile, moreover, the German proletariat had attained a much more clear class-consciousness than the German bourgeoisie. Thus, at the very moment when a bourgeois science of Political Economy seemed at last possible in Germany, it had in reality again become impossible.

Under these circumstances its professors fell into two groups. The one set, prudent, practical business folk, flocked to the banner of Bastiat, the most superficial and therefore the most adequate representative of the apologetic of vulgar economy; the other, proud of the professorial dignity of their science, followed John Stuart Mill in his attempt to reconcile irreconcilables. Just

as in the classical time of bourgeois economy, so also in the time of its decline, the Germans remained mere schoolboys, imitators and followers, petty retailers and hawkers in the service of the great foreign wholesale concern.

The peculiar historical development of German society therefore forbids, in that country, all original work in bourgeois economy; but not the criticism of that economy. So far as such criticism represents a class, it can only represent the class whose vocation in history is the overthrow of the capitalist mode of production and the final abolition of all classes—the proletariat.

The learned and unlearned spokesmen of the German bourgeoisie tried at first to kill “Das Kapital” by silence, as they had managed to do with my earlier writings. As soon as they found that these tactics no longer fitted in with the conditions of the time, they wrote, under pretence of criticising my book, prescriptions “for the tranquillisation of the bourgeois mind.” But they found in the workers’ press—see, *e.g.*, Joseph Dietzgen’s articles in the *Volksstaat*⁵¹—antagonists stronger than themselves, to whom (down to this very day) they owe a reply.*

An excellent Russian translation of “Das Kapital” appeared in the spring of 1872. The edition of 3,000 copies is already nearly exhausted. As early as 1871, N. Sieber, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Kiev, in his work “David Ricardo’s Theory of Value and of Capital,” referred to my theory of value, of money and of capital, as in its fundamentals a necessary sequel to the teaching of Smith and Ricardo. That which astonishes the Western European in the reading of this excellent work, is the author’s consistent and firm grasp of the purely theoretical position.

That the method employed in “Das Kapital” has been little understood, is shown by the various conceptions, contradictory one to another, that have been formed of it.

Thus the Paris *Revue Positiviste*⁵⁴ reproaches me in that, on

* The mealy-mouthed babblers of German vulgar economy fell foul of the style of my book. No one can feel the literary shortcomings in “Das Kapital” more strongly than I myself. Yet I will for the benefit and the enjoyment of these gentlemen and their public quote in this connexion one English and one Russian notice. The *Saturday Review*,⁵² always hostile to my views, said in its notice of the first edition: “The presentation of the subject invests the driest economic questions with a certain peculiar charm.” The “St. Petersburg Journal” (Sankt-Peterburgskie Vedomosti⁵³), in its issue of April 20, 1872, says: “The presentation of the subject, with the exception of one or two exceptionally special parts, is distinguished by its comprehensibility by the general reader, its clearness, and, in spite of the scientific intricacy of the subject, by an unusual liveliness. In this respect the author in no way resembles ... the majority of German scholars who ... write their books in a language so dry and obscure that the heads of ordinary mortals are cracked by it.”

the one hand, I treat economics metaphysically, and on the other hand—imagine!—confine myself to the mere critical analysis of actual facts, instead of writing receipts (Comtist ones?) for the cook-shops of the future. In answer to the reproach *in re* metaphysics, Professor Sieber has it:

“In so far as it deals with actual theory, the method of Marx is the deductive method of the whole English school, a school whose failings and virtues are common to the best theoretic economists.”⁵⁵

M. Block—“*Les Théoriciens du Socialisme en Allemagne. Extrait du Journal des Économistes, Juillet et Août 1872*”—makes the discovery that my method is analytic and says:

“Par cet ouvrage M. Marx se classe parmi les esprits analytiques les plus éminents.”*

German reviews, of course, shriek out at “Hegelian sophistics.” The *European Messenger*⁵⁶ of St. Petersburg in an article dealing exclusively with the method of “*Das Kapital*” (May number, 1872, pp. 427-436),** finds my method of inquiry severely realistic, but my method of presentation, unfortunately, German-dialectical. It says:

“At first sight, if the judgment is based on the external form of the presentation of the subject, Marx is the most ideal of ideal philosophers, always in the German, *i.e.*, the bad sense of the word. But in point of fact he is infinitely more realistic than all his fore-runners in the work of economic criticism. He can in no sense be called an idealist.”

I cannot answer the writer better than by aid of a few extracts from his own criticism, which may interest some of my readers to whom the Russian original is inaccessible.

After a quotation from the preface to my “*Criticism of Political Economy*,” Berlin, 1859, pp. IV-VII,*** where I discuss the materialistic basis of my method, the writer goes on:

“The one thing which is of moment to Marx, is to find the law of the phenomena with whose investigation he is concerned; and not only is that law of moment to him, which governs these phenomena, in so far as they have a definite form and mutual connexion within a given historical period. Of still greater moment to him is the law of their variation, of their development, *i.e.*, of their transition from one form into another, from one series of connexions into a different one. This law once discovered, he investigates in detail the effects in which it manifests itself in social life. Consequently, Marx only troubles himself about one thing: to show, by rigid scientific investigation, the necessity of successive determinate orders of social condi-

* “This work classes Mr. Marx among the most eminent analytical minds.”—*Ed.*

** The reference is to an article written by I. I. Kaufman.—*Ed.*

*** See present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 503-04.—*Ed.*

tions, and to establish, as impartially as possible, the facts that serve him for fundamental starting-points. For this it is quite enough, if he proves, at the same time, both the necessity of the present order of things, and the necessity of another order into which the first must inevitably pass over; and this all the same, whether men believe or do not believe it, whether they are conscious or unconscious of it. Marx treats the social movement as a process of natural history, governed by laws not only independent of human will, consciousness and intelligence, but rather, on the contrary, determining that will, consciousness and intelligence... If in the history of civilisation the conscious element plays a part so subordinate, then it is self-evident that a critical inquiry whose subject-matter is civilisation, can, less than anything else, have for its basis any form of, or any result of, consciousness. That is to say, that not the idea, but the material phenomenon alone can serve as its starting-point. Such an inquiry will confine itself to the confrontation and the comparison of a fact, not with ideas, but with another fact. For this inquiry, the one thing of moment is, that both facts be investigated as accurately as possible, and that they actually form, each with respect to the other, different momenta of an evolution; but most important of all is the rigid analysis of the series of successions, of the sequences and concatenations in which the different stages of such an evolution present themselves. But it will be said, the general laws of economic life are one and the same, no matter whether they are applied to the present or the past. This Marx directly denies. According to him, such abstract laws do not exist. On the contrary, in his opinion every historical period has laws of its own... As soon as society has outlived a given period of development, and is passing over from one given stage to another, it begins to be subject also to other laws. In a word, economic life offers us a phenomenon analogous to the history of evolution in other branches of biology. The old economists misunderstood the nature of economic laws when they likened them to the laws of physics and chemistry. A more thorough analysis of phenomena shows that social organisms differ among themselves as fundamentally as plants or animals. Nay, one and the same phenomenon falls under quite different laws in consequence of the different structure of those organisms as a whole, of the variations of their individual organs, of the different conditions in which those organs function, &c. Marx, *e.g.*, denies that the law of population is the same at all times and in all places. He asserts, on the contrary, that every stage of development has its own law of population... With the varying degree of development of productive power, social conditions and the laws governing them vary too. Whilst Marx sets himself the task of following and explaining from this point of view the economic system established by the sway of capital, he is only formulating, in a strictly scientific manner, the aim that every accurate investigation into economic life must have. The scientific value of such an inquiry lies in the disclosing of the special laws that regulate the origin, existence, development, death of a given social organism and its replacement by another and higher one. And it is this value that, in point of fact, Marx's book has."

Whilst the writer pictures what he takes to be actually my method, in this striking and [as far as concerns my own application of it] generous way, what else is he picturing but the dialectic method?

Of course the method of presentation must differ in form from that of inquiry. The latter has to appropriate the material in detail, to analyse its different forms of development, to trace out

their inner connexion. Only after this work is done, can the actual movement be adequately described. If this is done successfully, if the life of the subject-matter is ideally reflected as in a mirror, then it may appear as if we had before us a mere a priori construction.

My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, *i.e.*, the process of thinking, which, under the name of "the Idea," he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of "the Idea." With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought.

The mystifying side of Hegelian dialectic I criticised nearly thirty years ago, at a time when it was still the fashion. But just as I was working at the first volume of "Das Kapital," it was the good pleasure of the peevish, arrogant, mediocre *Ἐπιγονοί**⁵⁷ who now talk large in cultured Germany, to treat Hegel in the same way as the brave Moses Mendelssohn in Lessing's time treated Spinoza, *i.e.*, as a "dead dog." I therefore openly avowed myself the pupil of that mighty thinker, and even here and there, in the chapter on the theory of value, coquetted with the modes of expression peculiar to him. The mystification which dialectic suffers in Hegel's hands, by no means prevents him from being the first to present its general form of working in a comprehensive and conscious manner. With him it is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again, if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell.

In its mystified form, dialectic became the fashion in Germany, because it seemed to transfigure and to glorify the existing state of things. In its rational form it is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors, because it includes in its comprehension and affirmative recognition of the existing state of things, at the same time also, the recognition of the negation of that state, of its inevitable breaking up; because it regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence; because it lets nothing impose upon it, and is in its essence critical and revolutionary.

The contradictions inherent in the movement of capitalist society impress themselves upon the practical bourgeois most strikingly in the changes of the periodic cycle, through which modern industry runs, and whose crowning point is the universal crisis.

* Epigoni.—Ed.

That crisis is once again approaching, although as yet but in its preliminary stage; and by the universality of its theatre and the intensity of its action it will drum dialectics even into the heads of the mushroom-upstarts of the new, holy Prusso-German empire.

Karl Marx

London, *January 24*, 1873

First published in
the book: K. Marx,
*Das Kapital. Kritik der
politischen Oekonomie*,
Erster Band, Zweite
verbesserte Auflage,
Hamburg, 1872

Printed according to the
English edition, London, 1887
Edited by Engels

KARL MARX

CAPITAL

PART VIII*

THE SO-CALLED PRIMITIVE ACCUMULATION

Chapter XXVI

THE SECRET OF PRIMITIVE ACCUMULATION

We have seen how money is changed into capital; how through capital surplus-value is made, and from surplus-value more capital. But the accumulation of capital pre-supposes surplus-value; surplus-value pre-supposes capitalistic production; capitalistic production pre-supposes the pre-existence of considerable masses of capital and of labour-power in the hands of producers of commodities. The whole movement, therefore, seems to turn in a vicious circle, out of which we can only get by supposing a primitive accumulation (previous accumulation of Adam Smith) preceding capitalistic accumulation; an accumulation not the result of the capitalist mode of production but its starting-point.

This primitive accumulation plays in Political Economy about the same part as original sin in theology. Adam bit the apple, and thereupon sin fell on the human race. Its origin is supposed to be explained when it is told as an anecdote of the past. In times long gone by there were two sorts of people; one, the diligent, intelligent, and, above all, frugal élite; the other, lazy rascals, spending their substance, and more, in riotous living. The legend of theological original sin tells us certainly how man came to be condemned to eat his bread in the sweat of his brow; but the history of economic original sin reveals to us that there are people to whom this is by no means essential. Never mind! Thus it came to pass that the former sort accumulated wealth, and the latter sort had at last nothing to sell except their own skins. And from this original sin dates the poverty of the great majority that, despite all its labour, has up to now nothing to sell but itself, and the wealth of the few that increases constantly although they have long ceased to work. Such insipid childishness is every day preached to us in the defence of property. M. Thiers, *e.g.*, had the assurance to repeat it with all the solemnity of a statesman, to the French people, once so *spirituel*. But as soon as the question of property crops up, it becomes a sacred duty to proclaim the intellectual food of the infant as the one thing

* In the German edition it corresponds to Chapter XXIV.—Ed.

fit for all ages and for all stages of development. In actual history it is notorious that conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder, briefly force, play the great part. In the tender annals of Political Economy, the idyllic reigns from time immemorial. Right and "labour" were from all time the sole means of enrichment, the present year of course always excepted. As a matter of fact, the methods of primitive accumulation are anything but idyllic.

In themselves money and commodities are no more capital than are the means of production and of subsistence. They want transforming into capital. But this transformation itself can only take place under certain circumstances that centre in this, viz., that two very different kinds of commodity-possessors must come face to face and into contact; on the one hand, the owners of money, means of production, means of subsistence, who are eager to increase the sum of values they possess, by buying other people's labour-power; on the other hand, free labourers, the sellers of their own labour-power, and therefore the sellers of labour. Free labourers, in the double sense that neither they themselves form part and parcel of the means of production, as in the case of slaves, bondsmen, &c., nor do the means of production belong to them, as in the case of peasant-proprietors; they are, therefore, free from, unencumbered by, any means of production of their own. With this polarisation of the market for commodities, the fundamental conditions of capitalist production are given. The capitalist system pre-supposes the complete separation of the labourers from all property in the means by which they can realise their labour. As soon as capitalist production is once on its own legs, it not only maintains this separation, but reproduces it on a continually extending scale. The process, therefore, that clears the way for the capitalist system, can be none other than the process which takes away from the labourer the possession of his means of production; a process that transforms, on the one hand, the social means of subsistence and of production into capital, on the other, the immediate producers into wage-labourers. The so-called primitive accumulation, therefore, is nothing else than the historical process of divorcing the producer from the means of production. It appears as primitive, because it forms the pre-historic stage of capital and of the mode of production corresponding with it.

The economic structure of capitalistic society has grown out of the economic structure of feudal society. The dissolution of the latter set free the elements of the former.

The immediate producer, the labourer, could only dispose of his own person after he had ceased to be attached to the soil and ceased to be the slave, serf, or bondman of another. To become

a free seller of labour power, who carries his commodity wherever he finds a market, he must further have escaped from the regime of the guilds, their rules for apprentices and journeymen, and the impediments of their labour regulations. Hence, the historical movement which changes the producers into wage-workers, appears, on the one hand, as their emancipation from serfdom and from the fetters of the guilds, and this side alone exists for our bourgeois historians. But, on the other hand, these new freedmen became sellers of themselves only after they had been robbed of all their own means of production, and of all the guarantees of existence afforded by the old feudal arrangements. And the history of this, their expropriation, is written in the annals of mankind in letters of blood and fire.

The industrial capitalists, these new potentates, had on their part not only to displace the guild masters of handicrafts, but also the feudal lords, the possessors of the sources of wealth. In this respect their conquest of social power appears as the fruit of a victorious struggle both against feudal lordship and its revolting prerogatives, and against the guilds and the fetters they laid on the free development of production and the free exploitation of man by man. The chevaliers d'industrie, however, only succeeded in supplanting the chevaliers of the sword by making use of events of which they themselves were wholly innocent. They have risen by means as vile as those by which the Roman freedman once on a time made himself the master of his *patronus*.

The starting-point of the development that gave rise to the wage-labourer as well as to the capitalist, was the servitude of the labourer. The advance consisted in a change of form of this servitude, in the transformation of feudal exploitation into capitalist exploitation. To understand its march, we need not go back very far. Although we come across the first beginnings of capitalist production as early as the 14th or 15th century, sporadically, in certain towns of the Mediterranean, the capitalistic era dates from the 16th century. Wherever it appears, the abolition of serfdom has been long effected, and the highest development of the middle ages, the existence of sovereign towns, has been long on the wane.

In the history of primitive accumulation, all revolutions are epoch-making that act as levers for the capitalist class in course of formation; but, above all, those moments when great masses of men are suddenly and forcibly torn from their means of subsistence, and hurled as free and "unattached" proletarians on the labour-market. The expropriation of the agricultural producer, of the peasant, from the soil, is the basis of the whole process.

The history of this expropriation, in different countries, assumes different aspects, and runs through its various phases in different orders of succession, and at different periods. In England alone, which we take as our example, has it the classic form.*

Chapter XXVII

EXPROPRIATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL POPULATION FROM THE LAND

In England, serfdom had practically disappeared in the last part of the 14th century. The immense majority of the population** consisted then, and to a still larger extent, in the 15th century, of free peasant proprietors, whatever was the feudal title under which their right of property was hidden. In the larger seignorial domains, the old bailiff, himself a serf, was displaced by the free farmer. The wage-labourers of agriculture consisted partly of peasants, who utilised their leisure time by working on the large estates, partly of an independent special class of wage-labourers, relatively and absolutely few in numbers. The latter also were practically at the same time peasant farmers, since, besides their wages, they had allotted to them arable land to the extent of 4 or more acres, together with their cottages. Besides they, with the rest of the peasants, enjoyed the usufruct of the common land, which gave pasture to their cattle, furnished them

* In Italy, where capitalistic production developed earliest, the dissolution of serfdom also took place earlier than elsewhere. The serf was emancipated in that country before he had acquired any prescriptive right to the soil. His emancipation at once transformed him into a free proletarian, who, moreover, found his master ready waiting for him in the towns, for the most part handed down as legacies from the Roman time. When the revolution of the world-market, about the end of the 15th century,⁵⁸ annihilated Northern Italy's commercial supremacy, a movement in the reverse direction set in. The labourers of the towns were driven *en masse* into the country, and gave an impulse, never before seen, to the *petite culture*, carried on in the form of gardening.

** "The petty proprietors who cultivated their own fields with their own hands, and enjoyed a modest competence . . . then formed a much more important part of the nation than at present. If we may trust the best statistical writers of that age, not less than 160,000 proprietors who, with their families, must have made up more than a seventh of the whole population, derived their subsistence from little freehold estates. The average income of these small landlords . . . was estimated at between £60 and £70 a year. It was computed that the number of persons who tilled their own land was greater than the number of those who farmed the land of others." Macaulay: "History of England," 10th ed., 1854, I, pp. 333, 334. Even in the last third of the 17th century, 4/5 of the English people were agricultural. (I.c., p. 413.) I quote Macaulay, because as systematic falsifier of history he minimises as much as possible facts of this kind.

with timber, fire-wood, turf, &c.* In all countries of Europe, feudal production is characterised by division of the soil amongst the greatest possible number of sub-feudatories. The might of the feudal lord, like that of the sovereign, depended not on the length of his rent-roll, but on the number of his subjects, and the latter depended on the number of peasant proprietors.** Although, therefore, the English land, after the Norman conquest, was distributed in gigantic baronies, one of which often included some 900 of the old Anglo-Saxon lordships, it was bestrewn with small peasant properties, only here and there interspersed with great seignorial domains. Such conditions, together with the prosperity of the towns so characteristic of the 15th century, allowed of that wealth of the people which Chancellor Fortescue so eloquently paints in his "Laudibus legum Angliae"; but it excluded the possibility of capitalistic wealth.

The prelude of the revolution that laid the foundation of the capitalist mode of production, was played in the last third of the 15th, and the first decade of the 16th century. A mass of free proletarians was hurled on the labour-market by the breaking-up of the bands of feudal retainers, who, as Sir James Steuart well says, "everywhere uselessly filled house and castle."⁵⁹ Although the royal power, itself a product of bourgeois development, in its strife after absolute sovereignty forcibly hastened on the dissolution of these bands of retainers, it was by no means the sole cause of it. In insolent conflict with king and parliament, the great feudal lords created an incomparably larger proletariat by the forcible driving of the peasantry from the land, to which the latter had the same feudal right as the lord himself, and by the usurpation of the common lands. The rapid rise of the Flemish wool manufactures, and the corresponding rise in the price of wool in England, gave the direct impulse to these evictions. The old nobility had been devoured by the great feudal wars. The new nobility was the child of its time, for which

* We must never forget that even the serf was not only the owner, if but a tribute-paying owner, of the piece of land attached to his house, but also a co-possessor of the common land. "Le paysan (in Silesia, under Frederick II.) est serf." Nevertheless, these serfs possess common lands. "On n'a pas pu encore engager les Silésiens au partage des communes, tandis que dans la Nouvelle Marche, il n'y a guère de village où ce partage ne soit exécuté avec le plus grand succès." (Mirabeau: "De la Monarchie Prussienne." Londres, 1788, t. ii, pp. 125, 126.)

** Japan, with its purely feudal organisation of landed property and its developed *petite culture*, gives a much truer picture of the European middle ages than all our history books, dictated as these are, for the most part, by bourgeois prejudices. It is very convenient to be "liberal" at the expense of the middle ages.

money was the power of all powers. Transformation of arable land into sheep-walks was, therefore, its cry. Harrison, in his "Description of England, prefixed to Holinshed's Chronicles," describes how the expropriation of small peasants is ruining the country. "What care our great encroachers?" The dwellings of the peasants and the cottages of the labourers were razed to the ground or doomed to decay.

"If," says Harrison, "the old records of euerie manour be sought . . . it will soon appear that in some manour seventeene, eighteene, or twentie houses are shrunk . . . that England was neuer less furnished with people than at the present. . . . Of cities and townes either utterly decaied or more than a quarter or half diminished, though some one be a little increased here or there; of townes pulled downe for sheepe-walks, and no more but the lordships now standing in them . . . I could saie somewhat."

The complaints of these old chroniclers are always exaggerated, but they reflect faithfully the impression made on contemporaries by the revolution in the conditions of production. A comparison of the writings of Chancellor Fortescue and Thomas More reveals the gulf between the 15th and 16th century. As Thornton rightly has it, the English working-class was precipitated without any transition from its golden into its iron age.

Legislation was terrified at this revolution. It did not yet stand on that height of civilisation where the "wealth of the nation" (*i.e.*, the formation of capital, and the reckless exploitation and impoverishing of the mass of the people) figure as the *ultima Thule* of all state-craft. In his history of Henry VII., Bacon says:

"Inclosures at that time (1489) began to be more frequent, whereby arable land (which could not be manured without people and families) was turned into pasture, which was easily rid by a few herdsmen; and tenancies for years, lives, and at will (whereupon much of the yeomanry lived) were turned into demesnes. This bred a decay of people, and (by consequence) a decay of towns, churches, tithes, and the like. . . . In remedying of this inconvenience the king's wisdom was admirable, and the parliament's at that time . . . they took a course to take away depopulating inclosures, and depopulating pasturage."

An Act of Henry VII., 1489, cap. 19, forbad the destruction of all "houses of husbandry" to which at least 20 acres of land belonged. By an Act, 25 Henry VIII., the same law was renewed. It recites, among other things, that many farms and large flocks of cattle, especially of sheep, are concentrated in the hands of a few men, whereby the rent of land has much risen and tillage has fallen off, churches and houses have been pulled down, and marvellous numbers of people have been deprived of the means wherewith to maintain themselves and their families. The Act, therefore, ordains the rebuilding of the decayed farm-steads, and

fixes a proportion between corn land and pasture land, &c. An Act of 1533 recites that some owners possess 24,000 sheep, and limits the number to be owned to 2,000.* The cry of the people and the legislation directed, for 150 years after Henry VII., against the expropriation of the small farmers and peasants, were alike fruitless. The secret of their inefficiency Bacon, without knowing it, reveals to us.

"The device of King Henry VII.," says Bacon, in his "Essays, Civil and Moral," Essay 29, "was profound and admirable, in making farms and houses of husbandry of a standard; that is, maintained with such a proportion of land unto them as may breed a subject to live in convenient plenty, and no servile condition, and to keep the plough in the hands of the owners and not mere hirelings."**

What the capitalist system demanded was, on the other hand, a degraded and almost servile condition of the mass of the people, the transformation of them into mercenaries, and of their means of labour into capital. During this transformation period, legislation also strove to retain the 4 acres of land by the cottage of the agricultural wage-labourer, and forbade him to take lodgers into his cottage. In the reign of James I., 1627, Roger Crocker of Front Mill, was condemned for having built a cottage on the manor of Front Mill without 4 acres of land attached to the same in perpetuity. As late as Charles I.'s reign, 1638, a royal commission was appointed to enforce the carrying out of

* In his "Utopia," Thomas More says, that in England "your shepe that were wont to be so make and tame, and so smal eaters, now, as I heare saye, be become so great devourers and so wyld that they eate up, and swallow downe, the very men themselves." "Utopia," transl. by Robinson, ed. Arber, Lond., 1869, p. 41.

** Bacon shows the connexion between a free, well-to-do peasantry and good infantry. "This did wonderfully concern the might and mannerhood of the kingdom to have farms as it were of a standard sufficient to maintain an able body out of penury, and did in effect amortise a great part of the lands of the kingdom unto the hold and occupation of the yeomanry or middle people, of a condition between gentlemen, and cottagers and peasants. . . For it hath been held by the general opinion of men of best judgment in the wars . . . that the principal strength of an army consisteth in the infantry or foot. And to make good infantry it requireth men bred, not in a servile or indigent fashion, but in some free and plentiful manner. Therefore, if a state run most to noblemen and gentlemen, and that the husbandmen and ploughmen be but as their workfolk and labourers, or else mere cottagers (which are but hous'd beggars), you may have a good cavalry, but never good stable bands of foot. . . And this is to be seen in France, and Italy, and some other parts abroad, where in effect all is noblesse or peasantry . . . insomuch that they are enforced to employ mercenary bands of Switzers and the like, for their battalions of foot; whereby also it comes to pass that those nations have much people and few soldiers." ("The Reign of Henry VII." Verbatim reprint from Kennet's England. Ed. 1719. Lond., 1870, p. 308.)

the old laws, especially that referring to the 4 acres of land. Even in Cromwell's time, the building of a house within 4 miles of London was forbidden unless it was endowed with 4 acres of land. As late as the first half of the 18th century complaint is made if the cottage of the agricultural labourer has not an adjunct of one or two acres of land. Nowadays he is lucky if it is furnished with a little garden, or if he may rent, far away from his cottage, a few roods.

"Landlords and farmers," says Dr. Hunter, "work here hand in hand. A few acres to the cottage would make the labourers too independent."**

The process of forcible expropriation of the people received in the 16th century a new and frightful impulse from the Reformation, and from the consequent colossal spoliation of the church property. The Catholic church was, at the time of the Reformation, feudal proprietor of a great part of the English land. The suppression of the monasteries, &c., hurled their inmates into the proletariat. The estates of the church were to a large extent given away to rapacious royal favourites, or sold at a nominal price to speculating farmers and citizens, who drove out, *en masse*, the hereditary sub-tenants and threw their holdings into one. The legally guaranteed property of the poorer folk in a part of the church's tithes was tacitly confiscated.** "Pauper ubique jacet,"⁶⁰ cried Queen Elizabeth, after a journey through England. In the 43rd year of her reign the nation was obliged to recognise pauperism officially by the introduction of a poor-rate.

"The authors of this law seem to have been ashamed to state the grounds of it, for [contrary to traditional usage] it has no preamble whatever."***

By the 16th of Charles I., ch. 4, it was declared perpetual, and in fact only in 1834 did it take a new and harsher form.****

* Dr. Hunter, "Public Health. 7th Report 1864," London, 1865, p. 134. "The quantity of land assigned (in the old laws) would now be judged too great for labourers, and rather as likely to convert them into small farmers." (George Roberts: "The Social History of the People of the Southern Counties of England in Past Centuries." Lond., 1856, pp. 184-185.)

** "The right of the poor to share in the tithe, is established by the tenour of ancient statutes." (Tuckett, "A History of the Past and Present State of the Labouring Population," London, 1846, Vol. II, pp. 804-805.)

*** William Cobbett: "A History of the Protestant Reformation," §471.

**** The "spirit" of Protestantism may be seen from the following, among other things. In the south of England certain landed proprietors and well-to-do farmers put their heads together and propounded ten questions as to the right interpretation of the poor-law of Elizabeth. These they laid before a celebrated jurist of that time, Sergeant Snigge (later a judge under James I.) for his opinion. "Question 9—Some of the more wealthy farmers in the parish have

These immediate results of the Reformation were not its most lasting ones. The property of the church formed the religious bulwark of the traditional conditions of landed property. With its fall these were no longer tenable.*

Even in the last decade of the 17th century, the yeomanry, the class of independent peasants, were more numerous than the class of farmers. They had formed the backbone of Cromwell's strength, and, even according to the confession of Macaulay, stood in favourable contrast to the drunken squires and to their servants, the country clergy, who had to marry their masters' cast-off mistresses. About 1750, the yeomanry had disappeared,**

devised a skilful mode by which all the trouble of executing this Act (the 43rd of Elizabeth) might be avoided. They have proposed that we shall erect a prison in the parish, and then give notice to the neighbourhood, that if any persons are disposed to farm the poor of this parish, they do give in sealed proposals, on a certain day, of the lowest price at which they will take them off our hands; and that they will be authorised to refuse to any one unless he be shut up in the aforesaid prison. The proposers of this plan conceive that there will be found in the adjoining counties, persons, who, being unwilling to labour and not possessing substance or credit to take a farm or ship, so as to live without labour, may be induced to make a very advantageous offer to the parish. If any of the poor perish under the contractor's care, the sin will lie at his door, as the parish will have done its duty by them. We are, however, apprehensive that the present Act (43rd of Elizabeth) will not warrant a prudential measure of this kind; but you are to learn that the rest of the freeholders of the county, and of the adjoining county of B, will very readily join in instructing their members to propose an Act to enable the parish to contract with a person to lock up and work the poor; and to declare that if any person shall refuse to be so locked up and worked, he shall be entitled to no relief. This, it is hoped, will prevent persons in distress from wanting relief, and be the means of keeping down parishes." (R. Blakey: "The History of Political Literature from the Earliest Times." Lond., 1855, Vol. II., pp. 84-85.) In Scotland, the abolition of serfdom took place some centuries later than in England. Even in 1698, Fletcher of Saltoun, declared in the Scotch parliament, "The number of beggars in Scotland is reckoned at not less than 200,000. The only remedy that I, a republican on principle, can suggest, is to restore the old state of serfdom, to make slaves of all those who are unable to provide for their own subsistence." Eden, "The State of the Poor," London, 1797. Book 1., ch. 1, pp. 60-61, says, "The decrease of villenage seems necessarily to have been the era of the origin of the poor. Manufactures and commerce are the two parents of our national poor." Eden, like our Scotch republican on principle, errs only in this: not the abolition of villenage, but the abolition of the property of the agricultural labourer in the soil made him a proletarian, and eventually a pauper. In France, where the expropriation was effected in another way, the ordonnance of Moulins, 1571, and the Edict of 1656, correspond to the English poor-laws.

* Professor Rogers, although formerly Professor of Political Economy in the University of Oxford, the hotbed of Protestant orthodoxy, in his preface to the "History of Agriculture" lays stress on the fact of the pauperisation of the mass of the people by the Reformation.

** "A Letter to Sir T. C. Bunbury, Bart., on the High Price of Provisions. By a Suffolk Gentleman." Ipswich, 1795, p. 4. Even the fanatical advocate

and so had, in the last decade of the 18th century, the last trace of the common land of the agricultural labourer. We leave on one side here the purely economic causes of the agricultural revolution. We deal only with the forcible means employed.

After the restoration of the Stuarts, the landed proprietors carried, by legal means, an act of usurpation, effected everywhere on the Continent without any legal formality. They abolished the feudal tenure of land, *i.e.*, they got rid of all its obligations to the State, "indemnified" the State by taxes on the peasantry and the rest of the mass of the people, vindicated for themselves the rights of modern private property in estates to which they had only a feudal title, and, finally, passed those laws of settlement, which, *mutatis mutandis*, had the same effect on the English agricultural labourer, as the edict of the Tartar Boris Godunof on the Russian peasantry.⁶¹

The "glorious Revolution"⁶² brought into power, along with William of Orange, the landlord and capitalist appropriators of surplus-value.* They inaugurated the new era by practising on a colossal scale thefts of state lands, thefts that had been hitherto managed more modestly. These estates were given away, sold at a ridiculous figure, or even annexed to private estates by direct seizure.** All this happened without the slightest observation of legal etiquette. The Crown lands thus fraudulently appropriated, together with the robbery of the Church estates, as far as these had not been lost again during the republican revolution, form the basis of the to-day princely domains of the English oligar-

of the system of large farms, the author of the "Inquiry into the Connexion between the Present Price of Provisions," London, 1773, p. 139, says: "I most lament the loss of our yeomanry, that set of men who really kept up the independence of this nation; and sorry I am to see their lands now in the hands of monopolising lords, tenanted out to small farmers, who hold their leases on such conditions as to be little better than vassals ready to attend a summons on every mischievous occasion."

* On the private moral character of this bourgeois hero, among other things: "The large grant of lands in Ireland to Lady Orkney, in 1695, is a public instance of the king's affection, and the lady's influence. . . . Lady Orkney's endearing offices are supposed to have been—*foeda laborum ministeria*." (In the Sloane Manuscript Collection, at the British Museum, No. 4224. The Manuscript is entitled: "The character and behaviour of King William, Sunderland, etc., as represented in Original Letters to the Duke of Shrewsbury from Somers, Halifax, Oxford, Secretary Vernon, etc." It is full of curiosa.)

** "The illegal alienation of the Crown Estates, partly by sale and partly by gift, is a scandalous chapter in English history . . . a gigantic fraud on the nation." (F. W. Newman, "Lectures on Political Economy," London, 1851, pp. 129, 130.) [For details as to how the present large landed proprietors of England came into their possessions see "Our Old Nobility. By Noblesse Oblige." London, 1879.—F. E.]

chy.* The bourgeois capitalists favoured the operation with the view, among others, to promoting free trade in land, to extending the domain of modern agriculture on the large farm-system, and to increasing their supply of the free agricultural proletarians ready to hand. Besides, the new landed aristocracy was the natural ally of the new bankocracy, of the newly-hatched *haute finance*, and of the large manufacturers, then depending on protective duties. The English bourgeoisie acted for its own interest quite as wisely as did the Swedish bourgeoisie who, reversing the process, hand in hand with their economic allies, the peasantry, helped the kings in the forcible resumption of the Crown lands from the oligarchy. This happened since 1604 under Charles X. and Charles XI.

Communal property—always distinct from the State property just dealt with—was an old Teutonic institution which lived on under cover of feudalism. We have seen how the forcible usurpation of this, generally accompanied by the turning of arable into pasture land, begins at the end of the 15th and extends into the 16th century. But, at that time, the process was carried on by means of individual acts of violence against which legislation, for a hundred and fifty years, fought in vain. The advance made by the 18th century shows itself in this, that the law itself becomes now the instrument of the theft of the people's land, although the large farmers make use of their little independent methods as well.** The parliamentary form of the robbery is that of Acts for enclosures of Commons, in other words, decrees by which the landlords grant themselves the people's land as private property, decrees of expropriation of the people. Sir F. M. Eden refutes his own crafty special pleading, in which he tries to represent communal property as the private property of the great landlords who have taken the place of the feudal lords, when he, himself, demands a "general Act of Parliament for the enclosure of Commons" (admitting thereby that a parliamentary *coup d'état* is necessary for its transformation into private property), and moreover calls on the legislature for the indemnification for the expropriated poor.***

* Read, e.g., E. Burke's Pamphlet on the ducal house of Bedford, whose offshoot was Lord John Russell, the "tomtit of Liberalism."

** "The farmers forbid cottagers to keep any living creatures besides themselves and children, under the pretence that if they keep any beasts or poultry, they will steal from the farmers' barns for their support; they also say, keep the cottagers poor and you will keep them industrious, &c., but the real fact, I believe, is that the farmers may have the whole right of common to themselves." ("A Political Inquiry into the Consequences of Enclosing Waste Lands." London, 1785, p. 75.)

*** Eden, l. c., preface.

Whilst the place of the independent yeoman was taken by tenants at will, small farmers on yearly leases, a servile rabble dependent on the pleasure of the landlords, the systematic robbery of the Communal lands helped especially, next to the theft of the State domains, to swell those large farms, that were called in the 18th century capital farms* or merchant farms,** and to "set free" the agricultural population as proletarians for manufacturing industry.

The 18th century, however, did not yet recognise as fully as the 19th, the identity between national wealth and the poverty of the people. Hence the most vigorous polemic, in the economic literature of that time, on the "enclosure of commons." From the mass of materials that lie before me, I give a few extracts that will throw a strong light on the circumstances of the time.

"In several parishes of Hertfordshire," writes one indignant person, "24 farms, numbering on the average 50-150 acres, have been melted up into three farms."*** "In Northamptonshire and Leicestershire the enclosure of common lands has taken place on a very large scale, and most of the new lordships, resulting from the enclosure, have been turned into pasturage, in consequence of which many lordships have not now 50 acres ploughed yearly, in which 1,500 were ploughed formerly. The ruins of former dwelling-houses, barns, stables, &c.," are the sole traces of the former inhabitants. "An hundred houses and families have in some open field villages . . . dwindled to eight or ten. . . . The landholders in most parishes that have been enclosed only 15 or 20 years, are very few in comparison of the numbers who occupied them in their open-field state. It is no uncommon thing for 4 or 5 wealthy graziers to engross a large enclosed lordship which was before in the hands of 20 or 30 farmers, and as many smaller tenants and proprietors. All these are hereby thrown out of their livings with their families and many other families who were chiefly employed and supported by them."****

It was not only the land that lay waste, but often land cultivated either in common or held under a definite rent paid to the community, that was annexed by the neighbouring landlords under pretext of enclosure.

"I have here in view enclosures of open fields and lands already improved. It is acknowledged by even the writers in defence of enclosures that these diminished villages increase the monopolies of farms, raise the prices of provisions, and produce depopulation . . . and even the enclosure of waste

* "Capital Farms." Two letters on the Flour Trade and the Dearness of Corn. By a person in business. London, 1767, pp. 19, 20.

** "Merchant Farms." "An Enquiry into the Causes of the Present High Price of Provisions." London, 1767, p. 11. Note.—This excellent work, that was published anonymously, is by the Rev. Nathaniel Forster.

*** Thomas Wright: "A Short Address to the Public on the Monopoly of Large Farms," 1779, pp. 2, 3.

**** Rev. Addington: "Inquiry into the Reasons for or against Enclosing Open Fields." London, 1772, pp. 37-43 passim.

lands (as now carried on) bears hard on the poor, by depriving them of a part of their subsistence, and only goes towards increasing farms already too large.* "When," says Dr. Price, "this land gets into the hands of a few great farmers, the consequence must be that the little farmers" (earlier designated by him "a multitude of little proprietors and tenants, who maintain themselves and families by the produce of the ground they occupy, by sheep kept on a common, by poultry, hogs, &c., and who therefore have little occasion to purchase any of the means of subsistence") "will be converted into a body of men who earn their subsistence by working for others, and who will be under a necessity of going to market for all they want. . . . There will, perhaps, be more labour, because there will be more compulsion to it. . . . Towns and manufactures will increase, because more will be driven to them in quest of places and employment. This is the way in which the engrossing of farms naturally operates. And this is the way in which, for many years, it has been actually operating in this kingdom."**

He sums up the effect of the enclosures thus:

"Upon the whole, the circumstances of the lower ranks of men are altered in almost every respect for the worse. From little occupiers of land, they are reduced to the state of day-labourers and hirelings; and, at the same time, their subsistence in that state has become more difficult."***

In fact, usurpation of the common lands and the revolution in agriculture accompanying this, told so acutely on the agricultural labourers that, even according to Eden, between 1765 and 1780, their wages began to fall below the minimum, and to be supplemented by official poor-law relief. Their wages, he says,

* Dr. R. Price, "Observations on Reversionary Payments," 6 ed. By W. Morgan, London, 1803, v. ii., p. 155. Forster, Addington, Kent, Price, and James Anderson, should be read and compared with the miserable prattle of Sycophant MacCulloch in his catalogue: "The Literature of Political Economy," London, 1845.

** Price, l. c., p. 147.

*** Price, l. c., p. 159. We are reminded of ancient Rome. "The rich had got possession of the greater part of the undivided land. They trusted in the conditions of the time, that these possessions would not be again taken from them, and bought, therefore, some of the pieces of land lying near theirs, and belonging to the poor, with the acquiescence of their owners, and took some by force, so that they now were cultivating widely extended domains, instead of isolated fields. Then they employed slaves in agriculture and cattle-breeding, because freemen would have been taken from labour for military service. The possession of slaves brought them great gain, inasmuch as these, on account of their immunity from military service, could freely multiply and have a multitude of children. Thus the powerful men drew all wealth to themselves, and all the land swarmed with slaves. The Italians, on the other hand, were always decreasing in number, destroyed as they were by poverty, taxes, and military service. Even when times of peace came, they were doomed to complete inactivity, because the rich were in possession of the soil, and used slaves instead of freemen in the tilling of it." (Appian: "Civil Wars," I. 7.) This passage refers to the time before the Licinian rogations.⁶³ Military service, which hastened to so great an extent the ruin of the Roman plebeians, was also the chief means by which, as in a forcing-house, Charlemagne brought about the transformation of free German peasants into serfs and bondsmen.

“were not more than enough for the absolute necessities of life.”

Let us hear for a moment a defender of enclosures and an opponent of Dr. Price.

“Nor is it a consequence that there must be depopulation, because men are not seen wasting their labour in the open field. . . . If, by converting the little farmers into a body of men who must work for others, more labour is produced, it is an advantage which the nation” (to which, of course, the “converted” ones do not belong) “should wish for . . . the produce being greater when their joint labours are employed on one farm, there will be a surplus for manufactures, and by this means manufactures, one of the mines of the nation, will increase, in proportion to the quantity of corn produced.”*

The stoical peace of mind with which the political economist regards the most shameless violation of the “sacred rights of property” and the grossest acts of violence to persons, as soon as they are necessary to lay the foundations of the capitalistic mode of production, is shown by Sir F. M. Eden, philanthropist and tory, to boot. The whole series of thefts, outrages, and popular misery, that accompanied the forcible expropriation of the people, from the last third of the 15th to the end of the 18th century, lead him merely to the comfortable conclusion:

“The due proportion between arable land and pasture had to be established. During the whole of the 14th and the greater part of the 15th century, there was one acre of pasture to 2, 3 and even 4 of arable land. About the middle of the 16th century the proportion was changed of 2 acres of pasture to 2, later on, of 2 acres of pasture to one of arable, until at last the just proportion of 3 acres of pasture to one of arable land was attained.”

In the 19th century, the very memory of the connexion between the agricultural labourer and the communal property had, of course, vanished. To say nothing of more recent times, have the agricultural population received a farthing of compensation for the 3,511,770 acres of common land which between 1801 and 1831 were stolen from them and by parliamentary devices presented to the landlords by the landlords?

The last process of wholesale expropriation of the agricultural population from the soil is, finally, the so-called clearing of estates, *i.e.*, the sweeping men off them. All the English methods hitherto considered culminated in “clearing.” As we saw in the picture of modern conditions given in a former chapter, where

* [J. Arbuthnot.] “An Inquiry into the Connexion between the Present Price of Provisions, &c.,” pp. 124, 129. To the like effect, but with an opposite tendency: “Working-men are driven from their cottages and forced into the towns to seek for employment; but then a larger surplus is obtained, and thus capital is augmented.” ([R. B. Seeley.] “The Perils of the Nation,” 2nd ed. London, 1843, p. 14.)

there are no more independent peasants to get rid of, the "clearing" of cottages begins; so that the agricultural labourers do not find on the soil cultivated by them even the spot necessary for their own housing. But what "clearing of estates" really and properly signifies, we learn only in the promised land of modern romance, the Highlands of Scotland. There the process is distinguished by its systematic character, by the magnitude of the scale on which it is carried out at one blow (in Ireland landlords have gone to the length of sweeping away several villages at once; in Scotland areas as large as German principalities are dealt with), finally by the peculiar form of property, under which the embezzled lands were held.

The Highland Celts were organised in clans, each of which was the owner of the land on which it was settled. The representative of the clan, its chief or "great man," was only the titular owner of this property, just as the Queen of England is the titular owner of all the national soil. When the English government succeeded in suppressing the intestine wars of these "great men," and their constant incursions into the Lowland plains, the chiefs of the clans by no means gave up their time-honoured trade as robbers; they only changed its form. On their own authority they transformed their nominal right into a right of private property, and as this brought them into collision with their clansmen, resolved to drive them out by open force. "A king of England might as well claim to drive his subjects into the sea," says Professor Newman.* This revolution, which began in Scotland after the last rising of the followers of the Pretender,⁶⁴ can be followed through its first phases in the writings of Sir James Steuart** and James Anderson***. In the 18th century the hunted-out Gaels⁶⁶ were forbidden to emigrate from the country, with a view to driving them by force to Glasgow and other manufacturing towns.**** As an example of the method***** obtaining in

* I. c., p. 132.

** Steuart says: "If you compare the rent of these lands" (he erroneously includes in this economic category the tribute of the taksmen⁶⁵ to the clan-chief) "with the extent, it appears very small. If you compare it with the numbers fed upon the farm, you will find that an estate in the Highlands maintains, perhaps, ten times as many people as another of the same value in a good and fertile province." ("An Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy," London, 1767, vol. i, ch. xvi, p. 104.)

*** James Anderson: "Observations on the Means of Exciting a Spirit of National Industry, &c.," Edinburgh, 1777.

**** In 1860 the people expropriated by force were exported to Canada under false pretences. Some fled to the mountains and neighbouring islands. They were followed by the police, came to blows with them and escaped.

***** "In the Highlands of Scotland," says Buchanan, the commentator on Adam Smith, 1814, "the ancient state of property is daily subverted. . . . The

the 19th century, the "clearing" made by the Duchess of Sutherland will suffice here. This person, well instructed in economy, resolved, on entering upon her government, to effect a radical cure, and to turn the whole country, whose population had already been, by earlier processes of the like kind, reduced to 15,000, into a sheep-walk. From 1814 to 1820 these 15,000 inhabitants, about 3,000 families, were systematically hunted and rooted out. All their villages were destroyed and burnt, all their fields turned into pasturage. British soldiers enforced this eviction, and came to blows with the inhabitants. One old woman was burnt to death in the flames of the hut, which she refused to leave. Thus this fine lady appropriated 794,000 acres of land that had from time immemorial belonged to the clan. She assigned to the expelled inhabitants about 6,000 acres on the sea-shore—2 acres per family. The 6,000 acres had until this time lain waste, and brought in no income to their owners. The Duchess, in the nobility of her heart, actually went so far as to let these at an average rent of 2s. 6d. per acre to the clansmen, who for centuries had shed their blood for her family. The whole of the stolen clanland she divided into 29 great sheep farms, each inhabited by a single family, for the most part imported English farm-servants. In the year 1825 the 15,000 Gaels were already replaced by 131,000 sheep. The remnant of the aborigines flung on the sea-shore, tried to live by catching fish. They became amphibious and lived, as an English author says, half on land and half on water, and withal only half on both.*

landlord, without regard to the hereditary tenant (a category used in error here), now offers his land to the highest bidder, who, if he is an improver, instantly adopts a new system of cultivation. The land, formerly overspread with small tenants or labourers, was peopled in proportion to its produce, but under the new system of improved cultivation and increased rents, the largest possible produce is obtained at the least possible expense: and the useless hands being, with this view, removed, the population is reduced, not to what the land will maintain, but to what it will employ. "The dispossessed tenants either seek a subsistence in the neighbouring towns," &c. (David Buchanan: "Observations on, &c., A. Smith's Wealth of Nations." Edinburgh, 1814, vol. iv., p. 144.) "The Scotch grandes dispossessed families as they would grub up coppice-wood, and they treated villages and their people as Indians harassed with wild beasts do, in their vengeance, a jungle with tigers.... Man is bartered for a fleece or a carcase of mutton, nay, held cheaper.... Why, how much worse is it than the intention of the Moguls, who, when they had broken into the northern provinces of China, proposed in council to exterminate the inhabitants, and convert the land into pasture. This proposal many Highland proprietors have effected in their own country against their own countrymen." (George Ensor: "An Inquiry concerning the Population of Nations." Lond., 1818, pp. 215, 216.)

* When the present Duchess of Sutherland entertained Mrs. Beecher-Stowe, authoress of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," with great magnificence in London to show

But the brave Gaels must expiate yet more bitterly their idolatry, romantic and of the mountains, for the "great men" of the clan. The smell of their fish rose to the noses of the great men. They scented some profit in it, and let the sea-shore to the great fishmongers of London. For the second time the Gaels were hunted out.*

But, finally, part of the sheep-walks are turned into deer preserves. Every one knows that there are no real forests in England. The deer in the parks of the great are demurely domestic cattle, fat as London aldermen. Scotland is therefore the last refuge of the "noble passion."

"In the Highlands," says Somers in 1848, "new forests are springing up like mushrooms. Here, on one side of Gaick, you have the new forest of Glenfeshie; and there on the other you have the new forest of Ardverikie. In the same line you have the Black Mount, an immense waste also recently erected. From east to west—from the neighbourhood of Aberdeen to the crags of Oban—you have now a continuous line of forests; while in other parts of the Highlands there are the new forests of Loch Archaig, Glengarry, Glenmoriston, &c. Sheep were introduced into glens which had been the seats of communities of small farmers; and the latter were driven to seek subsistence on coarser and more sterile tracks of soil. Now deer are supplanting sheep; and these are once more dispossessing the small tenants, who will necessarily be driven down upon still coarser land and to more grinding penury. Deer-forests** and the people cannot co-exist. One or other of the two must yield. Let the forests be increased in number and extent during the next quarter of a century, as they have been in the last, and the Gaels will perish from their native soil. . . . This movement among the Highland proprietors is with some a matter of ambition . . . with some love of sport . . . while others, of a more practical cast, follow the trade in deer with an eye solely to profit. For it is a fact, that a mountain range laid out in forest is, in many cases, more profitable to the proprietor than when let as a sheep-walk. . . . The huntsman who wants a deer-forest limits his offers by no other calculation than the extent of his purse. . . . Sufferings have been inflicted in the Highlands scarcely less severe than those occasioned by the policy of the Norman kings. Deer have received extended ranges, while men have been hunted within a narrower and still narrower circle. . . . One after one the liberties of the people

her sympathy for the negro slaves of the American republic—a sympathy that she prudently forgot, with her fellow-aristocrats, during the civil war,⁴ in which every "noble" English heart beat for the slave-owner—I gave in the *New York Tribune* the facts about the Sutherland slaves.⁶⁷ (Epitomised in part by Carey in "The Slave Trade." Philadelphia, 1853, pp. 203, 204.) My article was reprinted in a Scotch newspaper, and led to a pretty polemic between the latter and the sycophants of the Sutherlands.

*Interesting details on this fish trade will be found in Mr. David Urquhart's Portfolio, new series.—Nassau W. Senior, in his posthumous work, already quoted, terms "the proceedings in Sutherlandshire one of the most beneficent clearings since the memory of man." ("Journals, Conversations and Essays relating to Ireland," London, 1868.)

** The deer-forests of Scotland contain not a single tree. The sheep are driven from, and then the deer driven to, the naked hills, and then it is called a deer-forest. Not even timber-planting and real forest culture.

have been cloven down. . . . And the oppressions are daily on the increase. . . . The clearance and dispersion of the people is pursued by the proprietors as a settled principle, as an agricultural necessity, just as trees and brushwood are cleared from the wastes of America or Australia; and the operation goes on in a quiet, business-like way, &c."*

* Robert Somers: "Letters from the Highlands: or the Famine of 1847." London, 1848, pp. 12-28 passim. These letters originally appeared in *The Times*. The English economists of course explained the famine of the Gaels in 1847, by their over-population. At all events, they "were pressing on their food-supply." The "clearing of estates," or as it is called in Germany, "Bauernlegen," occurred in Germany especially after the 30 years' war,⁶⁸ and led to peasant-revolts as late as 1790 in Kursachsen. It obtained especially in East Germany. In most of the Prussian provinces, Frederick II. for the first time secured right of property for the peasants. After the conquest of Silesia he forced the landlords to rebuild the huts, barns, etc., and to provide the peasants with cattle and implements. He wanted soldiers for his army and taxpayers for his treasury. For the rest, the pleasant life that the peasant led under Frederick's system of finance and hodge-podge rule of despotism, bureaucracy and feudalism, may be seen from the following quotation from his admirer, Mirabeau: "Le lin fait donc une des grandes richesses du cultivateur dans le Nord de l'Allemagne. Malheureusement pour l'espèce humaine, ce n'est qu'une ressource contre la misère et non un moyen de bien-être. Les impôts directs, les corvées, les servitudes de tout genre, écrasent le cultivateur allemand, qui paie encore des impôts indirects dans tout ce qu'il achète. . . et pour comble de ruine, il n'ose pas vendre ses productions où et comme il le veut; il n'ose pas acheter ce dont il a besoin aux marchands qui pourraient le lui livrer au meilleur prix. Toutes ces causes le ruinent insensiblement, et il se trouverait hors d'état de payer les impôts directs à léchéance sans la flicerie; elle lui offre une ressource, en occupant utilement sa femme, ses enfants, ses servants, ses valets, et lui-même; mais quelle pénible vie, même aidée de ce secours. En été, il travaille comme un forçat au labourage et à la récolte; il se couche à 9 heures et se lève à deux, pour suffire aux travaux; en hiver il devrait réparer ses forces par un plus grand repos; mais il manquera de grains pour le pain et les semailles, s'il se défait des denrées qu'il faudrait vendre pour payer les impôts. Il faut donc filer pour suppléer à ce vide. . . il faut y apporter la plus grande assiduité. Aussi le paysan se couche-t-il en hiver à minuit, une heure, et se lève à cinq ou six; ou bien il se couche à neuf, et se lève à deux, et cela tous les jours de la vie si ce n'est le dimanche. Ces excès de veille et de travail usent la nature humaine, et de là vient qu'hommes et femmes vieillissent beaucoup plutôt dans les campagnes que dans les villes." (Mirabeau, l. c., t. III, pp. 212 sqq.)

Note to the second edition. In April 1866, 18 years after the publication of the work of Robert Somers quoted above, Professor Leone Levi gave a lecture before the Society of Arts²⁹ on the transformation of sheep-walks into deer-forest, in which he depicts the advance in the devastation of the Scottish Highlands. He says, with other things: "Depopulation and transformation into sheep-walks were the most convenient means for getting an income without expenditure. . . . A deer-forest in place of a sheep-walk was a common change in the Highlands. The landowners turned out the sheep as they once turned out the men from their estates, and welcomed the new tenants—the wild beasts and the feathered birds. . . . One can walk from the Earl of Dalhousie's estates in Forfarshire to John o'Groats, without ever leaving forest land. . . . In many of these woods the fox, the wild cat, the marten, the polecat, the weasel and the Alpine hare are common; whilst the rabbit, the squirrel and the rat have lately made their way into the country. Immense tracts of land, much of which

The spoliation of the church's property, the fraudulent alienation of the State domains, the robbery of the common lands, the usurpation of feudal and clan property, and its transformation into modern private property under circumstances of reckless terrorism, were just so many idyllic methods of primitive accumulation. They conquered the field for capitalistic agriculture, made the soil part and parcel of capital, and created for the town industries the necessary supply of a "free" and outlawed proletariat.

Chapter XXVIII

BLOODY LEGISLATION AGAINST THE EXPROPRIATED, FROM THE END OF THE 15TH CENTURY. FORCING DOWN OF WAGES BY ACTS OF PARLIAMENT

The proletariat created by the breaking up of the bands of feudal retainers and by the forcible expropriation of the people from the soil, this "free" proletariat could not possibly be absorbed by the nascent manufactures as fast as it was thrown upon the world. On the other hand, these men, suddenly dragged from their wonted mode of life, could not as suddenly adapt themselves to the discipline of their new condition. They were turned *en masse* into beggars, robbers, vagabonds, partly from inclina-

is described in the statistical account of Scotland as having a pasturage in richness and extent of very superior description, are thus shut out from all cultivation and improvement, and are solely devoted to the sport of a few persons for a very brief period of the year." The London *Economist*⁶⁹ of June 2, 1866, says, "Amongst the items of news in a Scotch paper of last week, we read... 'One of the finest sheep farms in Sutherlandshire, for which a rent of £1,200 a year was recently offered, on the expiry of the existing lease this year, is to be converted into a deer-forest.' Here we see the modern instincts of feudalism... operating pretty much as they did when the Norman Conqueror... destroyed 36 villages to create the New Forest... Two millions of acres... totally laid waste, embracing within their area some of the most fertile lands of Scotland. The natural grass of Glen Tilt was among the most nutritive in the county of Perth. The deer-forest of Ben Alder was by far the best grazing ground in the wide district of Badenoch; a part of the Black Mount forest was the best pasture for black-faced sheep in Scotland. Some idea of the ground laid waste for purely sporting purposes in Scotland may be formed from the fact that it embraced an area larger than the whole county of Perth. The resources of the forest of Ben Alder might give some idea of the loss sustained from the forced desolations. The ground would pasture 15,000 sheep, and as it was not more than one-thirtieth part of the old forest ground in Scotland... it might, &c.,... All that forest land is as totally unproductive... It might thus as well have been submerged under the waters of the German Ocean... Such extemporised wildernesses or deserts ought to be put down by the decided interference of the Legislature."

tion, in most cases from stress of circumstances. Hence at the end of the 15th and during the whole of the 16th century, throughout Western Europe a bloody legislation against vagabondage. The fathers of the present working-class were chastised for their enforced transformation into vagabonds and paupers. Legislation treated them as "voluntary" criminals, and assumed that it depended on their own good will to go on working under the old conditions that no longer existed.

In England this legislation began under Henry VII.

Henry VIII. 1530: Beggars old and unable to work receive a beggar's licence. On the other hand, whipping and imprisonment for sturdy vagabonds. They are to be tied to the cart-tail and whipped until the blood streams from their bodies, then to swear an oath to go back to their birthplace or to where they have lived the last three years and to "put themselves to labour." What grim irony! In 27 Henry VIII. the former statute is repeated, but strengthened with new clauses. For the second arrest for vagabondage the whipping is to be repeated and half the ear sliced off; but for the third relapse the offender is to be executed as a hardened criminal and enemy of the common weal.

Edward VI.: A statute of the first year of his reign, 1547, ordains that if anyone refuses to work, he shall be condemned as a slave to the person who has denounced him as an idler. The master shall feed his slave on bread and water, weak broth and such refuse meat as he thinks fit. He has the right to force him to do any work, no matter how disgusting, with whip and chains. If the slave is absent a fortnight, he is condemned to slavery for life and is to be branded on forehead or back with the letter S; if he runs away thrice, he is to be executed as a felon. The master can sell him, bequeath him, let him out on hire as a slave, just as any other personal chattel or cattle. If the slaves attempt anything against the masters, they are also to be executed. Justices of the peace, on information, are to hunt the rascals down. If it happens that a vagabond has been idling about for three days, he is to be taken to his birthplace, branded with a red-hot iron with the letter V on the breast and be set to work, in chains, in the streets or at some other labour. If the vagabond gives a false birthplace, he is then to become the slave for life of this place, of its inhabitants, or its corporation, and to be branded with an S. All persons have the right to take away the children of the vagabonds and to keep them as apprentices, the young men until the 24th year, the girls until the 20th. If they run away, they are to become up to this age the slaves of their masters, who can put them in irons, whip them, &c., if they like. Every master may put an iron ring round the neck, arms or legs of his

slave, by which to know him more easily and to be more certain of him.* The last part of this statute provides, that certain poor people may be employed by a place or by persons, who are willing to give them food and drink and to find them work. This kind of parish-slaves was kept up in England until far into the 19th century under the name of "roundsmen."

Elizabeth, 1572: Unlicensed beggars above 14 years of age are to be severely flogged and branded on the left ear unless some one will take them into service for two years; in case of a repetition of the offence, if they are over 18, they are to be executed, unless some one will take them into service for two years; but for the third offence they are to be executed without mercy as felons. Similar statutes: 18 Elizabeth, c. 13, and another of 1597.**

* The author of the "Essay on Trade, etc.," 1770, says, "In the reign of Edward VI. indeed the English seem to have set, in good earnest, about encouraging manufactures and employing the poor. This we learn from a remarkable statute which runs thus: 'That all vagrants shall be branded, &c.'" l. c., p. 5.

** Thomas More says in his "Utopia": "Therefore that on covetous and unsatiable cormaraunte and very plague of his native contrey maye compass aboute and inclose many thousand akers of grounde together within one pale or hedge, the husbandmen be thrust owte of their owne, or els either by coneyne and fraude, or by violent oppression they be put besydes it, or by wrongs and iniuries they be so weried that they be compelled to sell all: by one meanes, therefore, or by other, either by hooke or crooke they muste needes departe awaye, poore, selye, wretched soules, men, women, husbands, wiues, fatherlesse children, widowes, wofull mothers with their yonge babes, and their whole household smal in substance, and muche in numbere, as husbandrye requireth many handes. Awaye thei trudge, I say, owte of their knowen accustomed houses, fyndyng no place to reste in. All their housholde stuffe, which is very little woorth, though it might well abide the sale: yet beeynge sodainely thruste owte, they be constrayned to sell it for a thing of nought. And when they haue wandered abrode tyll that be spent, what cant they then els doe but steale, and then iustly pardy be hanged, or els go about beggyng. And yet then also they be caste in prison as vagaboundes, because they go aboute and worke not: whom no man wyl set a worke though thei neuer so willyngly profre themselues therto." Of these poor fugitives of whom Thomas More says that they were forced to thieve, "7,200 great and petty thieves were put to death," in the reign of Henry VIII. (Holinshed, "Description of England," Vol. 1, p. 186.) In Elizabeth's time, "rogues were trussed up apace, and that there was not one year commonly wherein three or four hundred were not deuoured and eaten up by the gallowes." (Strype's "Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and other Various Occurrences in the Church of England during Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign." Second ed., 1725, Vol. 2.) According to this same Strype, in Somersetshire, in one year, 40 persons were executed, 35 robbers burnt in the hand, 37 whipped, and 183 discharged as "incorrigible vagabonds." Nevertheless, he is of opinion that this large number of prisoners does not comprise even a fifth of the actual criminals, thanks to the negligence of the justices and the foolish compassion of the people; and the other counties of England were not better off in this respect than Somersetshire, while some were even worse.

James I.: Any one wandering about and begging is declared a rogue and a vagabond. Justices of the peace in petty sessions⁷⁰ are authorised to have them publicly whipped and for the first offence to imprison them for 6 months, for the second for 2 years. Whilst in prison they are to be whipped as much and as often as the justices of the peace think fit. . . . Incurrable and dangerous rogues are to be branded with an R on the left shoulder and set to hard labour, and if they are caught begging again, to be executed without mercy. These statutes, legally binding until the beginning of the 18th century, were only repealed by 12 Anne, c. 23.

Similar laws in France, where by the middle of the 17th century a kingdom of vagabonds (truands) was established in Paris. Even at the beginning of Louis XVI.'s reign (Ordinance of July 13th, 1777) every man in good health from 16 to 60 years of age, if without means of subsistence and not practising a trade, is to be sent to the galleys. Of the same nature are the statute of Charles V. for the Netherlands (October, 1537), the first edict of the States and Towns of Holland (March 19, 1614), the "Plakaat" of the United Provinces (June 25, 1649), &c.

Thus were the agricultural people, first forcibly expropriated from the soil, driven from their homes, turned into vagabonds, and then whipped, branded, tortured by laws grotesquely terrible, into the discipline necessary for the wage system.

It is not enough that the conditions of labour are concentrated in a mass, in the shape of capital, at the one pole of society, while at the other are grouped masses of men, who have nothing to sell but their labour-power. Neither is it enough that they are compelled to sell it voluntarily. The advance of capitalist production develops a working-class, which by education, tradition, habit, looks upon the conditions of that mode of production as self-evident laws of Nature. The organisation of the capitalist process of production, once fully developed, breaks down all resistance. The constant generation of a relative surplus-population keeps the law of supply and demand of labour, and therefore keeps wages, in a rut that corresponds with the wants of capital. The dull compulsion of economic relations completes the subjection of the labourer to the capitalist. Direct force, outside economic conditions, is of course still used, but only exceptionally. In the ordinary run of things, the labourer can be left to the "natural laws of production," *i.e.*, to his dependence on capital, a dependence springing from, and guaranteed in perpetuity by, the conditions of production themselves. It is otherwise during the historic genesis of capitalist production. The bourgeoisie, at its rise, wants and uses the power of the state to "regu-

late" wages, *i.e.*, to force them within the limits suitable for surplus-value making, to lengthen the working-day and to keep the labourer himself in the normal degree of dependence. This is an essential element of the so-called primitive accumulation.

The class of wage-labourers, which arose in the latter half of the 14th century, formed then and in the following century only a very small part of the population, well protected in its position by the independent peasant proprietary in the country and the guild-organisation in the town. In country and town master and workmen stood close together socially. The subordination of labour to capital was only formal—*i.e.*, the mode of production itself had as yet no specific capitalistic character. Variable capital preponderated greatly over constant. The demand for wage-labour grew, therefore, rapidly with every accumulation of capital, whilst the supply of wage-labour followed but slowly. A large part of the national product, changed later into a fund of capitalist accumulation, then still entered into the consumption-fund of the labourer.

Legislation on wage-labour (from the first, aimed at the exploitation of the labourer and, as it advanced, always equally hostile to him),* is started in England by the Statute of Labourers, of Edward III., 1349. The ordinance of 1350 in France, issued in the name of King John, corresponds with it. English and French legislation run parallel and are identical in purport. So far as the labour-statutes aim at compulsory extension of the working-day, I do not return to them, as this point was treated earlier (Chap. X., Section 5).

The Statute of Labourers was passed at the urgent instance of the House of Commons.

A Tory says naively: "Formerly the poor demanded such *high* wages as to threaten industry and wealth. Next, their wages are so *low* as to threaten industry and wealth equally and perhaps more, but in another way."**

A tariff of wages was fixed by law for town and country, for piece-work and day-work. The agricultural labourers were to hire themselves out by the year, the town ones "in open market." It was forbidden, under pain of imprisonment, to pay higher wages than those fixed by the statute, but the taking of higher wages was more severely punished than the giving them. [So also

* "Whenever the legislature attempts to regulate the differences between masters and their workmen, its counsellors are always the masters," says A. Smith.⁷¹ "L'esprit des lois, c'est la propriété," says Linguet.⁷²

** [J. B. Byles.] "Sophisms of Free Trade." By a Barrister. Lond., 1850, p. 206. He adds maliciously: "We were ready enough to interfere for the employer, can nothing now be done for the employed?"

in Sections 18 and 19 of the Statute of Apprentices of Elizabeth, ten days' imprisonment is decreed for him that pays the higher wages, but twenty-one days for him that receives them.] A statute of 1360 increased the penalties and authorised the masters to extort labour at the legal rate of wages by corporal punishment. All combinations, contracts, oaths, &c., by which masons and carpenters reciprocally bound themselves, were declared null and void. Coalition of the labourers is treated as a heinous crime from the 14th century to 1825, the year of the repeal of the laws against Trades' Unions.⁷³ The spirit of the Statute of Labourers of 1349 and of its offshoots, comes out clearly in the fact, that indeed a maximum of wages is dictated by the State, but on no account a minimum.

In the 16th century, the condition of the labourers had, as we know, become much worse. The money wage rose, but not in proportion to the depreciation of money and the corresponding rise in the prices of commodities. Wages, therefore, in reality fell. Nevertheless, the laws for keeping them down remained in force, together with the ear-clipping and branding of those "whom no one was willing to take into service." By the Statute of Apprentices 5 Elizabeth, c. 3, the justices of the peace were empowered to fix certain wages and to modify them according to the time of the year and the price of commodities. James I. extended these regulations of labour also to weavers, spinners, and all possible categories of workers.* George II. extended the laws against coalitions of labourers to manufactures. In the manufacturing period *par excellence*, the capitalist mode of production had become sufficiently strong to render legal regula-

* From a clause of Statute 2 James I., c. 6, we see that certain cloth-makers took upon themselves to dictate, in their capacity of justices of the peace, the official tariff of wages in their own shops. In Germany, especially after the Thirty Years' War, statutes for keeping down wages were general. "The want of servants and labourers was very troublesome to the landed proprietors in the depopulated districts. All villagers were forbidden to let rooms to single men and women; all the latter were to be reported to the authorities and cast into prison if they were unwilling to become servants, even if they were employed at any other work, such as sowing seeds for the peasants at a daily wage, or even buying and selling corn. (Imperial privileges and sanctions for Silesia, I., 125.) For a whole century in the decrees of the small German potentates a bitter cry goes up again and again about the wicked and impertinent rabble that will not reconcile itself to its hard lot, will not be content with the legal wage; the individual landed proprietors are forbidden to pay more than the State had fixed by a tariff. And yet the conditions of service were at times better after the war than 100 years later; the farm servants of Silesia had, in 1652, meat twice a week, whilst even in our century, districts are known where they have it only three times a year. Further, wages after the war were higher than in the following century." (G. Freytag.)

tion of wages as impracticable as it was unnecessary; but the ruling classes were unwilling in case of necessity to be without the weapons of the old arsenal. Still, 8 George II. forbade a higher day's wage than 2s. 7¹/₂d. for journeymen tailors in and around London, except in cases of general mourning; still, 13 George III., c. 68, gave the regulation of the wages of silk-weavers to the justices of the peace; still, in 1796, it required two judgments of the higher courts to decide, whether the mandates of justices of the peace as to wages held good also for non-agricultural labourers; still, in 1799, an act of Parliament ordered that the wages of the Scotch miners should continue to be regulated by a statute of Elizabeth and two Scotch acts of 1661 and 1671. How completely in the meantime circumstances had changed, is proved by an occurrence unheard-of before in the English Lower House. In that place, where for more than 400 years laws had been made for the maximum, beyond which wages absolutely must not rise, Whitbread in 1796 proposed a legal minimum wage for agricultural labourers. Pitt opposed this, but confessed that the "condition of the poor was cruel." Finally, in 1813, the laws for the regulation of wages were repealed. They were an absurd anomaly, since the capitalist regulated his factory by his private legislation, and could by the poor-rates make up the wage of the agricultural labourer to the indispensable minimum. The provisions of the labour statutes as to contracts between master and workman, as to giving notice and the like, which only allow of a civil action against the contract-breaking master, but on the contrary permit a criminal action against the contract-breaking workman, are to this hour in full force. The barbarous laws against Trades' Unions fell in 1825 before the threatening bearing of the proletariat. Despite this, they fell only in part. Certain beautiful fragments of the old statute vanished only in 1859. Finally, the act of Parliament of June 29, 1871, made a pretence of removing the last traces of this class of legislation by legal recognition of Trades' Unions. But an act of Parliament of the same date (an act to amend the criminal law relating to violence, threats, and molestation), re-established, in point of fact, the former state of things in a new shape. By this Parliamentary escamotage the means which the labourers could use in a strike or lock-out were withdrawn from the laws common to all citizens, and placed under exceptional penal legislation, the interpretation of which fell to the masters themselves in their capacity as justices of the peace. Two years earlier, the same House of Commons and the same Mr. Gladstone in the well-known straightforward fashion brought in a bill for the abolition of all exceptional penal legislation against the working-class. But this was never

allowed to go beyond the second reading, and the matter was thus protracted until at last the "great Liberal party," by an alliance with the Tories, found courage to turn against the very proletariat that had carried it into power. Not content with this treachery, the "great Liberal party" allowed the English judges, ever complaisant in the service of the ruling classes, to dig up again the earlier laws against "conspiracy,"⁷⁴ and to apply them to coalitions of labourers. We see that only against its will and under the pressure of the masses did the English Parliament give up the laws against Strikes and Trades' Unions, after it had itself, for 500 years, held, with shameless egoism, the position of a permanent Trades' Union of the capitalists against the labourers.

During the very first storms of the revolution, the French bourgeoisie dared to take away from the workers the right of association but just acquired. By a decree of June 14, 1791, they declared all coalition of the workers as "an attempt against liberty and the declaration of the rights of man," punishable by a fine of 500 livres, together with deprivation of the rights of an active citizen for one year.* This law which, by means of State compulsion, confined the struggle between capital and labour within limits comfortable for capital, has outlived revolutions and changes of dynasties. Even the Reign of Terror⁷⁵ left it untouched. It was but quite recently struck out of the Penal Code. Nothing is more characteristic than the pretext for this bourgeois *coup d'état*. "Granting," says Chapelier, the reporter of the Select Committee on this law, "that wages ought to be a little higher than they are, . . . that they ought to be high enough for him that receives them, to be free from that state of absolute dependence due to the want of the necessaries of life, and which is almost that of slavery," yet the workers must not be allowed to come to any understanding about their own interests, nor to act in common and thereby lessen their "absolute dependence, which is almost that of slavery," because, forsooth, in doing this they injure "the freedom of their cidevant masters, the present

* Article I. of this law runs: "L'anéantissement de toute espèce de corporations du même état et profession étant l'une des bases fondamentales de la constitution française, il est défendu de les rétablir de fait sous quelque prétexte et sous quelque forme que ce soit." Article IV. declares, that if "des citoyens attachés aux mêmes professions, arts et métiers prenaient des délibérations, faisaient entre eux des conventions tendantes à refuser de concert ou à n'accorder qu'à un prix déterminé le secours de leur industrie ou de leurs travaux, les dites délibérations et conventions . . . seront déclarées inconstitutionnelles, attentatoires à la liberté et à la déclaration des droits de l'homme, &c."; felony, therefore, as in the old labour-statutes. ("Révolutions de Paris," Paris; 1791, t. III, p. 523.)

entrepreneurs," and because a coalition against the despotism of the quondam masters of the corporations is—guess what!—is a restoration of the corporations abolished by the French constitution.*

Chapter XXIX

GENESIS OF THE CAPITALIST FARMER

Now that we have considered the forcible creation of a class of outlawed proletarians, the bloody discipline that turned them into wage-labourers, the disgraceful action of the State which employed the police to accelerate the accumulation of capital by increasing the degree of exploitation of labour, the question remains: whence came the capitalists originally? For the expropriation of the agricultural population creates, directly, none but great landed proprietors. As far, however, as concerns the genesis of the farmer, we can, so to say, put our hand on it, because it is a slow process evolving through many centuries. The serfs, as well as the free small proprietors, held land under very different tenures, and were therefore emancipated under very different economic conditions. In England the first form of the farmer is the bailiff, himself a serf. His position is similar to that of the old Roman *villicus*, only in a more limited sphere of action. During the second half of the 14th century he is replaced by a farmer, whom the landlord provides with seed, cattle and implements. His condition is not very different from that of the peasant. Only he exploits more wage-labour. Soon he becomes a *métayer*, a half-farmer. He advances one part of the agricultural stock, the landlord the other. The two divide the total product in proportions determined by contract. This form quickly disappears in England, to give place to the farmer proper, who makes his own capital breed by employing wage-labourers, and pays a part of the surplus-product, in money or in kind, to the landlord as rent. So long, during the 15th century, as the independent peasant and the farm-labourer working for himself as well as for wages, enriched themselves by their own labour, the circumstances of the farmer, and his field of production, were equally mediocre. The agricultural revolution which commenced in the last third of the 15th century, and continued during almost the whole of the 16th (excepting, however, its last decade), enriched him just as speedily as it impoverished the mass of the agricultural people.**

* Buchez et Roux: "Histoire Parlementaire," t. x., pp. 193-195 passim.

** Harrison in his "Description of England," says "although peradventure foure pounds of old rent be improved to fortie, toward the end of his term,

The usurpation of the common lands allowed him to augment greatly his stock of cattle, almost without cost, whilst they yielded him a richer supply of manure for the tillage of the soil. To this, was added in the 16th century, a very important element. At that time the contracts for farms ran for a long time, often for 99 years. The progressive fall in the value of the precious metals, and therefore of money, brought the farmers golden fruit. Apart from all the other circumstances discussed above, it lowered wages. A portion of the latter was now added to the profits of the farm. The continuous rise in the price of corn, wool, meat, in a word of all agricultural produce, swelled the money capital of the farmer without any action on his part, whilst the rent he paid (being calculated on the old value of money) diminished in reality.* Thus they grew rich at the expense both of their labourers and their landlords. No wonder therefore, that England, at the end of the 16th century, had a class of capitalist farmers, rich, considering the circumstances of the time.

if he have not six or seven yeares rent lieng by him, fiftie or a hundred pounds, yet will the farmer thinke his gaines verie small."

* On the influence of the depreciation of money in the 16th century, on the different classes of society, see "A Compendious or Briefe Examination of Certayne Ordinary Complaints of Divers of our Countrymen in these our Days." By W. S., Gentleman. (London 1581.) The dialogue form of this work led people for a long time to ascribe it to Shakespeare, and even in 1751, it was published under his name. Its author is William Stafford. In one place the knight reasons as follows:

"Knight: You, my neighbour, the husbandman, you Maister Mercer, and you Goodman Cooper, with other artificers, may save yourselves metely well. For as much as all things are dearer than they were, so much do you arise in the pryce of your wares and occupations that ye sell agayne. But we have nothing to sell whereby we might advance ye price there of, to countervaille those things that we must buy agayne." In another place the knight asks the doctor: "I pray you, what be those sorts that ye meane. And first, of those that ye thinke should have no losse thereby?—Doctor: I mean all those that live by buying and selling, for as they buy deare, they sell thereafter. Knight: What is the next sort that ye say would win by it? Doctor: Marry, all such as have takings of fearmes in their owne manurance [cultivation] at the old rent, for where they pay after the olde rate they sell after the newe—that is, they paye for their lande good cheape, and sell all things growing thereof deare. Knight: What sorte is that which, ye sayde should have greater losse hereby, than these men had profit? Doctor: It is all noblemen, gentlemen, and all other that live either by a stinted rent or stypend, or do not manure [cultivation] the ground, or doe occupy no buying and selling."

** In France, the régisseur, steward, collector of dues for the feudal lords during the earlier part of the middle ages, soon became an homme d'affaires, who by extortion, cheating, &c., swindled himself into a capitalist. These régisseurs themselves were sometimes noblemen. *E.g.* "C'est li compte que messire Jacques de Thoraine, chevalier chastelain sor Besançon rent es-seigneur tenant les comptes à Dijon pour monseigneur le duc et comte de

Chapter XXX

REACTION OF THE AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION ON INDUSTRY.
CREATION OF THE HOME-MARKET FOR INDUSTRIAL CAPITAL

The expropriation and expulsion of the agricultural population, intermittent but renewed again and again, supplied, as we saw, the town industries with a mass of proletarians entirely unconnected with the corporate guilds and unfettered by them; a fortunate circumstance that makes old A. Anderson (not to be confounded with James Anderson) in his "History of Commerce,"⁷⁶ believe in the direct intervention of Providence. We must still pause a moment on this element of primitive accumulation. The thinning-out of the independent, self-supporting peasants not only brought about the crowding together of the industrial proletariat, in the way that Geoffroy Saint Hilaire explained the condensation of cosmical matter at one place, by its rarefaction at another.* In spite of the smaller number of its cultivators, the soil brought forth as much or more produce, after as before, because the revolution in the conditions of landed property was accompanied by improved methods of culture, greater co-operation, concentration of the means of production, &c., and because not only were the agricultural wage-labourers put on the strain more intensely,** but the field of production on which they worked for themselves, became more and more contracted. With the

Bourgoigne, des rentes appartenant à la dite chastellenie, depuis xxve jour de décembre MCCCLIX jusqu'au xxviiiie jour de décembre MCCCLX." (Alexis Monteil: "Traité des Matériaux manuscrits etc.," pp. 234, 235.) Already it is evident here how in all spheres of social life the lion's share falls to the middleman. In the economic domain, *e.g.*, financiers, stock-exchange speculators, merchants, shopkeepers skim the cream; in civil matters, the lawyer fleeces his clients; in politics the representative is of more importance than the voters, the minister than the sovereign; in religion God is pushed into the background by the "Mediator," and the latter again is shoved back by the priests, the inevitable middlemen between the good shepherd and his sheep. In France, as in England, the great feudal territories were divided into innumerable small homesteads, but under conditions incomparably more unfavourable for the people. During the 14th century arose the farms or *terriers*. Their number grew constantly, far beyond 100,000. They paid rents varying from 1/2 to 1/5 of the product in money or in kind. These farms were fiefs, sub-fiefs, &c., according to the value and extent of the domains, many of them only containing a few acres. But these farmers had rights of jurisdiction in some degree over the dwellers on the soil; there were four grades. The oppression of the agricultural population under all these petty tyrants will be understood. Monteil says that there were once in France 160,000 judges, where to-day, 4,000 tribunals, including justices of the peace, suffice.

* In his "Notions de Philosophie Naturelle." Paris, 1838.

** A point that Sir James Steuart emphasises.⁷⁷

setting free of a part of the agricultural population, therefore, their former means of nourishment were also set free. They were now transformed into material elements of variable capital. The peasant, expropriated and cast adrift, must buy their value in the form of wages, from his new master, the industrial capitalist. That which holds good of the means of subsistence holds with the raw materials of industry dependent upon home agriculture. They were transformed into an element of constant capital. Suppose, *e.g.*, a part of the Westphalian peasants, who, at the time of Frederick II., all span flax, forcibly expropriated and hunted from the soil; and the other part that remained, turned into day-labourers of large farmers. At the same time arise large establishments for flax-spinning and weaving, in which the men "set free" now work for wages. The flax looks exactly as before. Not a fibre of it is changed, but a new social soul has popped into its body. It forms now a part of the constant capital of the master manufacturer. Formerly divided among a number of small producers, who cultivated it themselves and with their families spun it in retail fashion, it is now concentrated in the hand of one capitalist, who sets others to spin and weave it for him. The extra labour expended in flax-spinning realised itself formerly in extra income to numerous peasant families, or maybe, in Frederick II.'s time, in taxes pour le roi de Prusse. It realises itself now in profit for a few capitalists. The spindles and looms, formerly scattered over the face of the country, are now crowded together in a few great labour-barracks, together with the labourers and the raw material. And spindles, looms, raw material, are now transformed, from means of independent existence for the spinners and weavers, into means for commanding them and sucking out of them unpaid labour.* One does not perceive, when looking at the large manufactories and the large farms, that they have originated from the throwing into one of many small centres of production, and have been built up by the expropriation of many small independent producers. Nevertheless, the popular intuition was not at fault. In the time of Mirabeau, the lion of the Revolution, the great manufactories were still called manufactures réunies, workshops thrown into one, as we speak of fields thrown into one. Says Mirabeau:

* "Je permettrai," says the capitalist, "que vous ayez l'honneur de me servir, à condition que vous me donniez le peu qui vous reste pour la peine que je prends de vous commander." (J. J. Rousseau: "Discours sur l'Economie Politique.")

"We are only paying attention to the grand manufactories, in which hundreds of men work under a director and which are commonly called *manufactures réunies*. Those where a very large number of labourers work, each separately and on his own account, are hardly considered; they are placed at an infinite distance from the others. This is a great error, as the latter alone make a really important object of national prosperity. . . . The large workshop (*manufacture réunie*) will enrich prodigiously one or two entrepreneurs, but the labourers will only be journeymen, paid more or less, and will not have any share in the success of the undertaking. In the discrete workshop (*manufacture séparée*), on the contrary, no one will become rich, but many labourers will be comfortable; the saving and the industrious will be able to amass a little capital, to put by a little for a birth of a child, for an illness, for themselves or their belongings. The number of saving and industrious labourers will increase, because they will see in good conduct, in activity, a means of essentially bettering their condition, and not of obtaining a small rise of wages that can never be of any importance for the future, and whose sole result is to place men in the position to live a little better, but only from day to day. . . . The large workshops, undertakings of certain private persons who pay labourers from day to day to work for their gain, may be able to put these private individuals at their ease, but they will never be an object worth the attention of governments. Discrete workshops, for the most part combined with cultivation of small holdings, are the only free ones."^{*}

The expropriation and eviction of a part of the agricultural population not only set free for industrial capital, the labourers, their means of subsistence, and material for labour; it also created the home-market.

In fact, the events that transformed the small peasants into wage-labourers, and their means of subsistence and of labour into material elements of capital, created, at the same time, a home-market for the latter. Formerly, the peasant family produced the means of subsistence and the raw materials, which they themselves, for the most part, consumed. These raw materials and means of subsistence have now become commodities; the large farmer sells them, he finds his market in manufactures. Yarn, linen, coarse woollen stuffs—things whose raw materials had been within the reach of every peasant family, had been spun and woven by it for its own use—were now transformed into articles of manufacture, to which the country districts at once served for markets. The many scattered customers, whom stray artisans until now had found in the numerous small producers working on their own account, concentrate themselves

* Mirabeau, I. c., t. III., pp. 20-109 passim. That Mirabeau considers the separate workshops more economical and productive than the "combined," and sees in the latter merely artificial exotics under government cultivation, is explained by the position at that time of a great part of the continental manufactures.

now into one great market provided for by industrial capital.* Thus, hand in hand with the expropriation of the self-supporting peasants, with their separation from their means of production, goes the destruction of rural domestic industry, the process of separation between manufacture and agriculture. And only the destruction of rural domestic industry can give the internal market of a country that extension and consistence which the capitalist mode of production requires. Still the manufacturing period, properly so called, does not succeed in carrying out this transformation radically and completely. It will be remembered that manufacture, properly so called, conquers but partially the domain of national production, and always rests on the handicrafts of the town and the domestic industry of the rural districts as its ultimate basis. If it destroys these in one form, in particular branches, at certain points, it calls them up again elsewhere, because it needs them for the preparation of raw material up to a certain point. It produces, therefore, a new class of small villagers who, while following the cultivation of the soil as an accessory calling, find their chief occupation in industrial labour, the products of which they sell to the manufacturers directly, or through the medium of merchants. This is one, though not the chief, cause of a phenomenon which, at first, puzzles the student of English history. From the last third of the 15th century he finds continually complaints, only interrupted at certain intervals, about the encroachment of capitalist farming in the country districts, and the progressive destruction of the peasantry. On the other hand, he always finds this peasantry turning up again, although in diminished number, and always under worse conditions.** The chief reason is: England is at one time chiefly a cultivator of corn, at another chiefly a breeder of cattle, in alternate periods, and with these the extent of peasant cultivation fluctuates. Modern Industry alone, and finally, supplies, in machinery, the lasting basis of capitalistic agriculture, expropriates radically the enormous majority of the agricultural population, and completes the separation between agriculture and

* "Twenty pounds of wool converted unobtrusively into the yearly clothing of a labourer's family by its own industry in the intervals of other work—this makes no show; but bring it to market, send it to the factory, thence to the dealer, and you will have great commercial operations, and nominal capital engaged to the amount of twenty times its value.... The working-class is thus emerged to support a wretched factory population, a parasitical shop-keeping class, and a fictitious commercial, monetary, and financial system. (David Urquhart, *l. c.*, p. 120.)

** Cromwell's time forms an exception. So long as the Republic lasted, the mass of the English people of all grades rose from the degradation into which they had sunk under the Tudors.

rural domestic industry, whose roots—spinning and weaving—it tears up.* It therefore also, for the first time, conquers for industrial capital the entire home-market.**

Chapter XXXI

GENESIS OF THE INDUSTRIAL CAPITALIST

The genesis of the industrial*** capitalist did not proceed in such a gradual way as that of the farmer. Doubtless many small guild-masters, and yet more independent small artisans, or even wage-labourers, transformed themselves into small capitalists, and (by gradually extending exploitation of wage-labour and corresponding accumulation) into full-blown capitalists. In the infancy of capitalist production, things often happened as in the infancy of mediæval towns, where the question, which of the escaped serfs should be master and which servant, was in great part decided by the earlier or later date of their flight. The snail's pace of this method corresponded in no wise with the commercial requirements of the new world-market that the great discoveries of the end of the 15th century created. But the middle ages had handed down two distinct forms of capital, which mature in the most different economic social formations, and which, before the era of the capitalist mode of production, are considered as capital *quand même*—usurer's capital and merchant's capital.

* Tuckett is aware that the modern woollen industry has sprung, with the introduction of machinery, from manufacture proper and from the destruction of rural and domestic industries. "The plough, the yoke, were 'the invention of gods, and the occupation of heroes'; are the loom, the spindle, the distaff, of less noble parentage. You sever the distaff and the plough, the spindle and the yoke, and you get factories and poor-houses, credit and panics, two hostile nations, agricultural and commercial." (David Urquhart, l. c., p. 122.) But now comes Carey, and cries out upon England, surely not with unreason, that it is trying to turn every other country into a mere agricultural nation, whose manufacturer is to be England. He pretends that in this way Turkey has been ruined, because "the owners and occupants of land have never been permitted by England to strengthen themselves by the formation of that natural alliance between the plough and the loom, the hammer and the harrow." ("The Slave Trade," p. 125.) According to him, Urquhart himself is one of the chief agents in the ruin of Turkey, where he had made Free-trade propaganda in the English interest. The best of it is that Carey, a great Russophile by the way, wants to prevent the process of separation by that very system of protection which accelerates it.

** Philanthropic English economists, like Mill, Rogers, Goldwin Smith, Fawcett, &c., and liberal manufacturers like John Bright & Co., ask the English landed proprietors, as God asked Cain after Abel, Where are our thousands of freeholders gone? But where do *you* come from then? From the destruction of those freeholders. Why don't you ask further, where are the independent weavers, spinners, and artisans gone?

*** Industrial here in contradistinction to agricultural. In the "categoric" sense the farmer is an industrial capitalist as much as the manufacturer.

"At present, all the wealth of society goes first into the possession of the capitalist . . . he pays the landowner his rent, the labourer his wages, the tax and tithe gatherer their claims, and keeps a large, indeed the largest, and a continually augmenting share, of the annual produce of labour for himself. The capitalist may now be said to be the first owner of all the wealth of the community, though no law has conferred on him the right to this property . . . this change has been effected by the taking of interest on capital . . . and it is not a little curious that all the law-givers of Europe endeavoured to prevent this by statutes, viz., statutes against usury. . . . The power of the capitalist over all the wealth of the country is a complete change in the right of property, and by what law, or series of laws, was it effected?"*

The author should have remembered that revolutions are not made by laws.

The money capital formed by means of usury and commerce was prevented from turning into industrial capital, in the country by the feudal constitution, in the towns by the guild organisation.** These fetters vanished with the dissolution of feudal society, with the expropriation and partial eviction of the country population. The new manufactures were established at sea-ports, or at inland points beyond the control of the old municipalities and their guilds. Hence in England an embittered struggle of the corporate towns against these new industrial nurseries.

The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief moments of primitive accumulation. On their heels treads the commercial war of the European nations, with the globe for a theatre. It begins with the revolt of the Netherlands from Spain,⁷⁸ assumes giant dimensions in England's Anti-Jacobin War,³² and is still going on in the opium wars against China,⁷⁹ &c.

The different moments of primitive accumulation distribute themselves now, more or less in chronological order, particularly over Spain, Portugal, Holland, France, and England. In England at the end of the 17th century, they arrive at a systematical combination, embracing the colonies, the national debt, the modern mode of taxation, and the protectionist system. These methods depend in part on brute force, *e.g.*, the colonial system. But they

* "The Natural and Artificial Rights of Property Contrasted." Lond., 1832, pp. 98-99. Author of the anonymous work: "Th. Hodgskin."

** Even as late as 1794, the small cloth-makers of Leeds sent a deputation to Parliament, with a petition for a law to forbid any merchant from becoming a manufacturer. (Dr. Aikin, "Description of the Country from 30 to 40 miles round Manchester," London, 1795.)

all employ the power of the State, the concentrated and organised force of society, to hasten, hothouse fashion, the process of transformation of the feudal mode of production into the capitalist mode, and to shorten the transition. Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one. It is itself an economic power.

Of the Christian colonial system, W. Howitt, a man who makes a speciality of Christianity, says:

"The barbarities and desperate outrages of the so-called Christian race, throughout every region of the world, and upon every people they have been able to subdue, are not to be paralleled by those of any other race, however fierce, however untaught, and however reckless of mercy and of shame, in any age of the earth."^{*}

The history of the colonial administration of Holland—and Holland was the head capitalistic nation of the 17th century—"is one of the most extraordinary relations of treachery, bribery, massacre, and meanness."^{**} Nothing is more characteristic than their system of stealing men, to get slaves for Java. The men stealers were trained for this purpose. The thief, the interpreter, and the seller, were the chief agents in this trade, native princes the chief sellers. The young people stolen, were thrown into the secret dungeons of Celebes, until they were ready for sending to the slave-ships. An official report says:

"This one town of Macassar, *e.g.*, is full of secret prisons, one more horrible than the other, crammed with unfortunates, victims of greed and tyranny fettered in chains, forcibly torn from their families."

To secure Malacca, the Dutch corrupted the Portuguese governor. He let them into the town in 1641. They hurried at once to his house and assassinated him, to "abstain" from the payment of £21,875, the price of his treason. Wherever they set foot, devastation and depopulation followed. Banjuwangi, a province of Java, in 1750 numbered over 80,000 inhabitants, in 1811 only 8,000. Sweet commerce!

The English East India Company,⁸⁰ as is well known, obtained, besides the political rule in India, the exclusive monopoly of the tea-trade, as well as of the Chinese trade in general, and of the transport of goods to and from Europe. But the coasting trade

* William Howitt: "Colonisation and Christianity: A Popular History of the Treatment of the Natives by the Europeans in all their Colonies." London, 1838, p. 9. On the treatment of the slaves there is a good compilation in Charles Comte, "Traité de la Législation." 3me ed. Bruxelles, 1837. This subject one must study in detail, to see what the bourgeoisie makes of itself and of the labourer, wherever it can, without restraint, model the world after its own image.

** Thomas Stamford Raffles, late Lieut.-Gov. of that island: "The History of Java," Lond., 1817.

of India and between the islands, as well as the internal trade of India, were the monopoly of the higher employés of the company. The monopolies of salt, opium, betel and other commodities, were inexhaustible mines of wealth. The employés themselves fixed the price and plundered at will the unhappy Hindus. The Governor-General took part in this private traffic. His favourites received contracts under conditions whereby they, cleverer than the alchemists, made gold out of nothing. Great fortunes sprang up like mushrooms in a day; primitive accumulation went on without the advance of a shilling. The trial of Warren Hastings swarms with such cases. Here is an instance. A contract for opium was given to a certain Sullivan at the moment of his departure on an official mission to a part of India far removed from the opium district. Sullivan sold his contract to one Binn for £ 40,000; Binn sold it the same day for £ 60,000, and the ultimate purchaser who carried out the contract declared that after all he realised an enormous gain. According to one of the lists laid before Parliament, the Company and its employés from 1757-1766 got £ 6,000,000 from the Indians as gifts. Between 1769 and 1770, the English manufactured a famine by buying up all the rice and refusing to sell it again, except at fabulous prices.*

The treatment of the aborigines was, naturally, most frightful in plantation-colonies destined for export trade only, such as the West Indies, and in rich and well-populated countries, such as Mexico and India, that were given over to plunder. But even in the colonies properly so called, the Christian character of primitive accumulation did not belie itself. Those sober virtuosi of Protestantism, the Puritans of New England, in 1703, by decrees of their assembly set a premium of £ 40 on every Indian scalp and every captured red-skin; in 1720 a premium of £ 100 on every scalp; in 1744, after Massachusetts-Bay had proclaimed a certain tribe as rebels, the following prices: for a male scalp of 12 years and upwards £ 100 (new currency), for a male prisoner £ 105, for women and children prisoners £ 55, for scalps of women and children £ 50. Some decades later, the colonial system took its revenge on the descendants of the pious pilgrim fathers, who had grown seditious in the meantime. At English instigation and for English pay they were tomahawked by red-skins. The British Parliament proclaimed blood-hounds and scalping as "means that God and Nature had given into its hand."

The colonial system ripened, like a hot-house, trade and navi-

* In the year 1866 more than a million Hindus died of hunger in the province of Orissa alone. Nevertheless, the attempt was made to enrich the Indian treasury by the price at which the necessaries of life were sold to the starving people.

gation. The "societies Monopolia" of Luther were powerful levers for concentration of capital. The colonies secured a market for the budding manufactures, and, through the monopoly of the market, an increased accumulation. The treasures captured outside Europe by undisguised looting, enslavement, and murder, floated back to the mother-country and were there turned into capital. Holland, which first fully developed the colonial system, in 1648 stood already in the acme of its commercial greatness.

It was "in almost exclusive possession of the East Indian trade and the commerce between the south-east and north-west of Europe. Its fisheries, marine, manufactures, surpassed those of any other country. The total capital of the Republic was probably more important than that of all the rest of Europe put together."⁸¹

Gulich forgets to add that by 1648, the people of Holland were more over-worked, poorer and more brutally oppressed than those of all the rest of Europe put together.

To-day industrial supremacy implies commercial supremacy. In the period of manufacture properly so called, it is, on the other hand, the commercial supremacy that gives industrial predominance. Hence the preponderant rôle that the colonial system plays at that time. It was "the strange God" who perched himself on the altar cheek by jowl with the old Gods of Europe, and one fine day with a shove and a kick chucked them all of a heap. It proclaimed surplus-value making as the sole end and aim of humanity.

The system of public credit, *i.e.*, of national debts, whose origin we discover in Genoa and Venice as early as the middle ages, took possession of Europe generally during the manufacturing period. The colonial system with its maritime trade and commercial wars served as a forcing-house for it. Thus it first took root in Holland. National debts, *i.e.*, the alienation of the state—whether despotic, constitutional or republican—marked with its stamp the capitalistic era. The only part of the so-called national wealth that actually enters into the collective possessions of modern peoples is—their national debt.* Hence, as a necessary consequence, the modern doctrine that a nation becomes the richer the more deeply it is in debt. Public credit becomes the *credo* of capital. And with the rise of national debt-making, want of faith in the national debt takes the place of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which may not be forgiven.

The public debt becomes one of the most powerful levers of

* William Cobbett remarks that in England all public institutions are designated "royal"; as compensation for this, however, there is the "national" debt.

primitive accumulation. As with the stroke of an enchanter's wand, it endows barren money with the power of breeding and thus turns it into capital, without the necessity of its exposing itself to the troubles and risks inseparable from its employment in industry or even in usury. The state-creditors actually give nothing away, for the sum lent is transformed into public bonds, easily negotiable, which go on functioning in their hands just as so much hard cash would. But further, apart from the class of lazy annuitants thus created, and from the improvised wealth of the financiers, middlemen between the government and the nation—as also apart from the tax-farmers, merchants, private manufacturers, to whom a good part of every national loan renders the service of a capital fallen from heaven—the national debt has given rise to joint-stock companies, to dealings in negotiable effects of all kinds, and to agiotage, in a word to stock-exchange gambling and the modern bankocracy.

At their birth the great banks, decorated with national titles, were only associations of private speculators, who placed themselves by the side of governments, and, thanks to the privileges they received, were in a position to advance money to the State. Hence the accumulation of the national debt has no more infallible measure than the successive rise in the stock of these banks, whose full development dates from the founding of the Bank of England in 1694. The Bank of England began with lending its money to the Government at 8⁰/₀; at the same time it was empowered by Parliament to coin money out of the same capital, by lending it again to the public in the form of banknotes. It was allowed to use these notes for discounting bills, making advances on commodities, and for buying the precious metals. It was not long ere this credit-money, made by the bank itself, became the coin in which the Bank of England made its loans to the State, and paid, on account of the State, the interest on the public debt. It was not enough that the bank gave with one hand and took back more with the other; it remained, even whilst receiving, the eternal creditor of the nation down to the last shilling advanced. Gradually it became inevitably the receptacle of the metallic hoard of the country, and the centre of gravity of all commercial credit. What effect was produced on their contemporaries by the sudden uprising of this brood of bankocrats, financiers, rentiers, brokers, stock-jobbers, &c., is proved by the writings of that time, *e.g.*, by Bolingbroke's.*

With the national debt arose an international credit system,

* "Si les Tartares inondaient l'Europe aujourd'hui, il faudrait bien des affaires pour leur faire entendre ce que c'est qu'un financier parmi nous." Montesquieu, "Esprit des lois," t. iv., p. 33, ed. Londres, 1769.

which often conceals one of the sources of primitive accumulation in this or that people. Thus the villainies of the Venetian thieving system formed one of the secret bases of the capital-wealth of Holland to whom Venice in her decadence lent large sums of money. So also was it with Holland and England. By the beginning of the 18th century the Dutch manufactures were far outstripped. Holland had ceased to be the nation preponderant in commerce and industry. One of its main lines of business, therefore, from 1701-1776, is the lending out of enormous amounts of capital, especially to its great rival England. The same thing is going on to-day between England and the United States. A great deal of capital, which appears to-day in the United States without any certificate of birth, was yesterday, in England, the capitalised blood of children.

As the national debt finds its support in the public revenue, which must cover the yearly payments for interest, &c., the modern system of taxation was the necessary complement of the system of national loans. The loans enable the government to meet extraordinary expenses, without the tax-payers feeling it immediately, but they necessitate, as a consequence, increased taxes. On the other hand, the raising of taxation caused by the accumulation of debts contracted one after another, compels the government always to have recourse to new loans for new extraordinary expenses. Modern fiscality, whose pivot is formed by taxes on the most necessary means of subsistence (thereby increasing their price), thus contains within itself the germ of automatic progression. Over-taxation is not an incident, but rather a principle. In Holland, therefore, where this system was first inaugurated, the great patriot, De Witt, has in his "Maxims"⁸² extolled it as the best system for making the wage-labourer submissive, frugal, industrious, and overburdened with labour. The destructive influence that it exercises on the condition of the wage-labourer concerns us less however, here, than the forcible expropriation, resulting from it, of peasants, artisans, and in a word, all elements of the lower middle-class. On this there are not two opinions, even among the bourgeois economists. Its expropriating efficacy is still further heightened by the system of protection, which forms one of its integral parts.

The great part that the public debt, and the fiscal system corresponding with it, has played in the capitalisation of wealth and the expropriation of the masses, has led many writers, like Cobbett, Doubleday and others, to seek in this, incorrectly, the fundamental cause of the misery of the modern peoples.

The system of protection was an artificial means of manufacturing manufacturers, of expropriating independent labourers, of

capitalising the national means of production and subsistence, of forcibly abbreviating the transition from the mediæval to the modern mode of production. The European states tore one another to pieces about the patent of this invention, and, once entered into the service of the surplus-value makers, did not merely lay under contribution in the pursuit of this purpose their own people, indirectly through protective duties, directly through export premiums. They also forcibly rooted out, in their dependent countries, all industry, as, *e.g.*, England did with the Irish woollen manufacture. On the continent of Europe, after Colbert's example, the process was much simplified. The primitive industrial capital, here, came in part directly out of the state treasury.

"Why," cries Mirabeau, "why go so far to seek the cause of the manufacturing glory of Saxony before the war?⁸³ 180,000,000 of debts contracted by the sovereigns!"*

Colonial system, public debts, heavy taxes, protection, commercial wars, &c., these children of the true manufacturing period, increase gigantically during the infancy of Modern Industry. The birth of the latter is heralded by a great slaughter of the innocents. Like the royal navy, the factories were recruited by means of the press-gang. Blasé as Sir F. M. Eden is as to the horrors of the expropriation of the agricultural population from the soil, from the last third of the 15th century to his own time; with all the self-satisfaction with which he rejoices in this process, "essential" for establishing capitalistic agriculture and "the due proportion between arable and pasture land"—he does not show, however, the same economic insight in respect to the necessity of child-stealing and child-slavery for the transformation of manufacturing exploitation into factory exploitation, and the establishment of the "true relation" between capital and labour-power. He says:

"It may, perhaps, be worthy the attention of the public to consider, whether any manufacture, which, in order to be carried on successfully, requires that cottages and workhouses should be ransacked for poor children; that they should be employed by turns during the greater part of the night and robbed of that rest which, though indispensable to all, is most required by the young; and that numbers of both sexes, of different ages and dispositions, should be collected together in such a manner that the contagion of example cannot but lead to profligacy and debauchery; will add to the sum of individual or national felicity?"**

"In the counties of Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, and more particularly in Lancashire," says Fielden, "the newly-invented machinery was used in large factories built on the sides of streams capable of turning the water-

* Mirabeau, l. c., t. vi., p. 101.

** Eden, l. c., Vol. I., Book II., Ch. I., p. 421.

wheel. Thousands of hands were suddenly required in these places, remote from towns; and Lancashire, in particular, being, till then, comparatively thinly populated and barren, a population was all that she now wanted. The small and nimble fingers of little children being by very far the most in request, the custom instantly sprang up of procuring *apprentices* from the different parish workhouses of London, Birmingham, and elsewhere. Many, many thousands of these little, hapless creatures were sent down into the north, being from the age of 7 to the age of 13 or 14 years old. The custom was for the master to clothe his apprentices and to feed and lodge them in an 'apprentice house' near the factory; overseers were appointed to see to the works, whose interest it was to work the children to the utmost, because their pay was in proportion to the quantity of work that they could exact. Cruelty was, of course, the consequence. . . . In many of the manufacturing districts, but particularly, I am afraid, in the guilty county to which I belong [Lancashire], cruelties the most heart-rending were practised upon the unoffending and friendless creatures who were thus consigned to the charge of master-manufacturers; they were harassed to the brink of death by excess of labour . . . were flogged, fettered and tortured in the most exquisite refinement of cruelty; . . . they were in many cases starved to the bone while flogged to their work and . . . even in some instances . . . were driven to commit suicide. . . . The beautiful and romantic valleys of Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Lancashire, secluded from the public eye, became the dismal solitudes of torture, and of many a murder. The profits of manufacturers were enormous; but this only whetted the appetite that it should have satisfied, and therefore the manufacturers had recourse to an expedient that seemed to secure to them those profits without any possibility of limit; they began the practice of what is termed 'night-working,' that is, having tired one set of hands, by working them throughout the day, they had another set ready to go on working throughout the night; the day-set getting into the beds that the night-set had just quitted, and in their turn again, the night-set getting into the beds that the day-set quitted in the morning. It is a common tradition in Lancashire, that the beds *never get cold*."^{*}

With the development of capitalist production during the manufacturing period, the public opinion of Europe had lost the

* John Fielden, "The Curse of the Factory System," London, 1836, pp. 5, 6. On the earlier infamies of the factory system, cf. Dr. Aikin (1795), l. c., p. 219, and Gisborne: "Enquiry into the Duties of Men," 1795, Vol. II. When the steam-engine transplanted the factories from the country waterfalls to the middle of towns, the "abstemious" surplus-value maker found the child-material ready to his hand, without being forced to seek slaves from the workhouses. When Sir R. Peel (father of the "minister of plausibility"), brought in his bill for the protection of children, in 1815, Francis Horner, lumen of the Bullion Committee and intimate friend of Ricardo, said in the House of Commons: "It is notorious, that with a bankrupt's effects, a gang, if he might use the word, of these children had been put up to sale, and were advertised publicly as part of the property. A most atrocious instance had been brought before the Court of King's Bench two years before, in which a number of these boys, apprenticed by a parish in London to one manufacturer, had been transferred to another, and had been found by some benevolent persons in a state of absolute famine. Another case more horrible had come to his knowledge while on a [Parliamentary] Committee . . . that not many years ago, an agreement had been made between a London parish and a Lancashire manufacturer, by which it was stipulated, that with every 20 sound children one idiot should be taken."

last remnant of shame and conscience. The nations bragged cynically of every infamy that served them as a means to capitalistic accumulation. Read, *e.g.*, the naïve *Annals of Commerce* of the worthy A. Anderson.⁷⁶ Here it is trumpeted forth as a triumph of English statecraft that at the Peace of Utrecht, England extorted from the Spaniards by the *Asiento Treaty*⁸⁴ the privilege of being allowed to ply the negro-trade, until then only carried on between Africa and the English West Indies, between Africa and Spanish America as well. England thereby acquired the right of supplying Spanish America until 1743 with 4,800 negroes yearly. This threw, at the same time, an official cloak over British smuggling. Liverpool waxed fat on the slave-trade. This was its method of primitive accumulation. And, even to the present day, Liverpool "respectability" is the Pindar of the slave-trade which—compare the work of Aikin [1795] already quoted—"has coincided with that spirit of bold adventure which has characterised the trade of Liverpool and rapidly carried it to its present state of prosperity; has occasioned vast employment for shipping and sailors, and greatly augmented the demand for the manufactures of the country" (p. 339). Liverpool employed in the slave-trade, in 1730, 15 ships; in 1751, 53; in 1760, 74; in 1770, 96; and in 1792, 132.

Whilst the cotton industry introduced child-slavery in England, it gave in the United States a stimulus to the transformation of the earlier, more or less patriarchal slavery, into a system of commercial exploitation. In fact, the veiled slavery of the wage-workers in Europe needed, for its pedestal, slavery pure and simple in the new world.*

Tantæ molis erat,⁸⁵ to establish the "eternal laws of Nature" of the capitalist mode of production, to complete the process of separation between labourers and conditions of labour, to transform, at one pole, the social means of production and subsistence into capital at the opposite pole, the mass of the population into wage-labourers, into "free labouring poor," that artificial product of modern society.** If money, according to

* In 1790, there were in the English West Indies ten slaves for one free man, in the French fourteen for one, in the Dutch twenty-three for one. (Henry Brougham: "An Inquiry into the Colonial Policy of the European Powers." Edin. 1803, vol. II., p. 74.)

** The phrase, "labouring poor," is found in English legislation from the moment when the class of wage-labourers becomes noticeable. This term is used in opposition, on the one hand, to the "idle poor," beggars, etc., on the other to those labourers, who, pigeons not yet plucked, are still possessors of their own means of labour. From the Statute Book it passed into Political Economy, and was handed down by Culpeper, J. Child, etc., to Adam Smith and Eden. After this, one can judge of the good faith of the "execrable

Augier* "comes into the world with a congenital blood-stain on one cheek," capital comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt.**

Chapter XXXII

HISTORICAL TENDENCY OF CAPITALIST ACCUMULATION

What does the primitive accumulation of capital, *i.e.*, its historical genesis, resolve itself into? In so far as it is not immediate transformation of slaves and serfs into wage-labourers, and therefore a mere change of form, it only means the expropriation of the immediate producers, *i.e.*, the dissolution of private property based on the labour of its owner. Private property, as the antithesis to social, collective property, exists only where the means of labour and the external conditions of labour belong to private individuals. But according as these private individuals are labourers or not labourers, private property has a different character. The numberless shades, that it at first sight presents, correspond to the intermediate stages lying between these two extremes. The private property of the labourer in his means of production is

political cant-monger," Edmund Burke, when he called the expression, "labouring poor,"—"execrable political cant." This sycophant who, in the pay of the English oligarchy, played the romantic laudator temporis acti against the French Revolution, just as, in the pay of the North American Colonies, at the beginning of the American troubles, he had played the Liberal against the English oligarchy, was an out and out vulgar bourgeois. "The laws of commerce are the laws of Nature, and therefore the laws of God." (E. Burke, "Thoughts and Details on Scarcity," London, 1800, pp. 31, 32.) No wonder that, true to the laws of God and of Nature, he always sold himself in the best market. A very good portrait of this Edmund Burke, during his liberal time, is to be found in the writings of the Rev. Mr. Tucker. Tucker was a parson and a Tory, but, for the rest, an honourable man and a competent political economist. In face of the infamous cowardice of character that reigns to-day, and believes most devoutly in "the laws of commerce," it is our bounden duty again and again to brand the Burkes, who only differ from their successors in one thing—talent.

* Marie Augier: "Du Crédit Public." Paris, 1842.

** "Capital is said by a Quarterly Reviewer to fly turbulence and strife, and to be timid, which is very true; but this is very incompletely stating the question. Capital eschews no profit, or very small profit, just as Nature was formerly said to abhor a vacuum. With adequate profit, capital is very bold. A certain 10 per cent. will ensure its employment anywhere; 20 per cent. certain will produce eagerness; 50 per cent., positive audacity; 100 per cent. will make it ready to trample on all human laws; 300 per cent., and there is not a crime at which it will scruple, nor a risk it will not run, even to the chance of its owner being hanged. If turbulence and strife will bring a profit, it will freely encourage both. Smuggling and the slave-trade have amply proved all that is here stated." (T. J. Dunning, "Trades' Unions and Strikes," London, 1860, pp. 35, 36.)

the foundation of petty industry, whether agricultural, manufacturing, or both; petty industry, again, is an essential condition for the development of social production and of the free individuality of the labourer himself. Of course, this petty mode of production exists also under slavery, serfdom, and other states of dependence. But it flourishes, it lets loose its whole energy, it attains its adequate classical form, only where the labourer is the private owner of his own means of labour set in action by himself; the peasant of the land which he cultivates, the artisan of the tool which he handles as a virtuoso. This mode of production pre-supposes parcelling of the soil, and scattering of the other means of production. As it excludes the concentration of these means of production, so also it excludes co-operation, division of labour within each separate process of production, the control over, and the productive application of the forces of Nature by society, and the free development of the social productive powers. It is compatible only with a system of production, and a society, moving within narrow and more or less primitive bounds. To perpetuate it would be, as Pecqueur rightly says, "to decree universal mediocrity."⁸⁶ At a certain stage of development it brings forth the material agencies for its own dissolution. From that moment new forces and new passions spring up in the bosom of society; but the old social organisation fetters them and keeps them down. It must be annihilated; it is annihilated. Its annihilation, the transformation of the individualised and scattered means of production into socially concentrated ones, of the pigmy property of the many into the huge property of the few, the expropriation of the great mass of the people from the soil, from the means of subsistence, and from the means of labour, this fearful and painful expropriation of the mass of the people forms the prelude to the history of capital. It comprises a series of forcible methods, of which we have passed in review only those that have been epoch-making as methods of the primitive accumulation of capital. The expropriation of the immediate producers was accomplished with merciless Vandalism, and under the stimulus of passions the most infamous, the most sordid, the pettiest, the most meanly odious. Self-earned private property, that is based, so to say, on the fusing together of the isolated, independent labouring-individual with the conditions of his labour, is supplanted by capitalistic private property, which rests on exploitation of the nominally free labour of others, *i.e.*, on wage-labour.*

* "Nous sommes dans une condition tout-à-fait nouvelle de la société... nous tendons à séparer toute espèce de propriété d'avec toute espèce de travail." (Sismondi: "Nouveaux Principes d'Econ. Polit." t. II., p. 434.)

As soon as this process of transformation has sufficiently decomposed the old society from top to bottom, as soon as the labourers are turned into proletarians, their means of labour into capital, as soon as the capitalist mode of production stands on its own feet, then the further socialisation of labour and further transformation of the land and other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production, as well as the further expropriation of private proprietors, takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the labourer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many labourers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralisation of capital. One capitalist always kills many. Hand in hand with this centralisation, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever-extending scale, the co-operative form of the labour-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labour into instruments of labour only usable in common, the economising of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialised labour, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market, and with this, the international character of the capitalistic regime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolise all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working-class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. Thus integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.

The capitalist mode of appropriation, the result of the capitalist mode of production, produces capitalist private property. This is the first negation of individual private property, as founded on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of Nature, its own negation. It is the negation of negation. This does not re-establish private property for the producer, but gives him individual property based on the acquisitions of the capitalist era: *i.e.*, on co-opera-

tion and the possession in common of the land and of the means of production.

The transformation of scattered private property, arising from individual labour, into capitalist private property is, naturally, a process, incomparably more protracted, violent, and difficult, than the transformation of capitalistic private property, already practically resting on socialised production, into socialised property. In the former case, we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people.*

First published in the book:
K. Marx, *Das Kapital. Kritik
der politischen Oekonomie,*
Erster Band, Hamburg, 1867

Printed according to the
English edition of 1887,
edited by Frederick Engels

* The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet, the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable. . . Of all the classes, that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie to-day, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes perish and disappear in the face of Modern Industry, the proletariat is its special and essential product. . . The lower middle-classes, the small manufacturers, the shopkeepers, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle-class . . . they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels, "Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei," London, 1848, pp. 9, 11.

FREDERICK ENGELS

MARX'S CAPITAL*⁸⁷

I

As long as there have been capitalists and workers on earth no book has appeared which is of as much importance for the workers as the one before us. The relation between capital and labour, the axis on which our entire present system of society turns, is here treated scientifically for the first time, and at that with a thoroughness and acuity such as was possible only for a German. Valuable as the writings of an Owen, Saint-Simon or Fourier are and will remain—it was reserved for a German to climb to the height from which the whole field of modern social relations can be seen clearly and in full view just as the lower mountain scenery is seen by an observer standing on the top-most peak.

Political economy up to now has taught us that labour is the source of all wealth and the measure of all values, so that two objects whose production has cost the same labour time possess the same value and must also be taken in exchange for each other, since on the average only equal values are exchangeable for one another. At the same time, however, it teaches that there exists a kind of stored-up labour, which it calls capital; that this capital, owing to the auxiliary sources contained in it, raises the productivity of living labour a hundred and a thousand fold, and in return claims a certain compensation which is termed profit or gain. As we all know, this occurs in reality in such a way that the profits of stored-up, dead labour become ever more massive, the capitals of the capitalists become ever more colossal, while the wages of living labour become constantly less and the mass of the workers living solely on wages becomes ever more numerous and poverty-stricken. How is this contradiction to be solved? How can there remain a profit for the capitalist if the worker receives in compensation the full value of the labour he adds to his product? Yet this ought to be the case, since only equal values are exchanged. On the other hand, how can equal

* Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie, von Karl Marx. Erster Band. Der Produktionsprozess des Kapitals. Hamburg, O. Meissner, 1867.

values be exchanged, how can the worker receive the full value of his product, if, as is admitted by many economists, this product is divided between him and the capitalist? Economics up to now has been helpless in the face of the contradiction, and writes or stutters embarrassed phrases which say nothing. Even the previous socialist critics of economics have not been able to do more than to emphasise the contradiction; no one resolved it, until now at last Marx has traced the process by which this profit arises right to its birthplace and has thereby made everything clear.

In tracing the development of capital, Marx starts out from the simple, notoriously obvious fact that the capitalists increase the value of their capital through exchange: they buy commodities for their money and afterwards sell them for more money than they cost them. For example, a capitalist buys cotton for 1,000 talers and resells it for 1,100, thus "earning" 100 talers. This excess of 100 talers over the original capital Marx calls *surplus value*. What is the origin of this surplus value? According to the economists' assumption, only equal values are exchanged and in the sphere of abstract theory this, of course, is correct. Hence the purchase of cotton and its resale can just as little yield surplus value as the exchange of a silver taler for thirty silver groschen and the re-exchange of the small coins for a silver taler, a process by which one becomes neither richer nor poorer. But surplus value can just as little arise from sellers selling commodities above their value, or purchasers buying them below their value, because each one is in turn buyer and seller and things would therefore again balance. Just as little can it arise from buyers and sellers reciprocally overreaching each other, for this would create no new or surplus value, but only divide the existing capital differently among the capitalists. In spite of the fact that the capitalist buys the commodities at their value and sells them at their value, he gets more value out than he puts in. How does this happen?

The capitalist finds on the commodity market under present social conditions a *commodity* which has the peculiar property that *its use is a source of new value, is a creation of new value, and this commodity is labour power.*

What is the value of labour power? The value of every commodity is measured by the labour required for its production. Labour power exists in the form of the living worker who requires a definite amount of means of subsistence for his existence as well as for the maintenance of his family, which ensures the continuance of labour power also after his death. The labour time necessary for producing these means of subsistence repre-

sents, therefore, the value of the labour power. The capitalist pays this value weekly and purchases for that the use of one week's labour of the worker. So far messieurs the economists will be pretty well in agreement with us as to the value of labour power.

The capitalist now sets his worker to work. In a certain period of time the worker will have performed as much labour as was represented by his weekly wages. Supposing that the weekly wage of a worker represents three workdays, then if the worker begins on Monday, he has by Wednesday evening *replaced* to the capitalist the *full value of the wage paid*. But does he then stop working? Not at all. The capitalist has bought his *week's* labour and the worker must go on working also during the last three week days. This *surplus labour* of the worker, over and above the time necessary to replace his wages, is the *source of surplus value*, of profit, of the steadily growing increase of capital.

Do not say it is an arbitrary assumption that the worker works off in three days the wages he has received, and works the remaining three days for the capitalist. Whether he takes exactly three days to replace his wages, or two or four, is to be sure quite immaterial here and hence varies according to circumstances; the main point is that the capitalist, besides the labour he pays for, also extracts labour that he *does not pay for*, and this is no arbitrary assumption, for the day the capitalist extracts from the worker in the long run only as much labour as he paid him in wages, on that day he will shut down his workshop, since indeed his whole profit would come to nought.

Here we have the solution of all those contradictions. The origin of surplus value (of which the capitalists' profit forms an important part) is now quite clear and natural. The value of the labour power is paid for, but this value is far less than that which the capitalist manages to extract from the labour power, and it is just the difference, the *unpaid labour*, which constitutes the share of the capitalist, or, more accurately, of the capitalist class. For even the profit that the cotton dealer made on his cotton in the above example must consist of unpaid labour, if cotton prices did not rise. The trader must have sold to a cotton manufacturer, who is able to extract a profit for himself from his product besides the 100 talers, and therefore shares with him the unpaid labour he has pocketed. In general it is this unpaid labour which maintains all the non-working members of society. The state and municipal taxes, as far as they affect the capitalist class, as also the ground rent of the land owners, etc., are paid from it. On it rests the whole existing social system.

It would, however, be absurd to assume that unpaid labour arose only under present conditions where production is carried on by capitalists on the one hand and wage-workers on the other. On the contrary, the oppressed class at all times has had to perform unpaid labour. During the whole long period when slavery was the prevailing form of the organisation of labour, the slaves had to perform much more labour than was returned to them in the form of means of subsistence. The same was the case under the rule of serfdom and right up to the abolition of peasant *corvée* labour; here in fact the difference stands out palpably between the time during which the peasant works for his own maintenance and the surplus labour for the lord of the manor, precisely because the latter is carried out separately from the former. The form has now been changed, but the substance remains and as long as "a part of society possesses the monopoly of the means of production, the labourer, free or not free, must add to the working-time necessary for his own maintenance an extra working-time in order to produce the means of subsistence for the owners of the means of production" (*Marx*, S. 202).*

II

In the previous article we saw that every worker employed by a capitalist performs two kinds of labour: during one part of his working-time he replaces the wages advanced to him by the capitalist, and this part of his labour Marx terms the *necessary labour*. But afterwards he has to go on working and during that time he produces *surplus value* for the capitalist, an important part of which constitutes profit. That part of the labour is called surplus labour.

Let us assume that the worker works three days of the week to replace his wages and three days to produce surplus value for the capitalist. Putting it otherwise, it means that, with a twelve-hour working day, he works six hours daily for his wages and six hours for the production of surplus value. One can get only six days out of the week, or at most seven even by including Sunday, but one can extract six, eight, ten, twelve, fifteen or even more hours of work out of every single day. The worker sells the capitalist a working day for his day's wages. But, *what is a working day?* Eight hours or eighteen?

It is to the capitalist's interest to make the working day as long as possible. The longer it is, the more surplus value it produces. The worker correctly feels that every hour of labour which

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1954, p. 235.—Ed.

he performs over and above the replacement of the wage is unjustly taken from him; he learns from bitter personal experience what it means to work excessive hours. The capitalist fights for his profit, the worker for his health, for a few hours of daily rest, to be able to engage in other human activities as well, besides working, sleeping and eating. It may be remarked in passing that it does not depend at all upon the good will of the individual capitalists whether they desire to embark on this struggle or not, since competition compels even the most philanthropic among them to join his colleagues and to make a working time as long as theirs the rule.

The struggle for the fixing of the working day has lasted from the first appearance of free workers in the arena of history down to the present day. In various trades various traditional working days prevail; but in reality they are seldom adhered to. Only where the law fixes the working day and supervises its observance can one really say that there exists a normal working day. And up to now this is the case almost solely in the factory districts of England. Here the ten-hour working day (ten and a half hours on five days, seven and a half hours on Saturday) has been fixed for all women and for youths of thirteen to eighteen, and since the men cannot work without them, they also come under the ten-hour working day. This law has been won by English factory workers by years of endurance, by the most persistent, stubborn struggle with the factory owners, by freedom of the press, the right of association and assembly, as well as by adroit utilisation of the splits in the ruling class itself. It has become the palladium of the English workers, it has gradually been extended to all important branches of industry and last year to almost *all trades*, at least to all those employing women and children. The present work contains most exhaustive material on the history of this legislative regulation of the working day in England. The next North German Reichstag will also have factory regulations to discuss and in connection therewith the regulation of factory labour. We expect that none of the deputies that have been elected by German workers will proceed to discuss this bill without previously making themselves thoroughly conversant with *Marx's* book. *There is much to be achieved here.* The splits within the ruling classes are more favourable to the workers than they ever were in England, because *universal suffrage compels the ruling classes to court the favour of the workers.* Under these circumstances, four or five representatives of the proletariat are *a power*, if they know how to use their position, if above all they know what is at issue, which the bour-

geois do not know. And for this purpose, Marx's book gives them all the material in ready form.

We will pass over a number of further very fine investigations of more theoretical interest and will halt only at the final chapter which deals with the accumulation of capital. Here it is first shown that the capitalist mode of production, that is, that effected by capitalists on the one hand and wage-workers on the other, not only continually produces anew for the capitalist his capital, but at the same time also continually produces anew the poverty of the workers; thereby it is provided for that there always exist anew, on the one hand, capitalists who are the owners of all means of subsistence, all raw materials and all instruments of labour, and, on the other hand, the great mass of the workers, who are compelled to sell their labour power to these capitalists for an amount of the means of subsistence which at best just suffices to keep them able-bodied and to bring up a new generation of able-bodied proletarians. But capital does not merely reproduce itself: it is continually increased and multiplied—and thereby its power over the propertyless class of workers. And just as it itself is reproduced on an ever greater scale, so the modern capitalist mode of production reproduces the class of propertyless workers also on an ever greater scale and in ever greater numbers. "... Accumulation of capital reproduces the capital-relation on a progressive scale, more capitalists or larger capitalists at this pole, more wage-workers at that. ... *Accumulation of capital is, therefore, increase of the proletariat.*" (S. 600.)* Since, however, owing to the progress of machinery, owing to improved agriculture, etc., fewer and fewer workers are necessary in order to produce the same quantity of products, since this perfecting, that is, this making the workers superfluous, grows more rapidly than even the growing capital, what becomes of this ever-increasing number of workers? They form an industrial reserve army, which, when business is bad or middling, is paid *below* the value of its labour and is irregularly employed or is left to be cared for by public charity, but which is indispensable to the capitalist class at times when business is especially lively, as is palpably evident in England—but which *under all circumstances* serves to break the power of resistance of the regularly employed workers and to keep their wages down. "The greater the social wealth . . . the greater is the relative surplus-population, or industrial reserve-army. But the greater this reserve-army in proportion to the active (regularly employed) labour-army, the greater is the mass of a consolidated (permanent) surplus-population, or strata of

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1954, pp. 613-14.—Ed.

workers, whose misery is in inverse ratio to its torment of labour. The more extensive, finally, the lazarus-layers of the working-class, and the industrial reserve-army, the greater is official pauperism. *This is the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation.*" (S. 631.)*

These, strictly scientifically proved—and the official economists take great care not to make even an attempt at a refutation—are some of the chief laws of the modern, capitalist, social system. But does this tell the whole story? By no means. Marx sharply stresses the bad sides of capitalist production but with equal emphasis clearly proves that this social form was necessary to develop the productive forces of society to a level which will make possible an equal development worthy of human beings for *all* members of society. All earlier forms of society were too poor for this. Capitalist production is the first to create the wealth and the productive forces necessary for this, but at the same time it also creates, in the numerous and oppressed workers, the social class which is compelled more and more to take possession of this wealth and these productive forces in order to utilise them for the whole of society—instead of their being utilised, as they are today, for a monopolist class.

Written by Engels between
March 2 and 13, 1868

Published in the *Demokratisches
Wochenblatt* Nos. 12 and 13,
March 21 and 28, 1868

Printed according to the
text of the journal

Translated from the German

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1954, p. 644.—Ed.

FREDERICK ENGELS

FROM THE PREFACE TO THE SECOND VOLUME OF *CAPITAL*

What, then, did Marx say about surplus value that is new? How is it that Marx's theory of surplus value struck home like a thunderbolt out of a clear sky, and that in all civilised countries, too, while the theories of all his socialist predecessors, including Rodbertus, vanished without effect?

The history of chemistry offers an illustration which explains this:

Until almost the end of last century, the phlogistic theory prevailed, as we know, according to which the essence of all combustion consisted in the separation from the burning substance of another, hypothetical substance, an absolute combustible, named phlogiston. This theory sufficed for the explanation of most of the chemical phenomena then known, although not without forcing in many cases. But in 1774, Priestley produced a kind of air "which he found to be so pure, or so free from phlogiston, that common air seemed adulterated in comparison with it." He called it dephlogisticated air. Shortly after him, Scheele obtained the same kind of air in Sweden, and demonstrated its presence in the atmosphere. He also found that this air disappeared, whenever a substance was burned in it or in ordinary air, and therefore he called it fire-air.

"From these facts he drew the conclusion that the compound arising from the union of phlogiston with one of the components of the air" (that is to say, in combustion) "was nothing but fire or heat, which escaped through the glass."*

Priestley and Scheele had produced oxygen, but did not know what it was. They "remained entangled in the" phlogistic "categories as they found them." The element, which was to upset the whole phlogistic concept and to revolutionise chemistry, remained barren in their hands. But Priestley had immediately communicated his discovery to Lavoisier in Paris, and Lavoisier, by means

* Roscoe-Schorlemmer: *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Chemie*. Braunschweig, 1877, I, pp. 13, 18. [Note by Engels.]

of this new fact, now examined all phlogistic chemistry. He first discovered that the new kind of air was a new chemical element, and that in combustion it was not a case of the mysterious phlogiston *departing* from the burning substance, but of this new element *combining* with the substance. Thus he was the first to place on its feet all chemistry, which in its phlogistic form had stood on its head. And even though he did not produce oxygen at the same time as the others and independently of them, as he claimed later on, he nevertheless is the real *discoverer* of oxygen *vis-à-vis* the other two, who had merely *produced* it without any suspicion of *what* it was they had produced.

Marx stands in the same relation to his predecessors in the theory of surplus value as Lavoisier to Priestley and Scheele. The *existence* of that part of product's value which we now call surplus value had been ascertained long before Marx. What it consists of had also been stated, more or less distinctly, namely, of the product of labour for which its appropriator has not paid any equivalent. But one got no further. The one group—the classical bourgeois economists—investigated at most the proportion in which the product of labour is divided between the labourer and the owner of the means of production. The other group—the Socialists—found this division unjust and looked for utopian means of abolishing this injustice. Both remained in thrall to the economic categories as they had found them.

Then Marx came forward. And he did so in direct opposition to all his predecessors. Where they had seen a *solution*, he saw only a *problem*. He saw that here there was neither dephlogisticated air, nor fire-air, but oxygen, that here it was not a matter of simply recording an economic fact or of the conflict of this fact with eternal justice and true morality, but that it concerned a fact destined to revolutionise all economics and offering a key to the understanding of all capitalist production—to him who knew how to use it. With this fact as his starting-point he examined all the categories he found at hand, just as Lavoisier, with oxygen as his starting-point, had examined the categories of phlogistic chemistry he had found at hand. In order to know what surplus value was, he had to know what value was. Ricardo's theory of value itself had to be subjected to criticism first of all. Thus Marx investigated labour in regard to its value-creating quality, and for the first time established *what* labour produces value, and why and how it does this, and that value is really nothing but coagulated labour of *this* kind—a point which Rodbertus never grasped to the end of his days. Marx then examined the relation of commodities to money, demonstrating how and why, thanks to their immanent property of value, com-

modities and commodity exchange must produce the antithesis of commodities and money. His theory of money, founded on this basis, is the first exhaustive, and now tacitly generally accepted one. He investigated the transformation of money into capital, proving that this transformation is based on the purchase and sale of labour power. By substituting labour power, the value-producing property, for labour, he solved with one stroke one of the difficulties upon which the Ricardian school was wrecked: the impossibility of harmonising the mutual exchange of capital and labour with the Ricardian law of value determination by labour. By establishing the distinction between constant and variable capital, he was the first able to trace the real course of the process of surplus value formation down to the minutest detail, and hence to explain it—something which none of his predecessors had accomplished. Thus he established a distinction within capital itself with which neither Rodbertus nor the bourgeois economists had been able to do anything whatever, which, nevertheless, furnishes the key for the solution of the most complicated economic problems, as is most strikingly proved once again by Volume II, and still more by Volume III, as will be shown. He analysed surplus value itself further, finding its two forms, absolute and relative surplus value, and showed the different but in each case decisive roles that they had played in the historical development of capitalist production. On the basis of surplus value he developed the first rational theory we have of wages, and gave for the first time the basic features of a history of capitalist accumulation and a portrayal of its historical tendency.

Written by Engels on May 5,
1885

First published in the
book: K. Marx, *Das Kapital*.
Kritik der politischen Oekonomie,
Zweiter Band, Herausgegeben
von Friedrich Engels,
Hamburg, 1885

Printed according to the
text of the book

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL LABOUR UNION OF THE UNITED STATES⁸⁸

Fellow-workmen,

In the initiatory programme of our Association we stated: "It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes, but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England that saved the West of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic."* Your turn has now come to stop a war, the clearest result of which would be, for an indefinite period, to hurl back the ascendant movement of the working class on both sides of the Atlantic.

We need hardly tell you that there exist European powers anxiously bent upon hurrying the United States into a war with England. A glance at commercial statistics will show that the Russian export of raw produce, and Russia has nothing else to export, was rapidly giving way before American competition, when the civil war⁴ suddenly turned the scales. To convert the American ploughshares into swords would just now rescue from impending bankruptcy that despotic power which your republican statesmen have, in their wisdom, chosen for their confidential adviser. But quite apart from the particular interests of this or that government, is it not the general interest of our common oppressors to turn our fast-growing international co-operation into an internecine war?

In a congratulatory address to Mr. Lincoln on his re-election as president, we expressed our conviction that the American civil war would prove of as great import to the advancement of the working class as the American war of independence¹⁰ had proved to that of the middle class.** And, in point of fact, the victorious termination of the anti-slavery war has opened a new epoch in the annals of the working class. In the States themselves, an independent working-class movement, looked upon with an evil eye by your old parties and their professional

* See p. 18 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** See p. 23 of this volume.—*Ed.*

politicians, has since that date sprung into life. To fructify it wants years of peace. To crush it, a war between the United States and England is wanted.

The next palpable effect of the civil war was, of course, to deteriorate the position of the American workman. In the United States, as in Europe, the monster incubus of a national debt was shifted from hand to hand, to settle down on the shoulders of the working class. The prices of necessaries, says one of your statesmen, have since 1860 risen 78 per cent, while the wages of unskilled labour rose 50 per cent, those of skilled labour 60 per cent only.

"Pauperism," he complains, "grows now in America faster than population."

Moreover, the sufferings of the working classes set off as a foil the new-fangled luxury of financial aristocrats, shoddy aristocrats,⁸⁹ and similar vermin bred by wars. Yet for all this the civil war did compensate by freeing the slave and the consequent moral impetus it gave to your own class movement. A second war, not hallowed by a sublime purpose and a great social necessity, but of the Old World's type, would forge chains for the free labourer instead of tearing asunder those of the slave. The accumulated misery left in its track would afford your capitalists at once the motive and the means to divorce the working class from its bold and just aspirations by the soulless sword of a standing army.

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

London, May 12th, 1869

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

Printed according to the leaflet

FREDERICK ENGELS

PREFACE TO THE PEASANT WAR IN GERMANY⁹⁰

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION OF 1870

The following work was written in London in the summer of 1850, while the impression of the counter-revolution just then completed was still fresh; it appeared in the fifth and sixth issues of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. A Politico-Economic Review*,⁹¹ edited by Karl Marx, Hamburg, 1850. My political friends in Germany desire it to be reprinted, and I accede to their desire, because, to my regret, the work is still timely today.

It makes no claim to providing material derived from independent research. On the contrary, the entire subject-matter on the peasant risings and on Thomas Münzer is taken from Zimmermann.⁹² His book, despite gaps here and there, is still the best compilation of the factual material. Moreover, old Zimmermann enjoyed his subject. The same revolutionary instinct, which prompted him here to champion the oppressed classes, made him later one of the best of the extreme Left in Frankfurt.⁹³ It is true that since then he is said to have aged somewhat.

If, nevertheless, Zimmermann's presentation lacks inner connections; if it does not succeed in showing the politico-religious controversies of the times as a reflection of the contemporary class struggles; if it sees in these class struggles only oppressors and oppressed, evil folk and good folk, and the ultimate victory of the evil ones; if its exposition of the social conditions which determined both the outbreak and the outcome of the struggle is extremely defective, it was the fault of the time in which the book came into existence. On the contrary, for its time, it is written quite realistically and is a laudable exception among the German idealist works on history.

My presentation, while sketching the historic course of the struggle only in its bare outlines, attempted to explain the origin of the Peasant War, the position of the various parties that played a part in it, the political and religious theories by which those parties sought to clarify their position in their own minds, and finally the result of the struggle itself as a necessary upshot of the historically established conditions of the social life of

these classes; that is to say, it attempted to demonstrate the political structure of the Germany of that time, the revolts against it and the contemporary political and religious theories not as causes but as results of the stage of development of agriculture, industry, land and waterways, commerce in commodities and money then obtaining in Germany. This, the only materialist conception of history, originates not with myself but with Marx, and can also be found in his work on the French Revolution of 1848-49,* in the same *Review*, and in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.**

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

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

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

The war of 1866⁹⁴ dropped Austria as a boon into the lap of the bourgeoisie. But it does not know how to rule, it is powerless and incapable of anything. It can do only one thing: savagely attack the workers as soon as they begin to stir. It is still at the helm solely because the *Hungarians* need it.

And in Prussia? True, the national debt has increased by leaps and bounds, the deficit has become a permanent feature, state expenditure grows from year to year, members of the bourgeoisie have a majority in the Chamber and without their consent taxes cannot be increased nor loans floated. But where is their power over the state? Only a few months ago, when

* K. Marx. *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* (see present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 205-99).—Ed.

** See present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 394-487.—Ed.

*** F. Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany*, Moscow, 1965, p. 127.—Ed.

there was again a deficit, the bourgeoisie occupied a most favourable position. By holding out only just *a little*, they could have forced far-reaching concessions. What do they do? They regard it as a sufficient concession that the government *allows them* to lay at its feet close on nine millions, not for *one* year, oh no, but for *every* year, and for all time to come.

I do not want to blame the poor National-Liberals⁹⁵ in the Chamber more than they deserve. I know they have been left in the lurch by those who stand behind them, by the mass of the bourgeoisie. This mass does not *want* to rule. It still has 1848 in its bones.

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

In other respects the above statement has been fully confirmed. Beginning with 1850, the more and more definite recession into the background of the small states, serving now only as levers for Prussian or Austrian intrigues; the increasingly violent struggles for sole rule waged between Austria and Prussia; finally, the forcible settlement of 1866, after which Austria retains her own provinces, while Prussia subjugates directly or indirectly the whole of the North and the three states* of the Southwest are left out in the cold for the time being.

In all this grand performance of state nothing but the following is of importance for the German working class:

First, universal suffrage has given the workers the means of being directly represented in the legislative assembly.

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

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

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

As regards the other important controversial points relative to 1866, which since then have been thrashed out *ad nauseam* between the National-Liberals on the one hand, and the People's

* Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg.—*Ed.*

** Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau.—*Ed.*

Party⁹⁶ on the other, the history of the next few years should prove that these two standpoints are so bitterly hostile to one another solely because they are the opposite poles of the same narrow-mindedness.

The year 1866 has changed almost nothing in the social pattern of Germany. The few bourgeois reforms—uniform weights and measures, freedom of movement, freedom of occupation, etc., all within limits acceptable to the bureaucracy—do not even come up to *what* the bourgeoisie of other West-European countries had long possessed, and leave the main abuse, the system of bureaucratic tutelage,⁹⁷ untouched. For the proletariat all legislation concerning freedom of movement, the right of naturalisation, the abolition of passports, *et cetera*, is anyhow made quite illusory by the common police practices.

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

It is the misfortune of the German bourgeoisie to have arrived too late, as is the favourite German manner. The period of its florescence is occurring at a time when the bourgeoisie of the other West-European countries is already politically in decline. In England, the bourgeoisie could get its real representative, Bright, into the government only by an extension of the franchise, whose consequences are bound to put an end to all bourgeois rule. In France, where the bourgeoisie as such, as a class in its entirety, held power for only two years, 1849 and 1850, under the republic, it was able to continue its social existence only by abdicating its political power to Louis Bonaparte and the army. And on account of the enormously increased interaction of the three most advanced European countries, it is

today no longer possible for the bourgeoisie to settle down to comfortable political rule in Germany after this rule has outlived its usefulness in England and France.

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

In Germany this turning point came as early as 1848. To be sure, the German bourgeoisie was less frightened by the German proletariat than by the French. The June 1848 battle in Paris¹⁸ showed the bourgeoisie what it ought to expect; the German proletariat was restless enough to prove to it that the seed that would yield the same crop had already been sown to German soil, too; from that day on the edge was taken off all bourgeois political action. The bourgeoisie looked round for allies, sold itself to them regardless of the price—and even today it has not advanced one step.

These allies are all reactionary by nature. There is the monarchy with its army and its bureaucracy; there is the big feudal nobility; there are the little cabbage-Junkers and there are even the priests. With all of these the bourgeoisie made pacts and bargains, if only to save its dear skin, until at last it had nothing left to barter. And the more the proletariat developed, the more it felt as a class and acted as a class, the more faint-hearted did the bourgeois become. When the astonishingly bad strategy of the Prussians triumphed over the astonishingly worse strategy of the Austrians at Sadowa,⁹⁸ it was difficult to say who heaved a deeper sigh of relief—the Prussian bourgeois, who was also defeated at Sadowa, or the Austrian.

Our big bourgeois of 1870 still act exactly as the middle burghers of 1525 acted. As to the petty bourgeois, artisans and shopkeepers, they will always be the same. They hope to climb, to swindle their way into the big bourgeoisie; they are afraid of being thrown down into the proletariat. Hovering between fear and hope, they will during the struggle save their precious skin

and join the victor when the struggle is over. Such is their nature.

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

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

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

The *lumpenproletariat*, this scum of depraved elements from all classes, with headquarters in the big cities, is the worst of all the possible allies. This rabble is absolutely venal and absolutely brazen. If the French workers, in every revolution, inscribed on the houses: *Mort aux voleurs!* Death to thieves! and even shot some, they did it not out of reverence for property, but because they rightly considered it necessary above all to get rid of that gang. Every leader of the workers who uses these scoundrels as guards or relies on them for support proves himself by this action alone a traitor to the movement.

The *small peasants*—for the bigger peasants belong to the bourgeoisie—differ in kind.

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

Or they are *tenant farmers*. In the latter case the situation is for the most part the same as in Ireland. Rents are pushed so high that in times of average crops the peasant and his family can barely make ends meet; when the crops are bad he is on the verge of starvation, is unable to pay his rent and is conse-

quently entirely at the mercy of the landlord. The bourgeoisie never does anything for these people, unless it is compelled to. From whom then should they expect salvation if not from the workers?

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

Wherever medium-sized and large estates prevail, *farm labourers* form the most numerous class in the countryside. This is the case throughout the North and East of Germany and it is *there* that the industrial workers of the towns find their *most numerous and most natural allies*. In the same way as the capitalist confronts the industrial worker, the landowner or large tenant confronts the farm labourer. The same measures that help the one must also help the other. The industrial workers can free themselves only by transforming the capital of the bourgeois, that is, the raw materials, machines and tools, and the means of subsistence they need to work in production, into the property of society, that is, into their own property, used by them in common. Similarly, the farm labourers can be rescued from their hideous misery only when, primarily, their chief object of labour, the land itself, is withdrawn from the private ownership of the big peasants and the still bigger feudal lords, transformed into public property and cultivated by co-operative associations of agricultural workers on their common account. Here we come to the famous decision of the International Working Men's Congress in Basle that it is in the interest of society to transform landed property into common, national property.⁹⁹ This resolution was adopted mainly for countries where there is big landed property, and where, consequently, these big estates are operated by one master and many labourers. This state of affairs, however, is still largely predominant in Germany, and therefore, next to England, the decision was most *timely pre-*

cisely for Germany. The agricultural proletariat, the farm labourers—that is the class from which the bulk of the armies of the princes is recruited. It is the class which, thanks to universal suffrage, sends into parliament the numerous feudal lords and Junkers; but it is also the class nearest to the industrial workers of the towns, which shares their living conditions and is steeped even more in misery than they. To galvanise and draw into the movement this class, impotent because split and scattered, is the immediate and most urgent task of the German labour movement. Its latent power is so well known to the government and nobility that they let the schools fall into decay deliberately in order to keep it ignorant. The day the farm labourers will have learned to understand their own interests, a reactionary, feudal, bureaucratic or bourgeois government will become impossible in Germany.

Written by Engels around
February 11, 1870

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

Printed according to the
text of the second edition

Translated from the German

SUPPLEMENT TO THE PREFACE OF 1870 FOR
THE THIRD EDITION OF 1875⁹⁰

The preceding passage was written over four years ago. It is still valid today. What was true after Sadowa⁹⁸ and the partition of Germany is being reconfirmed after Sedan¹⁰⁰ and the establishment of the Holy German Empire of the Prussian nation.¹⁰¹ So little do “world-shaking” grand performances of state in the realm of so-called high politics change the direction of the historical movement!

What these grand performances of state are able to do, however, is to accelerate this movement. And in this respect, the authors of the above-mentioned “world-shaking events” have had involuntary successes, which they themselves surely find most undesirable but which, all the same, for better or for worse, they have to accept.

The war of 1866 shook the old Prussia to its foundations. After 1848 it had a hard time bringing the rebellious industrial element of the Western provinces, bourgeois as well as proletarian, under the old discipline again; still, this had been accomplished, and the interests of the Junkers of the Eastern provinces again became, next to those of the army, the dominant interests in the state. In 1866 almost all Northwest Germany

became Prussian. Apart from the irreparable moral injury the Prussian crown suffered by the grace of God owing to its having swallowed three other crowns by the grace of God,* the centre of gravity in the monarchy now shifted considerably to the west. The five million Rhinelanders and Westphalians were reinforced, first, by the four million Germans annexed directly, and then by the six million annexed indirectly, through the North-German Union.¹⁰² And in 1870 there were further added the eight million Southwest Germans,¹⁰³ so that in the "New Reich", the fourteen and a half million old Prussians (from the six East Elbian provinces, including, besides, two million Poles) were confronted by some twenty-five million who had long outgrown the old Prussian Junker-feudalism. In this way the very victories of the Prussian army shifted the entire basis of the Prussian state structure; the Junker domination became intolerable even for the government. At the same time, however, the extremely rapid industrial development caused the struggle between bourgeois and worker to supersede the struggle between Junker and bourgeois, so that internally also the social foundations of the old state underwent a complete transformation. The basic precondition for the monarchy, which had been slowly rotting since 1840, was the struggle between nobility and bourgeoisie, in which the monarchy held the balance. When the nobility no longer needed protection against the onrush of the bourgeoisie and it became necessary to protect all the propertied classes against the onrush of the working class, the old, absolute monarchy had to go over completely to the form of state expressly devised for this purpose: *the Bonapartist monarchy*. This transition of Prussia to Bonapartism I have already discussed elsewhere (*The Housing Question*, Part 2, pp. 26 et seq.**). What I did not have to stress there, but what is very essential here, is that this transition was the *greatest progress* made by Prussia since 1848, so much had Prussia lagged behind in modern development. It was, to be sure, still a semi-feudal state, whereas Bonapartism is, at any rate, a modern form of state which presupposes the abolition of feudalism. Hence, Prussia has had to begin to get rid of its numerous survivals of feudalism, to sacrifice Junkerdom as such. This, naturally, is being done in the mildest possible form and to the favourite tune of: *Immer langsam voran!**** Take the notorious District Ordinance. It abolishes the feudal privileges of the individual Junker in relation

* Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau.—*Ed.*

** See pp. 348-49 of this volume.—*Ed.*

*** "Always slowly forward!"—*Ed.*

to his estate only to restore them as privileges of the totality of big landowners in relation to the entire district. The substance remains, being merely translated from the feudal into the bourgeois dialect. The old Prussian Junker is being forcibly transformed into something resembling an English squire, and need not have offered so much resistance because the one is as stupid as the other.

Thus it has been the peculiar fate of Prussia to complete its bourgeois revolution—begun in 1808 to 1813 and advanced to some extent in 1848—in the pleasant form of Bonapartism at the end of this century. If all goes well and the world remains nice and quiet, and all of us live long enough, we may see—perhaps in 1900—that the government of Prussia will actually have abolished all feudal institutions and that Prussia will finally have arrived at the point where France stood in 1792.

The abolition of feudalism, expressed positively, means the establishment of bourgeois conditions. As the privileges of the nobility fall, legislation becomes more and more bourgeois. And here we come to the crux of the relation of the German bourgeoisie to the government. We have seen that the government is *compelled* to introduce these slow and petty reforms. However, in its dealings with the bourgeoisie it portrays each of these small concessions as a *sacrifice* made to the bourgeois, as a concession wrung from the crown with the greatest difficulty, for which the bourgeois ought in return to concede something to the government. And the bourgeois, though the true state of affairs is fairly clear to them, allow themselves to be fooled. This is the origin of the tacit agreement that forms the mute basis of all Reichstag and Prussian Chamber debates in Berlin. On the one hand, the government reforms the laws at a snail's pace in the interest of the bourgeoisie, removes the feudal obstacles to industry as well as those which arose from the multiplicity of small states, establishes uniform coinage, weights and measures, freedom of occupation, etc., puts Germany's labour power at the unrestricted disposal of capital by granting freedom of movement, and favours trade and swindling. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie leaves all actual political power in the hands of the government, votes taxes, loans and soldiers, and helps to frame all new reform laws in a way as to sustain the full force and effect of the old police power over undesirable elements. The bourgeoisie buys gradual social emancipation at the price of the immediate renunciation of political power. Naturally, the chief reason why such an agreement is acceptable to the bourgeoisie is not fear of the government but fear of the proletariat.

However wretched a figure our bourgeoisie may cut in the political field, it cannot be denied that as far as industry and commerce are concerned it is at last doing its duty. The impetuous growth of industry and commerce referred to in the introduction to the second edition* has since proceeded with still greater vigour. What has taken place in this respect since 1869 in the Rhine-Westphalian industrial region is quite unprecedented for Germany and reminds one of the upsurge in the English manufacturing districts at the beginning of this century. The same thing holds true for Saxony and Upper Silesia, Berlin, Hanover and the seaports. At last we have world trade, a really big industry, a really modern bourgeoisie. But in return we have also had a real crash, and have likewise got a real, powerful proletariat.

The future historian will attach much less importance in the history of Germany since 1869-74 to the roar of battle at Spichern, Mars-la-Tour¹⁰⁴ and Sedan, and everything connected therewith, than to the unpretentious, quiet but constantly progressing development of the German proletariat. As early as 1870, the German workers were subjected to a severe test: the Bonapartist war provocation and its natural effect, the general national enthusiasm in Germany. The German socialist workers did not allow themselves to be confused for a single moment. They did not show any hint of national chauvinism. They kept their heads in the midst of the wildest jubilation over the victory, demanding "an equitable peace with the French republic and no annexations". Not even martial law could silence them. No battle glory, no talk of German "imperial magnificence", produced any effect on them; liberation of the entire European proletariat was still their sole aim. We may say with assurance that in no other country have the workers hitherto been put to so hard a test and acquitted themselves so splendidly.

Martial law during the war was followed by trials for treason, for *lèse majesté*, for insulting officials, and by the ever increasing police chicanery of peacetime. The *Volksstaat*⁵¹ usually had three or four editors in prison at one time and the other papers too. Every party speaker of any distinction had to stand trial at least once a year and was almost always convicted. Deportations, confiscations and the breaking-up of meetings proceeded in rapid succession, thick as hail. All in vain. The place of every man arrested or deported was at once filled by another; for every broken-up meeting two new ones were called, and thus the

* See pp. 158-65 of this volume.—Ed.

arbitrary power of the police was worn down in one place after the other by endurance and strict conformity to the law. All this persecution had the opposite effect to that intended. Far from breaking the workers' party or even bending it, it served only to enlist new recruits and consolidated the organisation. In their struggle with the authorities and also individual bourgeois, the workers showed themselves intellectually and morally superior, and proved, particularly in their conflicts with the so-called "providers of work", the employers, that they, the workers, were now the educated class and the capitalists were the ignoramuses. They conduct the fight for the most part with a sense of humour, which is the best proof of how sure they are of their cause and how conscious of their superiority. A struggle thus conducted on historically prepared soil must yield good results. The successes of the January elections stand unique in the history of the modern workers' movement¹⁰⁵ and the astonishment they caused throughout Europe was fully justified.

The German workers have two important advantages over those of the rest of Europe. First, they belong to the most theoretical people of Europe, and have retained the sense of theory which the so-called "educated" classes of Germany have almost completely lost. Without German philosophy, particularly that of Hegel, German scientific socialism—the only scientific socialism that has ever existed—would never have come into being. Without the workers' sense of theory this scientific socialism would never have entered their flesh and blood as much as is the case. What an incalculable advantage this is may be seen, on the one hand, from the indifference to theory which is one of the main reasons why the English working-class movement crawls along so slowly in spite of the splendid organisation of the individual trades, and on the other hand, from the mischief and confusion wrought by Proudhonism in its original form among the French and Belgians, and in the form further caricatured by Bakunin among the Spaniards and Italians.

The second advantage is that, chronologically speaking, the Germans were about the last to come into the workers' movement. Just as German theoretical socialism will never forget that it rests on the shoulders of Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen—three men who, in spite of all their fantastic notions and all their utopianism, stand among the most eminent thinkers of all time and whose genius anticipated innumerable things the correctness of which is now being scientifically proved by us—so the practical workers' movement in Germany ought never to forget that it developed on the shoulders of the English and

French movements, that it was able simply to utilise their dearly paid experience and could now avoid their mistakes, which were then mostly unavoidable. Where would we be now without the precedent of the English trade unions and French workers' political struggles, and especially without the gigantic impulse of the Paris Commune?

It must be said to the credit of the German workers that they have exploited the advantages of their situation with rare understanding. For the first time since a workers' movement has existed, the struggle is being waged pursuant to its three sides—the theoretical, the political and the economic-practical (resistance to the capitalists)—in harmony and in its interconnections, and in a systematic way. It is precisely in this, as it were concentric, attack that the strength and invincibility of the German movement lies.

Due to this advantageous situation, on the one hand, and to the insular peculiarities of the English and the forcible suppression of the French movement, on the other, the German workers stand for the moment in the vanguard of the proletarian struggle. How long events will allow them to occupy this place of honour, cannot be foretold. But let us hope that as long as they occupy it they will fill it fittingly. This demands redoubled efforts in every field of struggle and agitation. In particular, it will be the duty of the leaders to gain an ever clearer insight into all theoretical questions, to free themselves more and more from the influence of traditional phrases inherited from the old world outlook, and constantly to keep in mind that socialism, since it has become a science, demands that it be pursued as a science, that is, that it be studied. The task will be to spread with increased zeal among the masses of workers the ever more lucid understanding thus acquired and to knit together ever more strongly the organisation both of the party and of the trade unions. Even if the votes cast for the Socialists in January have formed quite a decent army, they are still far from constituting the majority of the working class; encouraging as are the successes of propaganda among the rural population, infinitely more remains to be done in this field. Hence, we must make it a point not to slacken the struggle, and to wrest from the enemy one town, one constituency after the other; the main point, however, is to safeguard the true international spirit, which allows no patriotic chauvinism to arise and which readily welcomes every new advance of the proletarian movement, no matter from which nation it comes. If the German workers progress in this way, they will not be marching exactly at the head of the movement—it is not at all in the interest of this movement that the

workers of any particular country should march at its head—but will occupy an honourable place in the battle line; they will stand armed for battle when either unexpectedly grave trials or momentous events demand of them added courage, added determination and energy.

Frederick Engels

London, July 1, 1874

Published in the book:
Friedrich Engels. *Der Deutsche Bauernkrieg*, Leipzig. 1875

Printed according to the
text of the book

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE
INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION
TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS OF THE RUSSIAN
SECTION IN GENEVA¹⁰⁶

Citizens,

At its meeting of March 22, the General Council declared by unanimous vote that your programme and rules accord with the general rules of the International Working Men's Association. It immediately admitted your section into the International. I am pleased to accept your proposal to take on the honourable duty of being your representative on the General Council.

You say in your programme:

"... that the imperial yoke oppressing Poland is a brake equally hampering the political and social emancipation of both nations—the Russian just as much as the Polish."

You might add that Russia's rape of Poland provides a pernicious support and real reason for the existence of a military regime in Germany, and, as a consequence, on the whole Continent. Therefore, in working on breaking Poland's chains, Russian socialists take on themselves the lofty task of destroying the military regime; that is essential as a precondition for the overall emancipation of the European proletariat.

A few months ago I received from St. Petersburg Flerovsky's work *The Condition of the Working Class in Russia*. This is a real eye-opener for Europe. *Russian optimism*, which is spread over the Continent even by the so-called revolutionaries, is mercilessly exposed in this work. It will not retract from its worth if I say that in one or two places it does not fully satisfy criticism from the purely theoretical point of view. It is the book of a serious observer, a tireless worker, an unbiased critic, a great artist and, above all, of a person intolerant of oppression in all its forms and of all national anthems, and ardently sharing all

the sufferings and all the aspirations of the producing class.

Such works as Flerovsky's and those of your teacher Chernyshevsky do real honour to Russia and prove that your country is also beginning to take part in the movement of our age.

Fraternal Greetings,

Karl Marx

London, March 24, 1870

Published in *Narodnoye Dyelo*
No. 1, Geneva, April 15, 1870

Printed according to
the newspaper text

Translated from the Russian

KARL MARX

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION¹⁰⁷

(Excerpt)

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

Long before the foundation of *L'Égalité*,¹⁰⁸ this proposition used to be made periodically inside the General Council by one or two of its English members. It was always rejected almost unanimously.

Although revolutionary *initiative* will probably come from France, England alone can serve as the *lever* for a serious *economic* revolution. It is the only country where there are no more peasants and where land property is concentrated in a few hands. It is the only country where the *capitalist form*, i.e., combined labour on a large scale under capitalist masters, embraces virtually the whole of production. It is the only country where the *great majority of the population consists of wages labourers*. It is the only country where the class struggle and organisation of the working class by the *Trades Unions* have *acquired* a certain degree of maturity and universality. It is the only country where, because of its domination on the world market, every revolution in economic matters must immediately affect the whole world. If landlordism and capitalism are classical examples in England, on the other hand the *material conditions* for their *destruction* are the most mature here. The General Council, now being in the *happy position of having its hand directly on this great lever of proletarian revolution*, what folly, we might say even what a crime, to let this lever fall into purely English hands!

The English have all the *material* necessary for the social revolution. What they lack is *the spirit of generalisation* and

revolutionary fervour. Only the General Council can provide them with this, can thus accelerate the truly revolutionary movement here, and in consequence, *everywhere*. The great effect we have already had is attested to by the most intelligent and influential of the newspapers of the ruling classes, as e.g. *Pall Mall Gazette*, *Saturday Review*, *Spectator* and *Fortnightly Review*,¹⁰⁹ not to speak of the so-called radicals in the *Commons* and the *Lords* who a little while ago still exerted a big influence on the leaders of the English workers. They accuse us publicly of having poisoned and almost extinguished the *English spirit* of the working class and of having pushed it into revolutionary socialism.

The only way to bring about this change is to agitate like the *General Council* of the *International Association*. As the General Council we can initiate measures (e.g., the founding of the *Land and Labour League*¹¹⁰) which as a result of their execution will later appear to the public as spontaneous movements of the English working class.

If a *Regional Council* were formed outside of the *General Council*, what would be the immediate effects?

Placed between the *General Council* and the *General Trades Union Council*, the *Regional Council* would have no authority. On the other hand, the *General Council* of the International would lose this *great lever*. If we preferred the showman's chatter to serious action behind the scenes, we would perhaps commit the mistake of replying publicly to *L'Égalité's* question, why the *General Council* permits "such a burdensome combination of functions".

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

5) *Question of the General Council Resolution on the Irish Amnesty*.

If England is the bulwark of landlordism and European capitalism, the only point where one can hit official England really hard is *Ireland*.

In the first place, Ireland is the *bulwark* of English landlordism. If it fell in Ireland it would fall in England. In Ireland this is a hundred times easier since *the economic struggle there is concentrated exclusively on landed property*, since this struggle is at the same time national, and since the people there are more revolutionary and exasperated than in England. Landlordism in Ireland is maintained solely by the *English army*. The moment the *forced union*¹¹¹ between the two countries ends, a social revolution will immediately break out in Ireland, though

in outmoded forms. English landlordism would not only lose a great source of wealth, but also its *greatest moral force*, i.e., that of *representing the domination of England over Ireland*. On the other hand, by maintaining the power of their landlords in Ireland, the English proletariat makes them invulnerable in England itself.

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

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

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

Lastly, England today is seeing a repetition of what happened on a monstrous scale in ancient Rome. Any nation that oppresses another forges its own chains.

Thus, the attitude of the International Association to the Irish question is very clear. Its first need is to encourage the social revolution in England. To this end a great blow must be struck in Ireland.

The General Council's resolutions on the Irish amnesty serve only as an introduction to other resolutions which will affirm

that, quite apart from international justice, it is a *precondition to the emancipation of the English working class* to transform the present *forced union* (i.e., the enslavement of Ireland) into *equal and free confederation* if possible, into *complete separation* if need be.

Written by Marx
about March 28, 1870

First published in
the journal *Die Neue Zeit*,
Bd. 2, No. 15, 1902

Printed according to the
text of the document "The
General Council to the
Federal Council of Romance
Switzerland" in *The General
Council of the First
International. 1868-1870.
Minutes*, Moscow

KARL MARX

THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE¹¹²

INTRODUCTION BY FREDERICK ENGELS¹¹³

I did not anticipate that I would be asked to prepare a new edition of the Address of the General Council of the International on *The Civil War in France*, and to write an introduction to it. Therefore I can only touch briefly here on the most important points.

I am prefacing the longer work mentioned above by the two shorter Addresses of the General Council on the Franco-Prussian War.* In the first place, because the second of these, which itself cannot be fully understood without the first, is referred to in *The Civil War*. But also because these two Addresses, likewise drafted by Marx, are, no less than *The Civil War*, outstanding examples of the author's remarkable gift, first proved in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*,** for grasping clearly the character, the import and the necessary consequences of great historical events, at a time when these events are still in progress before our eyes or have only just taken place. And, finally, because today we in Germany are still having to endure the consequences which Marx predicted would follow from these events.

Has that which was declared in the first Address not come to pass: that if Germany's defensive war against Louis Bonaparte degenerated into a war of conquest against the French people, all the misfortunes which befell Germany after the so-called wars of liberation¹¹⁴ would revive again with renewed intensity? Have we not had a further twenty years of Bismarck's rule, the Exceptional Law¹¹⁵ and Socialist-baiting taking the place of the prosecutions of demagogues,¹¹⁶ with the same arbitrary action of the police and with literally the same staggering interpretations of the law?

And has not the prediction been proved to the letter, that the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine would "force France into the arms of Russia," and that after this annexation Germany must

* See pp. 190-94, 195-201 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** See present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 394-487.—*Ed.*

either become the avowed servant of Russia, or must, after some short respite, arm for a new war, and, moreover, "a race war against the combined Slavonic and Roman races"?* Has not the annexation of the French provinces driven France into the arms of Russia? Has not Bismarck for fully twenty years vainly wooed the favour of the tsar, wooed it with services even more lowly than those which little Prussia, before it became the "first Power in Europe," was wont to lay at Holy Russia's feet? And is there not every day still hanging over our heads the Damocles' sword of war, on the first day of which all the chartered covenants of princes will be scattered like chaff; a war of which nothing is certain but the absolute uncertainty of its outcome; a race war which will subject the whole of Europe to devastation by fifteen or twenty million armed men, and which is not raging already only because even the strongest of the great military states shrinks before the absolute incalculability of its final result?

All the more is it our duty to make again accessible to the German workers these brilliant proofs, now half-forgotten, of the farsightedness of international working-class policy in 1870.

What is true of these two Addresses is also true of *The Civil War in France*. On May 28, the last fighters of the Commune succumbed to superior forces on the slopes of Belleville; and only two days later, on May 30, Marx read to the General Council the work in which the historical significance of the Paris Commune is delineated in short, powerful strokes, but with such trenchancy, and above all such truth as has never again been attained in all the mass of literature on this subject.

Thanks to the economic and political development of France since 1789, Paris has been placed for the last fifty years in such a position that no revolution could break out there without assuming a proletarian character, that is to say, without the proletariat, which had bought victory with its blood, advancing its own demands after victory. These demands were more or less unclear and even confused, corresponding to the state of development reached by the workers of Paris at the particular period, but in the last resort they all amounted to the abolition of the class antagonism between capitalists and workers. It is true that no one knew how this was to be brought about. But the demand itself, however indefinitely it still was couched, contained a threat to the existing order of society; the workers who put it forward were still armed; therefore, the disarming of the workers was the first commandment for the bourgeoisie,

* See p. 199 of this volume.—Ed.

who were at the helm of the state. Hence, after every revolution won by the workers, a new struggle, ending with the defeat of the workers.

This happened for the first time in 1848. The liberal bourgeois of the parliamentary opposition held banquets for securing a reform of the franchise, which was to ensure supremacy for their party. Forced more and more, in their struggle with the government, to appeal to the people, they had gradually to yield precedence to the radical and republican strata of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie. But behind these stood the revolutionary workers, and since 1830¹¹⁷ these had acquired far more political independence than the bourgeois, and even the republicans, suspected. At the moment of the crisis between the government and the opposition, the workers began street-fighting; Louis Philippe vanished, and with him the franchise reform; and in its place arose the republic, and indeed one which the victorious workers themselves designated as a "social" republic. No one, however, was clear as to what this social republic was to imply; not even the workers themselves. But they now had arms and were a power in the state. Therefore, as soon as the bourgeois republicans in control felt something like firm ground under their feet, their first aim was to disarm the workers. This took place by driving them into the insurrection of June 1848¹⁸ by direct breach of faith, by open defiance and the attempt to banish the unemployed to a distant province. The government had taken care to have an overwhelming superiority of force. After five days' heroic struggle, the workers were defeated. And then followed a blood-bath among the defenceless prisoners, the like of which has not been seen since the days of the civil wars which ushered in the downfall of the Roman republic. It was the first time that the bourgeoisie showed to what insane cruelties of revenge it will be goaded the moment the proletariat dares to take its stand against the bourgeoisie as a separate class, with its own interests and demands. And yet 1848 was only child's play compared with the frenzy of the bourgeoisie in 1871.

Punishment followed hard at heel. If the proletariat was not yet able to rule France, the bourgeoisie could no longer do so. At least not at that period, when the greater part of it was still monarchically inclined, and it was divided into three dynastic parties¹¹⁸ and a fourth, republican party. Its internal dissensions allowed the adventurer Louis Bonaparte to take possession of all the commanding points—army, police, administrative machinery—and, on December 2, 1851,¹¹⁹ to explode the last stronghold of the bourgeoisie, the National Assembly. The Second

Empire began—the exploitation of France by a gang of political and financial adventurers, but at the same time also an industrial development such as had never been possible under the narrow-minded and timorous system of Louis Philippe, with the exclusive domination of only a small section of the big bourgeoisie. Louis Bonaparte took the political power from the capitalists under the pretext of protecting them, the bourgeois, from the workers, and on the other hand the workers from them; but in return his rule encouraged speculation and industrial activity—in a word, the upsurge and enrichment of the whole bourgeoisie to an extent hitherto unknown. To an even greater extent, it is true, corruption and mass thievery developed, clustering around the imperial court, and drawing their heavy percentages from this enrichment.

But the Second Empire was the appeal to French chauvinism, was the demand for the restoration of the frontiers of the First Empire, which had been lost in 1814, or at least those of the First Republic.¹²⁰ A French empire within the frontiers of the old monarchy and, in fact, within the even more amputated frontiers of 1815—such a thing was impossible for any length of time. Hence the necessity for occasional wars and extensions of frontiers. But no extension of frontiers was so dazzling to the imagination of the French chauvinists as the extension to the German left bank of the Rhine. One square mile on the Rhine was more to them than ten in the Alps or anywhere else. Given the Second Empire, the demand for the restoration of the left bank of the Rhine, either all at once or piecemeal, was merely a question of time. The time came with the Austro-Prussian War of 1866; cheated of the anticipated “territorial compensation” by Bismarck and by his own over-cunning, hesitant policy, there was now nothing left for Napoleon but war, which broke out in 1870 and drove him first to Sedan, and thence to Wilhelmshöhe.¹⁰⁰

The necessary consequence was the Paris Revolution of September 4, 1870. The empire collapsed like a house of cards, and the republic was again proclaimed. But the enemy was standing at the gates; the armies of the empire were either hopelessly encircled at Metz or held captive in Germany. In this emergency the people allowed the Paris deputies to the former legislative body to constitute themselves into a “Government of National Defence.” This was the more readily conceded, since, for the purposes of defence, all Parisians capable of bearing arms had enrolled in the National Guard and were armed, so that now the workers constituted a great majority. But very soon the antagonism between the almost completely bourgeois

government and the armed proletariat broke into open conflict. On October 31, workers' battalions stormed the town hall and captured part of the membership of the government. Treachery, the government's direct breach of its undertakings, and the intervention of some petty-bourgeois battalions set them free again, and in order not to occasion the outbreak of civil war inside a city besieged by a foreign military power, the former government was left in office.

At last, on January 28, 1871, starved Paris capitulated. But with honours unprecedented in the history of war. The forts were surrendered, the city wall stripped of guns, the weapons of the regiments of the line and of the Mobile Guard were handed over, and they themselves considered prisoners of war. But the National Guard kept its weapons and guns, and only entered into an armistice with the victors. And these did not dare enter Paris in triumph. They only dared to occupy a tiny corner of Paris, which, into the bargain, consisted partly of public parks, and even this they only occupied for a few days! And during this time they, who had maintained their encirclement of Paris for 131 days, were themselves encircled by the armed workers of Paris, who kept a sharp watch that no "Prussian" should overstep the narrow bounds of the corner ceded to the foreign conqueror. Such was the respect which the Paris workers inspired in the army before which all the armies of the empire had laid down their arms; and the Prussian *Junkers*, who had come to take revenge at the home of the revolution, were compelled to stand by respectfully, and salute precisely this armed revolution!

During the war the Paris workers had confined themselves to demanding the vigorous prosecution of the fight. But now, when peace had come after the capitulation of Paris,¹²¹ now Thiers, the new supreme head of the government, was compelled to realise that the rule of the propertied classes—big land-owners and capitalists—was in constant danger so long as the workers of Paris had arms in their hands. His first action was an attempt to disarm them. On March 18, he sent troops of the line with orders to rob the National Guard of the artillery belonging to it, which had been constructed during the siege of Paris and had been paid for by public subscription. The attempt failed; Paris mobilised as one man for resistance, and war between Paris and the French Government sitting at Versailles was declared. On March 26 the Paris Commune was elected and on March 28 it was proclaimed. The Central Committee of the National Guard, which up to then had carried on the government, handed in its resignation to the Commune after

it had first decreed the abolition of the scandalous Paris "Morality Police". On March 30 the Commune abolished conscription and the standing army, and declared the sole armed force to be the National Guard, in which all citizens capable of bearing arms were to be enrolled. It remitted all payments of rent for dwelling houses from October 1870 until April, the amounts already paid to be booked as future rent payments, and stopped all sales of articles pledged in the municipal loan office. On the same day the foreigners elected to the Commune were confirmed in office, because "the flag of the Commune is the flag of the World Republic". On April 1 it was decided that the highest salary to be received by any employee of the Commune, and therefore also by its members themselves, was not to exceed 6,000 francs (4,800 marks). On the following day the Commune decreed the separation of the church from the state, and the abolition of all state payments for religious purposes as well as the transformation of all church property into national property; as a result of which, on April 8, the exclusion from the schools of all religious symbols, pictures, dogmas, prayers—in a word, "of all that belongs to the sphere of the individual's conscience"—was ordered and gradually put into effect. On the 5th, in reply to the shooting, day after day, of captured Commune fighters by the Versailles troops, a decree was issued for the imprisonment of hostages, but it was never carried into execution. On the 6th, the guillotine was brought out by the 137th battalion of the National Guard, and publicly burnt, amid great popular rejoicing. On the 12th, the Commune decided that the Victory Column on the *Place Vendôme*, which had been cast from captured guns by Napoleon after the war of 1809, should be demolished as a symbol of chauvinism and incitement to national hatred. This was carried out on May 16. On April 16 it ordered a statistical tabulation of factories which had been closed down by the manufacturers, and the working out of plans for the operation of these factories by the workers formerly employed in them, who were to be organised in co-operative societies, and also plans for the organisation of these co-operatives in one great union. On the 20th it abolished night work for bakers, and also the employment offices, which since the Second Empire had been run as a monopoly by creatures appointed by the police—labour exploiters of the first rank; these offices were transferred to the mayoralties of the twenty *arrondissements* of Paris. On April 30 it ordered the closing of the pawnshops, on the ground that they were a private exploitation of the workers, and were in contradiction with the right of the workers to their instruments of labour and to credit. On

May 5 it ordered the razing of the Chapel of Atonement, which had been built in expiation of the execution of Louis XVI.

Thus from March 18 onwards the class character of the Paris movement, which had previously been pushed into the background by the fight against the foreign invaders, emerged sharply and clearly. As almost only workers, or recognised representatives of the workers, sat in the Commune, its decisions bore a decidedly proletarian character. Either these decisions decreed reforms which the republican bourgeoisie had failed to pass solely out of cowardice, but which provided a necessary basis for the free activity of the working class—such as the realisation of the principle that *in relation to the state*, religion is a purely private matter—or the Commune promulgated decrees which were in the direct interest of the working class and in part cut deeply into the old order of society. In a beleaguered city, however, it was possible to make at most a start in the realisation of all this. And from the beginning of May onwards all their energies were taken up by the fight against the armies assembled by the Versailles government in ever-growing numbers.

On April 7 the Versailles troops had captured the Seine crossing at Neuilly, on the western front of Paris; on the other hand, in an attack on the southern front on the 11th they were repulsed with heavy losses by General Eudes. Paris was continually bombarded and, moreover, by the very people who had stigmatised as a sacrilege the bombardment of the same city by the Prussians. These same people now begged the Prussian government for the hasty return of the French soldiers taken prisoner at Sedan and Metz, in order that they might recapture Paris for them. From the beginning of May the gradual arrival of these troops gave the Versailles forces a decided superiority. This already became evident when, on April 23, Thiers broke off the negotiations for the exchange, proposed by the Commune, of the Archbishop of Paris* and a whole number of other priests held as hostages in Paris, for only one man, Blanqui, who had twice been elected to the Commune but was a prisoner in Clairvaux. And even more from the changed language of Thiers; previously procrastinating and equivocal, he now suddenly became insolent, threatening and brutal. The Versailles forces took the redoubt of Moulin Saquet on the southern front, on May 3; on the 9th, Fort Issy, which had been completely reduced to ruins by gunfire; on the 14th, Fort Vanves. On the western front they advanced gradually, capturing the numerous villages and buildings which extended up to the city wall, until they

* Georges Darboy.—Ed.

reached the main defences; on the 21st, thanks to treachery and the carelessness of the National Guards stationed there, they succeeded in forcing their way into the city. The Prussians, who held the northern and eastern forts, allowed the Versailles troops to advance across the land north of the city, which was forbidden ground to them under the armistice, and thus to march forward, attacking on a wide front, which the Parisians naturally thought covered by the armistice, and therefore held only weakly. As a result of this, only a weak resistance was put up in the western half of Paris, in the luxury city proper; it grew stronger and more tenacious the nearer the incoming troops approached the eastern half, the working-class city proper. It was only after eight days' fighting that the last defenders of the Commune succumbed on the heights of Belleville and Menilmontant; and then the massacre of defenceless men, women and children, which had been raging all through the week on an increasing scale, reached its zenith. The breechloaders could no longer kill fast enough; the vanquished were shot down in hundreds by *mitrailleuse* fire. The "Wall of the Federals"* at the Père Lachaise cemetery, where the final mass murder was consummated, is still standing today, a mute but eloquent testimony to the frenzy of which the ruling class is capable as soon as the working class dares to stand up for its rights. Then, when the slaughter of them all proved to be impossible, came the mass arrests, the shooting of victims arbitrarily selected from the prisoners' ranks, and the removal of the rest to great camps where they awaited trial by courts-martial. The Prussian troops surrounding the northeastern half of Paris had orders not to allow any fugitives to pass; but the officers often shut their eyes when the soldiers paid more obedience to the dictates of humanity than to those of the Supreme Command; particular honour is due to the Saxon army corps, which behaved very humanely and let through many who were obviously fighters for the Commune.

* * *

If today, after twenty years, we look back at the activity and historical significance of the Paris Commune of 1871, we shall find it necessary to make a few additions to the account given in *The Civil War in France*.

The members of the Commune were divided into a majority, the Blanquists, who had also been predominant in the Central Committee of the National Guard; and a minority, members of

* Now usually called the Wall of the Communards.—Ed.

the International Working Men's Association, chiefly consisting of adherents of the Proudhon school of socialism. The great majority of the Blanquists were at that time Socialists only by revolutionary, proletarian instinct; only a few had attained greater clarity on principles, through Vaillant, who was familiar with German scientific socialism. It is therefore comprehensible that in the economic sphere much was left undone which, according to our view today, the Commune ought to have done. The hardest thing to understand is certainly the holy awe with which they remained standing respectfully outside the gates of the Bank of France. This was also a serious political mistake. The bank in the hands of the Commune—this would have been worth more than ten thousand hostages. It would have meant the pressure of the whole of the French bourgeoisie on the Versailles government in favour of peace with the Commune. But what is still more wonderful is the correctness of much that nevertheless was done by the Commune, composed as it was of Blanquists and Proudhonists. Naturally, the Proudhonists were chiefly responsible for the economic decrees of the Commune, both for their praiseworthy and their unpraiseworthy aspects; as the Blanquists were for its political commissions and omissions. And in both cases the irony of history willed—as is usual when doctrinaires come to the helm—that both did the opposite of what the doctrines of their school prescribed.

Proudhon, the Socialist of the small peasant and master-craftsman, regarded association with positive hatred. He said of it that there was more bad than good in it; that it was by nature sterile, even harmful, because it was a fetter on the freedom of the worker; that it was a pure dogma, unproductive and burdensome, in conflict as much with the freedom of the worker as with economy of labour; that its disadvantages multiplied more swiftly than its advantages; that, as compared with it, competition, division of labour and private property were economic forces. Only in the exceptional cases—as Proudhon called them—of large-scale industry and large establishments, such as railways, was the association of workers in place. (See *General Idea of the Revolution, 3rd sketch.*)

By 1871, large-scale industry had already so much ceased to be an exceptional case even in Paris, the centre of artistic handicrafts, that by far the most important decree of the Commune instituted an organisation of large-scale industry and even of manufacture which was not only to be based on the association of the workers in each factory, but also to combine all these associations in one great union; in short, an organisation which, as Marx quite rightly says in *The Civil War*, must necessarily

have led in the end to communism, that is to say, the direct opposite of the Proudhon doctrine. And, therefore, the Commune was the grave of the Proudhon school of socialism. Today this school has vanished from French working-class circles; here, among the Possibilists¹²² no less than among the "Marxists", Marx's theory now rules unchallenged. Only among the "radical" bourgeoisie are there still Proudhonists.

The Blanquists fared no better. Brought up in the school of conspiracy, and held together by the strict discipline which went with it, they started out from the viewpoint that a relatively small number of resolute, well-organised men would be able, at a given favourable moment, not only to seize the helm of state, but also by a display of great, ruthless energy, to maintain power until they succeeded in sweeping the mass of the people into the revolution and ranging them round the small band of leaders. This involved, above all, the strictest, dictatorial centralisation of all power in the hands of the new revolutionary government. And what did the Commune, with its majority of these same Blanquists, actually do? In all its proclamations to the French in the provinces, it appealed to them to form a free federation of all French Communes with Paris, a national organisation which for the first time was really to be created by the nation itself. It was precisely the oppressing power of the former centralised government, army, political police, bureaucracy, which Napoleon had created in 1798 and which since then had been taken over by every new government as a welcome instrument and used against its opponents—it was precisely this power which was to fall everywhere, just as it had already fallen in Paris.

From the very outset the Commune was compelled to recognise that the working class, once come to power, could not go on managing with the old state machine; that in order not to lose again its only just conquered supremacy, this working class must, on the one hand, do away with all the old repressive machinery previously used against it itself, and, on the other, safeguard itself against its own deputies and officials, by declaring them all, without exception, subject to recall at any moment. What had been the characteristic attribute of the former state? Society had created its own organs to look after its common interests, originally through simple division of labour. But these organs, at whose head was the state power, had in the course of time, in pursuance of their own special interests, transformed themselves from the servants of society into the masters of society. This can be seen, for example, not only in the hereditary monarchy, but equally so in the democratic re-

public. Nowhere do "politicians" form a more separate and powerful section of the nation than precisely in North America. There, each of the two major parties which alternately succeed each other in power is itself in turn controlled by people who make a business of politics, who speculate on seats in the legislative assemblies of the Union as well as of the separate states, or who make a living by carrying on agitation for their party and on its victory are rewarded with positions. It is well known how the Americans have been trying for thirty years to shake off this yoke, which has become intolerable, and how in spite of it all they continue to sink ever deeper in this swamp of corruption. It is precisely in America that we see best how there takes place this process of the state power making itself independent in relation to society, whose mere instrument it was originally intended to be. Here there exists no dynasty, no nobility, no standing army, beyond the few men keeping watch on the Indians, no bureaucracy with permanent posts or the right to pensions. And nevertheless we find here two great gangs of political speculators, who alternately take possession of the state power and exploit it by the most corrupt means and for the most corrupt ends—and the nation is powerless against these two great cartels of politicians, who are ostensibly its servants, but in reality dominate and plunder it.

Against this transformation of the state and the organs of the state from servants of society into masters of society—an inevitable transformation in all previous states—the Commune made use of two infallible means. In the first place, it filled all posts—administrative, judicial and educational—by election on the basis of universal suffrage of all concerned, subject to the right of recall at any time by the same electors. And, in the second place, all officials, high or low, were paid only the wages received by other workers. The highest salary paid by the Commune to anyone was 6,000 francs. In this way an effective barrier to place-hunting and careerism was set up, even apart from the binding mandates to delegates to representative bodies which were added besides.

This shattering [*Sprengung*] of the former state power and its replacement by a new and truly democratic one is described in detail in the third section of *The Civil War*. But it was necessary to dwell briefly here once more on some of its features, because in Germany particularly the superstitious belief in the state has been carried over from philosophy into the general consciousness of the bourgeoisie and even of many workers. According to the philosophical conception, the state is the "realisation of the idea," or the Kingdom of God on earth, translated

into philosophical terms, the sphere in which eternal truth and justice is or should be realised. And from this follows a superstitious reverence for the state and everything connected with it, which takes root the more readily since people are accustomed from childhood to imagine that the affairs and interests common to the whole of society could not be looked after otherwise than as they have been looked after in the past, that is, through the state and its lucratively positioned officials. And people think they have taken quite an extraordinarily bold step forward when they have rid themselves of belief in hereditary monarchy and swear by the democratic republic. In reality, however, the state is nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and indeed in the democratic republic no less than in the monarchy; and at best an evil inherited by the proletariat after its victorious struggle for class supremacy, whose worst sides the victorious proletariat, just like the Commune, cannot avoid having to lop off at once as much as possible until such time as a generation reared in new, free social conditions is able to throw the entire lumber of the state on the scrap heap.

Of late, the Social-Democratic philistine¹²³ has once more been filled with wholesome terror at the words: Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Well and good, gentlemen, do you want to know what this dictatorship looks like? Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

London, on the twentieth anniversary
of the Paris Commune, March 18, 1891

F. Engels

Published in *Die Neue Zeit*,
Bd. 2, No. 28, 1890-91, and in
the book: Marx. *Der Bürgerkrieg
in Frankreich*. Berlin, 1891

Printed according to the
text of the book

Translated from the German

**FIRST ADDRESS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION ON THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR¹²⁴**

**TO THE MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION
IN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES**

In the Inaugural Address of the *International Working Men's Association*, of November, 1864, we said:—"If the emancipation of the working classes requires their fraternal concurrence, how are they to fulfil that great mission with a foreign policy in pursuit of criminal designs, playing upon national prejudices and squandering in piratical wars the people's blood and treasure?" We defined the foreign policy aimed at by the International in these words: "Vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the laws paramount of the intercourse of nations."^{*}

No wonder that Louis Bonaparte, who usurped his power by exploiting the war of classes in France, and perpetuated it by periodical wars abroad, should from the first have treated the International as a dangerous foe. On the eve of the plebiscite¹²⁵ he ordered a raid on the members of the Administrative Committees of the International Working Men's Association throughout France, at Paris, Lyons, Rouen, Marseilles, Brest, etc., on the pretext that the International was a secret society dabbling in a plot for his assassination, a pretext soon after exposed in its full absurdity by his own judges. What was the real crime of the French branches of the International? They told the French people publicly and emphatically that voting the plebiscite was voting despotism at home and war abroad. It has been, in fact, their work that in all the great towns, in all the industrial centres of France, the working class rose like one man to reject the plebiscite. Unfortunately the balance was turned by the

* See p. 18 of this volume.—Ed.

heavy ignorance of the rural districts. 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; and it was the signal for the assassination, not of an individual, but of nations.

The war plot of July, 1870,¹²⁶ is but an amended edition of the *coup d'état* of December, 1851.¹¹⁹ At first view the thing seemed so absurd that France would not believe in its real good earnest. It rather believed the deputy* denouncing the ministerial war talk as a mere stock-jobbing trick. When, on July 15th, war was at last officially announced to the *Corps Législatif*, the whole opposition refused to vote the preliminary subsidies, even Thiers branded it as "detestable"; all the independent journals of Paris condemned it, and, wonderful to relate, the provincial press joined in almost unanimously.

Meanwhile, the Paris members of the International had again set to work. In the *Réveil*¹²⁷ of July 12th they published their manifesto "to the workmen of all nations," from which we extract the following few passages:

"Once more," they say, "on the pretext of the European equilibrium, of national honour, the peace of the world is menaced by political ambitions. French, German, Spanish workmen! let our voices unite in one cry of reprobation against war! . . . War for a question of preponderance or a dynasty, can, in the eyes of workmen, be nothing but a criminal absurdity. In answer to the warlike proclamations of those who exempt themselves from the impost of blood, and find in public misfortunes a source of fresh speculations, we protest, we who want peace, labour and liberty! . . . Brothers of Germany! Our division would only result in the complete triumph of *despotism* on both sides of the Rhine. . . . Workmen of all countries! whatever may for the present become of our common efforts, we, the members of the International Working Men's Association, who know of no frontiers, we send you as a pledge of indissoluble solidarity the good wishes and the salutations of the workmen of France."

This manifesto of our Paris section was followed by numerous similar French addresses, of which we can here only quote the declaration of Neuilly-sur-Seine, published in the *Marseillaise*¹²⁸ of July 22nd:

"The war, is it just?—No! The war, is it national?—No! It is merely dynastic. In the name of humanity, of democracy, and the true interests of France, we adhere completely and energetically to the protestation of the International against the war."

These protestations expressed the true sentiments of the French working people, as was soon shown by a curious incident.

* Jules Favre.—*Ed.*

The Band of the 10th of December,¹²⁹ first organised under the presidency of Louis Bonaparte, having been masqueraded into blouses and let loose on the streets of Paris, there to perform the contortions of war fever, the real workmen of the Faubourgs came forward with public peace demonstrations so overwhelming that Pietri, the Prefect of Police, thought it prudent to at once stop all further street politics, on the plea that the real Paris people had given sufficient vent to their pent-up patriotism and exuberant war enthusiasm.

Whatever may be the incidents of Louis Bonaparte's war with Prussia, the death knell of the Second Empire has already sounded at Paris. It will end as it began, by a parody. But let us not forget that it is the Governments and the ruling classes of Europe who enabled Louis Bonaparte to play during eighteen years the ferocious farce of the *Restored Empire*.

On the German side, the war is a war of defence, but who put Germany to the necessity of defending herself? Who enabled Louis Bonaparte to wage war upon her? *Prussia!* It was Bismarck who conspired with that very same Louis Bonaparte for the purpose of crushing popular opposition at home, and annexing Germany to the Hohenzollern dynasty. If the battle of Sadowa⁹⁸ had been lost instead of being won, French battalions would have overrun Germany as the allies of Prussia. After her victory did Prussia dream one moment of opposing a free Germany to an enslaved France? Just the contrary. While carefully preserving all the native beauties of her old system, she super-added all the tricks of the Second Empire, its real despotism and its mock democratism, its political shams and its financial jobs, its high-flown talk and its low *legerdemains*. The Bonapartist regime, which till then only flourished on one side of the Rhine, had now got its counterfeit on the other. From such a state of things, what else could result but *war*?

If the German working class allow the present war to lose its strictly defensive character and to degenerate into a war against the French people, victory or defeat will prove alike disastrous. All the miseries that befell Germany after her war of independence will revive with accumulated intensity.

The principles of the International are, however, too widely spread and too firmly rooted amongst the German working class to apprehend such a sad consummation. The voices of the French workmen have re-echoed from Germany. A mass meeting of workmen, held at Brunswick on July 16th, expressed its full concurrence with the Paris manifesto, spurned the idea of national antagonism to France, and wound up its resolutions with these words:—

"We are enemies of all wars, but above all of dynastic wars. . . . With deep sorrow and grief we are forced to undergo a defensive war as an unavoidable evil; but we call, at the same time, upon the whole German working class to render the recurrence of such an immense social misfortune impossible by vindicating for the peoples themselves the power to decide on peace and war, and making them masters of their own destinies."

At Chemnitz, a meeting of delegates representing 50,000 Saxon workers adopted unanimously a resolution to this effect:—

"In the name of the German Democracy, and especially of the workmen forming the Democratic Socialist party, we declare the present war to be exclusively dynastic. . . . We are happy to grasp the fraternal hand stretched out to us by the workmen of France. . . . Mindful of the watchword of the International Working Men's Association: *Proletarians of all countries, unite*, we shall never forget that the workmen of all countries are our *friends* and the despots of all countries our *enemies*."

The Berlin branch of the International has also replied to the Paris manifesto:—

"We," they say, "join with heart and hand your protestation. . . . Solemnly we promise that neither the sound of the trumpet, nor the roar of the cannon, neither victory nor defeat shall divert us from our common work for the union of the children of toil of all countries."

Be it so!

In the background of this suicidal strife looms the dark figure of Russia. It is an ominous sign that the signal for the present war should have been given at the moment when the Moscovite Government had just finished its strategical lines of railway and was already massing troops in the direction of the Pruth. Whatever sympathy the Germans may justly claim in a war of defence against Bonapartist aggression, they would forfeit at once by allowing the Prussian Government to call for, or accept, the help of the Cossacks. Let them remember that, after their war of independence against the first Napoleon, Germany lay for generations prostrate at the feet of the Czar.

The English working class stretch the hand of fellowship to the French and German working people. They feel deeply convinced that whatever turn the impending horrid war may take, the alliance of the working classes of all countries will ultimately kill war. 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 goodwill; 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.

256, High Holborn,
London, Western Central,
July 23, 1870

Written by Marx between
July 19 and 23, 1870

Published as a leaflet in English
in July 1870 and also as leaflets
and in the press in German,
French and Russian in
August-September 1870

Printed according to the
text of the first English
edition of the leaflet,
checked with the text of
the second English edition
of 1870 and the authorised
German edition of 1870

**SECOND ADDRESS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION ON THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR** ¹²⁴

**TO THE MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION
IN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES**

In our first Manifesto of the 23rd of July we said:—"The death knell of the Second Empire has already sounded at Paris. It will end as it began, by a parody. But let us not forget that it is the Governments and the ruling classes of Europe who enabled Louis Napoleon to play during eighteen years the ferocious farce of the *Restored Empire*."^{*}

Thus, even before war operations had actually set in, we treated the Bonapartist bubble as a thing of the past.

If we were not mistaken as to the vitality of the Second Empire, we were not wrong in our apprehension lest the German war should "lose its strictly defensive character and degenerate into a war against the French people."^{**} The war of defence ended, in point of fact, with the surrender of Louis Bonaparte, the Sedan¹⁰⁰ capitulation, and the proclamation of the Republic at Paris. But long before these events, the very moment that the utter rottenness of the Imperialist arms became evident, the Prussian military *camarilla* had resolved upon conquest. There lay an ugly obstacle in their way—*King William's own proclamations at the commencement of the war*. In his speech from the throne to the North German Diet, he had solemnly declared to make war upon the emperor of the French, and not upon the French people. On the 11th of August he had issued a manifesto to the French nation, where he said:

"The Emperor Napoleon having made, by land and sea, an attack on the German nation, which desired and still desires to live in peace with the French people, I have assumed the command of the German armies *to repel his aggression*, and I have been led by *military events to cross the frontiers of France*."

Not content to assert the defensive character of the war by the statement that he only assumed the command of the German armies "*to repel aggression*," he added that he was only "led

^{*} See p. 192 of this volume.—*Ed.*

^{**} *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

by military events" to cross the frontiers of France. A defensive war does, of course, not exclude offensive operations, dictated by "military events."

Thus this pious king stood pledged before France and the world to a strictly defensive war. How to release him from his solemn pledge? The stage-managers had to exhibit him as giving, reluctantly, way to the irresistible behest of the German nation. They at once gave the cue to the liberal German middle class, with its professors, its capitalists, its aldermen, and its penmen. That middle class which in its struggle for civil liberty had, from 1846 to 1870, been exhibiting an unexampled spectacle of irresolution, incapacity, and cowardice, felt, of course, highly delighted to bestride the European scene as the roaring lion of German patriotism. It revindicated its civic independence by affecting to force upon the Prussian Government the secret designs of that same government. It does penance for its long-continued and almost religious faith in Louis Bonaparte's infallibility, by shouting for the dismemberment of the French Republic. Let us for a moment listen to the special pleadings of those stout-hearted patriots!

They dare not pretend that the people of Alsace and Lorraine pant for the German embrace; quite the contrary. To punish their French patriotism, Strasbourg, a town with an independent citadel commanding it, has for six days been wantonly and fiendishly bombarded by "German" explosive shells, setting it on fire, and killing great numbers of its defenceless inhabitants! Yet, the soil of those provinces once upon a time belonged to the whilom German Empire.¹³⁰ Hence, it seems, the soil and the human beings grown on it must be confiscated as imprescriptible German property. If the map of Europe is to be remade in the antiquary's vein, let us by no means forget that the Elector of Brandenburg, for his Prussian dominions, was the vassal of the Polish Republic.¹³¹

The more knowing patriots, however, require Alsace and the German-speaking part of Lorraine as a "material guarantee" against French aggression. As this contemptible plea has bewildered many weak-minded people, we are bound to enter more fully upon it.

There is no doubt that the general configuration of Alsace, as compared with the opposite bank of the Rhine, and the presence of a large fortified town like Strasbourg, about halfway between Basle and Germersheim, very much favour a French invasion of South Germany, while they offer peculiar difficulties to an invasion of France from South Germany. There is, further, no doubt that the addition of Alsace and German-speaking

Lorraine would give South Germany a much stronger frontier, inasmuch as she would then be master of the crest of the Vosges mountains in its whole length, and of the fortresses which cover its northern passes. If Metz were annexed as well, France would certainly for the moment be deprived of her two principal bases of operation against Germany, but that would not prevent her from constructing a fresh one at Nancy or Verdun. While Germany owns Coblenz, Mainz, Germersheim, Rastadt, and Ulm, all bases of operation against France, and plentifully made use of in this war, with what show of fair play can she begrudge France Strasbourg and Metz, the only two fortresses of any importance she has on that side? Moreover, Strasbourg endangers South Germany only while South Germany is a separate power from North Germany. From 1792-95 South Germany was never invaded from that direction, because Prussia was a party to the war against the French Revolution; but as soon as Prussia made a peace of her own¹³² in 1795, and left the South to shift for itself, the invasions of South Germany with Strasbourg for a base, began, and continued till 1809. The fact is, a *united* Germany can always render Strasbourg and any French army in Alsace innocuous by concentrating all her troops, as was done in the present war, between Saarlouis and Landau, and advancing, or accepting battle, on the line of road between Mainz and Metz. While the mass of the German troops is stationed there, any French army advancing from Strasbourg into South Germany would be outflanked, and have its communications threatened. If the present campaign has proved anything, it is the facility of invading France from Germany.

But, in good faith, is it not altogether an absurdity and an anachronism to make military considerations the principle by which the boundaries of nations are to be fixed? If this rule were to prevail, Austria would still be entitled to Venetia and the line of the Mincio, and France to the line of the Rhine, in order to protect Paris, which lies certainly more open to an attack from the North East than Berlin does from the South West. If limits are to be fixed by military interests, there will be no end to claims, because every military line is necessarily faulty, and may be improved by annexing some more outlying territory; and, moreover, they can never be fixed finally and fairly, because they always must be imposed by the conqueror upon the conquered, and consequently carry within them the seed of fresh wars.

Such is the lesson of all history. Thus with nations as with individuals. To deprive them of the power of offence, you must deprive them of the means of defence. You must not only gar-

rotte but murder. If ever conqueror took "material guarantees" for breaking the sinews of a nation, the first Napoleon did so by the Tilsit treaty,¹³³ and the way he executed it against Prussia and the rest of Germany. Yet, a few years later, his gigantic power split like a rotten reed upon the German people. What are the "material guarantees" Prussia, in her wildest dreams, can, or dare impose upon France, compared to the "material guarantees" the first Napoleon had wrenched from herself? The result will not prove the less disastrous. History will measure its retribution, not by the extent of the square miles conquered from France, but by the intensity of the crime of reviving, in the second half of the 19th century, *the policy of conquest!*

But, say the mouthpieces of Teutonic patriotism, you must not confound Germans with Frenchmen. What we want is not glory, but safety. The Germans are an essentially peaceful people. In their sober guardianship, conquest itself changes from a condition of future war into a pledge of perpetual peace. Of course, it is not Germans that invaded France in 1792, for the sublime purpose of bayoneting the revolution of the 18th century. It is not Germans that befouled their hands by the subjugation of Italy, the oppression of Hungary, and the dismemberment of Poland. Their present military system, which divides the whole adult male population into two parts—one standing army on service, and another standing army on furlough, both equally bound in passive obedience to rulers by divine right—such a military system is, of course, a "material guarantee" for keeping the peace, and the ultimate goal of civilising tendencies! In Germany, as everywhere else, the sycophants of the powers that be poison the popular mind by the incense of mendacious self-praise.

Indignant as they pretend to be at the sight of French fortresses in Metz and Strasbourg, those German patriots see no harm in the vast system of Moscovite fortifications at Warsaw, Modlin, and Ivangorod. While gloating at the terrors of imperialist invasion, they blink at the infamy of autocratic tutelage.

As in 1865 promises were exchanged between Louis Bonaparte and Bismarck, so in 1870 promises have been exchanged between Gorchakov and Bismarck. As Louis Bonaparte flattered himself that the War of 1866, resulting in the common exhaustion of Austria and Prussia, would make him the supreme arbiter of Germany, so Alexander flattered himself that the War of 1870, resulting in the common exhaustion of Germany and France, would make him the supreme arbiter of the Western Continent. As the Second Empire thought the North-German Union¹⁰² incompatible with its existence, so autocratic Russia must think

herself endangered by a German empire under Prussian leadership. Such is the law of the old political system. Within its pale the gain of one state is the loss of the other. The Czar's paramount influence over Europe roots in his traditional hold on Germany. At a moment when in Russia herself volcanic social agencies threaten to shake the very base of autocracy, could the Czar afford to bear with such a loss of foreign prestige? Already the Moscovite journals repeat the language of the Bonapartist journals after the war of 1866. Do the Teuton patriots really believe that liberty and peace will be guaranteed to Germany by forcing France into the arms of Russia? If the fortune of her arms, the arrogance of success, and dynastic intrigue lead Germany to a dismemberment of France, there will then only remain two courses open to her. She must at all risks become the *avowed* tool of Russian aggrandisement, or, after some short respite, make again ready for another "defensive" war, not one of those new-fangled "localised" wars, but a *war of races*—a war with the combined Slavonian and Roman races.

The German working class has resolutely supported the war, which it was not in their power to prevent, as a war for German independence and the liberation of France and Europe from that pestilential incubus, the Second Empire. It was the German workmen who, together with the rural labourers, furnished the sinews and muscles of heroic hosts, leaving behind their half-starved families. Decimated by the battles abroad, they will be once more decimated by misery at home. In their turn they are now coming forward to ask for "guarantees,"—guarantees that their immense sacrifices have not been brought in vain, that they have conquered liberty, that the victory over the Imperialist armies will not, as in 1815, be turned into the defeat of the German people¹³⁴; and, as the first of these guarantees, they claim an *honourable peace for France*, and the *recognition of the French Republic*.

The Central Committee of the German Socialist-Democratic Workmen's Party issued, on the 5th of September, a manifesto, energetically insisting upon these guarantees.

"We," they say, "we protest against the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. And we are conscious of speaking in the name of the German working class. In the common interest of France and Germany, in the interest of peace and liberty, in the interest of Western civilisation against Eastern barbarism, the German workmen will not patiently tolerate the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. . . . We shall faithfully stand by our fellow-workmen in all countries for the common international cause of the Proletariat!"

Unfortunately, we cannot feel sanguine of their immediate success. If the French workmen amidst peace failed to stop the

aggressor, are the German workmen more likely to stop the victor amidst the clangour of arms? The German workmen's manifesto demands the extradition of Louis Bonaparte as a common felon to the French Republic. Their rulers are, on the contrary, already trying hard to restore him to the Tuileries¹³⁵ as the best man to ruin France. However that may be, history will prove that the German working class are not made of the same malleable stuff as the German middle class. They will do their duty.

Like them, we hail the advent of the Republic in France, but at the same time we labour under misgivings which we hope will prove groundless. That Republic has not subverted the throne, but only taken its place become vacant. It has been proclaimed, not as a social conquest, but as a national measure of defence. It is in the hands of a Provisional Government composed partly of notorious Orleanists,¹¹⁸ partly of middle-class Republicans, upon some of whom the insurrection of June, 1848,¹⁸ has left its indelible stigma. The division of labour amongst the members of that Government looks awkward. The Orleanists have seized the strongholds of the army and the police, while to the professed Republicans have fallen the talking departments. Some of their first acts go far to show that they have inherited from the Empire, not only ruins, but also its dread of the working class. If eventual impossibilities are in wild phraseology demanded from the Republic, is it not with a view to prepare the cry for a "possible" government? Is the Republic, by some of its middle-class managers, not intended to serve as a mere stopgap and bridge over an Orleanist Restoration?

The French working class moves, therefore, under circumstances of extreme difficulty. Any attempt at upsetting the new Government in the present crisis, when the enemy is almost knocking at the doors of Paris, would be a desperate folly. The French workmen must perform their duties as citizens; but, at the same time, they must not allow themselves to be deluded by the national *souvenirs** of 1792, as the French peasants allowed themselves to be deluded by the national *souvenirs* of the First Empire. They have not to recapitulate the past, but to build up the future. Let them calmly and resolutely improve the opportunities of Republican liberty, for the work of their own class organisation. It will gift them with fresh Herculean powers for the regeneration of France, and our common task—the emancipation of labour. Upon their energies and wisdom hinges the fate of the Republic.

* Remembrances.—Ed.

The English workmen have already taken measures to overcome, by a wholesome pressure from without, the reluctance of their Government to recognise the French Republic.¹³⁶ The present dilatoriness of the British Government is probably intended to atone for the Anti-Jacobin war and its former indecent haste in sanctioning the *coup d'état*.¹³⁷ The English workmen call also upon their Government to oppose by all its power the dismemberment of France, which part of the English press is so shameless enough to howl for. It is the same press that for twenty years deified Louis Bonaparte as the providence of Europe, that frantically cheered on the slaveholders' rebellion.¹³⁸ Now, as then, it drudges for the slaveholder.

Let the sections of the *International Working Men's Association* in every country stir the working classes to action. If they forsake their duty, if they remain passive, the present tremendous war will be but the harbinger of still deadlier international feuds, and lead in every nation to a renewed triumph over the workman by the lords of the sword, of the soil, and of capital.

Vive la République!

256, High Holborn,
London, Western Central,
September 9, 1870

Written by Marx between
September 6 and 9, 1870

Published as a leaflet in
English between September 11
and 13, 1870. and also as a leaflet
in German and in the press in
German and French in
September-December 1870

Printed according to the
text of the English leaflet

THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE

ADDRESS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION¹²

TO ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION
IN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES

I

On the 4th of September, 1870, when the working men of Paris proclaimed the Republic, which was almost instantaneously acclaimed throughout France, without a single voice of dissent, a cabal of place-hunting barristers, with Thiers for their statesman and Trochu for their general, took hold of the Hôtel de Ville. At that time they were imbued with so fanatical a faith in the mission of Paris to represent France in all epochs of historical crisis, that, to legitimate their usurped titles as governors of France, they thought it quite sufficient to produce their lapsed mandates as representatives of Paris. In our second address on the late war, five days after the rise of these men, we told you who they were.* Yet, in the turmoil of surprise, with the real leaders of the working class still shut up in Bonapartist prisons and the Prussians already marching upon Paris, Paris bore with their assumption of power, on the express condition that it was to be wielded for the single purpose of national defence. Paris, however, was not to be defended without arming its working class, organising them into an effective force, and training their ranks by the war itself. But Paris armed was the Revolution armed. A victory of Paris over the Prussian aggressor would have been a victory of the French workman over the French capitalist and his State parasites. In this conflict between national duty and class interest, the Government of National Defence did not hesitate one moment to turn into a Government of National Defection.

The first step they took was to send Thiers on a roving tour to all the courts of Europe, there to beg mediation by offering the barter of the Republic for a king. Four months after the commencement of the siege, when they thought the opportune moment come for breaking the first word of capitulation, Trochu, in the presence of Jules Favre and others of his colleagues, addressed the assembled mayors of Paris in these terms:

* See p. 200 of this volume.—Ed.

"The first question put to me by my colleagues on the very evening of the 4th of September was this: Paris, can it with any chance of success stand a siege by the Prussian army? I did not hesitate to answer in the negative. Some of my colleagues here present will warrant the truth of my words and the persistence of my opinion. I told them, in these very terms, that, under the existing state of things, the attempt of Paris to hold out a siege by the Prussian army would be a folly. Without doubt, I added, it would be an heroic folly; but that would be all. . . . The events (managed by himself) have not given the lie to my prevision."

This nice little speech of Trochu was afterwards published by M. Corbon, one of the mayors present.

Thus, on the very evening of the proclamation of the republic, Trochu's "plan" was known to his colleagues to be the capitulation of Paris. If national defence had been more than a pretext for the personal government of Thiers, Favre, and Co., the upstarts of the 4th of September would have abdicated on the 5th—would have initiated the Paris people into Trochu's "plan," and called upon them to surrender at once, or to take their own fate into their own hands. Instead of this, the infamous impostors resolved upon curing the heroic folly of Paris by a regimen of famine and broken heads, and to dupe her in the meanwhile by ranting manifestoes, holding forth that Trochu, "the governor of Paris, will never capitulate," and Jules Favre, the foreign minister, will "not cede an inch of our territory, nor a stone of our fortresses." In a letter to Gambetta, that very same Jules Favre avows that what they were "defending" against were not the Prussian soldiers, but the working men of Paris. During the whole continuance of the siege the Bonapartist cut-throats, whom Trochu had wisely intrusted with the command of the Paris army, exchanged, in their intimate correspondence, ribald jokes at the well-understood mockery of defence. (See, for instance, the correspondence of Alphonse Simon Guiod, supreme commander of the artillery of the Army of Defence of Paris and Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour, to Susane, general of division of artillery, a correspondence published by the *Journal Officiel*¹³⁹ of the Commune.) The mask of imposture was at last dropped on the 28th of January, 1871.¹⁴⁰ With the true heroism of utter self-debasement, the Government of National Defence, in their capitulation, came out as the government of France by Bismarck's prisoners—a part so base that Louis Bonaparte himself had, at Sedan,¹⁰⁰ shrunk from accepting it. After the events of the 18th of March, on their wild flight to Versailles, the *capitulards*¹⁴¹ left in the hands of Paris the documentary evidence of their treason, to destroy which, as the Commune says in its manifesto to the provinces,

"those men would not recoil from battering Paris into a heap of ruins washed by a sea of blood."

To be eagerly bent upon such a consummation, some of the leading members of the Government of Defence had, besides, most peculiar reasons of their own.

Shortly after the conclusion of the armistice, M. Millière, one of the representatives of Paris to the National Assembly, now shot by express order of Jules Favre, published a series of authentic legal documents in proof that Jules Favre, living in concubinage with the wife of a drunkard resident at Algiers, had, by a most daring concoction of forgeries, spread over many years, contrived to grasp, in the name of the children of his adultery, a large succession, which made him a rich man, and that, in a lawsuit undertaken by the legitimate heirs, he only escaped exposure by the connivance of the Bonapartist tribunals. As these dry legal documents were not to be got rid of by any amount of rhetorical horse-power, Jules Favre, for the first time in his life, held his tongue, quietly awaiting the outbreak of the civil war, in order, then, frantically to denounce the people of Paris as a band of escaped convicts in utter revolt against family, religion, order and property. This same forger had hardly got into power, after the 4th of September, when he sympathetically let loose upon society Pic and Taillefer, convicted, even under the empire, of forgery, in the scandalous affair of the "Étendard."¹⁴² One of these men, Taillefer, having dared to return to Paris under the Commune, was at once reinstated in prison; and then Jules Favre exclaimed, from the tribune of the National Assembly, that Paris was setting free all her jail-birds!

Ernest Picard, the Joe Miller* of the government of National Defence, who appointed himself Finance Minister of the Republic after having in vain striven to become the Home Minister of the Empire; is the brother of one Arthur Picard, an individual expelled from the Paris *Bourse* as a blackleg (see report of the Prefecture of Police, dated the 31st of July, 1867), and convicted, on his own confession, of a theft of 300,000 francs, while manager of one of the branches of the *Société Générale*,¹⁴³ rue Palestro, No. 5 (see report of the Prefecture of Police, 11th December, 1868). This Arthur Picard was made by Ernest Picard the editor of his paper, *l'Électeur Libre*.¹⁴⁴ While the common run of stockjobbers were led astray by the official lies of this

* The German editions of 1871 and 1891 have Karl Vogt; the French edition of 1871, Falstaff.—Ed.

Finance office paper, Arthur was running backwards and forwards, between the Finance office and the *Bourse*, there to discount the disasters of the French army. The whole financial correspondence of that worthy pair of brothers fell into the hands of the Commune.

Jules Ferry, a penniless barrister before the 4th of September, contrived, as Mayor of Paris during the siege, to job a fortune out of famine. The day on which he would have to give an account of his maladministration would be the day of his conviction.

These men, then, could find, in the ruins of Paris only, their tickets-of-leave*: they were the very men Bismarck wanted. With the help of some shuffling of cards, Thiers, hitherto the secret prompter of the Government, now appeared at its head, with the ticket-of-leave-men for his Ministers.

Thiers, that monstrous gnome, has charmed the French bourgeoisie for almost half a century, because he is the most consummate intellectual expression of their own class-corruption. Before he became a statesman he had already proved his lying powers as an historian. The chronicle of his public life is the record of the misfortunes of France. Banded, before 1830, with the republicans, he slipped into office under Louis Philippe by betraying his protector Laffitte, ingratiating himself with the king by exciting mob-riots against the clergy, during which the church of Saint Germain l'Auxerrois and the Archbishop's palace were plundered, and by acting the minister-spy upon, and the jail-*accoucheur* of, the Duchess de Berry.¹⁴⁵ The massacre of the republicans in the rue Transnonain, and the subsequent infamous laws of September against the press and the right of association, were his work.¹⁴⁶ Reappearing as the chief of the Cabinet in March, 1840, he astonished France with his plan of fortifying Paris.¹⁴⁷ To the Republicans, who denounced this plan as a sinister plot against the liberty of Paris, he replied from the tribune of the Chamber of Deputies:

"What! to fancy that any works of fortification could ever endanger liberty! And first of all you calumniate any possible Government in supposing that it could some day attempt to maintain itself by bombarding the capital; ... but that government would be a hundred times more impossible after its victory than before."

* In England common criminals are often discharged on parole after serving the greater part of their term, and are placed under police surveillance. On such discharge they receive a certificate called ticket-of-leave, their possessors being referred to as ticket-of-leave-men. [Note by Engels to the German edition of 1871.]

Indeed, no Government would ever have dared to bombard Paris from the forts, but that Government which had previously surrendered these forts to the Prussians.

When King Bomba* tried his hand at Palermo, in January, 1848, Thiers, then long since out of office, again rose in the Chamber of Deputies:

"You know, gentlemen, what is happening at Palermo. You, all of you, shake with horror (in the parliamentary sense) on hearing that during forty-eight hours a large town has been bombarded—by whom? Was it by a foreign enemy exercising the rights of war? No, gentlemen, it was by its own Government. And why? Because that unfortunate town demanded its rights. Well, then, for the demand of its rights it has got forty-eight hours of bombardment. . . . Allow me to appeal to the opinion of Europe. It is doing a service to mankind to arise, and to make reverberate, from what is perhaps the greatest tribune in Europe, some words (indeed words) of indignation against such acts. . . . When the Regent Espartero, who had rendered services to his country (which M. Thiers never did), intended bombarding Barcelona, in order to suppress its insurrection, there arose from all parts of the world a general outcry of indignation."

Eighteen months afterwards, M. Thiers was amongst the fiercest defenders of the bombardment of Rome by a French army.¹⁴⁸ In fact, the fault of King Bomba seems to have consisted in this only, that he limited his bombardment to forty-eight hours.

A few days before the Revolution of February, fretting at the long exile from place and pelf to which Guizot had condemned him, and sniffing in the air the scent of an approaching popular commotion, Thiers, in that pseudo-heroic style which won him the nickname of *Mirabeau-mouche*,** declared to the Chamber of Deputies:

"I am of the party of Revolution, not only in France, but in Europe. I wish the Government of the Revolution to remain in the hands of moderate men . . . but if that Government should fall into the hands of ardent minds, even into those of Radicals, I shall, for all that, not desert my cause. I shall always be of the party of the Revolution."

The Revolution of February came. Instead of displacing the Guizot Cabinet by the Thiers Cabinet, as the little man had dreamt, it superseded Louis Philippe by the Republic. On the first day of the popular victory he carefully hid himself, forgetting that the contempt of the working men screened him from their hatred. Still, with his legendary courage, he continued to shy the public stage, until the June massacres¹⁴⁸ had cleared it for his sort of action. Then he became the leading mind of the "Party of Order"¹⁴⁹ and its Parliamentary Republic, that anon-

* Ferdinand II.—*Ed.*

** Mirabeau the fly.—*Ed.*

ymous interregnum, in which all the rival factions of the ruling class conspired together to crush the people, and conspired against each other to restore each of them its own monarchy. Then, as now, Thiers denounced the Republicans as the only obstacle to the consolidation of the Republic; then, as now, he spoke to the Republic as the hangman spoke to Don Carlos:—"I shall assassinate thee, but for thy own good." Now, as then, he will have to exclaim on the day after his victory: "*L'Empire est fait*"—the Empire is consummated. Despite his hypocritical homilies about necessary liberties and his personal grudge against Louis Bonaparte, who had made a dupe of him, and kicked out parliamentarism—and outside of its factitious atmosphere the little man is conscious of withering into nothingness—he had a hand in all the infamies of the Second Empire, from the occupation of Rome by French troops to the war with Prussia, which he incited by his fierce invective against German unity—not as a cloak of Prussian despotism, but as an encroachment upon the vested right of France in German disunion. Fond of brandishing, with his dwarfish arms, in the face of Europe the sword of the first Napoleon, whose historical shoe-black he had become, his foreign policy always culminated in the utter humiliation of France, from the London convention¹⁵⁰ of 1840 to the Paris capitulation of 1871, and the present civil war, where he hounds on the prisoners of Sedan and Metz¹⁵¹ against Paris by special permission of Bismarck. Despite his versatility of talent and shiftiness of purpose, this man has his whole lifetime been wedded to the most fossil routine. It is self-evident that to him the deeper under-currents of modern society remained forever hidden; but even the most palpable changes on its surface were abhorrent to a brain all the vitality of which had fled to the tongue. Thus he never tired of denouncing as a sacrilege any deviation from the old French protective system. When a minister of Louis Philippe, he railed at railways as a wild chimera; and when in opposition under Louis Bonaparte, he branded as a profanation every attempt to reform the rotten French army system. Never in his long political career has he been guilty of a single—even the smallest—measure of any practical use. Thiers was consistent only in his greed for wealth and his hatred of the men that produce it. Having entered his first ministry under Louis Philippe poor as Job, he left it a millionaire. His last ministry under the same king (of the 1st of March, 1840) exposed him to public taunts of peculation in the Chamber of Deputies, to which he was content to reply by tears—a commodity he deals in as freely as Jules Favre, or any other crocodile. At Bordeaux his first meas-

ure for saving France from impending financial ruin was to endow himself with three millions a year, the first and the last word of the "Economical Republic," the vista of which he had opened to his Paris electors in 1869. One of his former colleagues of the Chamber of Deputies of 1830, himself a capitalist and, nevertheless, a devoted member of the Paris Commune, M. Beslay, lately addressed Thiers thus in a public placard:

"The enslavement of labour by capital has always been the corner-stone of your policy, and from the very day you saw the Republic of Labour installed at the Hôtel de Ville, you have never ceased to cry out to France: 'These are criminals!'"

A master in small state roguery, a virtuoso in perjury and treason, a craftsman in all the petty stratagems, cunning devices, and base perfidies of parliamentary party-warfare; never scrupling, when out of office, to fan a revolution, and to stifle it in blood when at the helm of the state; with class prejudices standing him in the place of ideas, and vanity in the place of a heart; his private life as infamous as his public life is odious—even now, when playing the part of a French Sulla, he cannot help setting off the abomination of his deeds by the ridicule of his ostentation.

The capitulation of Paris, by surrendering to Prussia not only Paris, but all France, closed the long-continued intrigues of treason with the enemy, which the usurpers of the 4th of September had begun, as Trochu himself said, on that very same day. On the other hand, it initiated the civil war they were now to wage, with the assistance of Prussia, against the Republic and Paris. The trap was laid in the very terms of the capitulation. At that time above one-third of the territory was in the hands of the enemy, the capital was cut off from the provinces, all communications were disorganised. To elect under such circumstances a real representation of France was impossible, unless ample time were given for preparation. In view of this, the capitulation stipulated that a National Assembly must be elected within eight days; so that in many parts of France the news of the impending election arrived on its eve only. This assembly, moreover, was, by an express clause of the capitulation, to be elected for the sole purpose of deciding on peace or war, and, eventually, to conclude a treaty of peace. The population could not but feel that the terms of the armistice rendered the continuation of the war impossible, and that for sanctioning the peace imposed by Bismarck, the worst men in France were the best. But not content with these precautions, Thiers, even before the secret of the armistice had been broached to

Paris, set out for an electioneering tour through the provinces, there to galvanise back into life the Legitimist party,¹¹⁸ which now, along with the Orleanists, had to take the place of the then impossible Bonapartists. He was not afraid of them. Impossible as a government of modern France, and, therefore, contemptible as rivals, what party were more eligible as tools of counter-revolution than the party whose action, in the words of Thiers himself (Chamber of Deputies, 5th January, 1833),

“had always been confined to the three resources of foreign invasion, civil war, and anarchy”?

They verily believed in the advent of their long-expected retrospective millennium. There were the heels of foreign invasion trampling upon France; there was the downfall of an empire, and the captivity of a Bonaparte; and there they were themselves. The wheel of history had evidently rolled back to stop at the “Chambre introuvable” of 1816.¹⁵² In the assemblies of the republic, 1848 to 51, they had been represented by their educated and trained parliamentary champions; it was the rank-and-file of the party which now rushed in—all the *Pourceaugnacs** of France.

As soon as this Assembly of “Rurals”¹⁵³ had met at Bordeaux, Thiers made it clear to them that the peace preliminaries must be assented to at once, without even the honours of a Parliamentary debate, as the only condition on which Prussia would permit them to open the war against the Republic and Paris, its stronghold. The counter-revolution had, in fact, no time to lose. The Second Empire had more than doubled the national debt, and plunged all the large towns into heavy municipal debts. The war had fearfully swelled the liabilities, and mercilessly ravaged the resources of the nation. To complete the ruin, the Prussian Shylock was there with his bond for the keep of half a million of his soldiers on French soil, his indemnity of five milliards,¹²¹ and interest at 5 per cent on the unpaid instalments thereof. Who was to pay the bill? It was only by the violent overthrow of the Republic that the appropriators of wealth could hope to shift on the shoulders of its producers the cost of a war which they, the appropriators, had themselves originated. Thus, the immense ruin of France spurred on these patriotic representatives of land and capital, under the very eyes and patronage of the invader, to graft upon the foreign war a civil war—a slaveholders’ rebellion.

* *Pourceaugnac*: A character in one of Molière’s comedies, typifying the dull-witted, narrow-minded petty landed gentry.—Ed.

There stood in the way of this conspiracy one great obstacle—Paris. To disarm Paris was the first condition of success. Paris was therefore summoned by Thiers to surrender its arms. Then Paris was exasperated by the frantic anti-republican demonstrations of the “Rural” Assembly and by Thiers’ own equivocations about the legal status of the Republic; by the threat to decapitate and decapitalise Paris; the appointment of Orleanist ambassadors; Dufaure’s laws on over-due commercial bills and house-rents,¹⁵⁴ inflicting ruin on the commerce and industry of Paris; Pouyer-Quertier’s tax of two centimes upon every copy of every imaginable publication; the sentences of death against Blanqui and Flourens; the suppression of the Republican journals; the transfer of the National Assembly to Versailles; the renewal of the state of siege declared by Palikao, and expired on the 4th of September; the appointment of Vinoy, the *Décembriseur*,¹⁵⁵ as governor of Paris—of Valentin, the imperialist *gendarme*, as its prefect of police—and of Aurelle de Paladines, the Jesuit general, as the commander-in-chief of its National Guard.

And now we have to address a question to M. Thiers and the men of national defence, his under-strappers. It is known that, through the agency of M. Pouyer-Quertier, his finance minister, Thiers had contracted a loan of two milliards. Now, is it true, or not,—

1. That the business was so managed that a consideration of several hundred millions was secured for the private benefit of Thiers, Jules Favre, Ernest Picard, Pouyer-Quertier, and Jules Simon? and—

2. That no money was to be paid down until after the “pacification” of Paris¹⁵⁶?

At all events, there must have been something very pressing in the matter, for Thiers and Jules Favre, in the name of the majority of the Bordeaux Assembly, unblushingly solicited the immediate occupation of Paris by Prussian troops. Such, however, was not the game of Bismarck, as he sneeringly, and in public, told the admiring Frankfort philistines on his return to Germany.

II

Armed Paris was the only serious obstacle in the way of the counter-revolutionary conspiracy. Paris was, therefore, to be disarmed. On this point the Bordeaux Assembly was sincerity itself. If the roaring rant of its Rurals had not been audible enough, the surrender of Paris by Thiers to the tender mercies of the triumvirate of Vinoy the *Décembriseur*, Valentin the

Bonapartist *gendarme*, and Aurelle de Paladines the Jesuit general, would have cut off even the last subterfuge of doubt. But while insultingly exhibiting the true purpose of the disarmament of Paris, the conspirators asked her to lay down her arms on a pretext which was the most glaring, the most barefaced of lies. The artillery of the Paris National Guard, said Thiers, belonged to the State, and to the State it must be returned. The fact was this: From the very day of the capitulation, by which Bismarck's prisoners had signed the surrender of France, but reserved to themselves a numerous body-guard for the express purpose of cowing Paris, Paris stood on the watch. The National Guard reorganised themselves and intrusted their supreme control to a Central Committee elected by their whole body, save some fragments of the old Bonapartist formations. On the eve of the entrance of the Prussians into Paris, the Central Committee took measures for the removal to Montmartre, Belleville, and La Villette of the cannon and *mitrailleuses* treacherously abandoned by the *capitulards* in and about the very quarters the Prussians were to occupy. That artillery had been furnished by the subscriptions of the National Guard. As their private property, it was officially recognised in the capitulation of the 28th of January, and on that very title exempted from the general surrender, into the hands of the conqueror, of arms belonging to the government. And Thiers was so utterly destitute of even the flimsiest pretext for initiating the war against Paris, that he had to resort to the flagrant lie of the artillery of the National Guard being State property!

The seizure of her artillery was evidently but to serve as the preliminary to the general disarmament of Paris, and, therefore, of the Revolution of the 4th of September. But that Revolution had become the legal status of France. The republic, its work, was recognised by the conqueror in the terms of the capitulation. After the capitulation, it was acknowledged by all the foreign Powers, and in its name the National Assembly had been summoned. The Paris working men's revolution of the 4th of September was the only legal title of the National Assembly seated at Bordeaux, and of its executive. Without it, the National Assembly would at once have to give way to the *Corps Législatif* elected in 1869 by universal suffrage under French, not under Prussian, rule, and forcibly dispersed by the arm of the Revolution. Thiers and his ticket-of-leave-men would have had to capitulate for safe conducts signed by Louis Bonaparte, to save them from a voyage to Cayenne.¹⁵⁷ The National Assembly, with its power of attorney to settle the terms of peace with Prussia, was but an incident of that Revolution, the true

embodiment of which was still armed Paris, which had initiated it, undergone for it a five months' siege, with its horrors of famine, and made her prolonged resistance, despite Trochu's plan, the basis of an obstinate war of defence in the provinces. And Paris was now either to lay down her arms at the insulting behest of the rebellious slaveholders of Bordeaux, and acknowledge that her Revolution of the 4th of September meant nothing but a simple transfer of power from Louis Bonaparte to his Royal rivals; or she had to stand forward as the self-sacrificing champion of France, whose salvation from ruin, and whose regeneration were impossible, without the revolutionary overthrow of the political and social conditions that had engendered the Second Empire, and, under its fostering care, matured into utter rotteness. Paris, emaciated by a five months' famine, did not hesitate one moment. She heroically resolved to run all the hazards of a resistance against the French conspirators, even with Prussian cannon frowning upon her from her own forts. Still, in its abhorrence of the civil war into which Paris was to be goaded, the Central Committee continued to persist in a merely defensive attitude, despite the provocations of the Assembly, the usurpations of the Executive, and the menacing concentration of troops in and around Paris.

Thiers opened the civil war by sending Vinoy, at the head of a multitude of *sergents-de-ville* and some regiments of the line, upon a nocturnal expedition against Montmartre, there to seize, by surprise, the artillery of the National Guard. It is well known how this attempt broke down before the resistance of the National Guard and the fraternisation of the line with the people. Aurelle de Paladines had printed beforehand his bulletin of victory, and Thiers held ready the placards announcing his measures of *coup d'état*. Now these had to be replaced by Thiers' appeals, imparting his magnanimous resolve to leave the National Guard in the possession of their arms, with which, he said, he felt sure they would rally round the Government against the rebels. Out of 300,000 National Guards only 300 responded to this summons to rally round little Thiers against themselves. The glorious working men's Revolution of the 18th March took undisputed sway of Paris. The Central Committee was its provisional government. Europe seemed, for a moment, to doubt whether its recent sensational performances of state and war had any reality in them, or whether they were the dreams of a long bygone past.

From the 18th of March to the entrance of the Versailles troops into Paris, the proletarian revolution remained so free from the acts of violence in which the revolutions, and still

more the counter-revolutions, of the "better classes" abound, that no facts were left to its opponents to cry out about but the execution of Generals Lecomte and Clément Thomas, and the affair of the Place Vendôme.

One of the Bonapartist officers engaged in the nocturnal attempt against Montmartre, General Lecomte, had four times ordered the 81st line regiment to fire at an unarmed gathering in the Place Pigalle, and on their refusal fiercely insulted them. Instead of shooting women and children, his own men shot him. The inveterate habits acquired by the soldiery under the training of the enemies of the working class are, of course, not likely to change the very moment these soldiers changed sides. The same men executed Clément Thomas.

"General" Clément Thomas, a malcontent exquartermaster-sergeant, had, in the latter times of Louis Philippe's reign, enlisted at the office of the Republican newspaper *Le National*,¹⁵⁸ there to serve in the double capacity of responsible man-of-straw (*gérant responsable*) and of duelling bully to that very combative journal. After the revolution of February, the men of the *National* having got into power, they metamorphosed this old quartermaster-sergeant into a general on the eve of the butchery of June, of which he, like Jules Favre, was one of the sinister plotters, and became one of the most dastardly executioners. Then he and his generalship disappeared for a long time, to again rise to the surface on the 1st November, 1870. The day before the Government of Defence, caught at the Hôtel de Ville, had solemnly pledged their parole to Blanqui, Flourens, and other representatives of the working class, to abdicate their usurped power into the hands of a commune to be freely elected by Paris.¹⁵⁹ Instead of keeping their word, they let loose on Paris the Bretons of Trochu, who now replaced the Corsicans of Bonaparte.¹⁶⁰ General Tamisier alone, refusing to sully his name by such a breach of faith, resigned the commandership-in-chief of the National Guard, and in his place Clément Thomas for once became again a general. During the whole of his tenure of command, he made war, not upon the Prussians, but upon the Paris National Guard. He prevented their general armament, pitted the bourgeois battalions against the working men's battalions, weeded out the officers hostile to Trochu's "plan," and disbanded, under the stigma of cowardice, the very same proletarian battalions whose heroism has now astonished their most inveterate enemies. Clément Thomas felt quite proud of having reconquered his June pre-eminence as the personal enemy of the working class of Paris. Only a few days before the 18th of March, he laid before the War Minister,

Le Flô, a plan of his own for "finishing off *la fine fleur* [the cream] of the Paris *canaille*." After Vinoy's rout, he must needs appear upon the scene of action in the quality of an amateur spy. The Central Committee and the Paris working men were as much responsible for the killing of Clément Thomas and Lecomte as the Princess of Wales was for the fate of the people crushed to death on the day of her entrance into London.

The massacre of unarmed citizens in the Place Vendôme is a myth which M. Thiers and the Rurals persistently ignored in the Assembly, intrusting its propagation exclusively to the servants' hall of European journalism. "The men of order," the reactionists of Paris, trembled at the victory of the 18th of March. To them it was the signal of popular retribution at last arriving. The ghosts of the victims assassinated at their hands from the days of June, 1848, down to the 22nd of January, 1871,¹⁶¹ arose before their faces. Their panic was their only punishment. Even the *sergents-de-ville*, instead of being disarmed and locked up, as ought to have been done, had the gates of Paris flung wide open for their safe retreat to Versailles. The men of order were left not only unharmed, but allowed to rally and quietly to seize more than one stronghold in the very centre of Paris. This indulgence of the Central Committee—this magnanimity of the armed working men—so strangely at variance with the habits of the "Party of Order," the latter misinterpreted as mere symptoms of conscious weakness. Hence their silly plan to try, under the cloak of an unarmed demonstration, what Vinoy had failed to perform with his cannon and *mitrailleuses*. On the 22nd of March a riotous mob of swells started from the quarters of luxury, all the *petits crevés* in their ranks, and at their head the notorious familiars of the Empire—the Heeckeren, Coëtlogon, Henri de Pène, etc. Under the cowardly pretence of a pacific demonstration, this rabble, secretly armed with the weapons of the bravo, fell into marching order, ill-treated and disarmed the detached patrols and sentries of the National Guards they met with on their progress, and, on debouching from the Rue de la Paix, with the cry of "Down with the Central Committee! Down with the assassins! The National Assembly for ever!" attempted to break through the line drawn up there, and thus to carry by a surprise the headquarters of the National Guard in the Place Vendôme. In reply to their pistol-shots, the regular *sommations* (the French equivalent of the English Riot Act)¹⁶² were made, and, proving ineffective, fire was commanded by the general of the National Guard.* One

* Bergeret.—Ed.

volley dispersed into wild flight the silly coxcombs, who expected that the mere exhibition of their "respectability" would have the same effect upon the Revolution of Paris as Joshua's trumpets upon the wall of Jericho. The runaways left behind them two National Guards killed, nine severely wounded (among them a member of the Central Committee*), and the whole scene of their exploit strewn with revolvers, daggers, and sword-canes, in evidence of the "unarmed" character of their "pacific" demonstration. When, on the 13th of June, 1849, the National Guard made a really pacific demonstration in protest against the felonious assault of French troops upon Rome, Changarnier, then general of the Party of Order, was acclaimed by the National Assembly, and especially by M. Thiers, as the saviour of society, for having launched his troops from all sides upon these unarmed men, to shoot and sabre them down, and to trample them under their horses' feet. Paris, then, was placed under a state of siege. Dufaure hurried through the Assembly new laws of repression. New arrests, new proscriptions—a new reign of terror set in. But the lower orders manage these things otherwise. The Central Committee of 1871 simply ignored the heroes of the "pacific demonstration"; so much so that only two days later they were enabled to muster under Admiral Saisset for that *armed* demonstration, crowned by the famous stampede to Versailles. In their reluctance to continue the civil war opened by Thiers' burglarious attempt on Montmartre, the Central Committee made itself, this time, guilty of a decisive mistake in not at once marching upon Versailles, then completely helpless, and thus putting an end to the conspiracies of Thiers and his Rurals. Instead of this, the Party of Order was again allowed to try its strength at the ballot box, on the 26th of March, the day of the election of the Commune. Then, in the *mairies* of Paris, they exchanged bland words of conciliation with their too generous conquerors, muttering in their hearts solemn vows to exterminate them in due time.

Now look at the reverse of the medal. Thiers opened his second campaign against Paris in the beginning of April. The first batch of Parisian prisoners brought into Versailles was subjected to revolting atrocities, while Ernest Picard, with his hands in his trousers' pockets, strolled about jeering them, and while Mesdames Thiers and Favre, in the midst of their ladies of honour (?), applauded, from the balcony, the outrages of the Versailles mob. The captured soldiers of the line were massacred in cold blood; our brave friend, General Duval, the iron-founder,

* Maljournal.—Ed.

was shot without any form of trial. Galliffet, the kept man of his wife, so notorious for her shameless exhibitions at the orgies of the Second Empire, boasted in a proclamation of having commanded the murder of a small troop of National Guards, with their captain and lieutenant, surprised and disarmed by his Chasseurs. Vinoy, the runaway, was appointed by Thiers Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour, for his general order to shoot down every soldier of the line taken in the ranks of the Federals. Desmarest, the gendarme, was decorated for the treacherous butcher-like chopping in pieces of the high-souled and chivalrous Flourens, who had saved the heads of the Government of Defence on the 31st of October, 1870.¹⁶³ "The encouraging particulars" of his assassination were triumphantly expatiated upon by Thiers in the National Assembly. With the elated vanity of a parliamentary Tom Thumb, permitted to play the part of a Tamerlane, he denied the rebels against his littleness every right of civilised warfare, up to the right of neutrality for ambulances. Nothing more horrid than that monkey, allowed for a time to give full fling to his tigerish instincts, as foreseen by Voltaire.* (See note, p. 35.)**

After the decree of the Commune of the 7th April, ordering reprisals and declaring it to be its duty "to protect Paris against the cannibal exploits of the Versailles banditti, and to demand an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth,"¹⁶⁴ Thiers did not stop the barbarous treatment of prisoners, moreover insulting them in his bulletins as follows:—"Never have more degraded countenances of a degraded democracy met the afflicted gazes of honest men,"—honest like Thiers himself and his ministerial ticket-of-leave-men. Still the shooting of prisoners was suspended for a time. Hardly, however, had Thiers and his Decembrist generals¹¹⁹ become aware that the Communal decree of reprisals was but an empty threat, that even their gendarme spies caught in Paris under the disguise of National Guards, that even *sergents-de-ville*, taken with incendiary shells upon them, were spared,—when the wholesale shooting of prisoners was resumed and carried on uninterruptedly to the end. Houses to which National Guards had fled were surrounded by gendarmes, inundated with petroleum (which here occurs for the first time in this war), and then set fire to, the charred corpses being afterwards brought out by the ambulance of the Press at the Ternes. Four National Guards having surrendered to a troop of mounted Chasseurs at Belle Epine, on the 25th of April, were

* Voltaire, *Candide*, Chapter 22.—Ed.

** See p. 241 of this volume.—Ed.

afterwards shot down, one after another, by the captain, a worthy man of Galliffet's. One of his four victims, left for dead, Scheffer, crawled back to the Parisian outposts, and deposed to this fact before a commission of the Commune. When Tolain interpellated the War Minister upon the report of this commission, the Rurals drowned his voice and forbade Le Flô to answer. It would be an insult to their "glorious" army to speak of its deeds. The flippant tone in which Thiers' bulletins announced the bayoneting of the Federals surprised asleep at Moulin Saquet, and the wholesale fusillades at Clamart shocked the nerves even of the not over-sensitive London *Times*.¹⁶⁵ But it would be ludicrous today to attempt recounting the merely preliminary atrocities committed by the bombardiers of Paris and the fomenters of a slaveholders' rebellion protected by foreign invasion. Amidst all these horrors, Thiers, forgetful of his parliamentary laments on the terrible responsibility weighing down his dwarfish shoulders, boasts in his bulletin that *l'Assemblée siège paisiblement* (the Assembly continues meeting in peace), and proves by his constant carousals, now with Decembrist generals, now with German princes, that his digestion is not troubled in the least, not even by the ghosts of Lecomte and Clément Thomas.

III

On the dawn of the 18th of March, Paris arose to the thunderburst of "Vive la Commune!" What is the Commune, that sphinx so tantalising to the bourgeois mind?

"The proletarians of Paris," said the Central Committee in its manifesto of the 18th March, "amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs. . . . They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies, by seizing upon the governmental power."

But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.

The centralised State power, with its ubiquitous organs of standing army, police, bureaucracy, clergy, and judicature—organs wrought after the plan of a systematic and hierarchic division of labour,—originates from the days of absolute monarchy, serving nascent middle-class society as a mighty weapon in its struggles against feudalism. Still, its development remained clogged by all manner of mediaeval rubbish, seignorial rights, local privileges, municipal and guild monopolies and provincial

constitutions. The gigantic broom of the French Revolution of the eighteenth century swept away all these relics of bygone times, thus clearing simultaneously the social soil of its last hindrances to the superstructure of the modern State edifice raised under the First Empire, itself the offspring of the coalition wars of old semi-feudal Europe against modern France. During the subsequent *régimes* the Government, placed under parliamentary control—that is, under the direct control of the propertied classes—became not only a hotbed of huge national debts and crushing taxes; with its irresistible allurements of place, pelf, and patronage, it became not only the bone of contention between the rival factions and adventurers of the ruling classes; but its political character changed simultaneously with the economic changes of society. At the same pace at which the progress of modern industry developed, widened, intensified the class antagonism between capital and labour, the State power assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labour, of a public force organised for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism. After every revolution marking a progressive phase in the class struggle, the purely repressive character of the State power stands out in bolder and bolder relief. The Revolution of 1830, resulting in the transfer of Government from the landlords to the capitalists, transferred it from the more remote to the more direct antagonists of the working men. The bourgeois Republicans, who, in the name of the Revolution of February, took the State power, used it for the June massacres, in order to convince the working class that “social” republic meant the Republic ensuring their social subjection, and in order to convince the royalist bulk of the bourgeois and landlord class that they might safely leave the cares and emoluments of Government to the bourgeois “Republicans.” However, after their one heroic exploit of June, the bourgeois Republicans had, from the front, to fall back to the rear of the “Party of Order”—a combination formed by all the rival fractions and factions of the appropriating class in their now openly declared antagonism to the producing classes. The proper form of their joint-stock Government was the *Parliamentary Republic*, with Louis Bonaparte for its President. There was a *régime* of avowed class terrorism and deliberate insult toward the “vile multitude.” If the Parliamentary Republic, as M. Thiers said, “divided them (the different fractions of the ruling class) least,” it opened an abyss between that class and the whole body of society outside their spare ranks. The restraints by which their own divisions had under former *régimes* still checked the State power, were removed by their union; and

in view of the threatening upheaval of the proletariat, they now used that State power mercilessly and ostentatiously as the national war-engine of capital against labour. In their uninterrupted crusade against the producing masses they were, however, bound not only to invest the executive with continually increased powers of repression, but at the same time to divest their own parliamentary stronghold—the National Assembly—one by one, of all its own means of defence against the Executive. The Executive, in the person of Louis Bonaparte, turned them out. The natural offspring of the “Party-of-Order” Republic was the Second Empire.

The empire, with the *coup d'état* for its certificate of birth, universal suffrage for its sanction, and the sword for its sceptre, professed to rest upon the peasantry, the large mass of producers not directly involved in the struggle of capital and labour. It professed to save the working class by breaking down Parliamentarism, and, with it, the undisguised subserviency of Government to the propertied classes. It professed to save the propertied classes by upholding their economic supremacy over the working class; and, finally, it professed to unite all classes by reviving for all the chimera of national glory. In reality, it was the only form of government possible at a time when the bourgeoisie had already lost, and the working class had not yet acquired, the faculty of ruling the nation. It was acclaimed throughout the world as the saviour of society. Under its sway, bourgeois society, freed from political cares, attained a development unexpected even by itself. Its industry and commerce expanded to colossal dimensions; financial swindling celebrated cosmopolitan orgies; the misery of the masses was set off by a shameless display of gorgeous, meretricious and debased luxury. The State power, apparently soaring high above society, was at the same time itself the greatest scandal of that society and the very hotbed of all its corruptions. Its own rottenness, and the rottenness of the society it had saved, were laid bare by the bayonet of Prussia, herself eagerly bent upon transferring the supreme seat of that *régime* from Paris to Berlin. Imperialism is, at the same time, the most prostitute and the ultimate form of the State power which nascent middle-class society had commenced to elaborate as a means of its own emancipation from feudalism, and which full-grown bourgeois society had finally transformed into a means for the enslavement of labour by capital.

The direct antithesis to the empire was the Commune. The cry of “social republic,” with which the revolution of February was ushered in by the Paris proletariat, did but express a vague aspiration after a Republic that was not only to supersede the

monarchical form of class-rule, but class-rule itself. The Commune was the positive form of that Republic.

Paris, the central seat of the old governmental power, and, at the same time, the social stronghold of the French working class, had risen in arms against the attempt of Thiers and the Rurals to restore and perpetuate that old governmental power bequeathed to them by the empire. Paris could resist only because, in consequence of the siege, it had got rid of the army, and replaced it by a National Guard, the bulk of which consisted of working men: This fact was now to be transformed into an institution. The first decree of the Commune, therefore, was the suppression of the standing army, and the substitution for it of the armed people.

The Commune was formed of the municipal councillors, chosen by universal suffrage in the various wards of the town, responsible and revocable at short terms. The majority of its members were naturally working men, or acknowledged representatives of the working class. The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary, body, executive and legislative at the same time. Instead of continuing to be the agent of the Central Government, the police was at once stripped of its political attributes, and turned into the responsible and at all times revocable agent of the Commune. So were the officials of all other branches of the Administration. From the members of the Commune downwards, the public service had to be done at *workmen's wages*. The vested interests and the representation allowances of the high dignitaries of State disappeared along with the high dignitaries themselves. Public functions ceased to be the private property of the tools of the Central Government. Not only municipal administration, but the whole initiative hitherto exercised by the State was laid into the hands of the Commune.

Having once got rid of the standing army and the police, the physical force elements of the old Government, the Commune was anxious to break the spiritual force of repression, the "parson-power," by the disestablishment and disendowment of all churches as proprietary bodies. The priests were sent back to the recesses of private life, there to feed upon the alms of the faithful in imitation of their predecessors, the Apostles. The whole of the educational institutions were opened to the people gratuitously, and at the same time cleared of all interference of Church and State. Thus, not only was education made accessible to all, but science itself freed from the fetters which class prejudice and governmental force had imposed upon it.

The judicial functionaries were to be divested of that sham

independence which had but served to mask their abject subserviency to all succeeding governments to which, in turn, they had taken, and broken, the oaths of allegiance. Like the rest of public servants, magistrates and judges were to be elective, responsible, and revocable.

The Paris Commune was, of course, to serve as a model to all the great industrial centres of France. The communal *régime* once established in Paris and the secondary centres, the old centralised Government would in the provinces, too, have to give way to the self-government of the producers. In a rough sketch of national organisation which the Commune had no time to develop, it states clearly that the Commune was to be the political form of even the smallest country hamlet, and that in the rural districts the standing army was to be replaced by a national militia, with an extremely short term of service. The rural communes of every district were to administer their common affairs by an assembly of delegates in the central town, and these district assemblies were again to send deputies to the National Delegation in Paris, each delegate to be at any time revocable and bound by the *mandat impératif* (formal instructions) of his constituents. The few but important functions which still would remain for a central government were not to be suppressed, as has been intentionally mis-stated, but were to be discharged by Communal, and therefore strictly responsible agents. The unity of the nation was not to be broken, but, on the contrary, to be organised by the Communal Constitution and to become a reality by the destruction of the State power which claimed to be the embodiment of that unity independent of, and superior to, the nation itself, from which it was but a parasitic excrescence. While the merely repressive organs of the old governmental power were to be amputated, its legitimate functions were to be wrested from an authority usurping pre-eminence over society itself, and restored to the responsible agents of society. Instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to misrepresent the people in Parliament, universal suffrage was to serve the people, constituted in Communes, as individual suffrage serves every other employer in the search for the workmen and managers in his business. And it is well known that companies, like individuals, in matters of real business generally know how to put the right man in the right place, and, if they for once make a mistake, to redress it promptly. On the other hand, nothing could be more foreign to the spirit of the Commune than to supersede universal suffrage by hierarchic investiture.¹⁶⁶

It is generally the fate of completely new historical creations

to be mistaken for the counterpart of older and even defunct forms of social life, to which they may bear a certain likeness. Thus, this new Commune, which breaks the modern State power, has been mistaken for a reproduction of the mediaeval Communes, which first preceded, and afterwards became the substratum of, that very State power. The Communal Constitution has been mistaken for an attempt to break up into a federation of small States, as dreamt of by Montesquieu and the Girondins,¹⁶⁷ that unity of great nations which, if originally brought about by political force, has now become a powerful coefficient of social production. The antagonism of the Commune against the State power has been mistaken for an exaggerated form of the ancient struggle against over-centralisation. Peculiar historical circumstances may have prevented the classical development, as in France, of the bourgeois form of government, and may have allowed, as in England, to complete the great central State organs by corrupt vestries, jobbing councillors, and ferocious poor-law guardians in the towns, and virtually hereditary magistrates in the counties. The Communal Constitution would have restored to the social body all the forces hitherto absorbed by the State parasite feeding upon, and clogging the free movement of, society. By this one act it would have initiated the regeneration of France. The provincial French middle class saw in the Commune an attempt to restore the sway their order had held over the country under Louis Philippe, and which, under Louis Napoleon, was supplanted by the pretended rule of the country over the towns. In reality, the Communal Constitution brought the rural producers under the intellectual lead of the central towns of their districts, and these secured to them, in the working men, the natural trustees of their interests. The very existence of the Commune involved, as a matter of course, local municipal liberty, but no longer as a check upon the, now superseded, State power. It could only enter into the head of a Bismarck, who, when not engaged on his intrigues of blood and iron, always likes to resume his old trade, so befitting his mental calibre, of contributor to *Kladderadatsch*¹⁶⁸ (the *Berlin Punch*¹⁶⁹), it could only enter into such a head, to ascribe to the Paris Commune aspirations after that caricature of the old French municipal organisation of 1791, the Prussian municipal constitution which degrades the town governments to mere secondary wheels in the police-machinery of the Prussian State. The Commune made that catchword of bourgeois revolutions, cheap government, a reality, by destroying the two greatest sources of expenditure—the standing army and State functionalism. Its very existence presupposed the non-existence of

monarchy, which, in Europe at least, is the normal incumbrance and indispensable cloak of class-rule. It supplied the Republic with the basis of really democratic institutions. But neither cheap Government nor the "true Republic" was its ultimate aim; they were its mere concomitants.

The multiplicity of interpretations to which the Commune has been subjected, and the multiplicity of interests which construed it in their favour, show that it was a thoroughly expansive political form, while all previous forms of government had been emphatically repressive. Its true secret was this. It was essentially a working-class government, the produce of the struggle of the producing against the appropriating class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labour.

Except on this last condition, the Communal Constitution would have been an impossibility and a delusion. The political rule of the producer cannot coexist with the perpetuation of his social slavery. The Commune was therefore to serve as a lever for uprooting the economical foundations upon which rests the existence of classes, and therefore of class-rule. With labour emancipated, every man becomes a working man, and productive labour ceases to be a class attribute.

It is a strange fact. In spite of all the tall talk and all the immense literature, for the last sixty years, about Emancipation of Labour, no sooner do the working men anywhere take the subject into their own hands with a will, than uprisings at once all the apologetic phraseology of the mouthpieces of present society with its two poles of Capital and Wages Slavery (the landlord now is but the sleeping partner of the capitalist), as if capitalist society was still in its purest state of virgin innocence, with its antagonisms still undeveloped, with its delusions still unexploded, with its prostitute realities not yet laid bare. The Commune, they exclaim, intends to abolish property, the basis of all civilisation! Yes, gentlemen, the Commune intended to abolish that class-property which makes the labour of the many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators. It wanted to make individual property a truth by transforming the means of production, land and capital, now chiefly the means of enslaving and exploiting labour, into mere instruments of free and associated labour.—But this is Communism, "impossible" Communism! Why, those members of the ruling classes who are intelligent enough to perceive the impossibility of continuing the present system—and they are many—have become the obtrusive and full-mouthed apostles of co-operative production. If co-operative production is not to remain

a sham and a snare; if it is to supersede the Capitalist system; if united co-operative societies are to regulate national production upon a common plan, thus taking it under their own control, and putting an end to the constant anarchy and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of Capitalist production—what else, gentlemen, would it be but Communism, “possible” Communism?

The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce *par décret du peuple*. They know that in order to work out their own emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which present society is irresistibly tending by its own economical agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men. They have no ideals to realise, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant. In the full consciousness of their historic mission, and with the heroic resolve to act up to it, the working class can afford to smile at the coarse invective of the gentlemen’s gentlemen with the pen and inkhorn; and at the didactic patronage of well-wishing bourgeois-doctrinaires, pouring forth their ignorant platitudes and sectarian crotchets in the oracular tone of scientific infallibility.

When the Paris Commune took the management of the revolution in its own hands; when plain working men for the first time dared to infringe upon the Governmental privilege of their “natural superiors,” and, under circumstances of unexampled difficulty, performed their work modestly, conscientiously, and efficiently,—performed it at salaries the highest of which barely amounted to one-fifth of what, according to high scientific authority,* is the minimum required for a secretary to a certain metropolitan school board,—the old world writhed in convulsions of rage at the sight of the Red Flag, the symbol of the Republic of Labour, floating over the Hôtel de Ville.

And yet, this was the first revolution in which the working class was openly acknowledged as the only class capable of social initiative, even by the great bulk of the Paris middle class—shopkeepers, tradesmen, merchants—the wealthy capitalists alone excepted. The Commune had saved them by a sagacious settlement of that ever-recurring cause of dispute among the middle classes themselves—the debtor and creditor accounts.¹⁷⁰ The same portion of the middle class, after they had assisted in putting down the working men’s insurrection of June, 1848, had been at once unceremoniously sacrificed to their

* Professor Huxley. [Note to the German edition of 1871.]

creditors¹⁷¹ by the then Constituent Assembly. But this was not their only motive for now rallying round the working class. They felt that there was but one alternative—the Commune, or the Empire—under whatever name it might reappear. The Empire had ruined them economically by the havoc it made of public wealth, by the wholesale financial swindling it fostered, by the props it lent to the artificially accelerated centralisation of capital, and the concomitant expropriation of their own ranks. It had suppressed them politically, it had shocked them morally by its orgies, it had insulted their Voltairianism by handing over the education of their children to the *frères Ignorantins*,¹⁷² it had revolted their national feeling as Frenchmen by precipitating them headlong into a war which left only one equivalent for the ruins it made—the disappearance of the Empire. In fact, after the exodus from Paris of the high Bonapartist and capitalist *bohème*, the true middle-class Party of Order came out in the shape of the “Union Républicaine,”¹⁷³ enrolling themselves under the colours of the Commune and defending it against the wilful misconstruction of Thiers. Whether the gratitude of this great body of the middle class will stand the present severe trial, time must show.

The Commune was perfectly right in telling the peasants that “its victory was their only hope.” Of all the lies hatched at Versailles and re-echoed by the glorious European penny-a-liner, one of the most tremendous was that the Rurals represented the French peasantry. Think only of the love of the French peasant for the men to whom, after 1815, he had to pay the milliard of indemnity.¹⁷⁴ In the eyes of the French peasant, the very existence of a great landed proprietor is in itself an encroachment on his conquests of 1789. The bourgeois, in 1848, had burdened his plot of land with the additional tax of forty-five cents in the franc; but then he did so in the name of the revolution; while now he had fomented a civil war against the revolution, to shift on to the peasant’s shoulders the chief load of the five milliards of indemnity to be paid to the Prussian. The Commune, on the other hand, in one of its first proclamations, declared that the true originators of the war would be made to pay its cost. The Commune would have delivered the peasant of the blood tax,—would have given him a cheap government,—transformed his present blood-suckers, the notary, advocate, executor, and other judicial vampires, into salaried communal agents, elected by, and responsible to, himself. It would have freed him of the tyranny of the *garde champêtre*, the gendarme, and the prefect; would have put enlightenment by the schoolmaster in the place of stultification by the priest. And the French

peasant is, above all, a man of reckoning. He would find it extremely reasonable that the pay of the priest, instead of being extorted by the taxgatherer, should only depend upon the spontaneous action of the parishioners' religious instincts. Such were the great immediate boons which the rule of the Commune—and that rule alone—held out to the French peasantry. It is, therefore, quite superfluous here to expatiate upon the more complicated but vital problems which the Commune alone was able, and at the same time compelled, to solve in favour of the peasant, *viz.*, the hypothecary debt, lying like an incubus upon his parcel of soil, the *prolétariat foncier* (the rural proletariat), daily growing upon it, and his expropriation from it enforced, at a more and more rapid rate, by the very development of modern agriculture and the competition of capitalist farming.

The French peasant had elected Louis Bonaparte president of the Republic; but the Party of Order created the Empire. What the French peasant really wants he commenced to show in 1849 and 1850, by opposing his *maire* to the Government's prefect, his schoolmaster to the Government's priest, and himself to the Government's gendarme. All the laws made by the Party of Order in January and February, 1850, were avowed measures of repression against the peasant. The peasant was a Bonapartist, because the great Revolution, with all its benefits to him, was, in his eyes, personified in Napoleon. This delusion, rapidly breaking down under the Second Empire (and in its very nature hostile to the Rurals), this prejudice of the past, how could it have withstood the appeal of the Commune to the living interests and urgent wants of the peasantry?

The Rurals—this was, in fact, their chief apprehension—knew that three months' free communication of Communal Paris with the provinces would bring about a general rising of the peasants, and hence their anxiety to establish a police blockade around Paris, so as to stop the spread of the rinderpest.

If the Commune was thus the true representative of all the healthy elements of French society, and therefore the truly national Government, it was, at the same time, as a working men's Government, as the bold champion of the emancipation of labour, emphatically international. Within sight of the Prussian army, that had annexed to Germany two French provinces, the Commune annexed to France the working people all over the world.

The Second Empire had been the jubilee of cosmopolitan blacklegism, the rakes of all countries rushing in at its call for a share in its orgies and in the plunder of the French people. Even at this moment the right hand of Thiers is Ganesco, the

foul Wallachian, and his left hand is Markovsky, the Russian spy. The Commune admitted all foreigners to the honour of dying for an immortal cause. Between the foreign war lost by their treason, and the civil war fomented by their conspiracy with the foreign invader, the bourgeoisie had found the time to display their patriotism by organising police-hunts upon the Germans in France. The Commune made a German working man* its Minister of Labour. Thiers, the bourgeoisie, the Second Empire, had continually deluded Poland by loud professions of sympathy, while in reality betraying her to, and doing the dirty work of, Russia. The Commune honoured the heroic sons of Poland** by placing them at the head of the defenders of Paris. And, to broadly mark the new era of history it was conscious of initiating, under the eyes of the conquering Prussians, on the one side, and of the Bonapartist army, led by Bonapartist generals, on the other, the Commune pulled down that colossal symbol of martial glory, the Vendôme column.¹⁷⁵

The great social measure of the Commune was its own working existence. Its special measures could but betoken the tendency of a government of the people by the people. Such were the abolition of the nightwork of journeymen bakers; the prohibition, under penalty, of the employers' practice to reduce wages by levying upon their work-people fines under manifold pretexts,—a process in which the employer combines in his own person the parts of legislator, judge, and executor, and filches the money to boot. Another measure of this class was the surrender, to associations of workmen, under reserve of compensation, of all closed workshops and factories, no matter whether the respective capitalists had absconded or preferred to strike work.

The financial measures of the Commune, remarkable for their sagacity and moderation, could only be such as were compatible with the state of a besieged town. Considering the colossal robberies committed upon the city of Paris by the great financial companies and contractors, under the protection of Haussmann,**³ the Commune would have had an incomparably better title to confiscate their property than Louis Napoleon had against the Orleans family. The Hohenzollern and the English

* Leo Frankel.—*Ed.*

** J. Dąbrowski and W. Wróblewski.—*Ed.*

*** During the Second Empire, Baron Haussmann was Prefect of the Department of the Seine, that is, of the City of Paris. He introduced a number of changes in the layout of the city for the purpose of facilitating the crushing of workers' insurrections. [*Note to the Russian edition of 1905 edited by V. I. Lenin.*].—*Ed.*

oligarchs, who both have derived a good deal of their estates from Church plunder, were, of course, greatly shocked at the Commune clearing but 8,000 *l.* out of secularisation.

While the Versailles Government, as soon as it had recovered some spirit and strength, used the most violent means against the Commune; while it put down the free expression of opinion all over France, even to the forbidding of meetings of delegates from the large towns; while it subjected Versailles and the rest of France to an espionage far surpassing that of the Second Empire; while it burned by its gendarme inquisitors all papers printed at Paris, and sifted all correspondence from and to Paris; while in the National Assembly the most timid attempts to put in a word for Paris were howled down in a manner unknown even to the *Chambre introuvable* of 1816; with the savage warfare of Versailles outside, and its attempts at corruption and conspiracy inside Paris—would the Commune not have shamefully betrayed its trust by affecting to keep up all the decencies and appearances of liberalism as in a time of profound peace? Had the Government of the Commune been akin to that of M. Thiers, there would have been no more occasion to suppress Party-of-Order papers at Paris than there was to suppress Communal papers at Versailles.

It was irritating indeed to the Rurals that at the very same time they declared the return to the church to be the only means of salvation for France, the infidel Commune unearthed the peculiar mysteries of the Picpus nunnery, and of the Church of Saint Laurent.¹⁷⁶ It was a satire upon M. Thiers that, while he showered grand crosses upon the Bonapartist generals in acknowledgement of their mastery in losing battles, signing capitulations, and turning cigarettes at Wilhelmshöhe,¹⁷⁷ the Commune dismissed and arrested its generals whenever they were suspected of neglecting their duties. The expulsion from, and arrest by, the Commune of one of its members* who had slipped in under a false name, and had undergone at Lyons six days' imprisonment for simple bankruptcy, was it not a deliberate insult hurled at the forger, Jules Favre, then still the foreign minister of France, still selling France to Bismarck, and still dictating his orders to that paragon Government of Belgium? But indeed the Commune did not pretend to infallibility, the invariable attribute of all governments of the old stamp. It published its doings and sayings, it initiated the public into all its shortcomings.

In every revolution there intrude, at the side of its true agents, men of a different stamp; some of them survivors of and devotees

* Blanchet.—Ed.

to past revolutions, without insight into the present movement, but preserving popular influence by their known honesty and courage, or by the sheer force of tradition; others mere bawlers, who, by dint of repeating year after year the same set of stereotyped declamations against the Government of the day, have sneaked into the reputation of revolutionists of the first water. After the 18th of March, some such men did also turn up, and in some cases contrived to play pre-eminent parts. As far as their power went, they hampered the real action of the working class, exactly as men of that sort have hampered the full development of every previous revolution. They are an unavoidable evil: with time they are shaken off; but time was not allowed to the Commune.

Wonderful, indeed, was the change the Commune had wrought in Paris! No longer any trace of the meretricious Paris of the Second Empire. No longer was Paris the rendezvous of British landlords, Irish absentees,¹⁷⁸ American ex-slaveholders and shoddy men, Russian ex-serfowners, and Wallachian boyards. No more corpses at the morgue, no nocturnal burglaries, scarcely any robberies; in fact, for the first time since the days of February, 1848, the streets of Paris were safe, and that without any police of any kind.

"We," said a member of the Commune, "hear no longer of assassination, theft and personal assault; it seems indeed as if the police had dragged along with it to Versailles all its Conservative friends."

The *cocottes* had refound the scent of their protectors—the absconding men of family, religion, and, above all, of property. In their stead, the real women of Paris showed again at the surface—heroic, noble, and devoted, like the women of antiquity. Working, thinking, fighting, bleeding Paris—almost forgetful, in its incubation of a new society, of the cannibals at its gates—radiant in the enthusiasm of its historic initiative!

Opposed to this new world at Paris, behold the old world at Versailles—that assembly of the ghouls of all defunct *régimes*, Legitimists and Orleanists, eager to feed upon the carcass of the nation,—with a tail of antediluvian Republicans, sanctioning, by their presence in the Assembly, the slaveholders' rebellion, relying for the maintenance of their Parliamentary Republic upon the vanity of the senile mountebank at its head, and caricaturing 1789 by holding their ghastly meetings in the *Jeu de Paume*.* There it was, this Assembly, the representative

* *Jeu de Paume*: The tennis court where the National Assembly of 1789 adopted its famous decisions. [Note to the German edition of 1871.]

of everything dead in France, propped up to the semblance of life by nothing but the swords of the generals of Louis Bonaparte. Paris all truth, Versailles all lie; and that lie vented through the mouth of Thiers.

Thiers tells a deputation of the mayors of the Seine-et-Oise,—

“You may rely upon my word, which I have *never* broken!”

He tells the Assembly itself that “it was the most freely elected and most Liberal Assembly France ever possessed”; he tells his motley soldiery that it was “the admiration of the world, and the finest army France ever possessed”; he tells the provinces that the bombardment of Paris by him was a myth:

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

He again tells the provinces that

“the artillery of Versailles does not bombard Paris, but only cannonades it.”

He tells the Archbishop of Paris that the pretended executions and reprisals (!) attributed to the Versailles troops were all moonshine. He tells Paris that he was only anxious “to free it from the hideous tyrants who oppress it,” and that, in fact, the Paris of the Commune was “but a handful of criminals.”

The Paris of M. Thiers was not the real Paris of the “vile multitude,” but a phantom Paris, the Paris of the *francs-fleurs*,¹⁷⁹ the Paris of the Boulevards, male and female—the rich, the capitalist, the gilded, the idle Paris, now thronging with its lackeys, its blacklegs, its literary *bohème*, and its *cocottes* at Versailles, Saint-Denis, Rueil, and Saint-Germain; considering the civil war but an agreeable diversion, eyeing the battle going on through telescopes, counting the rounds of cannon, and swearing by their own honour and that of their prostitutes, that the performance was far better got up than it used to be at the Porte St. Martin. The men who fell were really dead; the cries of the wounded were cries in good earnest; and, besides, the whole thing was so intensely historical.

This is the Paris of M. Thiers, as the emigration of Coblenz was the France of M. de Calonne.¹⁸⁰

IV

The first attempt of the slaveholders' conspiracy to put down Paris by getting the Prussians to occupy it, was frustrated by Bismarck's refusal. The second attempt, that of the 18th of

March, ended in the rout of the army and the flight to Versailles of the Government, which ordered the whole administration to break up and follow in its track. By the semblance of peace-negotiations with Paris, Thiers found the time to prepare for war against it. But where to find an army? The remnants of the line regiments were weak in number and unsafe in character. His urgent appeal to the provinces to succour Versailles, by their National Guards and volunteers, met with a flat refusal. Brittany alone furnished a handful of *Chouans*¹⁸¹ fighting under a white flag, every one of them wearing on his breast the heart of Jesus in white cloth, and shouting "*Vive le Roi!*" (Long live the King!). Thiers was, therefore, compelled to collect, in hot haste, a motley crew, composed of sailors, marines, Pontifical Zouaves, Valentin's gendarmes, and Pietri's *sergents-de-ville* and *mouchards*. This army, however, would have been ridiculously ineffective without the instalments of imperialist war-prisoners, which Bismarck granted in numbers just sufficient to keep the civil war a-going, and keep the Versailles Government in abject dependence on Prussia. During the war itself, the Versailles police had to look after the Versailles army, while the gendarmes had to drag it on by exposing themselves at all posts of danger. The forts which fell were not taken, but bought. The heroism of the Federals convinced Thiers that the resistance of Paris was not to be broken by his own strategic genius and the bayonets at his disposal.

Meanwhile, his relations with the provinces became more and more difficult. Not one single address of approval came in to gladden Thiers and his Rurals. Quite the contrary. Deputations and addresses demanding, in a tone anything but respectful, conciliation with Paris on the basis of the unequivocal recognition of the Republic, the acknowledgement of the Communal liberties, and the dissolution of the National Assembly, whose mandate was extinct, poured in from all sides, and in such numbers that Dufaure, Thiers' Minister of Justice, in his circular of April 23 to the public prosecutors, commanded them to treat "the cry of conciliation" as a crime! In regard, however, of the hopeless prospect held out by his campaign, Thiers resolved to shift his tactics by ordering, all over the country, municipal elections to take place on the 30th of April, on the basis of the new municipal law dictated by himself to the National Assembly. What with the intrigues of his prefects; what with police intimidation, he felt quite sanguine of imparting, by the verdict of the provinces, to the National Assembly that moral power it had never possessed, and of getting at last from the provinces the physical force required for the conquest of Paris.

His banditti-warfare against Paris, exalted in his own bulletins, and the attempts of his ministers at the establishment, throughout France, of a reign of terror, Thiers was from the beginning anxious to accompany with a little by-play of conciliation, which had to serve more than one purpose. It was to dupe the provinces, to inveigle the middle-class element in Paris, and, above all, to afford the professed Republicans in the National Assembly the opportunity of hiding their treason against Paris behind their faith in Thiers. On the 21st of March, when still without an army, he had declared to the Assembly:

"Come what may, I will not send an army to Paris."

On the 27th March he rose again:

"I have found the Republic an accomplished fact, and I am firmly resolved to maintain it."

In reality, he put down the revolution at Lyons and Marseilles¹⁸² in the name of the Republic, while the roars of his Rurals drowned the very mention of its name at Versailles. After this exploit, he toned down the "accomplished fact" into an hypothetical fact. The Orleans princes, whom he had cautiously warned off Bordeaux, were now, in flagrant breach of the law, permitted to intrigue at Dreux. The concessions held out by Thiers in his interminable interviews with the delegates from Paris and the provinces, although constantly varied in tone and colour, according to time and circumstances, did in fact never come to more than the prospective restriction of revenge to the

"handful of criminals implicated in the murder of Lecomte and Clément Thomas,"

on the well-understood premise that Paris and France were unreservedly to accept M. Thiers himself as the best of possible Republics, as he, in 1830, had done with Louis Philippe. Even these concessions he not only took care to render doubtful by the official comments put upon them in the Assembly through his Ministers. He had his Dufaure to act. Dufaure, this old Orleanist lawyer, had always been the justiciary of the state of siege, as now in 1871, under Thiers, so in 1839 under Louis Philippe, and in 1849 under Louis Bonaparte's presidency. While out of office he made a fortune by pleading for the Paris capitalists, and made political capital by pleading against the laws he had himself originated. He now hurried through the National Assembly not only a set of repressive laws which were, after the fall of Paris, to extirpate the last remnants of Republican liberty in France; he foreshadowed the fate of Paris by abridging the,

for him, too slow procedure of courts-martial,¹⁸³ and by a new-fangled, Draconic code of deportation. The Revolution of 1848, abolishing the penalty of death for political crimes, has replaced it by deportation. Louis Bonaparte did not dare, at least not in theory, to re-establish the *régime* of the guillotine. The Rural Assembly, not yet bold enough even to hint that the Parisians were not rebels, but assassins, had therefore to confine its prospective vengeance against Paris to Dufaure's new code of deportation. Under all these circumstances Thiers himself could not have gone on with his comedy of conciliation, had it not, as he intended it to do, drawn forth shrieks of rage from the Rurals, whose ruminating mind did neither understand the play, nor its necessities of hypocrisy, tergiversation, and procrastination.

In sight of the impending municipal elections of the 30th April, Thiers enacted one of his great conciliation scenes on the 27th April. Amidst a flood of sentimental rhetoric, he exclaimed from the tribune of the Assembly:

"There exists no conspiracy against the Republic but that of Paris, which compels us to shed French blood. I repeat it again and again. Let those impious arms fall from the hands which hold them, and chastisement will be arrested at once by an act of peace excluding only the small number of criminals."

To the violent interruption of the Rurals he replied:

"Gentlemen, tell me, I implore you, am I wrong? Do you really regret that I could have stated the truth that the criminals are only a handful? Is it not fortunate in the midst of our misfortunes that those who have been capable to shed the blood of Clément Thomas and General Lecomte are but rare exceptions?"

France, however, turned a deaf ear to what Thiers flattered himself to be a parliamentary siren's song. Out of 700,000 municipal councillors returned by the 35,000 communes still left to France, the united Legitimists, Orleanists and Bonapartists did not carry 8,000. The supplementary elections which followed were still more decidedly hostile. Thus, instead of getting from the provinces the badly-needed physical force, the National Assembly lost even its last claim to moral force, that of being the expression of the universal suffrage of the country. To complete the discomfiture, the newly-chosen municipal councils of all the cities of France openly threatened the usurping Assembly at Versailles with a counter Assembly at Bordeaux.

Then the long-expected moment of decisive action had at last come for Bismarck. He peremptorily summoned Thiers to send

to Frankfort plenipotentiaries for the definitive settlement of peace. In humble obedience to the call of his master, Thiers hastened to despatch his trusty Jules Favre, backed by Pouyer-Quertier. Pouyer-Quertier, an "eminent" Rouen cotton-spinner, a fervent and even servile partisan of the Second Empire, had never found any fault with it save its commercial treaty with England,¹⁸⁴ prejudicial to his own shop-interest. Hardly installed at Bordeaux as Thiers' Minister of Finance, he denounced that "unholy" treaty, hinted at its near abrogation, and had even the effrontery to try, although in vain (having counted without Bismarck), the immediate enforcement of the old protective duties against Alsace, where, he said, no previous international treaties stood in the way. This man, who considered counter-revolution as a means to put down wages at Rouen, and the surrender of French provinces as a means to bring up the price of his wares in France, was he not *the one* predestined to be picked out by Thiers as the helpmate of Jules Favre in his last and crowning treason?

On the arrival at Frankfort of this exquisite pair of plenipotentiaries, bully Bismarck at once met them with the imperious alternative: Either the restoration of the Empire, or the unconditional acceptance of my own peace terms! These terms included a shortening of the intervals in which the war indemnity was to be paid and the continued occupation of the Paris forts by Prussian troops until Bismarck should feel satisfied with the state of things in France; Prussia thus being recognised as the supreme arbiter in internal French politics! In return for this he offered to let loose, for the extermination of Paris, the captive Bonapartist army, and to lend them the direct assistance of Emperor William's troops. He pledged his good faith by making payment of the first instalment of the indemnity dependent on the "pacification" of Paris. Such a bait was, of course, eagerly swallowed by Thiers and his plenipotentiaries. They signed the treaty of peace on the 10th of May, and had it endorsed by the Versailles Assembly on the 18th.

In the interval between the conclusion of peace and the arrival of the Bonapartist prisoners, Thiers felt the more bound to resume his comedy of conciliation, as his Republican tools stood in sore need of a pretext for blinking their eyes at the preparations for the carnage of Paris. As late as the 8th of May he replied to a deputation of middle-class conciliators:

"Whenever the insurgents will make up their minds for capitulation, the gates of Paris shall be flung wide open during a week for all except the murderers of Generals Clément Thomas and Lecomete."

A few days afterwards, when violently interpellated on these promises by the Rurals, he refused to enter into any explanations; not, however, without giving them this significant hint:

"I tell you there are impatient men amongst you, men who are in too great a hurry. They must have another eight days; at the end of these eight days there will be no more danger, and the task will be proportionate to their courage and to their capacities."

As soon as MacMahon was able to assure him that he could shortly enter Paris, Thiers declared to the Assembly that

"he would enter Paris with the *laws* in his hands, and demand a full expiation from the wretches who had sacrificed the lives of soldiers and destroyed public monuments."

As the moment of decision drew near he said—to the Assembly, "I shall be pitiless!"—to Paris, that it was doomed; and to his Bonapartist banditti, that they had State licence to wreak vengeance upon Paris to their hearts' content. At last, when treachery had opened the gates of Paris to General Douay, on the 21st of May, Thiers, on the 22nd, revealed to the Rurals the "goal" of his conciliation comedy, which they had so obstinately persisted in not understanding.

"I told you a few days ago that we were approaching *our goal*; today I come to tell you *the goal* is reached. The victory of order, justice and civilisation is at last won!"

So it was. The civilisation and justice of bourgeois order comes out in its lurid light whenever the slaves and drudges of that order rise against their masters. Then this civilisation and justice stand forth as undisguised savagery and lawless revenge. Each new crisis in the class struggle between the appropriator and the producer brings out this fact more glaringly. Even the atrocities of the bourgeois in June, 1848, vanish before the infamable infamy of 1871. The self-sacrificing heroism with which the population of Paris—men, women and children—fought for eight days after the entrance of the Versailles, reflects as much the grandeur of their cause, as the infernal deeds of the soldiery reflect the innate spirit of that civilisation of which they are the mercenary vindicators. A glorious civilisation, indeed, the great problem of which is how to get rid of the heaps of corpses it made after the battle was over!

To find a parallel for the conduct of Thiers and his bloodhounds we must go back to the times of Sulla and the two Triumvirates¹⁸⁵ of Rome. The same wholesale slaughter in cold blood; the same disregard, in massacre, of age and sex; the

same system of torturing prisoners; the same proscriptions, but this time of a whole class; the same savage hunt after concealed leaders, lest one might escape; the same denunciations of political and private enemies; the same indifference for the butchery of entire strangers to the feud. There is but this difference, that the Romans had no *mitrailleuses* for the despatch, in the lump, of the proscribed, and that they had not "the law in their hands," nor on their lips the cry of "civilisation."

And after those horrors, look upon the other, still more hideous, face of that bourgeois civilisation as described by its own press!

"With stray shots," writes the Paris correspondent of a London Tory paper, "still ringing in the distance, and untended wounded wretches dying amid the tombstones of Père Lachaise—with 6,000 terror-stricken insurgents wandering in an agony of despair in the labyrinth of the catacombs, and wretches hurried through the streets to be shot down in scores by the *mitrailleuse*—it is revolting to see the *cafés* filled with the votaries of absinthe, billiards, and dominoes; female profligacy perambulating the boulevards, and the sound of revelry disturbing the night from the *cabinets particuliers* of fashionable restaurants."

M. Edouard Hervé writes in the *Journal de Paris*,¹⁸⁶ a Versailles journal suppressed by the Commune:

"The way in which the population of Paris (!) manifested its satisfaction yesterday was rather more than frivolous, and we fear it will grow worse as time progresses. Paris has now a *fête* day appearance, which is sadly out of place; and, unless we are to be called the *Parisiens de la décadence*, this sort of thing must come to an end."

And then he quotes the passage from Tacitus:

"Yet, on the morrow of that horrible struggle, even before it was completely over, Rome—degraded and corrupt—began once more to wallow in the voluptuous slough which was destroying its body and polluting its soul—*alibi proelia et vulnere; alibi balnea popinaeque* (here fights and wounds, there baths and restaurants)."

M. Hervé only forgets to say that the "population of Paris" he speaks of is but the population of the Paris of M. Thiers—the *francs-fleurs* returning in throngs from Versailles, Saint-Denis, Rueil and Saint-Germain—the Paris of the "Decline."

In all its bloody triumphs over the self-sacrificing champions of a new and better society, that nefarious civilisation, based upon the enslavement of labour, drowns the moans of its victims in a hue-and-cry of calumny, reverberated by a world-wide echo. The serene working men's Paris of the Commune is suddenly changed into a pandemonium by the bloodhounds of "order." And what does this tremendous change prove to the bourgeois

mind of all countries? Why, that the Commune has conspired against civilisation! The Paris people die enthusiastically for the Commune in numbers unequalled in any battle known to history. What does that prove? Why, that the Commune was not the people's own government but the usurpation of a handful of criminals! The women of Paris joyfully give up their lives at the barricades and on the place of execution. What does this prove? Why, that the demon of the Commune has changed them into Megaeras and Hecates! The moderation of the Commune during two months of undisputed sway is equalled only by the heroism of its defence. What does that prove? Why, that for months the Commune carefully hid, under a mask of moderation and humanity, the blood-thirstiness of its fiendish instincts, to be let loose in the hour of its agony!

The working men's Paris, in the act of its heroic self-holocaust, involved in its flames buildings and monuments. While tearing to pieces the living body of the proletariat, its rulers must no longer expect to return triumphantly into the intact architecture of their abodes. The Government of Versailles cries, "Incendiarism!" and whispers this cue to all its agents, down to the remotest hamlet, to hunt up its enemies everywhere as suspect of professional incendiarism. The bourgeoisie of the whole world, which looks complacently upon the wholesale massacre after the battle, is convulsed by horror at the desecration of brick and mortar!

When governments give state-licences to their navies to "kill, burn and destroy," is that a licence for incendiarism? When the British troops wantonly set fire to the Capitol at Washington and to the summer palace of the Chinese Emperor,¹⁸⁷ was that incendiarism? When the Prussians, not for military reasons, but out of the mere spite of revenge, burned down, by the help of petroleum, towns like Châteaudun and innumerable villages, was that incendiarism? When Thiers, during six weeks, bombarded Paris, under the pretext that he wanted to set fire to those houses only in which there were people, was that incendiarism?—In war, fire is an arm as legitimate as any. Buildings held by the enemy are shelled to set them on fire. If their defenders have to retire, they themselves light the flames to prevent the attack from making use of the buildings. To be burnt down has always been the inevitable fate of all buildings situated in the front of battle of all the regular armies of the world. But in the war of the enslaved against their enslavers, the only justifiable war in history, this is by no means to hold good! The Commune used fire strictly as a means of defence. They used it to stop up to the Versailles troops those long, straight avenues

which Haussmann had expressly opened to artillery-fire; they used it to cover their retreat, in the same way as the Versailles, in their advance, used their shells which destroyed at least as many buildings as the fire of the Commune. It is a matter of dispute, even now, which buildings were set fire to by the defence, and which by the attack. And the defence resorted to fire only then, when the Versailles troops had already commenced their wholesale murdering of prisoners.—Besides, the Commune had, long before, given full public notice that, if driven to extremities, they would bury themselves under the ruins of Paris, and make Paris a second Moscow, as the Government of Defence, but only as a cloak for its treason, had promised to do. For this purpose Trochu had found them the petroleum. The Commune knew that its opponents cared nothing for the lives of the Paris people, but cared much for their own Paris buildings. And Thiers, on the other hand, had given them notice that he would be implacable in his vengeance. No sooner had he got his army ready on one side, and the Prussians shutting up the trap on the other, than he proclaimed: "I shall be pitiless! The expiation will be complete, and justice will be stern!" If the acts of the Paris working men were vandalism, it was the vandalism of defence in despair, not the vandalism of triumph, like that which the Christians perpetrated upon the really priceless art treasures of heathen antiquity; and even that vandalism has been justified by the historian as an unavoidable and comparatively trifling concomitant to the titanic struggle between a new society arising and an old one breaking down. It was still less the vandalism of Haussmann, razing historic Paris to make place for the Paris of the sightseer!

But the execution by the Commune of the sixty-four hostages, with the Archbishop of Paris at their head! The bourgeoisie and its army in June, 1848, re-established a custom which had long disappeared from the practice of war—the shooting of their defenceless prisoners. This brutal custom has since been more or less strictly adhered to by the suppressors of all popular commotions in Europe and India; thus proving that it constitutes a real "progress of civilisation!" On the other hand, the Prussians, in France, had re-established the practice of taking hostages—innocent men, who, with their lives, were to answer to them for the acts of others. When Thiers, as we have seen, from the very beginning of the conflict, enforced the humane practice of shooting down the Communal prisoners, the Commune, to protect their lives, was obliged to resort to the Prussian practice of securing hostages. The lives of the hostages had been forfeited over and over again by the continued shooting of prisoners on

the part of the Versaillese. How could they be spared any longer after the carnage with which MacMahon's praetorians¹⁸⁸ celebrated their entrance into Paris? Was even the last check upon the unscrupulous ferocity of bourgeois governments—the taking of hostages—to be made a mere sham of? The real murderer of Archbishop Darboy is Thiers. The Commune again and again had offered to exchange the archbishop, and ever so many priests in the bargain; against the single Blanqui, then in the hands of Thiers. Thiers obstinately refused. He knew that with Blanqui he would give to the Commune a head; while the archbishop would serve his purpose best in the shape of a corpse. Thiers acted upon the precedent of Cavaignac. How, in June 1848, did not Cavaignac and his men of order raise shouts of horror by stigmatising the insurgents as the assassins of Archbishop Affre! They knew perfectly well that the archbishop had been shot by the soldiers of order.¹⁴⁹ M. Jacquemet, the archbishop's vicar-general, present on the spot, had immediately afterwards handed them in his evidence to that effect.

All this chorus of calumny, which the Party of Order never fail, in their orgies of blood, to raise against their victims, only proves that the bourgeois of our days considers himself the legitimate successor to the baron of old, who thought every weapon in his own hand fair against the plebeian, while in the hands of the plebeian a weapon of any kind constituted in itself a crime.

The conspiracy of the ruling class to break down the Revolution by a civil war carried on under the patronage of the foreign invader—a conspiracy which we have traced from the very 4th of September down to the entrance of MacMahon's praetorians through the gate of St. Cloud—culminated in the carnage of Paris. Bismarck gloats over the ruins of Paris, in which he saw perhaps the first instalment of that general destruction of great cities he had prayed for when still a simple Rural in the Prussian *Chambre introuvable* of 1849.¹⁸⁹ He gloats over the cadavers of the Paris proletariat. For him this is not only the extermination of revolution, but the extinction of France, now decapitated in reality, and by the French Government itself. With the shallowness characteristic of all successful statesmen, he sees but the surface of this tremendous historic event. Whenever before has history exhibited the spectacle of a conqueror crowning his victory by turning into, not only the gendarme, but the hired bravo of the conquered Government? There existed no war between Prussia and the Commune of Paris. On the contrary, the Commune had accepted the peace preliminaries, and Prussia had announced her neutrality. Prussia was, therefore, no bel-

ligerent. She acted the part of a bravo, a cowardly bravo, because incurring no danger; a hired bravo, because stipulating beforehand the payment of her blood-money of 500 millions on the fall of Paris. And thus, at last, came out the true character of the war, ordained by Providence as a chastisement of godless and debauched France by pious and moral Germany! And this unparalleled breach of the law of nations, even as understood by the old-world lawyers, instead of arousing the "civilised" Governments of Europe to declare the felonious Prussian Government, the mere tool of the St. Petersburg Cabinet, an outlaw amongst nations, only incites them to consider whether the few victims who escape the double cordon around Paris are not to be given up to the hangman at Versailles!

That after the most tremendous war of modern times, the conquering and the conquered hosts should fraternise for the common massacre of the proletariat—this unparalleled event does indicate, not, as Bismarck thinks, the final repression of a new society upheaving, but the crumbling into dust of bourgeois society. The highest heroic effort of which old society is still capable is national war; and this is now proved to be a mere governmental humbug, intended to defer the struggle of classes, and to be thrown aside as soon as that class struggle bursts out into civil war. Class rule is no longer able to disguise itself in a national uniform; the national Governments are *one* as against the proletariat!

After Whit-Sunday, 1871, there can be neither peace nor truce possible between the working men of France and the appropriators of their produce. The iron hand of a mercenary soldiery may keep for a time both classes tied down in common oppression. But the battle must break out again and again in ever-growing dimensions, and there can be no doubt as to who will be the victor in the end,—the appropriating few, or the immense working majority. And the French working class is only the advanced guard of the modern proletariat.

While the European governments thus testify, before Paris, to the international character of class-rule, they cry down the International Working Men's Association—the international counter-organisation of labour against the cosmopolitan conspiracy of capital—as the head fountain of all these disasters. Thiers denounced it as the despot of labour, pretending to be its liberator. Picard ordered that all communications between the French Internationals and those abroad should be cut off; Count Jaubert, Thiers' mummified accomplice of 1835, declares it the great problem of all civilised governments to weed it out. The Rùrals roar against it, and the whole European press joins the chorus. An

honourable French writer,* completely foreign to our Association, speaks as follows:—

“The members of the Central Committee of the National Guard, as well as the greater part of the members of the Commune, are the most active, intelligent, and energetic minds of the International Working Men’s Association; . . . men who are thoroughly honest, sincere, intelligent, devoted, pure, and fanatical in the *good* sense of the word.”

The police-tinged bourgeois mind naturally figures to itself the International Working Men’s Association as acting in the manner of a secret conspiracy, its central body ordering, from time to time, explosions in different countries. Our Association is, in fact, nothing but the international bond between the most advanced working men in the various countries of the civilised world. Wherever, in whatever shape, and under whatever conditions the class struggle obtains any consistency, it is but natural that members of our Association should stand in the foreground. The soil out of which it grows is modern society itself. It cannot be stamped out by any amount of carnage. To stamp it out, the Governments would have to stamp out the despotism of capital over labour—the condition of their own parasitical existence.

Working men’s Paris, with its Commune, will be for ever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them.

256, High Holborn, London,
Western Central, May 30, 1871

NOTES

I

“The column of prisoners halted in the Avenue Uhrich, and was drawn up, four or five deep, on the footway facing to the road. General Marquis de Galliffet and his staff dismounted and commenced an inspection from the left of the line. Walking down slowly and eyeing the ranks, the General stopped here and there, tapping a man on the shoulder or beckoning him out of the rear ranks. In most cases, without further parley, the individual thus selected was marched out into the centre of the road, where a small supplementary column was, thus, soon formed. . . . It was evident that there was considerable room for error. A mounted officer pointed out to General Galliffet a man and woman for some particular offence. The woman, rushing out of the ranks, threw herself on her knees, and, with outstretched arms,

* Evidently Robinet.—*Ed.*

protested her innocence in passionate terms. The General waited for a pause, and then with most impassible face and unmoved demeanour, said, 'Madame, I have visited every theatre in Paris, your acting will have no effect on me' (*'ce n'est pas la peine de jouer la comédie'*)... It was not a good thing on that day to be noticeably taller, dirtier, cleaner, older, or uglier than one's neighbours. One individual in particular struck me as probably owing his speedy release from the ills of this world to his having a broken nose... Over a hundred being thus chosen, a firing party told off, and the column resumed its march, leaving them behind. A few minutes afterwards a dropping fire in our rear commenced, and continued for over a quarter of an hour. It was the execution of these summarily-convicted wretches."—*Paris Correspondent Daily News*,¹⁹⁰ June 8th.

—This Galliffet, "the kept man of his wife, so notorious for her shameless exhibitions at the orgies of the Second Empire," went, during the war, by the name of the French "Ensign Pistol."

"The *Temps*¹⁹¹ which is a careful journal, and not given to sensation, tells a dreadful story of people imperfectly shot and buried before life was extinct. A great number were buried in the square round St. Jacques-la Bouchière; some of them very superficially. In the daytime the roar of the busy streets prevented any notice being taken; but in the stillness of the night the inhabitants of the houses in the neighbourhood were roused by distant moans, and in the morning a clenched hand was seen protruding through the soil. In consequence of this, exhumations were ordered to take place... That many wounded have been buried alive I have not the slightest doubt. One case I can vouch for. When Brunel was shot with his mistress on the 24th ult. in the courtyard of a house in the Place Vendôme, the bodies lay there until the afternoon of the 27th. When the burial party came to remove the corpses, they found the woman living still and took her to an ambulance. Though she had received four bullets she is now out of danger."—*Paris Correspondent Evening Standard*,¹⁹² June 8th.

II

The following letter¹⁹³ appeared in the [London] *Times* of June 13th:

"To the Editor of the *Times*:

"Sir,—On June 6, 1871, M. Jules Favre issued a circular to all the European Powers, calling upon them to hunt down the International Working Men's Association. A few remarks will suffice to characterise that document.

"In the very preamble of our statutes it is stated that the International was founded 'September 28, 1864, at a public meeting held at St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre, London.' For purposes of his own Jules Favre puts back the date of its origin behind 1862.

"In order to explain our principles, he professes to quote 'their (the International's) sheet of the 25th of March, 1869.' And then what does he quote? The sheet of a society which is not

the International. This sort of manoeuvre he already recurred to when, still a comparatively young lawyer, he had to defend the *National* newspaper, prosecuted for libel by Cabet. Then he pretended to read extracts from Cabet's pamphlets while reading interpolations of his own—a trick exposed while the Court was sitting, and which, but for the indulgence of Cabet, would have been punished by Jules Favre's expulsion from the Paris bar. Of all the documents quoted by him as documents of the International, not one belongs to the International. He says, for instance:

"The Alliance declares itself Atheist, says the General Council, constituted in London in July 1869."

"The General Council never issued such a document. On the contrary, it issued a document* which quashed the original statutes of the 'Alliance'—L'Alliance de la Démocratie Socialiste at Geneva—quoted by Jules Favre.

"Throughout his circular, which pretends in part also to be directed against the Empire, Jules Favre repeats against the International but the police inventions of the public prosecutors of the Empire, which broke down miserably even before the law courts of that Empire.

"It is known that in its two addresses (of July and September last) on the late war,** the General Council of the International denounced the Prussian plans of conquest against France. Later on, Mr. Reitlinger, Jules Favre's private secretary, applied, though of course in vain, to some members of the General Council for getting up by the Council a demonstration against Bismarck, in favour of the Government of National Defence; they were particularly requested not to mention the republic. The preparations for a demonstration with regard to the expected arrival of Jules Favre in London were made—certainly with the best of intentions—in spite of the General Council, which, in its address of the 9th of September, had distinctly forewarned the Paris workmen against Jules Favre and his colleagues.

"What would Jules Favre say if, in its turn, the International were to send a circular on Jules Favre to all the Cabinets of Europe, drawing their particular attention to the documents published at Paris by the late M. Millière?

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"John Hales,

* See K. Marx, "The International Working Men's Association and the Alliance of Socialist Democracy"—Ed.

** See pp. 190-94 and 195-201 of this volume.—Ed.

"Secretary to the General Council of the International Working Men's Association."

256, High Holborn, London,
Western Central, June 12

In an article on "The International Society and its aims," that pious informer, the London *Spectator*¹⁰⁹ (June 24th), amongst other similar tricks, quotes, even more fully than Jules Favre has done, the above document of the "Alliance" as the work of the International, and that eleven days after the refutation had been published in the *Times*. We do not wonder at this. Frederick the Great used to say that of all Jesuits the worst are the Protestant ones.

Written by Marx in April-
May 1871

Published as a pamphlet
in London in mid-June 1871
and in several countries
of Europe and the United
States in 1871-72

Printed according to the third
English edition of 1871,
checked with the text
of the German editions
of 1871 and 1891

FREDERICK ENGELS

APROPOS OF WORKING-CLASS POLITICAL ACTION

REPORTER'S RECORD OF THE
SPEECH MADE AT THE LONDON CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
SEPTEMBER 21, 1871¹⁵⁴

Complete abstention from political action is impossible. The abstentionist press participates in politics every day. It is only a question of how one does it, and of what politics one engages in. For the rest, to us abstention is impossible. The working-class party functions as a political party in most countries by now, and it is not for us to ruin it by preaching abstention. Living experience, the political oppression of the existing governments compels the workers to occupy themselves with politics whether they like it or not, be it for political or for social goals. To preach abstention to them is to throw them into the embrace of bourgeois politics. The morning after the Paris Commune, which has made proletarian political action an order of the day, abstention is entirely out of the question.

We want the abolition of classes. What is the means of achieving it? The only means is political domination of the proletariat. For all this, now that it is acknowledged by one and all, we are told not to meddle with politics. The abstentionists say they are revolutionaries, even revolutionaries *par excellence*. Yet revolution is a supreme political act and those who want revolution must also want the means of achieving it, that is, political action, which prepares the ground for revolution and provides the workers with the revolutionary training without which they are sure to become the dupes of the Favres and Pyats the morning after the battle. However, our politics must be working-class politics. The workers' party must never be the tagtail of any bourgeois party; it must be independent and have its goal and its own policy.

The political freedoms, the right of assembly and association, and the freedom of the press—those are our weapons. Are we to sit back and abstain while somebody tries to rob us of them?

It is said that a political act on our part implies that we accept the existing state of affairs. On the contrary, so long as this state of affairs offers us the means of protesting against it, our use of these means does not signify that we recognise the prevailing order.

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

Printed according to
the manuscript

Translated from the French

KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

FICTITIOUS SPLITS IN THE INTERNATIONAL

PRIVATE CIRCULAR FROM THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE
INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION¹⁸⁶

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 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

* International Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—Ed.

** See pp. 20-44 of this volume.—Ed.

the leading English newspapers, which the Address forced to engage in the polemic kept going by the General Council's replies.

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. 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,¹⁹⁶ 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.

Along with all these preoccupations, the Council had to prepare for the Conference of Delegates that it had just called.¹⁹⁷

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.⁹⁹ 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. 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. The Franco-Prussian war

* Karl Marx, "Confidential Communication to All Sections."—*Ed.*

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 Conference³⁹ 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 Assembly¹⁵³ a law banning the International,¹⁹⁸ 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 Portugal¹⁹⁹; 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. The Americans, though they sent the Conference a detailed Memorandum on the situation of the International there, 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 England²⁰⁰; 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** as containing such dangerous designs—the *Times*¹⁶⁵ 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 sections²⁰¹ 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, conceived out of his long experience.²⁰² 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.²⁰³ 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 1868²⁰⁴ 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,

* See pp. 19-21 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** See pp. 245-46 of this volume.—*Ed.*

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.*"²⁰⁵ 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:

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,²⁰⁶ Lausanne²⁰⁷ 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:

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 ten-*

gency 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, according 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 social-

ism. 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*,²⁰⁹ then in the Geneva *Égalité*,¹⁰⁸ 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** 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 repiies 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

* An extract from the Nechayev trial²⁰⁸ will be published shortly. 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*.

** See Karl Marx, "The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland."—*Ed.*

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 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*²¹⁰ (Paris paper) to denounce, in its turn, the General Council. Which makes it akin to a League of Public Welfare.²¹¹

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*²¹² 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,"²¹³ 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 Richard 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. 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.¹⁰⁰ 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. In England, the General Council organised meetings which condemned the pro-Prussian tendencies of the court. In Germany, the International workers organised demonstrations

* See pp. 195-201 of this volume.—Ed.

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*,²¹⁴ 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.

Then came the Lyons uprising.²¹⁵ 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 1871.¹⁹⁴

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. 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, 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.²¹⁶ 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).

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 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."²¹⁸ 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*

* 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 book²¹⁷ 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 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!

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*²¹⁹ 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."

From its very first issue, the newspaper hastened to put itself on the same level as the *Figaro*, *Gaulois*, *Paris-Journal*²²⁰ 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.

* 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.

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 "proletarians," 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

* See pp. 19-21 of this volume.—Ed.

was an anti-revolutionary society. The arrest of French members of the International on the eve of the plebiscite,¹²⁵ 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*¹²⁸ and *Réveil*¹²⁷ 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. 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. 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 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,

* A little later, this Chautard whom they had wanted to put on the General Council was expelled from the section as an agent of 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.

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 fictitious. . . . 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 Gen-

* Karl Marx, "Draft Resolution of the General Council on the French Section of 1871."—*Ed.*

eral 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.

The "1871 section," far from being satisfied with this reply, published on December 14 a "declaration" 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.²²¹ 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!*, *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 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").

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

* Nikolai Utin.—*Ed.*

** Auguste Serrailhier.—*Ed.*

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.)

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 *maître* 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.

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 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.—The Conference had resolved that “the Conference resolutions which are

* This refers to Marx.—Ed.

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 *Progress* 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."

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 (*Egalité*, 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*,²²² 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 be-

tween 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 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."

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 Chartists²²³ 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 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 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,*"

* 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.²²⁴ The phraseology of these sectarians, whose radicalism is wholly restricted to verbiage, is extremely useful for promoting the aims of the reactionaries.

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 nonetheless 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 Rules²²⁵ 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 recognised 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 own 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. 13²²⁶).

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.²²⁷ It joined the International and began by passing a resolution in favour of the Jura people. Its newspaper, *Il Proletario*, is filled with outbursts

* Austria.—Ed.

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*,"

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).

Lastly, the Basle Congress, which provokes the bilious wrath of the Sixteen, occupied itself solely with regulating the administrative relations engendered by the Association's continuing

* Carlo Terzaghi.—*Ed.*

** 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.

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 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*.”*

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 just published the original text of that project in his report on the International’s organisation (see *Almanach du Peuple pour 1872, Genève*).

* 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 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.

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 Courtelary* 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 traditional 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 francs²²⁸; and, lastly, by the Bismarck socialists in Germany, who, apart from their police mouthpiece, the *Neuer Social-Demokrat*,²²⁹ played the role of "white shirts"²³⁰ 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.

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";

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,

* 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."

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 hierophant,* 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 "setting 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

* Mikhail Bakunin.—*Ed.*

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.*

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*)

Printed according to the
pamphlet
Translated from the French

* 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 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."

KARL MARX

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MEETING HELD TO CELEBRATE THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PARIS COMMUNE²³¹

[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

KARL MARX

THE NATIONALISATION OF THE LAND²³²

The property in the soil is the original source of all wealth, and has become the great problem upon the solution of which depends the future of the working class.

I do not intend discussing here all the arguments put forward by the advocates of private property in land, by jurists, philosophers and political economists, but shall confine myself firstly to state that they have tried hard to disguise the primitive fact of conquest under the cloak of "*Natural Right*." If conquest constituted a natural right on the part of the few, the many have only to gather sufficient strength in order to acquire the natural right of reconquering what has been taken from them.

In the progress of history the conquerors found it convenient to give to their original titles, derived from brute force, a sort of social standing through the instrumentality of laws imposed by themselves.

At last comes the philosopher and demonstrates that those laws imply and express the universal consent of mankind. If private property in land be indeed founded upon such an universal consent, it will evidently become extinct from the moment the majority of a society dissent from warranting it.

However, leaving aside the so-called "rights" of property, I assert that the economical development of society, the increase and concentration of people, the very circumstances that compel the capitalist farmer to apply to agriculture collective and organised labour, and to have recourse to machinery and similar contrivances, will more and more render the nationalisation of land a "*Social Necessity*," against which no amount of talk about the rights of property can be of any avail. The imperative wants of society will and must be satisfied, changes dictated by social necessity will work their own way, and sooner or later adopt legislation to their interests.

What we require is a daily increasing production and its exigencies cannot be met by allowing a few individuals to regulate it according to their whims and private interests, or to ignorantly exhaust the powers of the soil. All modern methods, such as

irrigation, drainage, steam ploughing, chemical treatment and so forth ought to be applied to agriculture at large. But the scientific knowledge we possess, and the technical means of agriculture we command, such as machinery, etc., can never be successfully applied but by cultivating the land on a large scale.

If cultivation on a large scale proves (even under its present capitalist form, that degrades the cultivator himself to a mere beast of burden) so superior, from an economical point of view, to small and piecemeal husbandry, would it not give an increased impulse to production if applied on national dimensions?

The ever-growing wants of the people on the one side, the ever-increasing price of agricultural produce on the other, afford the irrefutable evidence that the nationalisation of land has become a social necessity.

Such a diminution of agricultural produce as springs from individual abuse, will, of course, become impossible whenever cultivation is carried on under the control and for the benefit of the nation.

All the citizens I have heard here today during the progress of the debate, on this question, defended the nationalisation of land, but they took very different views of it.

France was frequently alluded to, but with its *peasant proprietorship* it is farther off the nationalisation of land than England with its landlordism. In France, it is true, the soil is accessible to all who can buy it, but this very facility has brought about a division into small plots cultivated by men with small means and mainly relying upon the land by exertions of themselves and their families. This form of landed property and the piecemeal cultivation it necessitates, while excluding all appliances of modern agricultural improvements, converts the tiller himself into the most decided enemy to social progress and, above all, the nationalisation of land. Enchained to the soil upon which he has to spend all his vital energies in order to get a relatively small return, having to give away the greater part of his produce to the state, in the form of taxes, to the law tribe in the form of judiciary costs, and to the usurer in the form of interest, utterly ignorant of the social movements outside his petty field of employment; still he clings with fanatic fondness to his bit of land and his merely nominal proprietorship in the same. In this way the French peasant has been thrown into a most fatal antagonism to the industrial working class.

Peasant proprietorship being then the greatest obstacle to the nationalisation of land, France, in its present state, is certainly not the place where we must look to for a solution of this great problem.

To nationalise the land, in order to let it out in small plots to individuals or working men's societies, would, under a middle-class government, only engender a reckless competition among themselves and thus result in a progressive increase of "Rent" which, in its turn, would afford new facilities to the appropriators of feeding upon the producers.

At the International Congress of Brussels, in 1868,²⁰⁴ one of our friends* said:

"Small private property in land is doomed by the verdict of science, large land property by that of justice. There remains then but one alternative. The soil must become the property of rural associations or the property of the whole nation. The future will decide that question."

I say on the contrary; the social movement will lead to this decision that the land can but be owned by the nation itself. To give up the soil to the hands of associated rural labourers, would be to surrender society to one exclusive class of producers.

The nationalisation of land will work a complete change in the relations between labour and capital, and finally, do away with the capitalist form of production, whether industrial or rural. Then class distinctions and privileges will disappear together with the economical basis upon which they rest. To live on other people's labour will become a thing of the past. There will be no longer any government or state power, distinct from society itself! Agriculture, mining, manufacture, in one word, all branches of production, will gradually be organised in the most adequate manner. *National centralisation of the means of production* will become the national basis of a society composed of associations of free and equal producers, carrying on the social business on a common and rational plan. Such is the humanitarian goal to which the great economic movement of the 19th century is tending.

Written by Marx in
March-April 1872

Published in the newspaper
The International Herald
No. 11, June 15, 1872

Published according to
the newspaper text, checked
with the manuscript

* César De Paepe.—Ed.

KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

FROM THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL CONGRESS HELD IN THE HAGUE

SEPTEMBER 2-7, 1872²³

I

RESOLUTION ON THE RULES

That the following article summing up the content of Resolution IX of the London Conference (September 1871)¹⁹⁴ be included in the Rules after Article 7.

Article 7a. In its struggle against the collective power of the possessing classes the proletariat can act as a class only by constituting itself a distinct political party, opposed to all the old parties formed by the possessing classes.

This constitution of the proletariat into a political party is indispensable to ensure the triumph of the social revolution and of its ultimate goal: the abolition of classes.

The coalition of the forces of the working class, already achieved by the economic struggle, must also serve, in the hands of this class, as a lever in its struggle against the political power of its exploiters.

As the lords of the land and of capital always make use of their political privileges to defend and perpetuate their economic monopolies and to enslave labour, the conquest of political power becomes the great duty of the proletariat.

Adopted by 29 votes against 5; 8 abstaining. . . .

Drawn up by Marx and Engels

Published as a pamphlet:

*Résolutions du congrès
général tenu à la Haye
du 2 au 7 septembre 1872;*

Londres, 1872, and in the
newspapers *La Emancipacion*

No. 72, November 2, 1872, and

The International Herald

No. 37, December 14, 1872

Printed according to the
pamphlet text, checked with
Engels's manuscript

Translated from the French

KARL MARX

THE HAGUE CONGRESS

REPORTER'S RECORD OF THE SPEECH MADE AT THE MEETING
HELD IN AMSTERDAM ON SEPTEMBER 8, 1872²⁴

In the eighteenth century, he said, kings and potentates used to meet at The Hague to discuss the interests of their Houses.

That was where we wanted to hold the assizes of labour, despite the fears that people sought to inspire us with. It is in the midst of the most reactionary population that we wanted to assert the existence of our great Association, and its expansion and its hopes for the future.

It was said, upon hearing of our decision, that we had sent emissaries to clear the ground. We do not deny that we have emissaries everywhere; but most of them are unknown to us. Our emissaries at The Hague were those workers whose toil is so back-breaking, just as in Amsterdam they are also workers—from among those who work sixteen hours a day. *Those* are our emissaries, nor have we any others. And in all countries where we appear, we find them willing to give us a sympathetic welcome, for they realise very soon that it is improvement of their lot that we seek.

The Hague Congress did three principal things:

It proclaimed the necessity for the working classes to fight, in the political as well as the social sphere, against the old society, a society which is collapsing; and we are happy to see that the resolution of the London Conference¹⁹⁴ is from now on included in our Rules.* A group had formed in our midst advocating the workers' abstention from politics.

We have thought it important to point out how very dangerous and baneful to our cause we considered these principles to be.

The worker will some day have to win political supremacy in order to organise labour along new lines; he will have to defeat the old policy supporting old institutions, under penalty—as in the case of the ancient Christians, who neglected and scorned it—of never seeing their kingdom on earth.

But we have by no means affirmed that this goal would be achieved by identical means.

* See p. 291 of this volume.—Ed.

We know of the allowances we must make for the institutions, customs and traditions of the various countries; and we do not deny that there are countries such as America, England, and I would add Holland if I knew your institutions better, where the working people may achieve their goal by peaceful means. If that is true, we must also recognise that in most of the continental countries it is force that will have to be the lever of our revolutions; it is force that we shall some day have to resort to in order to establish a reign of labour.

The Hague Congress has vested the General Council with new and greater powers. Indeed, at a time when kings are gathered together in Berlin,²³⁵ where new and harsher measures of repression are to be adopted against us as a result of that meeting of powerful representatives of the feudal system and past times, and when persecution is being set on foot, the Hague Congress has deemed it wise and necessary to increase the powers of its General Council and to centralise, for the struggle that is about to begin, an action which isolation would render powerless. Besides, whom but our enemies could the authority of the General Council make suspicious? Has it, then, a bureaucracy and an armed police force to impose its will? Is not its authority purely moral, and does it not submit all its decisions to the federations which are entrusted with carrying them out? Under these conditions, kings without army, police and magistracy would be but feeble obstacles to the march of the revolution, were they ever reduced to maintaining their power through moral influence and authority.

Lastly, the Hague Congress has transferred the seat of the General Council to New York. Many people, even among our friends, seem to be surprised by that decision. Are they forgetting, then, that America is becoming a world chiefly of working people, that half a million persons—working people—emigrate to that continent every year, and that the International must take strong root in soil dominated by the working man? And then, the decision of the Congress authorises the General Council to co-opt such members as it may find necessary and useful for the good of the common cause. Let us hope that it will be wise enough to choose people who will be equal to their task and will be able to bear firmly the banner of our Association in Europe.

Citizens, let us think of the fundamental principle of the International, solidarity! It is by establishing this vivifying principle on a strong basis, among all the working people of all countries, that we shall achieve the great goal we have set ourselves. The revolution needs solidarity, and we have a great example of it

in the Paris Commune, which fell because a great revolutionary movement corresponding to that supreme rising of the Paris proletariat did not arise in all centres, in Berlin, Madrid and elsewhere.

As far as I am concerned, I shall continue my effort, and shall work steadily to establish for the future this fruitful solidarity among all working people. I am not withdrawing from the International at all, and the rest of my life will be devoted, as have been my past efforts, to the triumph of the social ideas which some day—you may rest assured of it—will lead to the world-wide victory of the proletariat.

Published in the newspapers
La Liberté No. 37, September
15, 1872 and *Der Volksstaat*
No. 79, October 2, 1872

Printed according to the
Liberté text, checked
with the text in *Der Volksstaat*
Translated from the French

FREDERICK ENGELS

THE HOUSING QUESTION²³⁶

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The following work is a reprint of three articles which I wrote in 1872 for the Leipzig *Volksstaat*.⁵¹ Just at that time the French milliards came pouring down on Germany¹²¹: public debts were paid off, fortresses and barracks built, stocks of weapons and war material renewed; the available capital no less than the volume of money in circulation was suddenly enormously increased, and all this just at a time when Germany was entering the world arena not only as a "united empire," but also as a great industrial country. These milliards gave its young large-scale industry a powerful impetus, and it was they above all that were responsible for the short period of prosperity, so rich in illusions, which followed on the war, and for the great crash which came immediately afterwards, in 1873-74, by which Germany proved itself to be an industrial country capable of holding its own on the world market.

The period in which a country with an old culture makes such a transition from manufacture and small-scale production to large-scale industry, a transition which is, moreover, accelerated by such favourable circumstances, is at the same time predominantly a period of "housing shortage." On the one hand, masses of rural workers are suddenly drawn into the big towns, which develop into industrial centres; on the other hand, the building arrangement of these old towns does not any longer conform to the conditions of the new large-scale industry and the corresponding traffic; streets are widened and new ones cut through, and railways are run right across them. At the very time when workers are streaming into the towns in masses, workers' dwellings are pulled down on a large scale. Hence the sudden housing shortage for the workers and for the small traders and small manufacturing businesses, which depend for their custom on the workers. In towns which grew up from the very beginning as industrial centres this housing shortage is as good as unknown; for instance, Manchester, Leeds, Bradford, Barmen-Elberfeld. On the other hand, in London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, the shortage

took on acute forms at the time, and has, for the most part, continued to exist in a chronic form.

It was therefore just this acute housing shortage, this symptom of the industrial revolution taking place in Germany, which filled the press of the day with tractates on the "housing question" and gave rise to all sorts of social quackery. A series of such articles found their way also into the *Volksstaat*. The anonymous author, who revealed himself later on as A. Mülberger M. D. of Württemberg, considered the opportunity a favourable one for enlightening the German workers, by means of this question, on the miraculous effects of Proudhon's social panacea.²³⁷ When I expressed my astonishment to the editors at the acceptance of these peculiar articles, I was challenged to answer them, and this I did. (See Part One: How Proudhon Solves the Housing Question.) This series of articles was soon followed by a second series, in which I examined the philanthropic bourgeois view of the question, on the basis of a work by Dr. Emil Sax.²³⁸ (See Part Two: How the Bourgeoisie Solves the Housing Question.) After a rather long pause Dr. Mülberger did me the honour of replying to my articles,²³⁹ and this compelled me to make a rejoinder (see Part Three: Supplement on Proudhon and the Housing Question), whereby both the polemic and also my special occupation with this question came to an end. That is the history of the origin of these three series of articles, which have also appeared as a separate reprint in pamphlet form. The fact that a new reprint has now become necessary I owe undoubtedly to the benevolent solicitude of the German government which, by prohibiting the work, tremendously increased its sale, as usual, and I hereby take this opportunity of expressing my respectful thanks to it.

I have revised the text for this new edition, inserted a few additions and notes, and have corrected a small economic error in the first part, as my opponent, Dr. Mülberger, unfortunately failed to discover it. During this revision it was borne in on me what gigantic progress the international working-class movement has made during the past fourteen years. At that time it was still a fact that "for twenty years the workers speaking Romance languages have had no other mental pabulum than the works of Proudhon,"* and, in a pinch, the still more one-sided version of Proudhonism presented by the father of "anarchism," Bakunin, who regarded Proudhon as "the schoolmaster of us all," *notre maître à nous tous*. Although the Proudhonists in France were only a small sect among the workers, they were still the

* See p. 354 of this volume.—Ed.

only ones who had a definitely formulated programme and who were able in the Commune to take over the leadership in the economic field. In Belgium, Proudhonism reigned unchallenged among the Walloon workers, and in Spain and Italy, with a few isolated exceptions, everything in the working-class movement which was not anarchist was decidedly Proudhonist. And today? In France, Proudhon has been completely disposed of among the workers and retains supporters only among the radical bourgeois and petty bourgeois, who as Proudhonists also call themselves "Socialists," but against whom the most energetic fight is carried on by the socialist workers. In Belgium, the Flemings have ousted the Walloons from the leadership of the movement, deposed Proudhonism and greatly raised the level of the movement. In Spain, as in Italy, the anarchist high tide of the seventies has receded and swept away with it the remnants of Proudhonism. While in Italy the new party is still in process of clarification and formation, in Spain the small nucleus, which as the *Nueva Federación Madrileña*²⁴⁰ remained loyal to the General Council of the International, has developed into a strong party, which—as can be seen from the republican press itself—is destroying the influence of the bourgeois republicans on the workers far more effectively than its noisy anarchist predecessors were ever able to do. Among Latin workers the forgotten works of Proudhon have been replaced by *Capital*, the *Communist Manifesto* and a number of other works of the Marxist school, and the main demand of Marx—the seizure of all the means of production in the name of society by a proletariat risen to sole political power—is now the demand of the whole revolutionary working class in the Latin countries also.

If therefore Proudhonism has been finally supplanted among the workers of the Latin countries also, if it—in accordance with its real destination—only serves French, Spanish, Italian and Belgian bourgeois radicals as an expression of their bourgeois and petty-bourgeois desires, why revert to it today? Why combat anew a dead opponent by reprinting these articles?

First of all, because these articles do not confine themselves to a mere polemic against Proudhon and his German representative. As a consequence of the division of labour that existed between Marx and myself, it fell to me to present our opinions in the periodical press, and, therefore, particularly in the fight against opposing views, in order that Marx should have time for the elaboration of his great basic work. This made it necessary for me to present our views for the most part in a polemical form, in opposition to other kinds of views. So also here. Parts One and Three contain not only a criticism of the Proudhonist con-

ception of the question, but also a presentation of our own conception.

Secondly, Proudhon played much too significant a role in the history of the European working-class movement for him to fall into oblivion without more ado. Refuted theoretically and discarded practically, he still retains his historical interest. Whoever occupies himself in any detail with modern socialism must also acquaint himself with the "surmounted standpoints" of the movement. Marx's *Poverty of Philosophy* appeared several years before Proudhon put forward his practical proposals for social reform. Here Marx could only discover in embryo and criticise Proudhon's exchange bank. From this angle, therefore, this work of mine supplements, unfortunately imperfectly enough, Marx's work. Marx would have accomplished all this much better and more convincingly.

And finally, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois socialism is strongly represented in Germany down to this very hour. On the one hand, by Katheder-Socialists²⁴¹ and philanthropists of all sorts, with whom the wish to turn the workers into owners of their dwellings still plays a great role and against whom, therefore, my work is still appropriate. On the other hand, a certain petty-bourgeois socialism finds representation in the Social-Democratic Party itself, and even in the ranks of the Reichstag group. This is done in the following way: while the fundamental views of modern socialism and the demand for the transformation of all the means of production into social property are recognised as justified, the realisation of this is declared possible only in the distant future, a future which for all practical purposes is quite out of sight. Thus, for the present one has to have recourse to mere social patchwork, and sympathy can be shown, according to circumstances, even with the most reactionary efforts for so-called "uplifting of the labouring class." The existence of such a tendency is quite inevitable in Germany, the land of philistinism *par excellence*, particularly at a time when industrial development is violently and on a mass scale uprooting this old and deeply-rooted philistinism. The tendency is quite harmless to the movement, in view of the wonderful common sense of our workers, which has been demonstrated so magnificently precisely during the last eight years of the struggle against the Anti-Socialist Law,¹¹⁵ the police and the courts. But it is necessary clearly to realise that such a tendency exists. And if later on this tendency takes on a firmer shape and more clearly defined contours, as is necessary and even desirable, it will have to go back to its predecessors for the formulation of its programme, and in doing so it will hardly be able to avoid Proudhon.

The essence of both the big bourgeois and petty-bourgeois solutions of the "housing question" is that the worker should own his own dwelling. However, this is a point which has been shown in a very peculiar light by the industrial development of Germany during the past twenty years. In no other country do there exist so many wage-workers who own not only their own dwellings but also a garden or field as well. Besides these workers there are numerous others who hold house and garden or field as tenants, with in fact fairly secure possession. Rural domestic industry carried on in conjunction with kitchen-gardening or small-scale agriculture forms the broad basis of Germany's new large-scale industry. In the West the workers are for the most part the owners of their dwellings, and in the East they are chiefly tenants. We find this combination of domestic industry with kitchen-gardening and agriculture, and therefore with a secure dwelling, not only wherever hand weaving still fights against the mechanical loom: in the Lower Rhineland and in Westphalia, in the Saxon Erzgebirge and in Silesia, but also wherever domestic industry of any sort has established itself as a rural occupation; as, for instance, in the Thuringian Forest and in the Rhön area. At the time of the discussion of the tobacco monopoly, it was revealed to what great extent cigar making was already being carried on as a rural domestic industry. Whenever distress spreads among the small peasants, as for instance a few years ago in the Eifel area,²⁴² the bourgeois press immediately raises an outcry for the introduction of a suitable domestic industry as the only remedy. And in fact both the growing state of want of the German small-allotment peasants and the general situation of German industry urge a continual extension of rural domestic industry. This is a phenomenon peculiar to Germany. Only very exceptionally do we find anything similar in France; for instance, in the regions of silk cultivation. In England, where there are no small peasants, rural domestic industry depends on the work of the wives and children of the agricultural day-labourers. Only in Ireland can we observe the rural domestic industry of garment making being carried on, as in Germany, by real peasant families. Naturally we do not speak here of Russia and other countries not represented on the industrial world market.

Thus, as regards industry there exists today a state of affairs over widespread areas in Germany which appears at first glance to resemble that which prevailed generally before the introduction of machinery. However, this is so only at first glance. The rural domestic industry of earlier times, combined with kitchen-gardening and agriculture, was, at least in the countries in which

industry was developing, the basis of a tolerable and, here and there, even comfortable material situation for the working class, but at the same time the basis of its intellectual and political nullity. The hand-made product and its cost determined the market price, and owing to the insignificantly small productivity of labour, compared with the present day, the market as a rule grew faster than the supply. This held good at about the middle of the last century for England, and partly for France, particularly in the textile industry. In Germany, however, which was at that time only just recovering from the devastation of the Thirty Years' War⁶⁸ and working its way up under most unfavourable circumstances, the situation was of course quite different. The only domestic industry in Germany producing for the world market, linen weaving, was so burdened by taxes and feudal exactions that it did not raise the peasant weavers above the very low level of the rest of the peasantry. Nevertheless, at that time the rural industrial worker enjoyed a certain security of existence.

With the introduction of machinery all this was altered. Prices were now determined by the machine-made product, and the wage of the domestic industrial worker fell with this price. However, the worker had to accept it or look for other work, and he could not do that without becoming a proletarian, that is, without giving up his little house, garden and field, whether his own or rented. Only in the rarest cases was he ready to do this. And thus the kitchen-gardening and agriculture of the old rural hand weavers became the cause by virtue of which the struggle of the hand loom against the mechanical loom was everywhere so protracted and has not yet been fought to a conclusion in Germany. In this struggle it appeared for the first time, especially in England, that the same circumstance which formerly served as a basis of comparative prosperity for the worker—the fact that he owned his means of production—had now become a hindrance and a misfortune for him. In industry the mechanical loom defeated his hand loom, and in agriculture large-scale cultivation drove his small-scale cultivation from the lists. However, while the collective labour of many and the application of machinery and science became the social rule in both fields of production, the worker was chained to the antiquated method of individual production and hand labour by his little house, garden, field and hand loom. The possession of house and garden was now of much less advantage than the possession of complete freedom of movement (*vogelfreie Beweglichkeit*). No factory worker would have changed places with the slowly but surely starving rural hand weaver.

Germany appeared late on the world market. Our large-scale

industry dates from the forties; it received its first impetus from the Revolution of 1848, and was able to develop fully only after the revolutions of 1866 and 1870 had cleared at least the worst political obstacles out of its way. But to a large extent it found the world market already occupied. The articles of mass consumption were supplied by England and the elegant luxury articles by France. Germany could not beat the former in price or the latter in quality. For the moment, therefore, nothing else remained but, following the beaten path of German production up to that time, to edge into the world market with articles which were too petty for the English and too shoddy for the French. Of course the favourite German custom of cheating, by first sending good samples and afterwards inferior articles, soon met with sufficiently severe punishment on the world market and was pretty well abandoned. On the other hand, the competition of over-production has gradually forced even the respectable English along the downward path of quality deterioration and so given an advantage to the Germans, who are unbeatable in this sphere. And thus we finally came to possess a large-scale industry and to play a role on the world market. But our *large-scale* industry works almost exclusively for the home market (with the exception of the iron industry, which produces far beyond the limits of home demand), and our mass export consists of a tremendous number of small articles, for which large-scale industry provides at most the necessary half-finished products, while the small articles themselves are supplied chiefly by rural domestic industry.

And here is seen in all its glory the "blessing" of house- and landownership for the modern worker. Nowhere, hardly excepting even the Irish domestic industries, are such infamously low wages paid as in the German domestic industries. Competition permits the capitalist to deduct from the price of labour power that which the family earns from its own little garden or field. The workers are compelled to accept any piece wages offered them, because otherwise they would get nothing at all and they could not live from the products of their agriculture alone, and because, on the other hand, it is just this agriculture and landownership which chains them to the spot and prevents them from looking around for other employment. This is the basis which maintains Germany's capacity to compete on the world market in a whole series of small articles. *The whole profit is derived from a deduction from normal wages and the whole surplus value can be presented to the purchaser.* That is the secret of the extraordinary cheapness of most of the German export articles.

It is this circumstance more than any other which keeps the wages and the living conditions of the German workers also in other industrial fields below the level of the West European countries. The dead weight of such prices for labour, kept traditionally far below the value of labour power, depresses also the wages of the urban workers, and even of the workers in the big cities, below the value of labour power; and this is all the more the case because poorly-paid domestic industry has taken the place of the old handicrafts in the towns as well, and here too depresses the general level of wages.

Here we see clearly that what at an earlier historical stage was the basis of relative well-being for the workers, namely, the combination of agriculture and industry, the ownership of house, garden and field, and certainty of a dwelling place, is becoming today, under the rule of large-scale industry, not only the worst hindrance to the worker, but the greatest misfortune for the whole working class, the basis for an unexampled depression of wages below their normal level, and that not only for separate districts and branches of enterprise but for the whole country. No wonder that the big and petty bourgeoisie, who live and grow rich from these abnormal deductions from wages, are enthusiastic over rural industry and the workers owning their own houses, and that they regard the introduction of new domestic industries as the sole remedy for all rural distress!

That is one side of the matter, but it also has its reverse side. Domestic industry has become the broad basis of the German export trade and therefore of the whole of large-scale industry. Due to this it spread over wide areas of Germany and is extending still further daily. The ruin of the small peasant, inevitable ever since his industrial domestic production for his own use was destroyed by cheap confection and machine products, as was his animal husbandry, and hence his manure production also, by the dissolution of the mark system, the abolition of the common mark and of compulsory crop rotation—this ruin forcibly drives the small peasant, fallen victim to the usurer, into the arms of modern domestic industry. Like the ground rent of the landlord in Ireland, the interest of the mortgage usurer in Germany cannot be paid from the yield of the soil but only from the wages of the industrial peasant. However, with the expansion of domestic industry one peasant area after another is being dragged into the present-day industrial movement. It is this revolutionising of the rural areas by domestic industry which spreads the industrial revolution in Germany over a far wider territory than was the case in England and France. It is the comparatively low level of our industry which makes its ex-

tension in area all the more necessary. This explains why in Germany, in contrast to England and France, the revolutionary working-class movement has spread so tremendously over the greater part of the country instead of being confined exclusively to the urban centres. And this in turn explains the tranquil, certain and irresistible progress of the movement. It is perfectly clear that in Germany a victorious rising in the capital and in the other big cities will be possible only when the majority of the smaller towns and a great part of the rural districts have become ripe for the revolutionary change. Given anything like normal development, we shall never be in a position to win working-class victories like those of the Parisians in 1848 and 1871, but for just that reason we shall also not suffer defeats of the revolutionary capital by the reactionary provinces, such as Paris suffered in both cases. In France the movement always originated in the capital; in Germany it originated in the areas of big industry, of manufacture and of domestic industry; the capital was conquered only later. Therefore, perhaps in the future also, the initiative will continue to rest with the French, but the decision can be fought out only in Germany.

Now, this rural domestic industry and manufacture, which due to its expansion has become the decisive branch of German production and thus revolutionises the German peasantry more and more, is however itself only the preliminary stage of a further revolutionary change. As Marx has already proved (*Capital*, Vol. I, 3rd edition, pp. 484-95*), at a certain stage of development the hour of its downfall owing to machinery and factory production will sound for it also. And this hour would appear to be at hand. But in Germany the destruction of rural domestic industry and manufacture by machinery and factory production means the destruction of the livelihood of millions of rural producers, the expropriation of almost half the German small peasantry; the transformation, not only of domestic industry into factory production, but also of peasant farming into large-scale capitalist agriculture, and of small landed property into big estates—an industrial and agricultural revolution in favour of capital and big landownership at the cost of the peasants. Should it be Germany's fate to undergo also this transformation while still under the old social conditions it will unquestionably be the turning point. If the working class of no other country has taken the initiative by that time, Germany will certainly strike first, and the peasant sons of the "glorious army" will bravely lend assistance.

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1965, pp. 470-80.—Ed.

And with this the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois utopia, which would give each worker the ownership of his own little house and thus chain him in semi-feudal fashion to his particular capitalist, takes on a very different complexion. In lieu of its realisation there appears the transformation of all the small rural house-owners into industrial domestic workers; the destruction of the old isolation and with it the destruction of the political nullity of the small peasants who are dragged into the "social whirlpool"; the extension of the industrial revolution over the rural areas and thus the transformation of the most stable and conservative class of the population into a revolutionary hotbed; and, as the culmination of it all, the expropriation of the peasants engaged in home industry by machinery, which drives them forcibly into insurrection.

We can readily allow the bourgeois-socialist philanthropists the private enjoyment of their ideal so long as they continue in their public function as capitalists to realise it in this inverted fashion, to the benefit and advancement of the social revolution.

Frederick Engels

London, January 10, 1887

Published in the newspaper
Der Sozialdemokrat Nos. 3 and 4,
January 15 and 22, 1887 and
in the book: F. Engels, *Zur
Wohnungsfrage*, Hottingen-
Zürich, 1887

Printed according to the text
of the book

Translated from the German

THE HOUSING QUESTION

PART ONE

HOW PROUDHON SOLVES
THE HOUSING QUESTION

In No. 10 and the following issues of the *Volksstaat*⁵¹ may be found a series of six articles on the housing question.²³⁷ These articles are worthy of attention only because, apart from some long-forgotten would-be literary writings of the forties, they are the first attempt to transplant the Proudhonist school to Germany. This represents such an enormous step backward in comparison with the whole course of development of German socialism, which delivered a decisive blow precisely to the Proudhonist ideas as far back as twenty-five years ago,* that it is worth while answering this attempt immediately.

The so-called housing shortage, which plays such a great role in the press nowadays, does not consist in the fact that the working class generally lives in bad, overcrowded and unhealthy dwellings. *This* shortage is not something peculiar to the present; it is not even one of the sufferings peculiar to the modern proletariat in contradistinction to all earlier oppressed classes. On the contrary, all oppressed classes in all periods suffered rather uniformly from it. In order to put an end to *this* housing shortage there is only *one* means: to abolish altogether the exploitation and oppression of the working class by the ruling class. What is meant today by housing shortage is the peculiar intensification of the bad housing conditions of the workers as a result of the sudden rush of population to the big cities; a colossal increase in rents, still greater congestion in the separate houses, and, for some, the impossibility of finding a place to live in at all. And *this* housing shortage gets talked of so much only because it is not confined to the working class but has affected the petty bourgeoisie as well.

The housing shortage from which the workers and part of the petty bourgeoisie suffer in our modern big cities is one of the innumerable *smaller*, secondary evils which result from the present-day capitalist mode of production. It is not at all a direct

* In Marx: *Misère de la philosophie*. Bruxelles et Paris, 1847 (*The Poverty of Philosophy*).—[Note by Engels.]

result of the exploitation of the worker as worker by the capitalist. This exploitation is the basic evil which the social revolution wants to abolish by abolishing the capitalist mode of production. The cornerstone of the capitalist mode of production is, however, the fact that our present social order enables the capitalist to buy the labour power of the worker at its value, but to extract from it much more than its value by making the worker work longer than is necessary to reproduce the price paid for the labour power. The surplus value produced in this fashion is divided among the whole class of capitalists and landowners, together with their paid servants, from the Pope and the Kaiser down to the night watchman and below. We are not concerned here with how this distribution comes about, but this much is certain: that all those who do not work can live only on the pickings from this surplus value, which reach them in one way or another. (Compare Marx's *Capital*, where this was propounded for the first time.)

The distribution of this surplus value, produced by the working class and taken from it without payment, among the non-working classes proceeds amid extremely edifying squabbles and mutual swindling. In so far as this distribution takes place by means of buying and selling, one of its chief methods is the cheating of the buyer by the seller; and in retail trade, particularly in the big cities, this has become an absolute condition of existence for the seller. When, however, the worker is cheated by his grocer or his baker, either in regard to the price or the quality of the merchandise, this does not happen to him in his specific capacity as a worker. On the contrary, as soon as a certain average measure of cheating has become the social rule in any place, it must in the long run be adjusted by a corresponding increase in wages. The worker appears before the shopkeeper as a buyer, that is, as the owner of money or credit, and hence not at all in his capacity as a worker, that is, as a seller of labour power. The cheating may hit him, and the poorer class as a whole, harder than it hits the richer social classes, but it is not an evil which hits him exclusively, which is peculiar to his class.

And it is just the same with the housing shortage. The expansion of the big modern cities gives the land in certain sections of them, particularly in those which are centrally situated, an artificial and often enormously increasing value; the buildings erected in these areas depress this value, instead of increasing it, because they no longer correspond to the changed circumstances. They are pulled down and replaced by others. This takes place above all with centrally located workers' houses, whose

rents, even with the greatest overcrowding, can never, or only very slowly, increase above a certain maximum. They are pulled down and in their stead shops, warehouses and public buildings are erected. Through its Haussmann in Paris, Bonapartism exploited this tendency tremendously for swindling and private enrichment. But the spirit of Haussmann has also been abroad in London, Manchester and Liverpool, and seems to feel itself just as much at home in Berlin and Vienna. The result is that the workers are forced out of the centre of the towns towards the outskirts; that workers' dwellings, and small dwellings in general, become rare and expensive and often altogether unobtainable, for under these circumstances the building industry, which is offered a much better field for speculation by more expensive dwelling houses, builds workers' dwellings only by way of exception.

This housing shortage, therefore, certainly hits the worker harder than it hits any more prosperous class, but it is just as little an evil which burdens the working class exclusively as is the cheating of the shopkeeper, and, as far as the working class is concerned, when this evil reaches a certain level and attains a certain permanency, it must similarly find a certain economic adjustment.

It is largely with just such sufferings as these, which the working class endures in common with other classes, and particularly the petty bourgeoisie, that petty-bourgeois socialism, to which Proudhon belongs, prefers to occupy itself. And thus it is not at all accidental that our German Proudhonist* seizes chiefly upon the housing question, which, as we have seen, is by no means exclusively a working-class question; and that he declares it to be, on the contrary, a true, exclusively working-class question.

"The *tenant* is in the same position in relation to the *house-owner* as the *wage-worker* in relation to the *capitalist*."

This is totally untrue.

In the housing question we have two parties confronting each other: the tenant and the landlord, or house-owner. The former wishes to purchase from the latter the temporary use of a dwelling; he has money or credit, even if he has to buy this credit from the house-owner himself at a usurious price in the shape of an addition to the rent. It is a simple commodity sale; it is not a transaction between proletarian and bourgeois, between worker and capitalist. The tenant—even if he is a worker—ap-

* A. Mülberger.—Ed.

pears as a *man with money*; he must already have sold his commodity, a commodity peculiarly his own, his labour power, to be able to appear with the proceeds as the buyer of the use of a dwelling or he must be in a position to give a guarantee of the impending sale of this labour power. The peculiar results which attend the sale of labour power to the capitalist are completely absent here. The capitalist causes the purchased labour power first to produce its own value but secondly to produce a surplus value, which remains in his hands for the time being, subject to distribution among the capitalist class. In this case, therefore, an excess value is produced, the sum total of the existing value is increased. In a renting transaction the situation is quite different. No matter how much the landlord may overreach the tenant it is still only a transfer of already *existing*, previously *produced* value, and the total sum of values possessed by the landlord and the tenant *together* remains the same after as it was before. The worker is always cheated of a part of the product of his labour, whether that labour is paid for by the capitalist below, above or at its value; the tenant only when he is compelled to pay for the dwelling above its value. It is therefore a complete misrepresentation of the relation between landlord and tenant to attempt to make it equivalent to the relation between worker and capitalist. On the contrary, we are dealing here with a quite ordinary commodity transaction between two citizens, and this transaction proceeds according to the economic laws which govern the sale of commodities in general, and in particular the sale of the commodity "landed property." The building and maintenance costs of the house or of the part of the house in question enter first into the calculation; the value of the land, determined by the more or less favourable situation of the house, comes next; the relation between supply and demand existing at the moment decides in the end. This simple economic relation expresses itself in the mind of our Proudhonist as follows:

"The house, once it has been built, serves as a *perpetual legal title* to a definite fraction of social labour although the real value of the house has been paid to the owner long ago more than adequately in the form of rent. Thus it comes about that a house which, for instance, was built fifty years ago, during this period covers the original cost price two, three, five, ten and more times over in its rent yield."

Here we have at once Proudhon in his entirety. First, it is forgotten that the rent must not only pay the interest on the building costs, but must also cover repairs and the average amount of bad debts and unpaid rents as well as the occasional periods

when the house is untenanted, and finally must pay off in annual instalments the building capital which has been invested in a house, which is perishable and which in time becomes uninhabitable and worthless. Secondly, it is forgotten that the rent must also pay interest on the increased value of the land upon which the building is erected and that, therefore, a part of it consists of ground rent. Our Proudhonist immediately declares, it is true, that since this increment is brought about without the landowner having contributed anything, it does not equitably belong to him but to society as a whole. However, he overlooks the fact that he is thereby in reality demanding the abolition of landed property, a point which would lead us too far if we went into it here. And finally he overlooks the fact that the whole transaction is not at all one of buying the house from its owner, but of buying only its use for a certain time. Proudhon, who never bothered himself about the real, the actual conditions under which any economic phenomenon occurs, is naturally also unable to explain how the original cost price of a house is under certain circumstances paid back ten times over in the course of fifty years in the form of rent. Instead of examining this not at all difficult question economically and establishing whether it is really in contradiction to economic laws, and if so how, Proudhon resorts to a bold leap from economics into jurisprudence: "The house, once it has been built, serves as a *perpetual legal title*" to a certain annual payment. How this comes about, *how* the house *becomes* a legal title, on this Proudhon is silent. And yet that is just what he should have explained. Had he examined this question he would have found that not all the legal titles in the world, no matter how perpetual, could give a house the power of obtaining its cost price back ten times, over the course of fifty years, in the form of rent, but that only economic conditions (which may have obtained social recognition in the form of legal titles) can accomplish this. And with this he would again be where he started from.

The whole Proudhonist teaching rests on this saving leap from economic reality into legal phraseology. Every time our good Proudhon loses the economic hang of things—and this happens to him with every serious problem—he takes refuge in the sphere of law and appeals to *eternal justice*.

"Proudhon begins by taking his ideal of justice, of '*justice éternelle*,' from the juridical relations that correspond to the production of commodities; thereby, it may be noted, he proves, to the consolation of all good citizens, that the production of commodities is a form of production as everlasting as justice. Then he turns round and seeks to reform the actual production of

commodities, and the actual legal system corresponding thereto, in accordance with this ideal. What opinion should we have of a chemist, who, instead of studying the actual laws of the molecular changes in the composition and decomposition of matter, and on that foundation solving definite problems, claimed to regulate the composition and decomposition of matter by means of the 'eternal ideas,' of '*naturalité and affinité*'? Do we really know any more about 'usury,' when we say it contradicts '*justice éternelle,*' '*équité éternelle,*' '*mutualité éternelle,*' and other '*vérités éternelles,*' than the fathers of the church did when they said it was incompatible with '*grâce éternelle,*' '*foi éternelle,*' and '*la volonté éternelle de Dieu*'?" (Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 45.)*

Our Proudhonist** does not fare any better than his lord and master:

"The rent agreement is one of the thousand exchanges which are as necessary in the life of modern society as the circulation of the blood in the bodies of animals. Naturally, it would be in the interest of this society if all these exchanges were pervaded by a *conception of right*, that is to say, if they were carried out everywhere according to the strict demands of justice. In a word, the economic life of society must, as Proudhon says, raise itself to the heights of *economic right*. In reality, as we know, exactly the opposite takes place."

Is it credible that five years after Marx had characterised Proudhonism so summarily and convincingly precisely from this decisive angle, one can still print such confused stuff in the German language? What does this rigmarole mean? Nothing more than that the practical effects of the economic laws which govern present-day society run contrary to the author's sense of justice and that he cherishes the pious wish that the matter might be so arranged as to remedy this situation. Yes, if toads had tails they would no longer be toads! And is then the capitalist mode of production not "pervaded by a conception of right," namely, that of its own right to exploit the workers? And if the author tells us that is not *his* conception of right, are we one step further?

But let us go back to the housing question. Our Proudhonist now gives his "conception of right" free rein and treats us to the following moving declamation:

"We do not hesitate to assert that there is no more terrible mockery of the whole culture of our lauded century than the fact that in the big cities 90 per cent and more of the population have no place that they can call their own.

* Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1965, pp. 84-85.—Ed.

** A. Mülberger.—Ed.

The real nodal point of moral and family existence, hearth and home, is being swept away by the social whirlpool. . . . In this respect we are far below the savages. The troglodyte has his cave, the Australian his clay hut, the Indian his own hearth, but the modern proletarian is practically suspended in mid-air," etc.

In this jeremiad we have Proudhonism in its whole reactionary form. In order to create the modern revolutionary class of the proletariat it was absolutely necessary to cut the umbilical cord which still bound the worker of the past to the land. The hand weaver who had his little house, garden and field along with his loom was a quiet, contented man, "godly and honourable" despite all misery and despite all political pressure; he doffed his cap to the rich, to the priest and to the officials of the state and inwardly was altogether a slave. It is precisely modern large-scale industry which has turned the worker, formerly chained to the land, into a completely propertyless proletarian, liberated from all traditional fetters, a *free outlaw*; it is precisely this economic revolution which has created the sole conditions under which the exploitation of the working class in its final form, in capitalist production, can be overthrown. And now comes this tearful Proudhonist and bewails the driving of the workers from hearth and home as though it were a great retrogression instead of being the very first condition of their intellectual emancipation.

Twenty-seven years ago I described, in *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, the main features of just this process of driving the workers from hearth and home, as it took place in the eighteenth century in England. The infamies of which the land and factory owners were guilty in so doing, and the deleterious effects, material and moral, which this expulsion inevitably had on the workers concerned in the first place, are there also described as they deserve. But could it enter my head to regard this, which was in the circumstances an absolutely necessary historical process of development, as a retrogression "below the savages"? Impossible! The English proletarian of 1872 is on an infinitely higher level than the rural weaver of 1772 with his "hearth and home." And will the troglodyte with his cave, the Australian with his clay hut or the Indian with his own hearth ever accomplish a June insurrection¹⁸ or a Paris Commune?

That the situation of the workers has on the whole become materially worse since the introduction of capitalist production on a large scale is doubted only by the bourgeois. But should we therefore look backward longingly to the (likewise very meagre) fleshpots of Egypt,²⁴³ to rural small-scale industry, which

produced only servile souls, or to "the savages"? On the contrary. Only the proletariat created by modern large-scale industry, liberated from all inherited fetters including those which chained it to the land, and herded together in the big cities, is in a position to accomplish the great social transformation which will put an end to all class exploitation and all class rule. The old rural hand weavers with hearth and home would never have been able to do it; they would never have been able to conceive such an idea, not to speak of desiring to carry it out.

For Proudhon, on the other hand, the whole industrial revolution of the last hundred years, the introduction of steam power and large-scale factory production which substitutes machinery for hand labour and increases the productivity of labour a thousandfold, is a highly repugnant occurrence, something which really ought never to have taken place. The petty-bourgeois Proudhon aspires to a world in which each person turns out a separate and independent product that is immediately consumable and exchangeable in the market. Then, as long as each person receives back the full value of his labour in the form of another product, "eternal justice" is satisfied and the best possible world created. But this best possible world of Proudhon has already been nipped in the bud and trodden underfoot by the advance of industrial development, which long ago destroyed individual labour in all the big branches of industry and which is destroying it daily more and more in the smaller and even smallest branches, which is setting social labour supported by machinery and the harnessed forces of nature in its place, and whose finished product, immediately exchangeable or consumable, is the joint work of the many individuals through whose hands it has had to pass. And it is precisely this industrial revolution which has raised the productive power of human labour to such a high level that—for the first time in the history of mankind—the possibility exists, given a rational division of labour among all, of producing not only enough for the plentiful consumption of all members of society and for an abundant reserve fund, but also of leaving each individual sufficient leisure so that what is really worth preserving in historically inherited culture—science, art, forms of intercourse—may not only be preserved but converted from a monopoly of the ruling class into the common property of the whole of society, and may be further developed. And here is the decisive point: as soon as the productive power of human labour has risen to this height, every excuse disappears for the existence of a ruling class. After all, the ultimate basis on which class differences were defended was always: there must be a class which need not plague itself with the pro-

duction of its daily subsistence, in order that it may have time to look after the intellectual work of society. This talk, which up to now had its great historical justification, has been cut off at the root once and for all by the industrial revolution of the last hundred years. The existence of a ruling class is becoming daily more and more a hindrance to the development of industrial productive power, and equally so to that of science, art and especially of forms of cultural intercourse. There never were greater boons than our modern bourgeois.

All this is nothing to friend Proudhon. He wants "eternal justice" and nothing else. Each shall receive in exchange for his product the full proceeds of his labour, the full value of his labour. But to calculate this in a product of modern industry is a complicated matter. For modern industry obscures the particular share of the individual in the total product, which in the old individual handicraft was obviously represented by the finished product. Further, modern industry eliminates more and more individual exchange, on which Proudhon's whole system is built up, namely, direct exchange between two producers each of whom takes the product of the other in order to consume it. Consequently a reactionary streak runs through the whole of Proudhonism; an aversion to the industrial revolution and the desire, sometimes overtly, sometimes covertly expressed, to drive the whole of modern industry out of the temple—steam engines, mechanical looms and the rest of the business—and to return to old, respectable hand labour. That we would then lose nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of our productive power, that the whole of humanity would be condemned to the worst possible labour slavery, that starvation would become the general rule—what does all that matter if only we succeed in organising exchange in such a fashion that each receives "the full proceeds of his labour," and that "eternal justice" is realised?

Fiat justitia, pereat mundus!

Let justice be done though the whole world perish!

And the world would perish in this Proudhonist counter-revolution if it were at all possible to carry it out.

It is, however, self-evident that, even with social production conditioned by modern large-scale industry, it is possible to assure each person "the full proceeds of his labour," so far as this phrase has any meaning at all. And it has a meaning only if it is extended to purport not that each individual worker becomes the possessor of "the full proceeds of his labour," but that the whole of society, consisting entirely of workers, becomes the possessor of the total product of their labour, which product it partly distributes among its members for consumption, partly

uses for replacing and increasing its means of production, and partly stores up as a reserve fund for production and consumption.

* * *

After what has been said above, we already know in advance how our Proudhonist will solve the great housing question. On the one hand, we have the demand that each worker have and own his own home in order that we may no longer be *below the savages*. On the other hand, we have the assurance that the two, three, five or tenfold repayment of the original cost price of a house in the form of rent, as it actually takes place, is based on a *legal title*, and that this legal title is in contradiction to "*eternal justice*." The solution is simple: we abolish the legal title and by virtue of eternal justice declare the rent paid to be a payment on account of the cost of the dwelling itself. If one has so arranged one's premises that they already contain the conclusion, then of course it requires no greater skill than any charlatan possesses to produce the result, prepared beforehand, from the bag and proudly point to unshakeable logic whose result it is.

And so it happens here. The abolition of rented dwellings is proclaimed a necessity, and couched in the form of a demand that every tenant be turned into the owner of his dwelling. How are we to do that? Very simply:

"Rented dwellings will be redeemed. . . . The previous house-owner will be paid the value of his house to the last farthing. Whereas rent represents, as previously, the tribute which the tenant pays to the perpetual title of capital, from the day when the redemption of rented dwellings is proclaimed the exactly fixed sum paid by the tenant will become the annual instalment paid for the dwelling which has passed into his possession. . . . Society . . . transforms itself in this way into a totality of free and independent owners of dwellings."

The Proudhonist finds it a crime against eternal justice that the house-owner can without working obtain ground rent and interest out of the capital he has invested in the house. He decrees that this must cease, that capital invested in houses shall no longer yield interest; nor ground rent either, so far as it represents purchased landed property. Now we have seen that the capitalist mode of production, the basis of present-day society, is in no way affected hereby. The pivot on which the exploitation of the worker turns is the sale of his labour power to the capitalist and the use which the capitalist makes of this transaction, the fact that he compels the worker to produce far more than the paid value of his labour power amounts to. It is this transaction between capitalist and worker which produces all the surplus

value afterwards divided in the form of ground rent, commercial profit, interest on capital, taxes, etc., among the diverse varieties of capitalists and their servitors. And now our Proudhonist comes along and believes that if we were to prohibit *one single variety* of capitalists, and at that of capitalists who purchase no labour power directly and therefore also cause no surplus value to be produced, from making profit or receiving interest, it would be a step forward! The mass of unpaid labour taken from the working class would remain exactly the same even if house-owners were to be deprived tomorrow of the possibility of receiving ground rent and interest. However, this does not prevent our Proudhonist from declaring:

“The abolition of rented dwellings is thus one of the *most fruitful and magnificent aspirations* which have ever sprung from the womb of the revolutionary idea and it must become one of the *primary demands* of the Social-Democracy.”

This is exactly the type of market cry of the master Proudhon himself, whose cackling was always in inverse ratio to the size of the eggs laid.

And now imagine the fine state of things if each worker, petty bourgeois and bourgeois, were compelled by paying annual instalments to become first part owner and then full owner of his dwelling! In the industrial districts in England, where there is large-scale industry but small workers' houses and each married worker occupies a little house of his own, there might possibly be some sense in it. But the small-scale industry in Paris and in most of the big cities on the continent is supplemented by large houses in each of which ten, twenty or thirty families live together. Supposing that on the day of the world-delivering decree, when the redemption of rent dwellings is proclaimed, Peter is working in an engineering works in Berlin. A year later he is owner of, if you like, the fifteenth part of his flat consisting of a little room on the fifth floor of a house somewhere in the neighbourhood of the Hamburger Tor. He then loses his job and soon afterwards finds himself in a similar flat on the third floor of a house in the Pothof in Hanover with a wonderful view of the courtyard. After five months' stay there he has just acquired $1/36$ part of this property when a strike sends him to Munich and compels him by a stay of eleven months to assume ownership of exactly $11/180$ of a rather gloomy abode on the street level behind the Ober-Angergasse. Subsequent removals, such as nowadays are so frequent with workers, saddle him further with $7/360$ of a no less desirable residence in St. Gallen, $23/180$ of another one in Leeds, and $347/56223$, figured out exactly in order

that "eternal justice" may have nothing to complain about, of a third flat in Seraing. And now, of what use are all these shares in flats to our Peter? Who is to give him the real value of these shares? Where is he to find the owner or owners of the remaining shares in his various one-time flats? And what exactly are the property relations regarding any big house whose floors hold, let us say, twenty flats and which, when the redemption period has elapsed and rented flats are abolished, belongs to perhaps three hundred part owners who are scattered all over the world? Our Proudhonist will answer that by that time the Proudhonist exchange bank will exist, which will pay to anyone at any time the full labour proceeds for any labour product, and will therefore pay out also the full value of a share in a flat. But in the first place we are not at all concerned here with the Proudhonist exchange bank since it is nowhere mentioned in the articles on the housing question, and secondly it rests on the peculiar error that if someone wants to sell a commodity he will necessarily always find a buyer for its full value, and thirdly it went bankrupt in England more than once under the name of Labour Exchange Bazaar,²⁴⁴ before Proudhon invented it.

The whole conception that the worker should *buy* his dwelling rests again on the reactionary basic outlook, already emphasised, of Proudhonism, according to which the conditions created by modern large-scale industry are morbid excrescences, and society must be brought forcibly, that is, against the trend which it has been following for a hundred years, to a condition in which the old stable handicraft of the individual is the rule, and which, generally speaking, is nothing but an idealised restoration of small-scale enterprise, which has gone and is still going to rack and ruin. Once the workers are flung back into these stable conditions and the "social whirlpool" has been happily removed, the worker can naturally again make use of property in "hearth and home," and the above redemption theory appears less absurd. Proudhon only forgets that in order to accomplish all this he must first of all put back the clock of world history a hundred years, and that if he did he would turn the present-day workers into just such narrow-minded, crawling, sneaking servile souls as their great-great-grandfathers were.

As far, however, as this Proudhonist solution of the housing question contains any rational and practically applicable content it is already being carried out today, but this realisation does not spring from "the womb of the revolutionary idea," but from—the big bourgeois themselves. Let us listen to an excellent Spanish newspaper, *La Emancipación*,²⁴⁵ of Madrid, of March 16, 1872:

"There is still another means of solving the housing question, the way proposed by Proudhon, which dazzles at first glance, but on closer examination reveals its utter impotence. Proudhon proposed that tenants should be converted into buyers on the instalment plan, that the rent paid annually be booked as an instalment on the redemption payment of the value of the particular dwelling, so that after a certain time the tenant would become its owner. This method, which Proudhon considered very revolutionary, is being put into operation in all countries by companies of speculators who thus secure double and treble the value of the houses by raising the rents. M. Dollfus and other big manufacturers in North-Eastern France have carried out this system not only in order to make money but, in addition, with a political idea at the back of their minds.

"The cleverest leaders of the ruling class have always directed their efforts towards increasing the number of small property owners in order to build an army for themselves against the proletariat. The bourgeois revolutions of the last century divided up the big estates of the nobility and the church into small allotments, just as the Spanish republicans propose to do today with the still existing large estates, and created thereby a class of small landowners which has since become the most reactionary element in society and a permanent hindrance to the revolutionary movement of the urban proletariat. Napoleon III aimed at creating a similar class in the towns by reducing the denominations of the individual bonds of the public debt, and M. Dollfus and his colleagues sought to stifle all revolutionary spirit in their workers by selling them small dwellings to be paid for in annual instalments, and at the same time to chain the workers by this property to the factory once they worked in it. Thus the Proudhon plan, far from bringing the working class any relief, even turned directly against it."*

How is the housing question to be settled, then? In present-day society, just as any other social question is settled: by the gradual economic levelling of demand and supply, a settlement which reproduces the question itself again and again and therefore is no settlement. How a social revolution would settle this question not only depends on the circumstances in each particular case, but is also connected with much more far-reaching questions, one of the most fundamental of which is the abolition of the antithesis between town and country. As it is not our task to create utopian systems for the organisation of the future society, it would be more than idle to go into the question here.

* How this solution of the housing question by means of chaining the worker to his own "home" is arising spontaneously in the neighbourhood of big or rapidly rising American towns can be seen from the following passage of a letter by Eleanor Marx-Aveling, Indianapolis, November 28, 1886: "In, or rather near, Kansas City we saw some miserable little wooden shacks, containing about three rooms each, still in the wilds; the land cost 600 dollars and was just big enough to put the little house on it; the latter cost a further 600 dollars, that is, together, 4,800 marks, for a miserable little thing, an hour away from the town, in a muddy desert." In this way the workers must shoulder heavy mortgage debts in order to obtain even these dwellings, and now become the slaves of their employers for fair. They are tied to their houses, they cannot go away, and must put up with whatever working conditions are offered them. [Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.]

But one thing is certain: there is already a sufficient quantity of houses in the big cities to remedy immediately all real "housing shortage," provided they are used judiciously. This can naturally only occur through the expropriation of the present owners by quartering in their houses homeless workers or workers overcrowded in their present homes. As soon as the proletariat has won political power, such a measure prompted by concern for the common good will be just as easy to carry out as are other expropriations and billetings by the present-day state.

* * *

However, our Proudhonist* is not satisfied with his previous achievements in the housing question. He must raise the question from the level ground into the sphere of higher socialism in order that it may prove there also an essential "fractional part of the social question":

"Let us now assume that the productivity of capital is really taken by the horns, as it must be sooner or later, for instance, by a transitional law which fixes *the interest on all capitals at one per cent*, but mark you, with the tendency to make even this rate of interest approximate more and more to the zero point, so that finally nothing more will be paid than *the labour necessary to turn over the capital*. Like all other products, houses and dwellings are naturally also included within the purview of this law.... The owner himself will be the first one to agree to a sale because otherwise his house would be unused and the capital invested in it simply useless."

This passage contains one of the chief articles of faith of the Proudhonist catechism and offers a striking example of the confusion prevailing in it.

The "productivity of capital" is an absurdity that Proudhon takes over uncritically from the bourgeois economists. The bourgeois economists, it is true, also begin with the proposition that labour is the source of all wealth and the measure of value of all commodities; but they likewise have to explain how it comes about that the capitalist who advances capital for an industrial or handicraft business receives back at the end of it not only the capital which he advanced but also a profit over and above it. In consequence they are compelled to entangle themselves in all sorts of contradictions and to ascribe also to capital a certain productivity. Nothing proves more clearly how completely Proudhon remains enmeshed in the bourgeois ideology than the fact that he has taken over this phrase about the productivity of capital. We have seen at the very beginning that the so-called

* A. Mülberger.—Ed

“productivity of capital” is nothing but the quality attached to it (under present-day social relations, without which it would not be capital at all) of being able to appropriate the unpaid labour of wage-workers.

However, Proudhon differs from the bourgeois economists in that he does not approve of this “productivity of capital,” but, on the contrary, discovers in it a violation of “eternal justice.” It is this productivity which prevents the worker from receiving the full proceeds of his labour. It must therefore be abolished. But how? By lowering the *rate of interest* by compulsory legislation and finally reducing it to zero. Then, according to our Proudhonist, capital will cease to be productive.

The interest on loaned *money* capital is only a part of profit; profit, whether on industrial or commercial capital, is only a part of the surplus value taken by the capitalist class from the working class in the form of unpaid labour. The economic laws which govern the rate of interest are as independent of those which govern the rate of surplus value as could possibly be the case with laws of one and the same form of society. But as far as the distribution of this surplus value among the individual capitalists is concerned, it is clear that for industrialists and merchants who have in their businesses large amounts of capital advanced by other capitalists the rate of profit must rise—all other things being equal—to the same extent as the rate of interest falls. The reduction and final abolition of interest would, therefore, by no means really take the so-called “productivity of capital” “by the horns.” It would do no more than re-arrange the distribution among the individual capitalists of the unpaid surplus value taken from the working class. It would not give an advantage to the worker as against the industrial capitalist, but to the industrial capitalist as against the rentier.

Proudhon, from his legal standpoint, explains the rate of interest, as he does all economic facts, not by the conditions of social production, but by the state laws in which these conditions receive their general expression. From this point of view, which lacks any inkling of the interconnection between the state laws and the conditions of production in society, these state laws necessarily appear as purely arbitrary orders which at any moment could be replaced just as well by their exact opposites. Nothing is, therefore, easier for Proudhon than to issue a decree—as soon as he has the power to do so—reducing the rate of interest to one per cent. And if all the other social conditions remain as they were, this Proudhonist decree will simply exist on paper only. The rate of interest will continue to be governed by the economic laws to which it is subject today, all decrees not-

withstanding. Persons possessing credit will continue to borrow money at two, three, four and more per cent, according to circumstances, just as before, and the only difference will be that *rentiers* will be very careful to advance money only to persons with whom no litigation is to be expected. Moreover, this great plan to deprive capital of its "productivity" is as old as the hills; it is as old as—the *usury laws* which aim at nothing else but limiting the rate of interest, and which have since been abolished everywhere because in practice they were continually broken or circumvented, and the state was compelled to admit its impotence against the laws of social production. And the re-introduction of these medieval and unworkable laws is "to take the productivity of capital by the horns"? One sees that the closer Proudhonism is examined the more reactionary it appears.

And when thereupon the rate of interest has been reduced to zero in this fashion, and interest on capital therefore abolished, then "nothing more would be paid than the labour necessary to turn over the capital." This is supposed to mean that the abolition of interest is equivalent to the abolition of profit and even of surplus value. But if it were possible *really* to abolish interest by decree, what would be the consequence? The class of *rentiers* would no longer have any inducement to loan out their capital in the form of advances, but would invest it for their own account in their own industrial enterprises or in joint-stock companies. The mass of surplus value extracted from the working class by the capitalist class would remain the same; only its distribution would be altered, and even that not much.

In fact, our Proudhonist fails to see that already now, in commodity purchase in bourgeois society, no more is paid on the average than "the labour necessary to turn over the capital" (it should read, necessary for the production of the commodity in question). Labour is the measure of value of all commodities, and in present-day society—apart from fluctuations of the market—it is absolutely impossible that in the aggregate more should be paid on the average for commodities than the labour necessary for their production. No, no, my dear Proudhonist, the difficulty lies elsewhere. It is contained in the fact that "the labour necessary to turn over the capital" (to use your confused terminology) is simply *not fully paid for!* How this comes about you can look up in Marx (*Capital*, Vol. I, pp. 128-60*).

But that is not enough. If interest on capital [*Kapitalzins*] is abolished, *house rent* [*Mietzins*]** is abolished with it; for, "like

* See Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1965, pp. 164-94.—Ed.

** *Mietzins*: Literally—rent interest.—Ed.

all other products, houses and dwellings are naturally also included within the purview of this law." This is quite in the spirit of the old Major who summoned his one-year volunteer recruit and declared:

"I say, I hear you are a doctor; you might report from time to time at my quarters; when one has a wife and seven children there is always something to patch up."

Recruit: "Excuse me, Major, but I am a doctor of philosophy."

Major: "That's all the same to me; one sawbones is the same as another."

Our Proudhonist behaves the same way: house rent [*Mietzins*] or interest on capital [*Kapitalzins*], it is all the same to him. Interest is interest; sawbones is sawbones. We have seen above that the rent price [*Mietpreis*], commonly called house rent [*Mietzins*], is composed as follows: 1) a part which is ground rent; 2) a part which is interest on the building capital, including the profit of the builder; 3) a part which goes for repairs and insurance; 4) a part which has to amortise the building capital inclusive of profit in annual deductions according to the rate, at which the house gradually depreciates.

And now it must have become clear even to the blindest that "the owner himself would be the first to agree to a sale because otherwise his house would remain unused and the capital invested in it would be simply useless." Of course. If the interest on loaned capital is abolished no house-owner can thereafter obtain a penny piece in rent for his house, simply because house rent [*Miete*] may be spoken of as rent *interest* [*Mietzins*] and because such "rent interest" contains a part which is really interest on capital. Sawbones is sawbones. Whereas the usury laws relating to ordinary interest on capital could be made ineffective only by circumventing them, yet they never touched the rate of house rent even remotely. It was reserved for Proudhon to imagine that his new usury law would without more ado regulate and gradually abolish not only simple interest on capital but also the complicated house rent [*Mietzins*] for dwellings. Why then the "simply useless" house should be purchased for good money from the house-owner, and how it is that under such circumstances the house-owner would not pay money himself to get rid of this "simply useless" house in order to save himself the cost of repairs—about this we are left in the dark.

After this triumphant achievement in the sphere of higher socialism (Master Proudhon called it suprasocialism) our Proudhonist considers himself justified in flying still higher:

"All that still has to be done now is to draw some conclusions in order to cast complete light from all sides on our so important subject."

And what are these conclusions? Things which follow as little from what has been said before as the worthlessness of dwelling houses from the abolition of interest. Stripped of the pompous and solemn phraseology of our author, they mean nothing more than that, in order to facilitate the business of redemption of rented dwellings, the following is desirable: 1) exact statistics on the subject; 2) a good sanitary inspection force; 3) co-operatives of building workers to undertake the building of new houses. All these things are certainly very fine and good, but, despite all the vociferous phrases in which they are enveloped, they by no means cast "complete light" into the obscurity of Proudhonist mental confusion.

One who has achieved such great things has the right to address a serious exhortation to the German workers:

"Such and similar questions, it would seem to us, are well worth the attention of the Social-Democracy.... Let it seek to clarify its mind, as here on the housing question, so also on other and equally important questions, such as *credit, state debts, private debts, taxes,*" etc.

Thus, our Proudhonist here confronts us with the prospect of a whole series of articles on "similar questions," and if he deals with them all as thoroughly as with the present "so important subject," the *Volksstaat* will have copy enough for a year. But we are in a position to anticipate—it all amounts to what has already been said: interest on capital is to be abolished and with that the interest on public and private debts disappears, credit will be gratis, etc. The same magic formula is applied to any and every subject and in each particular case the same astonishing result is obtained with inexorable logic, namely, that when interest on capital has been abolished no more interest will have to be paid on borrowed money.

They are fine questions, by the way, with which our Proudhonist threatens us: *credit!* What credit does the worker need besides that from week to week, or the credit he obtains at the pawnshop? Whether he gets this credit free or at interest, even at the usurious interest charged by the pawnshop, how much difference does that make to him? And if he did, generally speaking, obtain some advantage from it, that is to say, if the cost of production of labour power were reduced, would not the price of labour power be bound to fall? But to the bourgeois, and in particular to the petty bourgeois, credit is an important matter, and it would be a very fine thing for the petty bourgeois in particular if credit could be obtained at any time, and besides without payment of interest. "State debts!" The working class knows that it did not make them, and when it comes to power it will

leave the payment of them to those who contracted them. "Private debts!"—see credit. "Taxes!" A matter that interests the bourgeoisie very much but the worker only very little. What the worker pays in taxes goes in the long run into the cost of production of labour power and must therefore be compensated for by the capitalist. All these things which are held up to us here as highly important questions for the working class are in reality of essential interest only to the bourgeois, and still more so to the petty bourgeois; and, despite Proudhon, we maintain that the working class is not called upon to safeguard the interests of these classes.

Our Proudhonist has not a word to say about the great question which really concerns the workers, that of the relation between capitalist and wage-worker, the question of how it comes about that the capitalist can enrich himself by the labour of his workers. True enough, his lord and master did occupy himself with it, but introduced absolutely no clearness into the matter. Even in his latest writings he has got essentially no farther than he was in his *Philosophy of Poverty*, which Marx so strikingly reduced to nothingness in 1847.*

It was bad enough that for twenty-five years the workers of the Latin countries had almost no other socialist mental nourishment than the writings of this "Socialist of the Second Empire," and it would be a double misfortune if the Proudhonist theory were now to inundate Germany too. However, there need be no fear of this. The theoretical standpoint of the German workers is fifty years ahead of that of Proudhonism, and it will be sufficient to make an example of this one question, the housing question, to save further trouble in this respect.

PART TWO

HOW THE BOURGEOISIE SOLVES THE HOUSING QUESTION

I

In the section on the *Proudhonist* solution of the housing question it was shown how greatly the petty bourgeoisie is directly interested in this question. However, the big bourgeoisie is also very much interested in it, even if indirectly. Modern natural science has proved that the so-called "poor districts,"

* Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*. Answer to the *Philosophy of Poverty* by M. Bakunin.—Ed.

in which the workers are crowded together, are the breeding places of all those epidemics which from time to time afflict our towns. Cholera, typhus, typhoid fever, small-pox and other ravaging diseases spread their germs in the pestilential air and the poisoned water of these working-class quarters. Here the germs hardly ever die out completely, and as soon as circumstances permit they develop into epidemics and then spread beyond their breeding places into the more airy and healthy parts of the town inhabited by the capitalists. Capitalist rule cannot allow itself the pleasure of generating epidemic diseases among the working class with impunity; the consequences fall back on it and the angel of death rages in its ranks as ruthlessly as in the ranks of the workers.

As soon as this fact had been scientifically established the philanthropic bourgeois became inflamed with a noble spirit of competition in their solicitude for the health of their workers. Societies were founded, books were written, proposals drawn up, laws debated and passed, in order to stop up the sources of the ever-recurring epidemics. The housing conditions of the workers were investigated and attempts made to remedy the most crying evils. In England particularly, where the largest number of big towns existed and where the bourgeoisie itself was, therefore, running the greatest risk, extensive activity began. Government commissions were appointed to inquire into the hygienic conditions of the working classes. Their reports, honourably distinguished from all continental sources by their accuracy, completeness and impartiality, provided the basis for new, more or less thoroughgoing laws. Imperfect as these laws are, they are still infinitely superior to everything that has been done in this direction up to the present on the Continent. Nevertheless, the capitalist order of society reproduces again and again the evils to be remedied, and does so with such inevitable necessity that even in England the remedying of them has hardly advanced a single step.

Germany, as usual, needed a much longer time before the chronic sources of infection existing there also reached the acute stage necessary to arouse the somnolent big bourgeoisie. But he who goes slowly goes surely, and so among us too there finally has arisen a bourgeois literature on public health and the housing question, a watery extract of its foreign, and in particular its English, predecessors, to which it is sought fraudulently to impart a semblance of higher conception by means of fine-sounding and unctuous phrases. *The Housing Conditions of the Working Classes and Their Reform*, by Dr. Emil Sax, Vienna, 1869²³⁸ belongs to this literature.

I have selected this book for a presentation of the bourgeois treatment of the housing question only because it makes the attempt to summarise as far as possible the bourgeois literature on the subject. And a fine literature it is which serves our author as his "sources"! Of the English parliamentary reports, the real main sources, only three, the very oldest, are mentioned by name; the whole book proves that its author has *never glanced at even a single one of them*. On the other hand, a whole series of banal bourgeois, well-meaning philistine and hypocritical philanthropic writings are enumerated: Ducpétiaux, Roberts, Hole, Huber, the proceedings of the English congresses on social science (or rather social bosh), the journal of the Association for the Welfare of the Labouring Classes in Prussia, the official Austrian report on the World Exhibition in Paris, the official Bonapartist reports on the same subject, the *Illustrated London News*,²⁴⁶ *Über Land und Meer*,²⁴⁷ and finally "a recognised authority," a man of "acute practical perception," of "convincing impressiveness of speech," namely—*Julius Faucher*! All that is missing in this list of sources is the *Gartenlaube*,²⁴⁸ *Kladderadatsch*¹⁶⁸ and the *Fusilier Kutschke*.²⁴⁹

In order that no misunderstanding may arise concerning the standpoint of Herr Sax, he declares on page 22:

"By social economy we mean the doctrine of national economy in its application to social questions; or to put it more precisely, the totality of the ways and means which this science offers us *for raising the so-called (1) propertyless classes to the level of the propertied classes, on the basis of its 'iron' laws within the framework of the order of society at present prevailing.*"

We shall not go into the confused idea that generally speaking "the doctrine of national economy," or political economy, deals with other than "social" questions. We shall get down to the main point immediately. Dr. Sax demands that the "iron laws" of bourgeois economics, the "framework of the order of society at present prevailing," in other words, that the capitalist mode of production, must continue to exist unchanged, but nevertheless the "so-called propertyless classes" are to be raised "to the level of the propertied classes." Now, it is an unavoidable preliminary condition of the capitalist mode of production that a really, and not a so-called, propertyless class, should exist, a class which has nothing to sell but its labour power and which is therefore compelled to sell its labour power to the industrial capitalists. The task of the new science of social economy invented by Herr Sax is, therefore, to find ways and means—in a state of society founded on the antagonism of capitalists, owners of all raw materials, instruments of production and means of subsistence,

on the one hand, and of propertyless wage-workers, who call only their labour power and nothing else their own, on the other hand—by which, inside this social order, all wage-workers can be turned into capitalists without ceasing to be wage-workers. Herr Sax thinks he has solved this question. Perhaps he would be so good as to show us how all the soldiers of the French army, each of whom carries a marshal's baton in his knapsack since the days of the old Napoleon, can be turned into field marshals without at the same time ceasing to be privates. Or how it could be brought about that all the forty million subjects of the German Reich could be made German kaisers.

It is the essence of bourgeois socialism to want to maintain the basis of all the evils of present-day society and at the same time to want to abolish the evils themselves. As already pointed out in the *Communist Manifesto*, the bourgeois Socialists are desirous of "redressing social grievances, in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society"; they want "*a bourgeoisie without a proletariat*."* We have seen that Herr Sax formulates the problem in exactly the same fashion. Its solution he finds in the solution of the housing problem. He is of the opinion that

"by improving the housing of the labouring classes it would be possible successfully to remedy the material and spiritual misery which has been described, and thereby—by a radical improvement of the housing conditions *alone*—to raise the greater part of these classes out of the morass of their often hardly human conditions of existence to the pure heights of material and spiritual well-being." (Page 14.)

Incidentally, it is in the interest of the bourgeoisie to gloss over the fact of the existence of a proletariat created by the bourgeois relations of production and determining the continued existence of these relations. Therefore Herr Sax tells us (page 21) that the expression labouring classes is to be understood as including all "impecunious social classes," "and, in general, people in a small way, such as handicraftsmen, widows, pensioners (!), subordinate officials, etc." as well as actual workers. Bourgeois socialism extends its hand to the petty-bourgeois variety.

Whence the housing shortage then? How did it arise? As a good bourgeois, Herr Sax is not supposed to know that it is a necessary product of the bourgeois social order; that it cannot fail to be present in a society in which the great labouring masses are exclusively dependent upon wages, that is to say, upon the quantity of means of subsistence necessary for their existence and for the propagation of their kind; in which improvements

* See present edition, Vol. 1, p. 133.—Ed.

of the machinery, etc., continually throw masses of workers out of employment; in which violent and regularly recurring industrial fluctuations determine on the one hand the existence of a large reserve army of unemployed workers, and on the other hand drive the mass of the workers from time to time on to the streets unemployed; in which the workers are crowded together in masses in the big towns, at a quicker rate than dwellings come into existence for them under the prevailing conditions; in which, therefore, there must always be tenants even for the most infamous pigsties; and in which finally the house-owner in his capacity as capitalist has not only the right but, by reason of competition, to a certain extent also the duty of ruthlessly making as much out of his property in house rent as he possibly can. In such a society the housing shortage is no accident; it is a necessary institution and can be abolished together with all its effects on health, etc., only if the whole social order from which it springs is fundamentally refashioned. That, however, bourgeois socialism dare not know. It *dare* not explain the housing shortage as arising from the existing conditions. And therefore it has no other way but to explain the housing shortage by moralising that it is the result of the wickedness of man, the result of original sin, so to speak.

"And here we cannot fail to recognise—and in consequence we cannot deny" (daring conclusion!)—"that the blame . . . rests partly *with the workers themselves*, those who want dwellings, and partly, the much greater part, it is true, with those who undertake to supply the need or those who, although they have sufficient means at their command, make no attempt to supply the need, namely, *the propertied, higher social classes*. The latter are to be blamed . . . because they do not make it their business to provide for a sufficient supply of good dwellings."

Just as Proudhon takes us from the sphere of economics into the sphere of legal phrases, so our bourgeois Socialist takes us here from the economic sphere into the moral sphere. And nothing is more natural. Whoever declares that the capitalist mode of production, the "iron laws" of present-day bourgeois society, are inviolable, and yet at the same time would like to abolish their unpleasant but necessary consequences, has no other recourse but to deliver moral sermons to the capitalists, moral sermons whose emotional effects immediately evaporate under the influence of private interest and, if necessary, of competition. These moral sermons are in effect exactly the same as those of the hen at the edge of the pond in which she sees the brood of ducklings she has hatched out gaily swimming. Ducklings take to the water although it has no beams, and capitalists pounce on profit although it is heartless. "There is no room for sentiment

in money matters," was already said by old Hansemann, who knew more about it than Herr Sax.

"Good dwellings are so expensive that *it is absolutely impossible* for the greater part of the workers to make use of them. Big capital ... is shy of investing in houses for the working classes ... and as a result these classes and their housing needs fall mostly a prey to the speculators."

Disgusting speculation—big capital naturally never speculates! But it is not ill will, it is only ignorance which prevents big capital from speculating in workers' houses:

"House-owners do not *know* at all what a great and important role ... is played by a normal satisfaction of housing needs; *they do not know what they are doing to the people* when they offer them, as a general rule so irresponsibly, bad and harmful dwellings, and, finally, they do not *know* how they damage themselves thereby." (Page 27.)

However, the ignorance of the capitalists must be supplemented by the ignorance of the workers before a housing shortage can be created. After Herr Sax has admitted that "the very lowest sections" of the workers "are obliged (!) to seek a night's lodging wherever and however they can find it in order not to remain altogether without shelter and in this connection are absolutely defenceless and helpless," he tells us:

"For it is a well-known fact that many among them (the workers) from carelessness, but chiefly from ignorance, deprive their bodies, one is almost inclined to say, with virtuosity, of the conditions of natural development and healthy existence, in that they *have not the faintest idea* of rational hygiene and, in particular, of the enormous importance that attaches to the dwelling in this hygiene." (Page 27.)

Here however the bourgeois donkey's ears protrude. Where the capitalists are concerned "blame" evaporates into ignorance, but where the workers are concerned ignorance is made the cause of their guilt. Listen:

"Thus it comes (namely, through ignorance) that if they can only save something on the rent they will move into dark, damp and inadequate dwellings, which are in short a mockery of all the demands of hygiene ... that often several families together rent a single dwelling, and even a single room—all this in order to spend as little as possible on rent, while on the other hand they *squander* their income in *truly sinful fashion* on drink and all sorts of idle pleasures."

The money which the workers "waste on spirits and tobacco" (page 28), the "life in the pubs with all its regrettable consequences, which drags the workers again and again like a dead weight back into the mire," lies indeed like a dead weight in Herr Sax's stomach. The fact that under the existing circumstances drunkenness among the workers is a necessary product

of their living conditions, just as necessary as typhus, crime, vermin, bailiff and other social ills, so necessary in fact that the average figures of those who succumb to inebriety can be calculated in advance, is again something that Herr Sax cannot allow himself to know. My old primary school teacher used to say, by the way: "The common people go to the pubs and the people of quality go to the clubs," and as I have been in both I am in a position to confirm it.

The whole talk about the "ignorance" of both parties amounts to nothing but the old phrases about the harmony of interests of labour and capital. If the capitalists knew their true interests, they would give the workers good houses and improve their position in general; and if the workers understood their true interests, they would not go on strike, they would not go in for Social-Democracy, they would not play politics, but would be nice and follow their betters, the capitalists. Unfortunately, both sides find their interests altogether elsewhere than in the sermons of Herr Sax and his countless predecessors. The gospel of harmony between capital and labour has been preached for almost fifty years now, and bourgeois philanthropy has expended large sums of money to prove this harmony by building model institutions; yet, as we shall see later, we are today exactly where we were fifty years ago.

Our author now proceeds to the practical solution of the problem. How little revolutionary Proudhon's proposal to make the workers owners of their dwellings was can be seen from the fact that bourgeois socialism even before him tried to carry it out in practice and is still trying to do so. Herr Sax also declares that the housing problem can be completely solved only by transferring property in dwellings to the workers. (Pages 58 and 59.) More than that, he goes into poetic raptures at the idea, giving vent to his feelings in the following outburst of enthusiasm:

"There is something peculiar about the longing inherent in man to own land; it is an urge which not even the *feverishly pulsating business life* of the present day has been able to abate. It is the unconscious appreciation of the significance of the economic achievement represented by landownership. With it the individual obtains a secure hold; he is rooted firmly in the earth, as it were, and every enterprise (!) has its most permanent basis in it. However, the blessings of landownership extend far beyond these material advantages. Whoever is fortunate enough to call a piece of land his own has reached the *highest conceivable stage of economic independence*; he has a territory on which he can rule with *sovereign power*; he is *his own master*; he has a certain power and a *sure support* in time of need; his self-confidence develops and with this his moral strength. Hence the deep significance of property in the question before us. . . . The worker, today helplessly exposed to all the vicissitudes of economic life and in constant dependence on his employer, would thereby be saved to a certain extent from this precarious

situation; *he would become a capitalist* and be safeguarded against the dangers of unemployment or incapacitation as a result of the credit which his real estate would open to him. *He would thus be raised from the ranks of the propertyless into the propertied class.*" (Page 63.)

Herr Sax seems to assume that man is essentially a peasant, otherwise he would not falsely impute to the workers of our big cities a longing to own land, a longing which no one else has discovered in them. For our workers in the big cities freedom of movement is the prime condition of existence, and landownership can only be a fetter to them. Give them their own houses, chain them once again to the soil and you break their power of resistance to the wage cutting of the factory owners. The individual worker might be able to sell his house on occasion, but during a big strike or a general industrial crisis all the houses belonging to the workers affected would have to be put up for sale and would therefore find no purchasers or be sold off far below their cost price. And even if they all found purchasers, Herr Sax's whole grand housing reform would have come to nothing and he would have to start from the beginning again. However, poets live in a world of fantasy, and so does Herr Sax, who imagines that a landowner has "reached the highest stage of economic independence," that he has "a sure support," that "he would *become a capitalist* and be safeguarded against the dangers of unemployment or incapacitation as a result of the credit which his real estate would open to him," etc. Herr Sax should take a look at the French and our own Rhenish small peasants. Their houses and fields are loaded down with mortgages, their harvests belong to their creditors before they are reaped, and it is not they who rule with sovereign power on their "territory" but the usurer, the lawyer and the bailiff. That certainly represents the highest conceivable stage of economic independence—for the usurer! And in order that the workers may bring their little houses as quickly as possible under the same sovereignty of the usurer, our well-meaning Herr Sax carefully points to the *credit* which their *real estate* can secure them in times of unemployment or incapacitation instead of their becoming a burden on the poor rate.

In any case, Herr Sax has solved the question raised in the beginning: the worker "*becomes a capitalist*" by acquiring his own little house.

Capital is the command over the unpaid labour of others. The little house of the worker can therefore become capital only if he rents it to a third person and appropriates a part of the labour product of this third person in the form of rent. But the house is prevented from becoming capital precisely by the fact that

the worker lives in it himself, just as a coat ceases to be capital the moment I buy it from the tailor and put it on. The worker who owns a little house to the value of a thousand talers is, true enough, no longer a proletarian, but it takes Herr Sax to call him a capitalist.

However, this capitalist streak of our worker has still another side. Let us assume that in a given industrial area it has become the rule that each worker owns his own little house. In that case *the working class of that area lives rent-free*; housing expenses no longer enter into the value of its labour power. Every reduction in the cost of production of labour power, that is to say, every permanent price reduction in the worker's necessities of life is equivalent "on the basis of the iron laws of the doctrine of national economy" to a depression of the value of labour power and will therefore finally result in a corresponding drop in wages. Wages would thus fall on an average as much as the average sum saved on rent, that is, the worker would pay rent for his own house, but not, as formerly, in money to the house-owner, but in unpaid labour to the factory owner for whom he works. In this way the savings of the worker invested in his little house would in a certain sense become capital, however not capital for him but for the capitalist employing him.

Herr Sax thus lacks the ability to turn his worker into a capitalist even on paper.

Incidentally, what has been said above applies to all so-called social reforms which can be reduced to saving schemes or to cheapening the means of subsistence of the worker. Either they become general and then they are followed by a corresponding reduction of wages or they remain quite isolated experiments and then their very existence as isolated exceptions proves that their realisation on an extensive scale is incompatible with the existing capitalist mode of production. Let us assume that in a certain area a general introduction of consumers' co-operatives succeeds in reducing the cost of the means of subsistence for the workers by 20 per cent. Hence in the long run wages would fall in that area by approximately 20 per cent, that is to say, in the same proportion as the means of subsistence in question enter into the budget of the workers. If the worker, for example, spends three-quarters of his weekly wage on these means of subsistence, wages would in the end fall by $\frac{3}{4} \times 20 = 15$ per cent. In short, as soon as any such saving reform has become general, the worker's wages diminish by as much as his savings permit him to live cheaper. Give *every* worker an independent income of 52 talers, achieved by saving, and his weekly wage must finally fall one taler. Therefore, the more he saves the less he will receive in

wages. He saves, therefore, not in his own interest but in the interest of the capitalist. What else is needed "to stimulate" in him ... "in the most powerful fashion ... the primary economic virtue, thrift"? (Page 64.)

Moreover, Herr Sax tells us immediately afterwards that the workers are to become house-owners not so much in their own interest as in the interest of the capitalists:

"However, not only the working class but society as a whole has the greatest interest in seeing as many of its members as possible bound (!) to the land" (I should like to see Herr Sax himself even for once in this posture). "...All the secret forces which set on fire the volcano called the social question which glows under our feet, the proletarian bitterness, the hatred ... the dangerous confusion of ideas, ... must all disappear like mist before the morning sun when ... the workers themselves enter in this fashion into the ranks of the propertied class." (Page 65.)

In other words, Herr Sax hopes that by a shift in their proletarian status, such as would be brought about by the acquisition of a house, the workers would also lose their proletarian character and become once again obedient toadies like their forefathers, who were also house-owners. The Proudhonists should lay this thing to heart.

Herr Sax believes he has thereby solved the social question:

"*A juster distribution of goods, the riddle of the Sphinx which so many have already tried in vain to solve, does it not now lie before us as a tangible fact, has it not thereby been taken from the regions of ideals and brought into the realm of reality? And if it is carried out, does this not mean the achievement of one of the highest aims, one which even the Socialists of the most extreme tendency present as the culminating point of their theories?*" (Page 66.)

It is really lucky that we have worked our way through as far as this, because this shout of triumph is the "summit" of the Saxian book. From now on we once more gently descend from "the regions of ideals" to flat reality, and when we get down we shall find that nothing, nothing at all, has changed in our absence.

Our guide takes us the first step down by informing us that there are two systems of workers' dwellings: the cottage system, in which each working-class family has its own little house and if possible a little garden as well, as in England; and the barrack system of the large tenement houses containing numerous workers' dwellings, as in Paris, Vienna, etc. Between the two is the system prevailing in Northern Germany. Now it is true, he tells us, that the cottage system is the only correct one, and the *only one* whereby the worker can acquire the ownership of his own house; besides, he argues, the barrack system has very great

disadvantages with regard to hygiene, morality and domestic peace. But, alas and alack! says he, the cottage system is not realisable in the centres of the housing shortage, in the big cities, on account of the high cost of land, and one should, therefore, be glad if houses were built containing from four to six flats instead of big barracks, or if the main disadvantages of the barrack system were alleviated by various ingenious building devices. (Pages 71-92.)

We have come down quite a bit already, haven't we? The transformation of the workers into capitalists, the solution of the social question, a house of his own for each worker—all these things have been left behind, up above in "the regions of ideals." All that remains for us to do is to introduce the cottage system into the countryside and to make the workers' barracks in the cities as tolerable as possible.

On its own admission, therefore, the bourgeois solution of the housing question has come to grief—it has come to grief owing to the *contrast between town and country*. And with this we have arrived at the kernel of the problem. The housing question can be solved only when society has been sufficiently transformed for a start to be made towards abolishing the contrast between town and country, which has been brought to its extreme point by present-day capitalist society. Far from being able to abolish this antithesis, capitalist society on the contrary is compelled to intensify it day by day. On the other hand, already the first modern Utopian Socialists, Owen and Fourier, correctly recognised this. In their model structures the contrast between town and country no longer exists. Consequently there takes place exactly the opposite of what Herr Sax contends: it is not that the solution of the housing question simultaneously solves the social question, but that only by the solution of the social question, that is, by the abolition of the capitalist mode of production, is the solution of the housing question made possible. To want to solve the housing question while at the same time desiring to maintain the modern big cities is an absurdity. The modern big cities, however, will be abolished only by the abolition of the capitalist mode of production, and when this is once set going there will be quite other issues than supplying each worker with a little house of his own.

In the beginning, however, each social revolution will have to take things as it finds them and do its best to get rid of the most crying evils with the means at its disposal. And we have already seen that the housing *shortage* can be remedied immediately by expropriating a part of the luxury dwellings belonging to the

propertied classes and by compulsory quartering in the remaining part.

If now Herr Sax, continuing, once more leaves the big cities and delivers a verbose discourse on working-class colonies to be established near the towns, if he describes all the beauties of such colonies with their common "water supply, gas lighting, air or hot-water heating, laundries, drying-rooms, bath-rooms, etc.," each with its "nursery, school, prayer hall (!), reading-room, library ... wine and beer hall, dancing and concert hall in all respectability," with steam power fitted to all the houses so that "to a certain extent production can be transferred back from the factory to the domestic workshop"—this does not alter the situation at all. The colony he describes has been directly borrowed by Mr. Huber from the Socialists Owen and Fourier and merely made entirely bourgeois by discarding everything socialist about it. Thereby, however, it has become really utopian. No capitalist has any interest in establishing such colonies, and in fact none such exists anywhere in the world, except in Guise in France, and that was build by a follower of Fourier, not as profitable speculation but as a socialist experiment.* Herr Sax might just as well have quoted in support of his bourgeois project-spinning the example of the communist colony "Harmony Hall"²⁵¹ founded by Owen in Hampshire at the beginning of the forties and long since defunct.

In any case, all this talk about building colonies is nothing more than a lame attempt to soar again into "the regions of ideals" and it is immediately afterwards again abandoned. We descend rapidly again. The simplest solution now is

"that the employers, the factory owners, should assist the workers to obtain suitable dwellings, whether they do so by building such themselves or by encouraging and assisting the workers to do their own building, providing them with land, advancing them building capital, etc." (Page 106.)

With this we are once again out of the big towns, where there can be no question of anything of the sort, and back in the country. Herr Sax now proves that here it is in the interest of the factory owners themselves that they should assist their workers to obtain tolerable dwellings, on the one hand because it is a good investment, and on the other hand because the inevitably

"resulting uplift of the workers ... must entail an increase of their mental and physical working capacity, which naturally is of ... no less ... ad-

* And this one also has finally become a mere site of working-class exploitation. (See the Paris *Socialiste* of 1886.²⁵⁰) [Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.]

vantage to the employers. With this, however, the right point of view for the participation of the latter in the solution of the housing question is given. It appears as the outcome of a *latent association*, as the outcome of the care of the employers for the physical and economic, mental and moral well-being of their workers, which is concealed for the most part under the cloak of humanitarian endeavours and which is its own pecuniary reward because of its successful results: the producing and maintaining of a diligent, skilled, willing, contented and *devoted* working class." (Page 108.)

The phrase "latent association"²⁵² with which Huber attempts to endow this bourgeois philanthropic drivel with a "loftier significance," does not alter the situation at all. Even without this phrase the big rural factory owners, particularly in England, have long ago realised that the building of workers' dwellings is not only a necessity, a part of the factory equipment itself, but also that it pays very well. In England whole villages have grown up in this way, and some of them have later developed into towns. The workers, however, instead of being thankful to the philanthropic capitalists, have always raised very considerable objections to this "cottage system." Not only are they compelled to pay monopoly prices for these houses because the factory owner has no competitors, but immediately a strike breaks out they are homeless because the factory owner throws them out of his houses without any more ado and thus renders any resistance very difficult. Details can be studied in my *Condition of the Working Class in England*, pp. 224 and 228.* Herr Sax, however, thinks that these objections "hardly deserve refutation." (Page 111.) But does he not want to make the worker the owner of his little house? Certainly, but as "the employers must always be in a position to dispose of the dwelling in order that when they dismiss a worker they may have room for the one who replaces him," well then, there is nothing for it but "to make provision for such cases *by stipulating that the ownership shall be revocable.*"** (Page 113.)

* See K. Marx and F. Engels, *On Britain*, pp. 287, 291-92.—*Ed.*

** In this respect too the English capitalists have long ago not only fulfilled but far exceeded all the cherished wishes of Herr Sax. On Monday, October 14, 1872, the court in Morpeth for the establishment of the lists of parliamentary electors had to adjudicate a petition on behalf of 2,000 miners to have their names enrolled on the list of parliamentary voters. It transpired that the greater number of these miners, according to the regulations of the mine at which they were employed, were *not* to be regarded as *lessees* of the dwellings in which they lived but as occupying these dwellings *on sufferance*, and could be thrown out of them at any moment without notice. (The mine-owner and house-owner were naturally one and the same person.) The judge decided that these men were not lessees but *servants*, and as such not entitled to be included in the list of voters. (*Daily News*,¹⁹⁰ October 15, 1872.) [*Note by Engels.*]

This time we have stepped down with unexpected suddenness. First it was said the worker must own his own little house. Then we were informed that this was impossible in the towns and could be carried out only in the country. And now we are told that ownership even in the country is to be "*revocable by agreement*"! With this new sort of property for the workers discovered by Herr Sax, with this transformation of the workers into capitalists "*revocable by agreement*," we have safely arrived again on level ground, and have here to examine what the capitalists and other philanthropists have *actually* done to solve the housing question.

II

If we are to believe our Dr. Sax, much has already been done by these gentlemen, the capitalists, to remedy the housing shortage, and the proof has been provided that the housing problem can be solved on the basis of the capitalist mode of production.

First of all, Herr Sax cites to us the example of—Bonapartist France! As is known, Louis Bonaparte appointed a commission at the time of the Paris World Exhibition ostensibly to report upon the situation of the working classes in France, but in reality to describe their situation as blissful in the extreme, to the greater glory of the Empire. And it is to the report of *this* commission, composed of the corruptest tools of Bonapartism, that Herr Sax refers, particularly because the results of its work are, "according to the authorised committee's *own statement*, fairly complete for France." And what are these results? Of eighty-nine big industrialists or joint-stock companies which gave information, thirty-one had built *no* workers' dwellings at all. According to Sax's own estimate the dwellings that were built house at the most from 50,000 to 60,000 people and consist almost exclusively of no more than two rooms for each family!

It is obvious that every capitalist who is tied down to a particular rural locality by the conditions of his industry—water power, the location of coal mines, iron-ore deposits and other mines, etc.—must build dwellings for his workers if none are available. To see in this a proof of "latent association," "an eloquent testimony to a growing understanding of the question and its wide import," a "very promising beginning" (page 115), requires a highly developed habit of self-deception. For the rest, the industrialists of the various countries differ from each other in this respect also, according to their national character. For instance, Herr Sax informs us (page 117):

"In *England only quite recently* has increased activity on the part of employers in this direction been observable. This refers in particular to the out-of-the-way hamlets in the rural areas. . . . The circumstance that otherwise the workers often have to walk a long way from the nearest village to the factory and arrive there so exhausted that they do not perform enough work is the employers' main *motive for building dwellings* for their workers. However, the number of those who have a *deeper understanding* of conditions and who combine with the cause of housing *reform* more or less all the other elements of latent association is also increasing, and it is these people to whom credit is due for the establishment of those flourishing colonies. . . . The names of Ashton in Hyde, Ashworth in Turton, Grant in Bury, Greg in Bolington, Marshall in Leeds, Strutt in Belper, Salt in Saltaire, Ackroyd in Copley, and others are well known on this account throughout the United Kingdom."

Blessed simplicity, and still more blessed ignorance! The English rural factory owners have only "quite recently" been building workers' dwellings! No, my dear Herr Sax, the English capitalists are really big industrialists, not only as regards their purses but also as regards their brains. Long before Germany possessed a really large-scale industry they had realised that for factory production in the rural districts expenditure on workers' dwellings was a necessary part of the total investment of capital, and a very profitable one, both directly and indirectly. Long before the struggle between Bismarck and the German bourgeois had given the German workers freedom of association, the English factory, mine and foundry owners had had practical experience of the pressure they can exert on striking workers if they are at the same time the landlords of those workers. The "flourishing colonies" of a Greg, an Ashton and an Ashworth are so "recent" that even forty years ago they were hailed by the bourgeoisie as models, as I myself wrote twenty-eight years ago. (*The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Note on pp. 228-30.*) The colonies of Marshall and Akroyd (that is how the man spells his name) are about as old, and the colony of Strutt is even much older, its beginnings reaching back into the last century. Since in England the average duration of a worker's dwelling is reckoned as forty years, Herr Sax can calculate on his fingers the dilapidated condition in which these "flourishing colonies" are today. In addition, the majority of these colonies are now no longer in the countryside. The colossal expansion of industry has surrounded most of them with factories and houses to such an extent that they are now situated in the middle of dirty, smoky towns with 20,000, 30,000 and more inhabitants. But all this does not prevent German bourgeois science, as represented by Herr Sax, from devoutly repeating today the old

* See K. Marx and F. Engels, *On Britain*, Moscow, 1962, pp. 221-22.—Ed.

English paeans of praise of 1840, which no longer have any application.

And to give us old Akroyd as an example! This worthy was certainly a philanthropist of the first water. He loved his workers, and in particular his female employees, to such an extent that his less philanthropic competitors in Yorkshire used to say of him that he ran his factories exclusively with his own children! True, Herr Sax contends that "illegitimate children are becoming more and more rare" in these flourishing colonies. (Page 118.) Yes, illegitimate children *born out of wedlock*, for in the English industrial districts the pretty girls marry very young.

In England the establishment of workers' dwellings close to each big rural factory and simultaneously *with* the factory has been the rule for sixty years and more. As already mentioned, many of these factory villages have become the nucleus around which later on a whole factory town has grown up with all the evils which a factory town brings with it. These colonies have therefore not solved the housing question; on the contrary, they *first really created it* in their localities.

On the other hand, in countries which in the sphere of large-scale industry have only limped along behind England, and which really got to know what large-scale industry is only after 1848, in France and particularly in Germany, the situation is quite different. Here it was only colossal foundries and factories which decided after much hesitation to build a certain number of workers' dwellings—for instance, the Schneider works in Creusot and the Krupp works in Essen. The great majority of the rural industrialists let their workers trudge miles through the heat, snow and rain every morning to the factories, and back again every evening to their homes. This is particularly the case in mountainous districts, in the French and Alsatian Vosges districts, in the valleys of the Wupper, Sieg, Agger, Lenne and other Rhineland-Westphalian rivers. In the Erzgebirge the situation is probably no better. The same petty niggardliness occurs among both Germans and French.

Herr Sax knows very well that the very promising beginning as well as the flourishing colonies means less than nothing. Therefore, he tries now to prove to the capitalists that they can obtain magnificent rents by building workers' dwellings. In other words, he seeks to show them a new way of cheating the workers.

First of all, he holds up to them the example of a number of London building societies, partly philanthropic and partly speculative, which have shown a net profit of from four to six per cent and more. It is not at all necessary for Herr Sax to prove

to us that capital invested in workers' houses yields a good profit. The reason why the capitalists do not invest still more than they do in workers' dwellings is that more expensive dwellings bring in still greater profits for their owners. Herr Sax's exhortation to the capitalists, therefore, amounts once again to nothing but a moral sermon.

Now, as far as these London building societies are concerned, whose brilliant successes Herr Sax so loudly trumpets forth, they have, according to his own figures—and every sort of building speculation is included here—provided housing for a total of 2,132 families and 706 single men, that is, for less than 15,000 persons! And is it presumed seriously to present in Germany this sort of childishness as a great success, although in the East End of London alone a million workers live under the most miserable housing conditions? The whole of these philanthropic efforts are in fact so miserably futile that the English parliamentary reports dealing with the condition of the workers never even mention them.

We will not speak here of the ludicrous ignorance of London displayed throughout this whole section. Just one point, however. Herr Sax is of the opinion that the Lodging House for Single Men in Soho went out of business because there "was no hope of obtaining a large clientele" in this neighbourhood. Herr Sax imagines that the whole of the West End of London is one big luxury town, and does not know that right behind the most elegant streets the dirtiest workers' quarters are to be found, of which, for example, Soho is one. The model lodging house in Soho, which he mentions and which I already knew twenty-three years ago, was much frequented in the beginning, but closed down because no one could stand it there, and yet it was one of the best.

But the workers' town of Mülhausen in Alsace—that is surely a success, is it not?

The Workers' City in Mülhausen is the great show-piece of the continental bourgeois, just as the one-time flourishing colonies of Ashton, Ashworth, Greg and Co. are of the English bourgeois. Unfortunately, the Mülhausen example is not a product of "latent" association but of the open association between the Second French Empire and the capitalists of Alsace. It was one of Louis Bonaparte's socialist experiments, for which the state advanced one-third of the capital. In fourteen years (up to 1867) it built 800 small houses, according to a defective system, an impossible one in England where they understand these things better, and these houses are handed over to the workers to become their own property after thirteen to fifteen years of

monthly payments of an increased rental. It was not necessary for the Bonapartists of Alsace to invent this mode of acquiring property; as we shall see, it had been introduced by the English co-operative building societies long before. Compared with that in England, the extra rent paid for the purchase of these houses is rather high. For instance, after having paid 4,500 francs in instalments during fifteen years, the worker receives a house which was worth 3,300 francs fifteen years before. If the worker wants to go away or if he is in arrears with only a single monthly instalment (in which case he can be evicted), six and two-thirds per cent of the original value of the house is charged as the annual rent (for instance, 17 francs a month for a house worth 3,000 francs) and the rest is paid out to him, but *without a penny of interest*. It is quite clear that under such circumstances the society is able to grow fat, quite apart from "state assistance." It is just as clear that the houses provided under these circumstances are better than the old tenement houses in the town itself, if only because they are built outside the town in a semi-rural neighbourhood.

We need not say a word about the few miserable experiments which have been made in Germany; even Herr Sax, on page 157, admits their woefulness.

What, then, exactly do all these examples prove? Simply that the building of workers' dwellings is profitable from the capitalist point of view, even when not all the laws of hygiene are trodden underfoot. But that has never been denied; we all knew that long ago. *Any* investment of capital which satisfies an existing need is profitable if conducted rationally. The question, however, is precisely, why the housing shortage continues to exist *all the same*, why the capitalists all the same do not provide sufficient healthy dwellings for the workers. And here Herr Sax has again nothing but exhortations to make to capital and fails to provide us with an answer. The real answer to this question we have already given above.

Capital does not *want* to abolish the housing shortage even if it could; this has now been finally established. There remain, therefore, only two other expedients: self-help on the part of the workers, and state assistance.

Herr Sax, an enthusiastic worshipper of self-help, is able to report miraculous things about it also in regard to the housing question. Unfortunately he is compelled to admit right at the beginning that self-help can only effect anything where the cottage system either already exists or where it is feasible, that is, once again only in the rural areas. In the big cities, even in Eng-

land, it can be effective only in a very limited measure. Herr Sax then sighs:

“Reform in this way (by self-help) can be effected only in a *roundabout way* and therefore *always* only imperfectly, namely, only in so far as the principle of private ownership is so strengthened as to react on the quality of the dwelling.”

This too could be doubted; in any case, the “principle of private ownership” has not exercised any reforming influence on the “quality” of the author’s style. Despite all this, self-help in England has achieved such wonders “that thereby everything done there along other lines to solve the housing problem has been *far exceeded*.” Herr Sax is referring to the English “building societies” and he deals with them at great length particularly because

“very inadequate or erroneous ideas are current about their character and activities in general. The English building societies are by no means ... associations for building houses or building co-operatives; they can be described ... in German rather as something like ‘*Hauserwerbvereine*’ [associations for the acquisition of houses]. They are associations whose object it is to accumulate funds from the periodical contributions of their members in order then, out of these funds and according to their size, to grant loans to their members for the purchase of a house... The building society is thus a savings bank for one section of its members, and a loan bank for the other section. The building societies are, therefore, mortgage credit institutions designed to meet the requirements of the workers which, in the main ... use the savings of the workers ... to assist persons of the same social standing as the depositors to purchase or build a house. As may be supposed, such loans are granted by mortgaging the real estate in question, and on condition that they must be paid back at short intervals in instalments which combine both interest and amortisation... The interest is not paid out to the depositors but always *placed to their credit and compounded*... The members can demand the return of the sums they have paid in, plus interest ... at any time by giving a month’s notice.” (Pages 170 to 172.) “There are over 2,000 such societies in England; ... the total capital they have accumulated amounts to about £ 15,000,000. In this way about 100,000 *working-class* families have already obtained possession of their own hearth and home—a social achievement which it would certainly be difficult to parallel.” (Page 174.)

Unfortunately here too the “but” comes limping along immediately after:

“But a perfect solution of the problem has *by no means been achieved* in this way, for the reason, if for no other, that the acquisition of a house is something only the *better situated* workers ... can afford... In particular, sanitary conditions are often not sufficiently taken into consideration.” (Page 176.)

On the continent “such associations ... find only little scope for development.” They presuppose the existence of the cottage system, which here exists only in the countryside; and in the

countryside the workers are not yet sufficiently developed for self-help. On the other hand, in the towns where real building co-operatives could be formed they are faced with "very considerable and serious difficulties of all sorts." (Page 179.) They could build only cottages and that will not do in the big cities. In short, "this form of co-operative self-help" cannot "in the present circumstances—and hardly in the near future either—play the chief role in the solution of the problem before us." These building societies, you see, are still "in their initial, undeveloped stage." "This is true even of England." (Page 181.)

Hence, the capitalists *will* not and the workers *cannot*. And with this we could close this section if it were not absolutely necessary to provide a little information about the English building societies, which the bourgeois of the Schulze-Delitzsch type always hold up to our workers as models.

These building societies are not workers' societies, nor is it their main aim to provide workers with their own houses. On the contrary, we shall see that this happens only very exceptionally. The building societies are essentially of a speculative nature, the small ones, which were the original societies, not less so than their big imitators. In a public house, usually at the instigation of the proprietor, on whose premises the weekly meetings then take place, a number of regular customers and their friends, shopkeepers, office clerks, commercial travellers, master artisans and other petty bourgeois—with here and there perhaps a mechanic or some other worker belonging to the aristocracy of his class—get together and found a building co-operative. The immediate occasion is usually that the proprietor has discovered a comparatively cheap plot of land in the neighbourhood or somewhere else. Most of the members are not bound by their occupations to any particular locality. Even many of the shopkeepers and craftsmen have only business premises in the town but no living quarters. Everyone in a position to do so prefers to live in the suburbs rather than in the centre of the smoky town. The building plot is purchased and as many cottages as possible erected on it. The credit of the more substantial members makes the purchase possible, and the weekly contributions together with a few small loans cover the weekly costs of building. Those members who aim at getting a house of their own receive cottages by lot as they are completed, and the appropriate extra rent serves for the amortisation of the purchase price. The remaining cottages are then either let or sold. The building society, however, if it does good business, accumulates a more or less considerable sum. This remains the property of the members, provided they keep up their contributions, and is distributed

among them from time to time, or when the society is dissolved. Such is the life history of nine out of ten of the English building societies. The others are bigger associations, sometimes formed under political or philanthropic pretexts, but in the end their chief aim is always to provide a more profitable mortgage investment for the savings of the *petty bourgeoisie*, at a good rate of interest and the prospect of dividends from speculation in real estate.

The sort of clients these societies speculate on can be seen from the prospectus of one of the largest, if not the largest, of them. The Birkbeck Building Society, 29 and 30, Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane, London, whose gross receipts since its foundation total over £10,500,000 (70,000,000 taler), which has over £416,000 in the bank or invested in government securities, and which at present has 21,441 members and depositors, introduces itself to the public in the following fashion:

"Most people are acquainted with the so-called three-year system of the piano manufacturers, under which anyone renting a piano for three years becomes the owner of the piano after the expiration of that period. Prior to the introduction of this system it was almost as difficult for people of limited income to acquire a good piano as it was for them to acquire their own house. Year after year such people had paid the rent for the piano and spent two or three times the money the piano was worth. What applies to a piano applies also to a house... However, as a house costs more than a piano, ... it takes longer to pay off the purchase price in rent. In consequence the directors have entered into an arrangement with house-owners in various parts of London and its suburbs which enables them to offer the members of the Birkbeck Building Society and others a great selection of houses in the most diverse parts of the town. The system which the Board of Directors intends to put into operation is as follows: it will let these houses for twelve and a half years and at the end of this period, providing that the rent has been paid regularly, the tenant will become the absolute owner of the house without any further payment of any kind... The tenant can also contract for a shorter space of time with a higher rental, or for a longer space of time with a lower rental... *People of limited income, clerks, shop assistants*, and others can make themselves independent of landlords immediately by becoming members of the Birkbeck Building Society."

That is clear enough. There is no mention of workers, but there is of people of limited income, clerks and shop assistants, etc., and in addition it is assumed that, as a rule, the applicants *already possess a piano*. In fact we do not have to do here with workers at all but with petty bourgeois and those who would like *and are able* to become such; people whose incomes gradually rise as a rule, even if within certain limits, such as clerks and similar employees. The income of the worker, on the contrary, at best remains the same in amount, and in reality falls in proportion to the increase of his family and its growing needs. In

fact only a few workers can, by way of exception, belong to such societies. On the one hand their income is too low, and on the other hand it is of too uncertain a character for them to be able to undertake responsibilities for twelve and a half years in advance. The few exceptions where this is not valid are either the best-paid workers or foremen.*

For the rest, it is clear to everyone that the Bonapartists of the workers' town of Mülhausen are nothing more than miserable apers of these petty-bourgeois English building societies. The sole difference is that the former, in spite of the state assistance granted to them, swindle their clients far more than the building societies do. On the whole their terms are less liberal than the average existing in England, and while in England interest and compound interest are calculated on each deposit and can be withdrawn at a month's notice, the factory owners of Mülhausen put both interest and compound interest into their own pockets and repay no more than the amount paid in by the workers in hard five-franc pieces. And no one will be more astonished at this difference than Herr Sax who has it all in his book without knowing it.

Thus, workers' self-help is also no good. There remains state assistance. What can Herr Sax offer us in this regard? Three things:

"First of all, the state must take care that in its legislation and administration all those things which in any way result in accentuating the housing

* We add here a little contribution on the way in which these building associations, and in particular the London building associations, are managed. As is known, almost the whole of the land on which London is built belongs to about a dozen aristocrats, including the most eminent, the Duke of Westminster, the Duke of Bedford, the Duke of Portland, etc. They originally leased out the separate building sites for a period of ninety-nine years, and at the end of that period took possession of the land with everything on it. They then let the houses on shorter leases, thirty-nine years for example, on a so-called repairing lease, according to which the leaseholder must put the house in good repair and maintain it in such condition. As soon as the contract has progressed thus far, the landlord sends his architect and the district surveyor to inspect the house and determine the repairs necessary. These repairs are often very considerable and may include the renewal of the whole frontage, or of the roof, etc. The leaseholder now deposits his lease as security with a building association and receives from this society a loan of the necessary money—up to £1,000 and more in the case of an annual rental of from £130 to £150—for the building repairs to be made at *his* expense. These building associations have thus become an important intermediate link in a system which aims at securing the continual renewal and maintenance in habitable condition of London's houses belonging to the landed aristocracy without any trouble to the latter and at the cost of the public. And this is supposed to be a solution of the housing question for the workers! [*Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.*]

shortage among the working classes are abolished or appropriately remedied." (Page 187.)

Consequently, revision of building legislation and freedom for the building trades in order that building shall be cheaper. But in England building legislation is reduced to a minimum, the building trades are as free as the birds in the air; nevertheless, the housing shortage exists. In addition building is now done so cheaply in England that the houses shake when a cart goes by and every day some of them collapse. Only yesterday (October 25, 1872) six of them collapsed simultaneously in Manchester and seriously injured six workers. Therefore, that is also no remedy.

"Secondly, the state power must prevent individuals in their narrow-minded individualism from spreading the evil or calling it forth anew."

Consequently, sanitary and building-police inspection of workers' dwellings; transference to the authorities of power to forbid the occupancy of dilapidated and unhygienic houses, as has been the case in England since 1857. But how did it come about there? The first law, that of 1855 (the Nuisances Removal Act), was "a dead letter," as Herr Sax admits himself, as was the second, the law of 1858 (the Local Government Act). (Page 197.) On the other hand Herr Sax believes that the third law (the Artisans' Dwellings Act), which applies only to towns with a population of over 10,000, "certainly offers favourable testimony of the great understanding of the British Parliament in social matters." (Page 199.) But as a matter of fact this assertion does no more than "offer favourable testimony" of the utter ignorance of Herr Sax in English "matters." That England in general is far in advance of the Continent "in social matters" is a matter of course. England is the motherland of modern large-scale industry; the capitalist mode of production has developed there most freely and extensively of all, its consequences show themselves there most glaringly of all and therefore it is likewise there that they first produced a reaction in the sphere of legislation. The best proof of this is factory legislation. If however Herr Sax thinks that an Act of Parliament only requires to become legally effective in order to be carried immediately into practice as well, he is grievously mistaken. And this is true of the Local Government Act more than of any other act (with the exception, of course, of the Workshops Act). The administration of this law was entrusted to the urban authorities, which almost everywhere in England are recognised centres of corruption of every kind, of nepotism and jobbery.* The agents of these urban authorities,

* Jobbery is the use of a public office to the private advantage of the official or his family. If, for instance, the director of the state telegraph

who owe their positions to all sorts of family considerations, are either incapable of carrying into effect such social laws or disinclined to do so. On the other hand it is precisely in England that the state officials entrusted with the preparation and execution of social legislation are usually distinguished by a strict sense of duty—although in a lesser degree today than twenty or thirty years ago. In the town councils the owners of unsound and dilapidated dwellings are almost everywhere strongly represented either directly or indirectly. The system of electing these town councils by small wards makes the elected members dependent on the pettiest local interests and influences; no town councillor who desires to be re-elected dare vote for the application of this law in his constituency. It is comprehensible, therefore, with what aversion this law was received almost everywhere by the local authorities, and that up to the present it has been applied only in the most scandalous cases—and even then, as a general rule, only as the result of the outbreak of some epidemic, such as in the case of the small-pox epidemic last year in Manchester and Salford. Appeals to the Home Secretary have up to the present been effective only in such cases, for it is the principle of every *Liberal* government in England to propose social reform laws only when compelled to do so and, if at all possible, to avoid carrying into effect those already existing. The law in question, like many others in England, is of importance only because in the hands of a government dominated by or under the pressure of the workers, a government which would at last really administer it, it will be a powerful weapon for making a breach in the existing social state of things.

“Thirdly,” the state power ought, according to Herr Sax, “to make the most extensive use possible of all the positive means at its disposal to allay the existing housing shortage.”

That is to say, it should build barracks, “truly model buildings,” for its “subordinate officials and servants” (but then these are not workers!), and “grant loans . . . to municipalities, societies and also to private persons for the purpose of improving the housing conditions of the working classes” (page 203), as is done in England under the Public Works Loan Act, and as Louis Bonaparte has done in Paris and Mülhausen. But the Public Works Loan Act also exists only on paper. The government places at

of a country becomes a silent partner in a paper factory, provides this factory with timber from his forests and then gives the factory orders for supplying paper for the telegraph offices, that is, true, a fairly small but still quite a pretty “job,” inasmuch as it demonstrates a complete understanding of the principles of jobbery; such as, by the way, in the days of Bismarck was a matter of course and to be expected. [Note by Engels.]

the disposal of the commissioners a maximum sum of £ 50,000, that is, sufficient to build at the utmost 400 cottages, or in forty years a total of 16,000 cottages or dwellings for at the most 80,000 persons—a drop in the bucket! Even if we assume that after twenty years the funds at the disposal of the commission were to double as a result of repayments, that therefore during the past twenty years dwellings for a further 40,000 persons have been built, it still is only a drop in the bucket. And as the cottages last on the average only forty years, after forty years the liquid assets of £ 50,000 or £ 100,000 must be used every year to replace the most dilapidated, the oldest of the cottages. This, Herr Sax declares on page 203, is carrying the principle into practice correctly “and to an unlimited extent!” And with this confession that even in England the state, to “an unlimited extent,” has achieved next to nothing, Herr Sax concludes his book, but not without having first delivered another homily to all concerned.*

It is perfectly clear that the state as it exists today is neither able nor willing to do anything to remedy the housing calamity. The state is nothing but the organised collective power of the possessing classes, the landowners and the capitalists, as against the exploited classes, the peasants and the workers. What the individual capitalists (and it is here only a question of these because in this matter the landowner, who is concerned, also acts primarily in his capacity as a capitalist) do not want, their state also does not want. If therefore the *individual* capitalists deplore the housing shortage, but can hardly be moved to palliate even superficially its most terrifying consequences, the *collective* capitalist, the state, will not do much more. At most it will see to it that that measure of superficial palliation which has become customary is carried into execution everywhere uniformly. And we have seen that this is the case.

But, one might object, in Germany the bourgeois do not rule

* In recent English Acts of Parliament giving the London building authorities the right of expropriation for the purpose of new street construction, a certain amount of consideration is given to the workers thus turned out of their homes. A provision has been inserted that the new buildings to be erected must be suitable for housing those classes of the population previously living there. Big five or six storey tenement houses are therefore erected for the workers on the least valuable sites and in this way the letter of the law is complied with. It remains to be seen how this arrangement will work, for the workers are quite unaccustomed to it and in the midst of the old conditions in London these buildings represent a completely foreign development. At best, however, they will provide new dwellings for hardly a quarter of the workers actually evicted by the building operations. [Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.]

as yet; in Germany the state is still to a certain extent a power hovering independently over society, which for that very reason represents the collective interests of society and not those of a single class. *Such* a state can certainly do much that a bourgeois state cannot do, and one ought to expect from it something quite different in the social field also.

That is the language of reactionaries. In reality however the state as it exists in Germany is likewise the necessary product of the social basis out of which it has developed. In Prussia—and Prussia is now decisive—there exists side by side with a landowning aristocracy, which is still powerful, a comparatively young and extremely cowardly bourgeoisie, which up to the present has not won either direct political domination, as in France, or more or less indirect domination as in England. Side by side with these two classes, however, there exists a rapidly increasing proletariat which is intellectually highly developed and which is becoming more and more organised every day. We therefore find here, alongside of the basic condition of the old absolute monarchy—an equilibrium between the landed aristocracy and the bourgeoisie—the basic condition of modern Bonapartism—an equilibrium between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. But both in the old absolute monarchy and in the modern Bonapartist monarchy the real governmental authority lies in the hands of a special caste of army officers and state officials. In Prussia this caste is replenished partly from its own ranks, partly from the lesser primogenitary aristocracy, more rarely from the higher aristocracy, and least of all from the bourgeoisie. The independence of this caste, which appears to occupy a position outside and, so to speak, above society, gives the state the semblance of independence in relation to society.

The form of state which has developed with the necessary consistency in Prussia (and, following the Prussian example, in the new Reich constitution of Germany) out of these contradictory social conditions is pseudo-constitutionalism, a form which is at once both the present-day form of the dissolution of the old absolute monarchy and the form of existence of the Bonapartist monarchy. In Prussia pseudo-constitutionalism from 1848 to 1866 only concealed and facilitated the slow decay of the absolute monarchy. However, since 1866, and still more since 1870, the upheaval in social conditions, and with it the dissolution of the old state, has proceeded in the sight of all and on a tremendously increasing scale. The rapid development of industry, and in particular of stock-exchange swindling, has dragged all the ruling classes into the whirlpool of speculation. The wholesale corruption imported from France in 1870 is develop-

ing at an unprecedented rate. Strousberg and Pereire take off their hats to each other. Ministers, generals, princes and counts gamble in stocks in competition with the most cunning stock-exchange wolves, and the state recognises their equality by conferring baronetcies wholesale on these stock-exchange wolves. The rural nobility, who have been industrialists for a long time as manufacturers of beet sugar and distillers of brandy, have long left the old respectable days behind and their names now swell the lists of directors of all sorts of sound and unsound joint-stock companies. The bureaucracy is beginning more and more to despise embezzlement as the sole means of improving its income; it is turning its back on the state and beginning to hunt after the far more lucrative posts on the administration of industrial enterprises. Those who still remain in office follow the example of their superiors and speculate in stocks, or "acquire interests" in railways, etc. One is even justified in assuming that the lieutenants also have their hands in certain speculations. In short, the decomposition of all the elements of the old state and the transition from the absolute monarchy to the Bonapartist monarchy is in full swing. With the next big business and industrial crisis not only will the present swindle collapse, but the old Prussian state as well.*

And this state, in which the non-bourgeois elements are becoming more bourgeois every day, is it to solve "the social question," or even only the housing question? On the contrary. In all economic questions the Prussian state is falling more and more into the hands of the bourgeoisie. And if legislation in the economic field since 1866 has not been adapted even more to the interests of the bourgeoisie than has actually been the case, whose fault is that? The bourgeoisie itself is chiefly responsible, first because it is too cowardly to press its own demands energetically, and secondly because it resists every concession if the latter simultaneously provides the menacing proletariat with new weapons. And if the political power, that is, Bismarck, is attempting to organise its own bodyguard proletariat to keep the political activity of the bourgeoisie in check, what else is that if not a necessary and quite familiar Bonapartist recipe which pledges the state to nothing more, as far as the workers are concerned, than a few benevolent phrases and at the utmost to a minimum of state assistance for building societies *à la Louis Bonaparte*?

* Even today, in 1886, the only thing that holds together the old Prussian state and its basis, the alliance of big landownership and industrial capital sealed by the protective tariffs, is fear of the proletariat, which has grown tremendously in numbers and class-consciousness since 1872. [Note by Engels to the 1887 edition.]

The best proof of what the workers have to expect from the Prussian state lies in the utilisation of the French milliards¹²¹ which have given a new, short reprieve to the independence of the Prussian state machine in regard to society. Has even a single taler of all these milliards been used to provide shelter for those Berlin working-class families which have been thrown on to the streets? On the contrary. As autumn approached, the state caused to be pulled down even those few miserable hovels which had given them a temporary roof over their heads during the summer. The five milliards are going rapidly enough the way of all flesh: for fortresses, cannon and soldiers; and despite Wagner's asinities,²⁵³ and despite Stieber's conferences with Austria,²⁵⁴ less will be allotted to the German workers out of those milliards than was allotted to the French workers out of the millions which Louis Bonaparte stole from France.

III

In reality the bourgeoisie has only one method of settling the housing question after *its* fashion—that is to say, of settling it in such a way that the solution continually poses the question anew. This method is called "*Haussmann*."

By the term "*Haussmann*" I do not mean merely the specifically Bonapartist manner of the Parisian Haussmann—breaking long, straight and broad streets right through the closely-built workers' quarters and lining them on both sides with big luxurious buildings, the intention having been, apart from the strategic aim of making barricade fighting more difficult, to develop a specifically Bonapartist building trades' proletariat dependent on the government and to turn the city into a luxury city pure and simple. By "*Haussmann*" I mean the practice, which has now become general, of making breaches in the working-class quarters of our big cities, particularly in those which are centrally situated, irrespective of whether this practice is occasioned by considerations of public health and beautification or by the demand for big centrally located business premises or by traffic requirements, such as the laying down of railways, streets, etc. No matter how different the reasons may be, the result is everywhere the same: the most scandalous alleys and lanes disappear to the accompaniment of lavish self-glorification by the bourgeoisie on account of this tremendous success, but—they appear again at once somewhere else, and often in the immediate neighbourhood.

In *The Condition of the Working Class in England* I gave a picture of Manchester as it looked in 1843 and 1844. Since then

the construction of railways through the centre of the city, the laying out of new streets and the erection of great public and private buildings have broken through, laid bare and improved some of the worst districts described there, others have been abolished altogether; although, apart from the fact that sanitary-police inspection has since become stricter, many of them are still in the same state or in an even worse state of dilapidation than they were then. On the other hand, thanks to the enormous extension of the town, whose population has since increased by more than a half, districts which were at that time still airy and clean are now just as overbuilt, just as dirty and congested as the most ill-famed parts of the town formerly were. Here is but one example: On page 80 *et seq.* of my book I described a group of houses situated in the valley bottom of the Medlock River, which under the name of Little Ireland was for years the disgrace of Manchester.* Little Ireland has long ago disappeared and on its site there now stands a railway station built on a high foundation. The bourgeoisie pointed with pride to the happy and final abolition of Little Ireland as to a great triumph. Now last summer a great inundation took place, as in general the rivers embanked in our big cities cause more and more extensive floods year after year for reasons that can be easily explained. And it was then revealed that Little Ireland had not been abolished at all, but had simply been shifted from the south side of Oxford Road to the north side, and that it still continues to flourish. Let us hear what the *Manchester Weekly Times*, the organ of the radical bourgeoisie of Manchester, has to say in its issue of July 20, 1872:

“The misfortune which befell the inhabitants of the lower valley of the Medlock last Saturday will, it is to be hoped, have one good result, namely, that public attention will be directed to the obvious mockery of all the laws of hygiene which has been tolerated there so long under the noses of our municipal officials and our municipal health committee. A trenchant article in our day edition yesterday revealed, though hardly forcibly enough, the scandalous condition of some of the cellar dwellings near Charles Street and Brook Street which were reached by the flood. A detailed examination of one of the courts mentioned in this article enables us to confirm all the statements made about them, and to declare that the cellar dwellings in this court should long ago have been closed down, or rather, they should never have been tolerated as human habitations. Squire’s Court is made up of seven or eight dwelling houses on the corner of Charles Street and Brook Street. Even at the lowest part of Brook Street, under the railway viaduct, a pedestrian may pass daily and never dream that human beings are living far down, under his feet, in caves. The court itself is hidden from public view and is accessible only to those who are compelled by their impoverishment to seek a shelter in its sepulchral seclusion. Even if the usually stag-

* See K. Marx and F. Engels, *On Britain*, Moscow, 1962, p. 94.—Ed.

nant waters of the Medlock, which are shut in between locks, do not exceed their usual level, the floors of those dwellings can hardly be more than a few inches above the surface of the river. A good shower of rain is capable of driving up foul, nauseous water through the drains and filling the rooms with pestilential gases such as every flood leaves behind it as a souvenir. . . . Squire's Court lies at a still lower level than the uninhabited cellars of the houses in Brook Street . . . twenty feet below street level, and the noxious water driven up on Saturday through the drains reached to the roofs. We knew this and therefore expected that we should find the place uninhabited or occupied only by the sanitary officials engaged in washing off the stinking walls and disinfecting the houses. Instead of this we saw a man in the cellar home of a barber . . . engaged in shovelling a heap of decomposing filth, which lay in a corner, on to a wheelbarrow. The barber, whose cellar was already more or less cleaned up, sent us still lower down to a number of dwellings about which he declared that, if he could write, he would have informed the press and demanded that they be closed down. And so finally we came to Squire's Court where we found a buxom and healthy-looking Irishwoman busy at the wash-tub. She and her husband, a night watchman, had lived for six years in the court and had a numerous family. . . . In the house which they had just left the water had risen almost to the roof, the windows were broken and the furniture was completely ruined. The man declared that the occupant of the house had been able to keep the smells from becoming intolerable only by whitewashing it every two months. . . . In the inner court into which our correspondent then went he found three houses whose rear walls abutted on the rear walls of the houses just described. Two of these three houses were inhabited. The stench there was so frightful that the healthiest man would have felt sick at the stomach in a very short space of time. . . . This disgusting hole was inhabited by a family of seven, all of whom had slept in the place on Thursday night (the first day the water rose). Or rather, not slept, as the woman immediately corrected herself, for she and her husband had vomited continually the greater part of the night owing to the terrible smell. On Saturday they had been compelled to wade through the water, chest high, to carry out their children. Besides, she was of the opinion that the place was not fit for pigs to live in, but on account of the low rent—one and six pence a week—she had taken it, for her husband had been out of work a lot recently owing to sickness. The impression made upon the observer by this court and the inhabitants huddled in it as though in a premature grave was one of utter helplessness. We must point out, by the way, that, according to our observations, Squire's Court is no more than typical—though perhaps an extreme case—of many other places in the neighbourhood whose continued existence our health committee cannot justify. Should these places be permitted to be tenanted in the future, the committee assumes a responsibility and the whole neighbourhood exposes itself to a danger of epidemic infection whose gravity we shall not further discuss."

This is a striking example of how the bourgeoisie settles the housing question in practice. The breeding places of disease, the infamous holes and cellars in which the capitalist mode of production confines our workers night after night, are not abolished; they are merely *shifted elsewhere!* The same economic necessity which produced them in the first place produces them in the next place also. As long as the capitalist mode of production continues to exist it is folly to hope for an isolated settlement of the housing question or of any other social question affecting

the lot of the workers. The solution lies in the abolition of the capitalist mode of production and the appropriation of all the means of subsistence and instruments of labour by the working class itself.

PART THREE

SUPPLEMENT ON PROUDHON AND THE HOUSING
QUESTION

I

In No. 86 of the *Volksstaat*, A. Mülberger reveals himself as the author of the articles criticised by me in No. 51 and subsequent numbers of the paper.* In his answer²³⁹ he overwhelms me with such a series of reproaches, and at the same time confuses all the issues to such an extent that willy-nilly I am compelled to reply to him. I shall attempt to give my reply, which to my regret must be made to a large extent in the field of personal polemics enjoined upon me by Mülberger himself, a general interest by presenting the chief points once again and if possible more clearly than before, even at the risk of being told once more by Mülberger that all this "contains nothing essentially new either for him or for the other readers of the *Volksstaat*."

Mülberger complains of the form and content of my criticism. As far as the form is concerned it will be sufficient to reply that at the time I did not even know who had written the articles in question. There can, therefore, be no question of any personal "prejudice" against their author; against the solution of the housing problem put forward in the articles I was of course in so far "prejudiced" as I was long ago acquainted with it from Proudhon and my opinion on it was firmly fixed.

I am not going to quarrel with friend Mülberger about the "tone" of my criticism. When one has been so long in the movement as I have, one develops a fairly thick skin against attacks, and therefore one easily presumes the existence of the same in others. In order to compensate Mülberger I shall endeavour this time to bring my "tone" into the right relation to the sensitiveness of his epidermis.

Mülberger complains with particular bitterness that I said he was a Proudhonist, and he protests that he is not. Naturally I must believe him, but I shall adduce proof that the articles in

* See pp. 305-23 of this volume.—*Ed.*

question—and I had to do with them alone—contain nothing but undiluted Proudhonism.

But according to Mülberger I have also criticised Proudhon “frivolously” and have done him a serious injustice.

“The doctrine of the petty bourgeois Proudhon has become an accepted dogma in Germany, which is even proclaimed by many who have never read a line of him.”

When I express regret that for twenty years the workers speaking Romance languages have had no other mental pabulum than the works of Proudhon, Mülberger answers that as far as the Latin workers are concerned, “the principles formulated by Proudhon are almost everywhere the driving spirit of the movement.” This I must deny. First of all, the “driving spirit” of the working-class movement nowhere lies in “principles,” but everywhere in the development of large-scale industry and its effects, the accumulation and concentration of capital, on the one hand, and of the proletariat, on the other. Secondly, it is not correct to say that in the Latin countries Proudhon’s so-called “principles” play the decisive role ascribed to them by Mülberger; that “the principles of anarchism, of the organisation of the *forces économiques*, of the *liquidation sociale*, etc., have there . . . become the true bearers of the revolutionary movement.” Not to speak of Spain and Italy, where the Proudhonist panacea has gained some influence only in the still more botched form presented by Bakunin, it is a notorious fact for anyone who knows the international working-class movement that in France the Proudhonists form a numerically rather insignificant sect, while the mass of the French workers refuses to have anything to do with the social reform plan drawn up by Proudhon under the titles of *Liquidation sociale* and *Organisation des forces économiques*. This was shown, among other things, in the Commune. Although the Proudhonists were strongly represented in the Commune, not the slightest attempt was made to liquidate the old society or to organise the economic forces according to Proudhon’s proposals. On the contrary, it does the Commune the greatest honour that in all its economic measures the “driving spirit” was not any set of “principles,” but simple, practical needs. And therefore these measures—abolition of night work in the bakeries, prohibition of monetary fines in the factories, confiscation of shut-down factories and workshops and handing them over to workers’ associations—were not at all in accordance with the spirit of Proudhonism, but certainly in accordance with the spirit of German scientific socialism. The only social measure which the Proudhonists put through was the decision *not* to confiscate

the Bank of France, and this, was partly responsible for the downfall of the Commune. In the same way, when the so-called Blanquists made an attempt to transform themselves from mere political revolutionists into a socialist workers' faction with a definite programme—as was done by the Blanquist fugitives in London in their manifesto, *Internationale et Révolution*—they did not proclaim the “principles” of the Proudhonist plan for the salvation of society, but adopted, and almost literally at that, the views of German scientific socialism on the necessity of political action by the proletariat and of its dictatorship as the transition to the abolition of classes and, with them, of the state—views such as had already been expressed in the *Communist Manifesto** and since then on innumerable occasions. And if Mülberger even draws the conclusion from the Germans' disdain of Proudhon that there has been a lack of understanding of the movement in the Latin countries “down to the Paris Commune,” let him as proof of this lack tell us what work from the Latin side has understood and described the Commune even approximately as correctly as has the *Address of the General Council of the International on the Civil War in France*, written by the German Marx.**

The only country where the working-class movement is directly under the influence of Proudhonist “principles” is Belgium, and precisely as a result of this the Belgian movement comes, as Hegel would say, “from nothing through nothing to nothing.”²⁵⁵

When I consider it a misfortune that for twenty years the workers of the Latin countries fed intellectually, directly or indirectly, exclusively on Proudhon, I do not mean that thoroughly mythical dominance of Proudhon's reform recipe—termed by Mülberger the “principles”—but the fact that their economic criticism of existing society was contaminated with absolutely false Proudhonist phrases and that their political actions were bungled by Proudhonist influence. Whether thus the “Proudhonised workers of the Latin countries” “stand more in the revolution” than the German workers, who in any case understand the meaning of scientific German socialism infinitely better than the Latins understand their Proudhon, we shall be able to answer only after we have learnt what “to stand in the revolution” really means. We have heard talk of people who “stand in Christianity, in the true faith, in the grace of God,” etc. But “standing” in the revolution, in the most violent of all movements? Is, then,

* See present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 117-19, 126-27.—Ed.

** See pp. 217-30 of this volume.—Ed.

“the revolution” a dogmatic religion in which one must believe?

Mülberger further reproaches me with having asserted, in defiance of the express wording of his articles, that he had declared the housing question to be an exclusively working-class question.

This time Mülberger is really right. I overlooked the passage in question. It was irresponsible of me to overlook it, for it is one most characteristic of the whole tendency of his disquisition. Mülberger actually writes in plain words:

“As we have been so frequently and largely exposed to the *absurd* charge of pursuing a *class policy*, of striving for *class domination*, and such like, we wish to stress first of all and expressly that the housing question is by no means a question which affects the proletariat exclusively, but that, *on the contrary*, it interests to a quite prominent extent the *middle classes proper*, the small tradesmen, the petty bourgeoisie, the whole bureaucracy... The housing question is precisely that point of social reform which more than any other seems appropriate to reveal the *absolute inner identity of the interests of the proletariat*, on the one hand, and the interests of the *middle classes proper* of society, on the other. The middle classes suffer just as much as, and *perhaps even more than*, the proletariat under the oppressive fetters of the rented dwelling... Today the middle classes proper of society are faced with the question of whether they... can summon sufficient strength... to participate in the process of the transformation of society in alliance with the youthful, vigorous and energetic workers’ party, a transformation *whose blessings will be enjoyed above all by them.*”

Friend Mülberger thus makes the following points here:

1. “We” do not pursue any “class policy” and do not strive for “class domination.” But the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party, just *because* it is a *workers’ party*, necessarily pursues a “class policy,” the policy of the working class. Since each political party sets out to establish its rule in the state, so the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party is necessarily striving to establish *its* rule, the rule of the working class, hence “class domination.” Moreover, *every* real proletarian party, from the English Chartists onward, has put forward a class policy, the organisation of the proletariat as an independent political party, as the primary condition of its struggle, and the dictatorship of the proletariat as the immediate aim of the struggle. By declaring this to be “absurd,” Mülberger puts himself outside the proletarian movement and inside the camp of petty-bourgeois socialism.

2. The housing question has the advantage that it is not an exclusively working-class question, but a question which “interests to a quite prominent extent” the petty bourgeoisie, in that “the middle classes proper” suffer from it ‘just as much as, and perhaps even more than,’ the proletariat. If anyone declares that the petty bourgeoisie suffers, even if in one respect only,

"perhaps even more than the proletariat," he can hardly complain if one counts him among the petty-bourgeois Socialists. Has Mülberger therefore any grounds for complaint when I say:

"It is largely with just such sufferings as these, which the working class endures in common with other classes, and particularly the petty bourgeoisie, that petty-bourgeois socialism, to which Proudhon belongs, prefers to occupy itself. And thus it is not at all accidental that our German Proudhonist seizes chiefly upon the housing question, which, as we have seen, is by no means exclusively a working-class question."^{*}

3. There is an "absolute inner identity" between the interests of the "middle classes proper of society" and the interests of the proletariat, and it is not the proletariat, but these middle classes proper which will "enjoy above all" the "blessings" of the coming process of transformation of society.

The workers, therefore, are going to make the coming social revolution "above all" in the interests of the petty bourgeoisie. And furthermore, there is an absolute inner identity of the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and those of the proletariat. If the interests of the petty bourgeoisie have an inner identity with those of the workers, then those of the workers have an inner identity with those of the petty bourgeoisie. The petty-bourgeois standpoint has thus as much right to exist in the movement as the proletarian standpoint, and it is precisely the assertion of this equality of right that is called petty-bourgeois socialism.

It is therefore perfectly consistent when, on page 25 of the separate reprint,²³⁷ Mülberger extols "petty industry" as the "actual *buttress* of society," "because in accordance with its very nature it combines within itself the three factors: labour—acquisition—possession, and because in the combination of these three factors it places no bounds to the capacity for development of the individual"; and when he reproaches modern industry in particular with destroying this nursery for the production of normal human beings and "making out of a virile *class* continually reproducing itself an unconscious *heap* of humans who do not know wither to direct their anxious gaze." The petty bourgeois is thus Mülberger's model human being and petty industry is Mülberger's model mode of production. Did I defame him, therefore, when I classed him among the petty-bourgeois Socialists?

As Mülberger rejects all responsibility for Proudhon, it would be superfluous to discuss here any further how Proudhon's re-

* See p. 307 of this volume.—Ed.

form plans aim at transforming all members of society into petty bourgeois and small peasants. It will be just as unnecessary to deal with the alleged identity of interests of the petty bourgeoisie and the workers. What is necessary is to be found already in the *Communist Manifesto*. (Leipzig Edition, 1872, pp. 12 and 21.*)

The result of our examination is, therefore, that side by side with the "myth of the petty bourgeois Proudhon" appears the reality of the petty bourgeois Mülberger.

II

We now come to one of the main points. I accused Mülberger's articles of falsifying economic relationships after the manner of Proudhon by translating them into legal terminology. As an example of this, I picked the following statement by Mülberger:

"The house, once it has been built, serves as a *perpetual legal title* to a definite fraction of social labour although the real value of the house has been paid to the owner long ago more than adequately in the form of rent. *Thus it comes about* that a house which, for instance, was built fifty years ago, during this period covers the original cost price two, three, five, ten and more times over in its rent yield."

Mülberger now complains as follows:

"This *simple, sober statement of fact* causes Engels to enlighten me to the effect that I should have explained *how* the house became a 'legal title'—something which was quite beyond the scope of my task.... A *description* is one thing, an *explanation* another. When I say with Proudhon that the economic life of society should be pervaded by a *conception of right*, I am *describing* present-day society as one in which, true, not every conception of right is absent, but in which the *conception of right of the revolution* is absent, a fact which Engels himself will admit."

Let us keep for the moment to the house which has been built. The house; once it has been let, yields its builder ground rent, repairing costs, and interest on the building capital invested, including as well the profit made thereon in the form of rent; and, according to the circumstances, the rent, paid gradually, can amount to twice, thrice, five times or ten times as much as the original cost price. This, friend Mülberger, is the "simple, sober statement" of "fact," an *economic fact*; and if we want to know "how it comes" that it exists, we must conduct our examination in the economic field. Let us therefore look a little closer at this

* See present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 117-18, 129-30.—Ed.

fact so that not even a child may misunderstand it any longer. As is known, the sale of a commodity consists in the fact that its owner relinquishes its use-value and pockets its exchange-value. The use-values of commodities differ from one another among other things in the different periods of time required for their consumption. A loaf of bread is consumed in a day, a pair of trousers will be worn out in a year, and a house, if you like, in a hundred years. Hence, in the case of durable commodities, the possibility arises of selling their use-value piecemeal and each time for a definite period, that is to say, to *let* it. The piecemeal sale therefore realises the exchange-value only gradually. As a compensation for his renouncing the immediate repayment of the capital advanced and the profit accrued on it, the seller receives an increased price, interest, whose rate is determined by the laws of political economy and not by any means in an arbitrary fashion. At the end of the hundred years the house is used up, worn out and no longer habitable. If we then deduct from the total rent paid for the house the following: 1) the ground rent together with any increase it may have experienced during the period in question, and 2) the sums expended for current repairs, we shall find that the remainder is composed on an average as follows: 1) the building capital originally invested in the house, 2) the profit on this, and 3) the interest on the gradually maturing capital and profit. Now it is true that at the end of this period the tenant has no house, but neither has the house-owner. The latter has only the lot (provided that it belongs to him) and the building material on it, which, however, is no longer a house. And although in the meantime the house may have brought in a sum "which covers five or ten times the original cost price," we shall see that this is solely due to an increase of the ground rent. This is no secret to anyone in such cities as London where the landowner and the house-owner are in most cases two different persons. Such tremendous rent increases occur in rapidly growing towns, but not in a farming village, where the ground rent for building sites remains practically unchanged. It is indeed a notorious fact that, apart from increases in the ground rent, house rents produce on an average no more than seven per cent per annum on the invested capital (including profit) for the house-owner, and out of this sum repair costs, etc., must be paid. In short, a rent agreement is quite an ordinary commodity transaction which theoretically is of no greater and no lesser interest to the worker than any other commodity transaction, with the exception of that which concerns the buying and selling of labour power, while practically the worker faces the rent agreement as one of the thousand forms of bourgeois cheating, which

I dealt with on page 4 of the separate reprint.* But, as I proved there, this form is also subject to economic regulation.

Mülberger, on the other hand, regards the rent agreement as nothing but pure "arbitrariness" (page 19 of the separate reprint) and when I prove the contrary to him he complains that I am telling him "solely things which to his regret he already knew himself."

But all the economic investigations into house rent will not enable us to turn the abolition of the rented dwelling into "one of the most fruitful and magnificent aspirations which has ever sprung from the womb of the revolutionary idea." In order to accomplish this we must translate the simple fact from sober economics into the really far more ideological sphere of jurisprudence. "The house serves as a perpetual legal title" to house rent, and "*thus it comes*" that the value of a house can be paid back in rent two, three, five or ten times. The "legal title" does not help us a jot to discover how it really "does come," and therefore I said that Mülberger would have been able to find out *how* it really "does come" only by inquiring how the house becomes a legal title. We discover this only after we have examined, as I did, the *economic* nature of house rent, instead of quarrelling with the legal expression under which the ruling class sanctions it. Anyone who proposes the taking of economic steps to abolish rent surely ought to know a little more about house rent than that it "represents the tribute which the tenant pays to the perpetual title of capital." To this Mülberger answers, "A description is one thing, an explanation another."

We have thus converted the house, although it is by no means everlasting, into a perpetual legal title to house rent. We find, no matter how "it comes," that by virtue of this legal title, the house brings in its original value several times over in the form of rent. By the translation into legal phraseology we are happily so far removed from economics that we now can see no more than the phenomenon that a house can gradually get paid for in gross rent several times over. As we are thinking and talking in legal terms, we apply to this phenomenon the measuring stick of right, of justice, and find that it is *unjust*, that it is not in accordance with the "conception of right of the revolution," whatever that may be, and that therefore the legal title is no good. We find further that the same holds good for interest-bearing capital and leased agricultural land, and we now have the excuse for separating these classes of property from the others and subjecting them to exceptional treatment. This consists in the demands:

* See p. 306 of this volume.—Ed.

1) to deprive the owner of the right to give notice to quit, the right to demand the return of his property; 2) to give the lessee, borrower or tenant the gratuitous use of the object transferred to him but not belonging to him; and 3) to pay off the owner in instalments over a long period without interest. And with this we have exhausted the Proudhonist "principles" from this angle. This is Proudhon's "social liquidation."

Incidentally, it is obvious that this whole reform plan is to benefit almost exclusively the petty bourgeois and the small peasants, in that it *consolidates* them in their position as petty bourgeois and small peasants. Thus "the petty bourgeois Proudhon," who, according to Mülberger, is a mythical figure, suddenly takes on here a very tangible historical existence.

Mülberger continues:

"When I say with Proudhon that the economic life of society should be pervaded by a *conception of right*, I am *describing* present-day society as one in which, true, not every conception of right is absent, but in which the conception of right of the revolution is absent, a fact which Engels himself will admit."

Unfortunately I am not in a position to do Mülberger this favour. Mülberger demands that society *should be* pervaded by a conception of right and calls that a description. If a court sends a bailiff to me with a summons demanding the payment of a debt, then, according to Mülberger, it does no more than *describe* me as a man who does not pay his debts! A description is one thing, and a presumptuous demand is another. And precisely herein lies the essential difference between German scientific socialism and Proudhon. We describe—and despite Mülberger every real description of a thing is at the same time an explanation of it—economic relationships as they are and as they are developing, and we provide the proof, strictly economically, that their development is at the same time the development of the elements of a social revolution: the development, on the one hand, of a class whose conditions of life necessarily drive it to social revolution, the proletariat, and, on the other hand, of productive forces which, having grown beyond the framework of capitalist society, must necessarily burst that framework, and which at the same time offer the means of abolishing class distinctions once and for all in the interest of social progress itself. Proudhon, on the contrary, demands of present-day society that it shall transform itself not according to the laws of its own economic development, but according to the precepts of justice (the "*conception of right*" does not belong to him, but to Mül-

berger). Where we prove, Proudhon, and with him Mülberger, *preaches* and laments.

What kind of thing "the conception of right of the revolution" is I am absolutely unable to guess. Proudhon, it is true, makes a sort of goddess out of "*the Revolution*," the bearer and executrix of his "Justice," in doing which he then falls into the peculiar error of mixing up the bourgeois revolution of 1789-94 with the coming proletarian revolution. He does this in almost all his works, particularly since 1848; I shall quote only one as an example, namely, the *General Idea of the Revolution*, pages 39 and 40 of the 1868 edition.* As, however, Mülberger rejects all and every responsibility for Proudhon, I am not allowed to explain "the conception of right of the revolution" from Proudhon and remain therefore in Egyptian darkness.

Mülberger says further:

"But neither Proudhon nor I appeal to an 'eternal justice' in order thereby to *explain* the existing unjust conditions, or even expect, as Engels imputes to me, the improvement of these conditions from an appeal to this justice."

Mülberger must be banking on the idea that "in Germany Proudhon is, in general, as good as unknown." In all his works Proudhon measures all social, legal, political and religious propositions with the rod of "justice," and rejects or recognises them according to whether they conform or do not conform to what he calls "justice." In his *Economic Contradictions*** this justice is still called "eternal justice," "*justice éternelle*." Later on, nothing more is said about eternity, but the idea remains in essence. For instance, in his *Justice in the Revolution and in the Church*,*** 1858 edition, the following passage is the text of the whole three-volume sermon (Vol. I, page 42):

"What is the basic principle, the organic, regulating, sovereign principle of societies, the principle which subordinates all others to itself, which rules, protects, represses, punishes, and in case of need even suppresses all rebellious elements? Is it religion, the ideal or *interest*? . . . In my opinion this principle is *justice*. What is justice? *It is the very essence of humanity*. What has it been since the beginning of the world? Nothing. What ought it to be? Everything."

Justice which is the very essence of humanity, what is that if not *eternal justice*? Justice which is the organic, regulating,

* P. J. Proudhon, *Idée générale de la révolution du XIX siècle*. Paris 1868.—Ed.

** The reference is to Proudhon's *Système des contradictions économiques ou philosophie de la misère*.—Ed.

*** P. J. Proudhon, *De la justice dans la révolution et dans l'église*, T. 1-3, Paris 1858.—Ed.

sovereign basic principle of societies, which has nevertheless been nothing up to the present, but which ought to be everything—what is that if not the stick with which to measure all human affairs, if not the final arbiter to be appealed to in all conflicts? And did I assert anything else but that Proudhon cloaks his economic ignorance and helplessness by judging all economic relations not according to economic laws, but according to whether they conform or do not conform to his conception of this eternal justice? And what is the difference between Mülberger and Proudhon if Mülberger demands that “all these changes in the life of modern society” should be “pervaded by a *conception of right*, that is to say,” should “everywhere be carried out according to the *strict demands of justice*”? Is it that I can't read, or that Mülberger can't write?

Mülberger says further:

“Proudhon knows as well as Marx and Engels that the actual driving spirit in human society is the economic and not the juridical relations; he also knows that the given conceptions of right among a people are only the expression, the imprint, the product of the economic relations—and in particular the relations of production.... In a word, for Proudhon right is a historically evolved economic product.”

If Proudhon knows all this (I am prepared to let the unclear expressions used by Mülberger pass and take his good intentions for the deed), if Proudhon knows it all “as well as Marx and Engels,” what is there left to quarrel about? The trouble is that the situation with regard to Proudhon's knowledge is somewhat different. The economic relations of a given society present themselves in the first place as *interests*. Now, in the passage which has just been quoted from his opus Proudhon says in so many words that the “regulating, organic, sovereign basic principle of societies, the principle which subordinates all others to itself,” is not *interest* but *justice*. And he repeats the same thing in all the decisive passages of all his works, which does not prevent Mülberger from continuing:

“...The idea of economic right, as it was developed by Proudhon most profoundly of all in *War and Peace**, completely coincides with that basic idea of Lassalle so excellently expressed by him in his foreword to the *System of Acquired Rights*.”

War and Peace is perhaps the most schoolboyish of all the many schoolboyish works of Proudhon, but I could not have expected it to be put forward as proof of Proudhon's alleged understanding of the German materialist conception of history,

* P. J. Proudhon, *La guerre et la paix*, T. 1-2, Paris 1869.—Ed.

which explains all historical events and ideas, all politics, philosophy and religion, from the material, economic conditions of life of the historical period in question. The book is so little materialistic that it cannot even construct its conception of war without calling in the help of the *creator*:

"However, the creator, who chose this form of life for us, had his own purposes." (Vol. II, page 100, 1869 edition.)

On what historical knowledge the book is based can be judged from the fact that it believes in the historical existence of the Golden Age:

"In the beginning, when the human race was still sparsely spread over the earth's surface, nature supplied its needs without difficulty. It was the Golden Age, the age of peace and plenty." (*Ibid.*, page 102.)

Its economic standpoint is that of the crassest Malthusianism:

"When production is doubled, the population will soon be doubled also." (Page 105.)

In what does the materialism of this book consist, then? In that it declares the cause of war to have always been and still to be: "pauperism" (for instance, page 143). Uncle Bräsigt* was just such an accomplished materialist when in his 1848 speech he placidly uttered these grand words: "the cause of the great poverty is the great *pauvreté*."

Lassalle's *System of Acquired Rights* bears the imprint of the illusions of not only the jurist, but also the Old Hegelian. On page VII, Lassalle declares expressly that also "in *economics* the conception of acquired right is the driving force of all further development," and he seeks to prove that "right is a rational organism developing *out of itself*" (and not, therefore, out of economic prerequisites). (Page IX.) For Lassalle it is a question of deriving right not from economic relations, but from "the concept of the will itself, of which the philosophy of law is only the development and exposition." (Page X.) So, where does this book come in here? The only difference between Proudhon and Lassalle is that the latter was a real jurist and Hegelian, while in both jurisprudence and philosophy, as in all other matters, Proudhon was merely a dilettante.

I know perfectly well that this man Proudhon, who notoriously continually contradicts himself, occasionally makes an utterance which looks as though he explained ideas on the basis of

* *Uncle Bräsigt*: A comical character figuring in the works of German bourgeois humourist and novelist Fritz Reuter.—Ed.

facts. But such utterances are devoid of any significance when contrasted with the basic tendency of his thought, and where they do occur they are, besides, extremely confused and inherently inconsistent.

At a certain, very primitive stage of the development of society, the need arises to bring under a common rule the daily recurring acts of production, distribution and exchange of products, to see to it that the individual subordinates himself to the common conditions of production and exchange. This rule, which at first is custom, soon becomes *law*. With law, organs necessarily arise which are entrusted with its maintenance—public authority, the state. With further social development, law develops into a more or less comprehensive legal system. The more intricate this legal system becomes, the more is its mode of expression removed from that in which the usual economic conditions of the life of society are expressed. It appears as an independent element which derives the justification for its existence and the substantiation of its further development not from the economic relations but from its own inner foundations or, if you like, from “the concept of the will.” People forget that their right derived from their economic conditions of life, just as they have forgotten that they themselves derive from the animal world. With the development of the legal system into an intricate, comprehensive whole a new social division of labour becomes necessary; an order of professional jurists develops and with these legal science comes into being. In its further development this science compares the legal systems of various peoples and various times not as a reflection of the given economic relationships, but as systems which find their substantiations in themselves. The comparison presupposes points in common, and these are found by the jurists compiling what is more or less common to all these legal systems and calling it *natural right*. And the stick used to measure what is natural right and what is not is the most abstract expression of right itself, namely, *justice*. Henceforth, therefore, the development of right for the jurists, and for those who take their word for everything, is nothing more than a striving to bring human conditions, so far as they are expressed in legal terms, ever closer to the ideal of justice, *eternal justice*. And always this justice is but the ideologised, glorified expression of the existing economic relations, now from their conservative, and now from their revolutionary angle. The justice of the Greeks and Romans held slavery to be just; the justice of the bourgeois of 1789 demanded the abolition of feudalism on the ground that it was unjust. For the Prussian Junker even the miserable District Ordinance is a vio-

lation of eternal justice.²⁵⁶ The conception of eternal justice, therefore, varies not only with time and place, but also with the persons concerned, and belongs among those things of which Mülberger correctly says, "everyone understands something different." While in everyday life, in view of the simplicity of the relations discussed, expressions like right, wrong, justice, and sense of right are accepted without misunderstanding even with reference to social matters, they create, as we have seen, the same hopeless confusion in any scientific investigation of economic relations as would be created, for instance, in modern chemistry if the terminology of the phlogiston theory were to be retained. The confusion becomes still worse if one, like Proudhon, believes in this social phlogiston, "justice," or if one, like Mülberger, avers that the phlogiston theory is as correct as the oxygen theory.*

III

Mülberger further complains that I called his "emphatic" utterance,

"that there is no more terrible mockery of the whole culture of our lauded century than the fact that in the big cities 90 per cent and more of the population have no place that they can call their own"

—a reactionary jeremiad.

To be sure. If Mülberger had confined himself, as he pretends, to describing "the horrors of the present time" I should certainly not have said one ill word about "him and his modest words." In fact, however, he does something quite different. He describes these "horrors" as the *result* of the fact that the workers "*have no place that they can call their own.*" Whether one laments "the horrors of the present time" for the reason that the ownership of houses by the workers has been abolished or, as the Junkers do, for the reason that feudalism and the guilds have been

* Before the discovery of oxygen chemists explained the burning of substances in atmospheric air by assuming the existence of a special igneous substance, phlogiston, which escaped during the process of combustion: Since they found that simple substances on combustion weighed more after having been burned than they did before, they declared that phlogiston had a negative weight so that a substance without its phlogiston weighed more than one with it. In this way all the main properties of oxygen were gradually ascribed to phlogiston, but all in an *inverted* form. The discovery that combustion consists in a combination of the burning substance with another substance, oxygen, and the discovery of this oxygen disposed of the original assumption, but only after long resistance on the part of the older chemists. [Note by Engels.]

abolished, in either case nothing can come of it but a reactionary jeremiad, a song of sorrow at the coming of the inevitable, of the historically necessary. Its reactionary character lies precisely in the fact that Mülberger wishes to re-establish individual house ownership for the workers—a matter which history has long ago put an end to; that he can conceive of the emancipation of the workers in no other way than by making everyone once again the owner of his own house.

And further:

“I declare most emphatically, the real struggle is to be waged against the capitalist mode of production; only *from its transformation* is an improvement of housing conditions to be hoped for. Engels sees nothing of all this. . . . I presuppose the complete settlement of the social question in order to be able to proceed to the abolition of the rented dwelling.”

Unfortunately, I still see nothing of all this even now. It surely is impossible for me to know what someone whose name I never heard presupposes in the secret recesses of his mind. All I could do was to stick to the printed articles of Mülberger. And there I find even today (pages 15 and 16 of the reprint²³⁷) that Mülberger, in order to be able to proceed to the abolition of the rented dwelling, presupposes nothing except—the rented dwelling. Only on page 17 he takes “the productivity of capital by the horns,” to which we shall come back later. Even in his answer he confirms this when he says:

“It was rather a question of showing how, *from existing conditions*, a complete transformation in the housing question could be achieved.”

From existing conditions, and from the transformation (read: abolition) of the capitalist mode of production, are surely diametrically opposite things.

No wonder Mülberger complains when I regard the philanthropic efforts of Herr Dollfus and other manufacturers to assist the workers to obtain houses of their own as the only possible practical realisation of his Proudhonist projects. If he were to realise that Proudhon's plan for the salvation of society is a fantasy resting completely on the basis of *bourgeois* society, he would naturally not believe in it. I have never at any time called his good intentions in question. But why then does he praise Dr. Reschauer for proposing to the Vienna City Council that it should imitate Dollfus's projects?

Mülberger further declares:

“As far as the antithesis between town and country is particularly concerned, it is utopian to want to abolish it. This antithesis is a natural one, or more correctly, one that has arisen historically. . . . The question is not one of *abolishing* this antithesis, but of finding political and social forms in

which it would be *harmless*, indeed even *fruitful*. In this way it would be possible to expect adjustment, a gradual balancing of interests."

So the abolition of the antithesis between town and country is utopian, *because* this antithesis is a natural one, or more correctly, one that has arisen historically. Let us apply this same logic to other contrasts in modern society and see where we land. For instance:

"As far, in particular, as the antithesis between 'the capitalists and the wage-workers' is concerned, it is utopian to want to abolish it. This antithesis is a natural one, or more correctly, one that has arisen historically. The question is not one of *abolishing* this antithesis, but of finding political and social forms in which it would be *harmless*, indeed even *fruitful*. In this way it would be possible to expect a peaceful adjustment, a gradual balancing of interests."

And with this we have once again arrived at Schulze-Delitzsch.

The abolition of the antithesis between town and country is no more and no less utopian than the abolition of the antithesis between capitalists and wage-workers. From day to day it is becoming more and more a practical demand of both industrial and agricultural production. No one has demanded this more energetically than Liebig in his writings on the chemistry of agriculture, in which his first demand has always been that man shall give back to the land what he receives from it, and in which he proves that only the existence of the towns, and in particular the big towns, prevents this. When one observes how here in London alone a greater quantity of manure than is produced by the whole kingdom of Saxony is poured away every day into the sea with an expenditure of enormous sums, and what colossal structures are necessary in order to prevent this manure from poisoning the whole of London, then the utopia of abolishing the distinction between town and country is given a remarkably practical basis. And even comparatively unimportant Berlin has been suffocating in the malodours of its own filth for at least thirty years. On the other hand, it is completely utopian to want, like Proudhon, to upheave present-day bourgeois society while maintaining the peasant as such. Only as uniform a distribution as possible of the population over the whole country, only an intimate connection between industrial and agricultural production together with the extension of the means of communication made necessary thereby—granted the abolition of the capitalist mode of production—will be able to deliver the rural population from the isolation and stupor in which it has vegetated almost unchanged for thousands of years. To be utopian does not mean to maintain that the emancipation of humanity

from the chains which its historic past has forged will be complete only when the antithesis between town and country has been abolished; the utopia begins only when one ventures, "from existing conditions," to prescribe the *form* in which this or any other antithesis of present-day society is to be resolved. And this is what Mülberger does by adopting the Proudhonist formula for the settlement of the housing question.

Mülberger then complains that I have made him to a certain extent co-responsible for "Proudhon's monstrous views on capital and interest," and declares:

"I *presuppose* the alteration of the relations of production as an *accomplished fact*, and the transitional law regulating the rate of interest does not deal with relations of production but with the social turnover, the relations of circulation. . . . The alteration of the relations of production, or, as the German school says more accurately, the abolition of the capitalist mode of production, certainly does not result, as Engels *tries to make me say*, from a transitional law abolishing interest, but from the *actual seizure of all the instruments of labour*, from the seizure of industry as a whole by the working people. Whether the working people will in that event worship (!) redemption sooner than immediate expropriation is not for either Engels or me to decide."

I rub my eyes in astonishment, I am reading Mülberger's disquisition through once again from beginning to end in order to find the passage where he says his redemption of the rented dwelling presupposes as an accomplished fact "the actual seizure of all the instruments of labour, the seizure of industry as a whole by the working people," but I am unable to find any such passage. It does not exist. There is nowhere mention of "actual seizure," etc., but there is the following on page 17:

"Let us now assume that the productivity of capital is *really taken by the horns*, as it must be sooner or later, for instance, *by a transitional law which fixes the interest on all capitals at one per cent*, but mark you, with the tendency to make even this rate of interest approximate more and more to the zero point. . . . Like all other products, houses and dwellings are naturally also included within the purview of this law. . . . We see, therefore, from this angle that the redemption of the rented dwelling is a *necessary consequence of the abolition of the productivity of capital in general*."

Thus it is said here in plain words, quite contrary to Mülberger's latest about-face, that the productivity of capital, by which confused phrase he admittedly means the capitalist mode of production, is really "taken by the horns" by a law abolishing interest, and that precisely as a result of such a law "the redemption of the rented dwelling is a necessary consequence of the abolition of the productivity of capital in general." Not at all, says Mülberger now. That transitional law "does not deal with relations of *production* but with relations of *circulation*." In view

of this crass contradiction, "equally mysterious for wise men as for fools," as Goethe would say,* all that is left for me to do is to assume that I am dealing with two separate and distinct Mülbergers, one of whom rightly complains that I "tried to make him say" what the other caused to be printed.

It is certainly true that the working people will ask neither me nor Mülberger whether in the actual seizure they will "worship redemption sooner than immediate expropriation." In all probability they will prefer not to "worship" at all. However, there never was any question of the actual seizure of all the instruments of labour by the working people, but only of Mülberger's assertion (page 17) that "the whole content of the solution of the housing question is comprised in the word *redemption*." If he now declares this redemption to be extremely doubtful, what was the sense in giving the two of us and our readers all this unnecessary trouble?

Moreover, it must be pointed out that the "actual seizure" of all the instruments of labour, the taking possession of industry as a whole by the working people, is the exact opposite of the Proudhonist "redemption." In the latter case the *individual worker* becomes the owner of the dwelling, the peasant farm, the instruments of labour; in the former case, the "working people" remain the collective owners of the houses, factories and instruments of labour, and will hardly permit their use, at least during a transitional period, by individuals or associations without compensation for the cost. In the same way, the abolition of property in land is not the abolition of ground rent but its transfer, if in a modified form, to society. The actual seizure of all the instruments of labour by the working people, therefore, does not at all preclude the retention of rent relations.

In general, the question is not whether the proletariat when it comes to power will simply seize by force the instruments of production, the raw materials and means of subsistence, whether it will pay immediate compensation for them or whether it will redeem the property therein by small instalment payments. To attempt to answer such a question in advance and for all cases would be utopia-making, and that I leave to others.

IV

There was need to consume so much ink and paper in order to bore a way through Mülberger's diverse twists and turns to the real point at issue, a point which Mülberger carefully evades in his answer.

* Goethe, *Faust*, Part I, Scene 6 ("Hexenküche") (paraphrased).—Ed.

What were Mülberger's positive statements in his article?

First: that "the difference between the original cost price of a house, building site, etc., and its present value" belongs by right to society. In the language of economics, this difference is called ground rent. Proudhon too wants to appropriate this for society, as one may read in his *General Idea of the Revolution*, page 219 of the 1868 edition.

Secondly: that the solution of the housing problem consists in everyone becoming the owner instead of the tenant of his dwelling.

Thirdly: that this solution shall be put into effect by passing a law turning rent payments into instalment payments on the purchase price of the dwelling. Points 2 and 3 are both borrowed from Proudhon, as anyone can see in the *General Idea of the Revolution*, page 199 *et seq.*, where on page 203 a project of the law in question is to be found already drafted.

Fourthly: that the productivity of capital is taken by the horns by a transitional law reducing the rate of interest provisionally to one per cent, subject to further reduction later on. This point has also been taken from Proudhon, as may be read in detail on pages 182 to 186 of the *General Idea*.

With regard to each of these points I have cited the passage in Proudhon where the original of the Mülberger copy is to be found, and I ask now whether I was justified in calling the author of an article containing completely Proudhonist and nothing but Proudhonist views a Proudhonist or not? Nevertheless, Mülberger complains about nothing more bitterly than that I call him a Proudhonist because I "came upon a few *expressions* that are peculiar to Proudhon!" On the contrary. The "*expressions*" all belong to Mülberger, their *content* belongs to Proudhon. And when I then supplement this Proudhonist disquisition with Proudhon, Mülberger complains that I am ascribing to him the "monstrous views" of Proudhon!

What did I reply to this Proudhonist plan?

First: that the transfer of ground rent to the state is tantamount to the abolition of individual property in land.

Secondly: that the redemption of the rented dwelling and the transfer of property in the dwelling to the party who was the tenant hitherto does not at all affect the capitalist mode of production.

Thirdly: that with the present development of large-scale industry and towns this proposal is as absurd as it is reactionary, and that the reintroduction of the individual ownership of his dwelling by each individual would be a step backward.

Fourthly: that the compulsory reduction of the rate of interest

on capital would by no means attack the capitalist mode of production; and that, on the contrary, as the usury laws prove, it is as old as it is impossible.

Fifthly: that the abolition of interest on capital by no means abolishes the payment of rent for houses.

Mülberger has now admitted points 2 and 4. To the other points he makes no reply whatever. And yet these are just the points around which the whole debate centres. Mülberger's answer, however, is not a refutation: it carefully avoids dealing with all economic points, which after all are the decisive ones. It is a personal complaint, nothing more. For instance, he complains when I anticipate his announced solution of other questions, for example, state debts, private debts and credit, and say that his solution is everywhere the same, namely, that, as in the housing question, the abolition of interest, the conversion of interest payments into instalment payments on the capital sum, and free credit. Nevertheless, I am still ready to bet that if these articles of Mülberger see the light of day, their essential content will coincide with Proudhon's *General Idea*; credit, page 182; state debts, page 186; private debts, page 196; just as much as his articles on the housing question coincided with the passages I quoted from the same book.

Mülberger takes this opportunity to inform me that questions such as taxation, state debts, private debts and credit, to which is now added the question of municipal autonomy, are of the greatest importance to the peasant and for propaganda in the countryside. To a great extent I agree, but, 1) up to the moment there has been no discussion of the peasant, and 2) the Proudhonian "solutions" of all these problems are just as absurd economically and just as essentially bourgeois as his solution of the housing problem. I need hardly defend myself against Mülberger's suggestion that I fail to appreciate the necessity of drawing the peasants into the movement. However, I certainly consider it folly to recommend the Proudhonian quackery to them for this purpose. There is still very much big landed property in Germany. According to Proudhon's theory all this ought to be divided up into small peasant farms, which, in the present state of scientific agriculture and after the experience with small land allotments in France and Western Germany, would be positively reactionary. The big landed estates which still exist will rather afford us a welcome basis for the carrying on of agriculture on a large scale—the only system of farming which can utilise all modern facilities, machinery, etc.—by associated workers, and thus demonstrating to the small peasants the advantages of large-scale operation by means of association. The Danish Socialists,

who in this respect are ahead of all others, saw this long ago.

It is equally unnecessary for me to defend myself against the suggestion that I regard the existing infamous housing conditions of the workers as "an insignificant detail." As far as I know, I was the first to describe in German these conditions in their classical form as they exist in England; not, as Mülberger opines, because they "violated my *sense of justice*"—anyone who insisted on writing books about all the facts which violated his sense of justice would have a lot to do—but, as can be read in the Introduction to my book,* in order to provide a factual basis, by describing the social conditions created by modern large-scale industry, for German socialism, which was then arising and expending itself in empty phrases. However, it never entered my head to try to settle the so-called housing *question* any more than to occupy myself with the details of the still more important *food question*. I am satisfied if I can prove that the production of our modern society is sufficient to provide all its members with enough to eat, and that there are houses enough in existence to provide the working masses for the time being with roomy and healthy living accommodation. To speculate on how a future society might organise the distribution of food and dwellings leads directly to *utopia*. The utmost we can do is to state from our understanding of the basic conditions of all modes of production up to now that with the downfall of the capitalist mode of production certain forms of appropriation which existed in society hitherto will become impossible. Even the transitional measures will everywhere have to be in accordance with the relations existing at the moment. In countries of small landed property they will be substantially different from those in countries where big landed property prevails, etc. Mülberger himself shows us better than anyone else where one arrives at if one attempts to find separate solutions for so-called practical problems like the housing question. He first took 28 pages to explain that "the whole content of the solution of the housing question is comprised in the word *redemption*," and then, when hard pressed, begins to stammer in embarrassment that it is really very doubtful whether, on actually taking possession of the houses, "the working people will worship redemption" sooner than some other form of expropriation.

Mülberger demands that we should become *practical*, that we should not "come forward merely with dead and abstract formulas" when "faced with real practical relations," that we should "proceed beyond abstract socialism and *come close to the definite*

* Frederick Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*.—Ed.

concrete relations of society." If Mülberger had done this he might perhaps have rendered great service to the movement. The first step in coming close to the definite concrete relations of society is surely that one should learn what they are, that one should examine them according to their existing economic inter-connections. But what do we find in Mülberger's articles? Two whole sentences, namely:

1. "The tenant is in the same position in relation to the house-owner as the wage-worker in relation to the capitalist."

I have proved on page 6* of the reprint that this is totally wrong, and Mülberger has not a word to say in reply.

2. "However, the bull which (in the social reform) must be taken by the horns is the *productivity of capital*, as the liberal school of political economy calls it, a thing which *in reality does not exist*, but which *in its apparent existence* serves as a cloak for all the inequality which burdens present-day society."

Thus, the bull which has to be taken by the horns "*in reality does not exist*," and therefore also has no "horns." Not the bull itself is the evil, but his *seeming existence*. Despite this, "the so-called productivity (of capital) is able to conjure up houses and towns" whose existence is anything but "seeming." (Page 12.) And a man who, although Marx's *Capital* "is familiar also to him," jabbars in this hopelessly confused fashion about the relation of capital and labour, undertakes to show the German workers a new and better path, and presents himself as the "master builder" who is "clear about the architectural structure of the future society, at least in its main outlines"!

No one "has come" closer "to the definite and concrete relations of society" than Marx in *Capital*. He spent twenty-five years investigating them from all angles, and the results of his criticism contain throughout also the germs of so-called solutions, in so far as they are possible at all today. But that is not enough for friend Mülberger. That is all abstract socialism, dead and abstract formulas. Instead of studying the "definite concrete relations of society," friend Mülberger contents himself with reading through a few volumes of Proudhon which, although they offer him next to nothing concerning the definite concrete relations of society, offer him, on the contrary, very definite concrete miraculous remedies for all social evils. He then presents this ready-made plan for social salvation, this Proudhonian *system*, to the German workers under the pretext that *he* wants

* See p. 307 of this volume.—Ed.

“to say good-bye to the *systems*,” while I “choose the opposite path”! In order to grasp this I must assume that I am blind and Mülberger deaf so that any understanding between us is utterly impossible.

But enough. If this polemic serves for nothing else it has in any case the value of having given proof of what there really is to the practice of these self-styled “practical” Socialists. These practical proposals for the abolition of all social evils, these universal social panaceas, have always and everywhere been the work of founders of sects who appeared at a time when the proletarian movement was still in its infancy. Proudhon too belongs to them. The development of the proletariat soon casts aside these swaddling-clothes and engenders in the working class itself the realisation that nothing is less practical than these “practical solutions,” concocted in advance and universally applicable, and that practical socialism consists rather in a correct knowledge of the capitalist mode of production from its various aspects. A working class which knows what’s what in this regard will *never* be in doubt in any case as to which social institutions should be the objects of its main attacks, and in what manner these attacks should be executed.

Written by F. Engels in May
1872-January 1873

Published in the newspaper
Der Volksstaat Nos. 51, 52, 53,
103 and 104, June 26 and 29,
July 3, December 25 and 28,
1872; Nos. 2, 3, 12, 13, 15 and 16,
January 4 and 8, February 8, 12,
19 and 22, 1873; and in three
separate parts in Leipzig
in 1872-73

Signed: *Frederick Engels*

Printed according to the
second edition of 1887,
checked with the newspaper text

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS

ON AUTHORITY²⁵⁷

A number of Socialists have latterly launched a regular crusade against what they call the *principle of authority*. It suffices to tell them that this or that act is *authoritarian* for it to be condemned. This summary mode of procedure is being abused to such an extent that it has become necessary to look into the matter somewhat more closely. Authority, in the sense in which the word is used here, means: the imposition of the will of another upon ours; on the other hand, authority presupposes subordination. Now, since these two words sound bad and the relationship which they represent is disagreeable to the subordinated party, the question is to ascertain whether there is any way of dispensing with it, whether—given the conditions of present-day society—we could not create another social system, in which this authority would be given no scope any longer and would consequently have to disappear. On examining the economic, industrial and agricultural conditions which form the basis of present-day bourgeois society, we find that they tend more and more to replace isolated action by combined action of individuals. Modern industry with its big factories and mills, where hundreds of workers supervise complicated machines driven by steam, has superseded the small workshops of the separate producers; the carriages and wagons of the highways have been substituted by railway trains, just as the small schooners and sailing feluccas have been by steam-boats. Even agriculture falls increasingly under the dominion of the machine and of steam, which slowly but relentlessly put in the place of the small proprietors big capitalists, who with the aid of hired workers cultivate vast stretches of land. Everywhere combined action, the complication of processes dependent upon each other, displaces independent action by individuals. But whoever mentions combined action speaks of organisation; now, is it possible to have organisation without authority?

Supposing a social revolution dethroned the capitalists, who now exercise their authority over the production and circulation of wealth. Supposing, to adopt entirely the point of view of

the anti-authoritarians, that the land and the instruments of labour had become the collective property of the workers who use them. Will authority have disappeared or will it only have changed its form? Let us see.

Let us take by way of example a cotton spinning mill. The cotton must pass through at least six successive operations before it is reduced to the state of thread, and these operations take place for the most part in different rooms. Furthermore, keeping the machines going requires an engineer to look after the steam engine, mechanics to make the current repairs, and many other labourers whose business it is to transfer the products from one room to another, and so forth. All these workers, men, women and children, are obliged to begin and finish their work at the hours fixed by the authority of the steam, which cares nothing for individual autonomy. The workers must, therefore, first come to an understanding on the hours of work; and these hours, once they are fixed, must be observed by all, without any exception. Thereafter particular questions arise in each room and at every moment concerning the mode of production, distribution of materials, etc., which must be settled at once on pain of seeing all production immediately stopped; whether they are settled by decision of a delegate placed at the head of each branch of labour or, if possible, by a majority vote, the will of the single individual will always have to subordinate itself, which means that questions are settled in an authoritarian way. The automatic machinery of a big factory is much more despotic than the small capitalists who employ workers ever have been. At least with regard to the hours of work one may write upon the portals of these factories: *Lasciate ogni autonomia, voi che entrate!** If man, by dint of his knowledge and inventive genius, has subdued the forces of nature, the latter avenge themselves upon him by subjecting him, in so far as he employs them, to a veritable despotism independent of all social organisation. Wanting to abolish authority in large-scale industry is tantamount to wanting to abolish industry itself, to destroy the power loom in order to return to the spinning wheel.

Let us take another example—the railway. Here too the co-operation of an infinite number of individuals is absolutely necessary, and this co-operation must be practised during precisely fixed hours so that no accidents may happen. Here, too, the first condition of the job is a dominant will that settles all subordinate questions, whether this will is represented by a single delegate or

* "Leave, ye that enter in, all autonomy behind!" (Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, Hell, Song III, Verse 3—paraphrased).—Ed.

a committee charged with the execution of the resolutions of the majority of persons interested. In either case there is very pronounced authority. Moreover, what would happen to the first train dispatched if the authority of the railway employees over the Hon. passengers were abolished?

But the necessity of authority, and of imperious authority at that, will nowhere be found more evident than on board a ship on the high seas. There, in time of danger, the lives of all depend on the instantaneous and absolute obedience of all to the will of one.

When I submitted arguments like these to the most rabid anti-authoritarians the only answer they were able to give me was the following: Yes, that's true, but here it is not a case of authority which we confer on our delegates, *but of a commission entrusted!* These gentlemen think that when they have changed the names of things they have changed the things themselves. This is how these profound thinkers mock at the whole world.

We have thus seen that, on the one hand, a certain authority, no matter how delegated, and, on the other hand, a certain subordination, are things which, independently of all social organisation, are imposed upon us together with the material conditions under which we produce and make products circulate.

We have seen, besides, that the material conditions of production and circulation inevitably develop with large-scale industry and large-scale agriculture, and increasingly tend to enlarge the scope of this authority. Hence it is absurd to speak of the principle of authority as being absolutely evil, and of the principle of autonomy as being absolutely good. Authority and autonomy are relative things whose spheres vary with the various phases of the development of society. If the autonomists confined themselves to saying that the social organisation of the future would restrict authority solely to the limits within which the conditions of production render it inevitable, we could understand each other; but they are blind to all facts that make the thing necessary and they passionately fight the word.

Why do the anti-authoritarians not confine themselves to crying out against political authority, the state? All Socialists are agreed that the political state, and with it political authority, will disappear as a result of the coming social revolution, that is, that public functions will lose their political character and be transformed into the simple administrative functions of watching over the true interests of society. But the anti-authoritarians demand that the authoritarian political state be abolished at one stroke, even before the social conditions that gave birth

to it have been destroyed. They demand that the first act of the social revolution shall be the abolition of authority. Have these gentlemen ever seen a revolution? A revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is; it is the act whereby one part of the population imposes its will upon the other part by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon—authoritarian means, if such there be at all; and if the victorious party does not want to have fought in vain, it must maintain this rule by means of the terror which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. Would the Paris Commune have lasted a single day if it had not made use of this authority of the armed people against the bourgeois? Should we not, on the contrary, reproach it for not having used it freely enough?

Therefore, either one of two things: either the anti-authoritarians don't know what they are talking about, in which case they are creating nothing but confusion; or they do know, and in that case they are betraying the movement of the proletariat. In either case they serve the reaction.

Written by Engels in October
1872-March 1873

Published in December 1873 in
the miscellany *Almanacco
Repubblicano* for 1874

Signed: *Federico Engels*

Printed according to the
text of the miscellany

Translated from the Italian

FREDERICK ENGELS

PROGRAMME OF THE BLANQUIST COMMUNE EMIGRANTS

(ARTICLE II FROM "FLÜCHTLINGSLITERATUR")²⁵³

After every unsuccessful revolution or counter-revolution feverish activity develops among the emigrants who escaped abroad. Party groups of various shades are formed, which accuse each other of having driven the cart into the mud, of treason and of all other mortal sins. They maintain active relations with the homeland, organise, conspire, print leaflets and newspapers, swear that it will start over again within the next twenty four hours, that victory is certain, and in the wake of this expectation distribute government posts. Naturally, disappointment follows disappointment, which is attributed not to inevitable historical conditions, that they do not wish to understand, but to accidental mistakes of individuals, recriminations accumulate and result in general bickering. Such is the history of all refugee societies, from the royalist émigrés of 1792 to those of today; and those among the emigrants who have common sense and reason give up this fruitless squabbling as soon as this can properly be done, and turn to something more useful.

The French emigration after the Commune has not escaped this inevitable fate either. Due to the European smear campaign, which attacked all equally, and especially in London, where the French emigration had its common centre in the General Council of the International, it was compelled to conceal for some time its internal squabbles at least from the outside world. However, in the last two years it was no longer able to hide the process of disintegration that is rapidly progressing in its ranks and an open quarrel flared up everywhere. In Switzerland part of the emigrants joined the Bakuninists, notably under the influence of *Malon*, who was one of the founders of the secret Alliance. Then in London the so-called Blanquists split from the International and formed a group which called itself the Revolutionary Commune. Later a number of other groups emerged which were constantly fusing and reorganising, and which did not produce anything worthwhile even as regards manifestos. The Blanquists, however, have just issued the proclamation to the "Com-

muneux,"* calling the world's attention to their programme.

They are called Blanquists not because they are a group founded by Blanqui—of the thirty-three signatories to the programme only a few may ever have spoken to Blanqui—but because they want to act in his spirit and in accordance with his tradition. Blanqui is essentially a political revolutionary, a Socialist only by sentiment, because of his sympathy for the sufferings of the people, but he has neither socialist theory nor definite practical proposals for social reforms. In his political activities he was essentially a "man of action," believing that if a small well-organised minority should attempt to effect a revolutionary uprising at the right moment, it may, after scoring a few initial successes, carry the mass of the people and thus accomplish a victorious revolution. Naturally, under Louis Philippe he was able to organise this nucleus only in the form of a secret society, and it met the fate usually reserved for conspiracies: the people, fed up with the constant proffering of empty promises that it would soon begin, finally lost all patience, became rebellious, and there remained only the alternative of letting the conspiracy collapse or of striking without any external cause. They struck (May 12, 1839), but the insurrection was immediately suppressed. The Blanqui conspiracy, by the way, was the only one in which the police never succeeded in getting a foothold; therefore, as far as the police were concerned the insurrection came like a bolt from the blue.—Since Blanqui regards every revolution as a coup de main of a small revolutionary minority, it automatically follows that its success must inevitably be followed by the establishment of a dictatorship—not, it should be well noted, of the entire revolutionary class, the proletariat, but of the small number of those who accomplished the insurrection and who themselves are at first organised under the dictatorship of one or several persons.

Obviously, Blanqui is a revolutionary of the old generation. These views on the course of revolutionary events are long since obsolescent, at least as far as the German workers' party is concerned, and in France, too, they can meet the approval only of the less mature or more impatient workers. We shall also find that in the programme in question definite limitations have been imposed on these views. However, our London Blanquists too are guided by the principle that revolutions do not occur by themselves but are made; that they are made by a relatively small minority and according to a plan worked out in advance; and finally that at any time it may "soon begin." With such principles

* "Communards".—Ed.

people naturally become irretrievable victims of all the self-deceptions of the emigrants and have to plunge from one folly into another. Most of all they want to play the role of Blanqui—the “man of action.” But little good can be accomplished here by good will alone; alas, Blanqui’s revolutionary instinct, his ability to reach quick decisions are not given to all, and no matter how much Hamlet may speak of action, he still remains Hamlet. Moreover, when our thirty-three men of action find that there is absolutely nothing to be done in the field they call action, our thirty-three Brutuses fall into a contradiction within themselves, which is comical rather than tragical, a contradiction wherein the tragedy is not heightened by the gloomy appearance they assume, as though they are a lot of “Möros, of the cloak and dagger,” which, by the way, does not even enter their heads. What can they do? They are preparing for the next “outburst,” by drawing up prescription lists for the future, to cleanse (*épuré*) the ranks of the people who took part in the Commune, which is why the other emigrants style them as the *pure* (*les purs*). Whether or not they have themselves assumed that title I do not know, it would ill fit some of them. Their meetings are closed, their decisions are kept secret, which, however, does not prevent their being echoed throughout the whole French Quarter on the following morning. As always happens with such serious men of action, when they have nothing to do—they have picked first a personal, then a literary quarrel with a worthy opponent, one of the most notorious members of the Paris petite press, a certain Vermersch, who under the Commune published the *Père Duchêne*, a miserable caricature of Hébert’s newspaper of 1793.²⁵⁹ In reply to their moral indignation this gentleman published a pamphlet in which he branded them as “rogues or accomplices of rogues” and poured a veritable stream of abusive invectives at them:

Each word a night-pot
and not an empty one at that.*

And our thirty-three Brutuses find it worthwhile to pick a public quarrel with such an opponent!

If one thing is certain it is that after the exhausting war, after the hunger in Paris and notably after the awful blood-letting of the May days in 1871, the Paris proletariat needs a long rest to recuperate, and that every premature attempt at an insurrection can only end in a new, perhaps still more horrible defeat. Our

* Heine, *Disputation*.—Ed.

Blanquists hold a different view. The disintegration of the monarchic majority in Versailles, in their opinion, ushers in

"the fall of Versailles, the revanche for the Commune. This is because we are approaching a great historical moment, one of the great crises when the people, apparently succumbing in wretchedness and condemned to death, resume their revolutionary advance with renewed force."

In other words, it begins again, and what is more, immediately. This hope for an immediate "revanche for the Commune" is not merely an emigrant illusion, it is an essential dogma for people who have taken in into their heads to play "men of action" at a time when absolutely nothing can be done in their sense, that is, in the sense of precipitating a revolution. But, just the same, since it is to begin, they feel that "the time has come for all emigrants who still have a spark of life left in them to define their position." And thus the thirty-three tell us that they are 1. atheists, 2. Communists, 3. revolutionaries.

Our Blanquists have a basic feature in common with the Bakuninists in that they want to represent the most far-reaching, most extreme trend. It is for this reason, incidentally, that the Blanquists while opposing the Bakuninists as regards aims, often agree with them as regards means. Therefore it is a question of being more radical than all others as regards atheism. Luckily, it is easy enough these days to be an atheist. In the European workers' parties atheism is more or less self-understood, even though in some European countries it is similar to that of the Spanish Bakuninist who declared: to believe in God is against all socialism, but to believe in the Virgin Mary is something quite different, and every decent Socialist should naturally believe in her. As regards the German Social-Democratic workers, it can be said that atheism has already outlived its usefulness for them; this pure negation does not apply to them, since they no longer stand in theoretical but only in practical opposition to all belief in God: *they are simply through with God*, they live and think in the real world and are therefore materialists. Probably, the same applies to France. If not, there could be nothing simpler than to organise the mass distribution among workers of the splendid French materialistic literature of the last century, of the literature in which the French spirit has attained its sublime expression both as regards form and content, and which, considering the then existing level of science, even today stands exceedingly high as regards content, and still unexcelled as regards form. This, however, does not suit our Blanquists. To prove that they are the most radical of all, God, as in 1793, is decreed out of existence:

"The Commune will forever deliver mankind from this spectre of past misery" (God), "of this cause" (non-existent God a cause!) "of their present misery.—There is no room for priests in the Commune; every religious service, every religious organisation must be banned."

And this demand to transform the people *par ordre du mufti** into atheists is signed by two members of the Commune, who surely must have had sufficient opportunity to discover, first, that anything can be decreed on paper but that this does not mean that it will be carried out, second, that persecution is the best means of strengthening undesirable convictions! This much is certain: the only service that can still be rendered to God today is to make atheism a compulsory dogma and to surpass Bismarck's anticlerical *Kulturkampf*²⁶⁰ laws by prohibiting religion in general.

The second point of the programme is communism. Here we find ourselves on more familiar grounds for the ship we are sailing here is called the "Manifesto of the Communist Party," published in February 1848.** Already in the autumn of 1872 the five Blanquists who had left the International embraced a socialist programme which in all its essential features was that of present-day German communism, and based their withdrawal solely on the refusal of the International to play at revolution after the fashion of those five. Now the council of the thirty-three has adopted this programme with all its materialistic view on history, even though the translation of it into Blanquist French leaves much to be desired where the wording of the "Manifesto" was not kept almost verbatim, as for example, in this phrase:

"The bourgeoisie has removed the mystic veils from the exploitation of labour in which this last expression of all forms of slavery was formerly shrouded: governments, religions, the family, laws, institutions of both the past and present are finally revealed in this society, resting on the simple opposition of capitalist and wage-workers, as the instruments of oppression, with whose help the bourgeoisie upholds its rule and suppresses the proletariat."

Let us compare this with the "Communist Manifesto," Section I: "In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation. The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-labourers. The bour-

* —by order of the mufti, by order from above.—Ed.

** See present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 108-37.—Ed.

geoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation," etc.*

However, as soon as we leave theory aside and get down to practice, the peculiar stand of the thirty-three becomes evident:

"We are Communists because we want to arrive at our aim without stopovers at intermediate stations, without entering into compromises, which only put off victory and prolong slavery."

The German Communists are Communists because through all intermediate stations and compromises, created not by them but by historical development, they clearly perceive the ultimate aim: the abolition of classes, the inauguration of a society in which there will be no private ownership of land and means of production. The thirty-three are Communists because they imagine that as soon as *they* have only the good will to jump over intermediate stations and compromises everything is assured, and if, as they firmly believe, it "begins" in a day or two, and they take the helm, "communism will be introduced" on the day after tomorrow. Neither are they Communists if this cannot be done immediately. What childish naïveté to advance impatience as a convincing theoretical argument!

Finally, our thirty-three are "revolutionaries." In this respect the Bakuninists have done everything humanly possible as regards the bandying of big words; but our Blanquists feel obliged to outdo them. But how? It will be remembered that the whole socialist proletariat, from Lisbon and New York to Budapest and Belgrade, had immediately adopted responsibility for the actions of the Paris Commune *en bloc*. But that is not enough for our Blanquists:

"As far as we are concerned, we claim our share of the responsibility for the executions" (under the Commune) "of the enemies of the people" (a list of the executed is appended), "we claim our share of the responsibility for the arson that destroyed the instruments of monarchic or bourgeois oppression or protected those engaged in struggle."

A lot of mistakes are unavoidably made in every revolution, as they are indeed at all other times, and when at last people calm down sufficiently to be able to review events critically, they inevitably draw the following conclusion: we have done many things which it would have been better to leave undone, and have failed to do many things which it would have been better to do, and that is why things took a bad turn. But what a lack of critical attitude is needed to declare the Commune impeccable and infallible and to assert that every time a house

* See present edition, Vol. 1, p. 111.—Ed.

was burned down or a hostage shot, this was a case of retributive justice, to the dot on the "i." Is this not tantamount to asserting that during the week in May the people shot exactly those persons, and no more, than was necessary to shoot, that exactly those buildings were burned down, and no more, than had to be burned down? Is that not tantamount to saying of the first French revolution: each beheaded got his deserts, first those whom Robespierre beheaded, and then Robespierre himself? Such childish patter results when essentially quite good-natured people give in to the urge to appear savagely brutal.

Enough. In spite of all the foolish actions taken by the emigrants and the droll attempts to make boy Karl (or Eduard?)* appear awe-inspiring, some definite progress can be noted in this programme. It is the first manifesto in which *French workers rally to the cause of present-day German communism*. What is more, these workers are of a trend that regards the French as the chosen people of the revolution, and Paris the revolutionary Jerusalem. To have brought them this far is to the indisputable credit of Vaillant, who is one of the signatories and who, as is commonly known, has a good knowledge of the German language and of German socialist writing. The German socialist workers who in 1870 proved that any national chauvinism is absolutely alien to them, may consider it a favourable omen that the French workers are adopting correct theoretical principles, even though these come from Germany.

Written by Engels in June 1874

Published in the newspaper
Der Volksstaat No. 73,
June 26, 1874, and in
the book: F. Engels,
*Internationales aus dem
"Volksstaat" (1871-1875)*,
Berlin, 1894

Signed: *F. Engels*

Printed according to the
newspaper text, checked with
the 1894 edition

Translated from the German

* An allusion to Édouard Vaillant.—Ed.

FREDERICK ENGELS

ON SOCIAL RELATIONS IN RUSSIA²⁶¹

(ARTICLE V FROM "FLÜCHTLINGSLITERATUR")

On the subject matter proper, Mr. Tkachov tells the German workers that as regards Russia I possess not even a "little knowledge," possess nothing but "ignorance"; and he feels himself, therefore, obliged to explain to them the real state of affairs, and in particular the reasons why just at the present time a social revolution could be made in Russia with the greatest of ease, much more easily than in Western Europe.

"We have no urban proletariat, that is undoubtedly true; but, then, we also have no bourgeoisie; . . . our workers will have to fight only against the *political power*—the *power of capital* is with us still only in embryo. And you, sir, are undoubtedly aware that the fight against the former is much easier than against the latter."²⁶²

The revolution which modern socialism strives to achieve is, briefly, the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, and the establishment of a new organisation of society by the destruction of all class distinctions. This requires not only a proletariat that carries out this revolution, but also a bourgeoisie in whose hands the productive forces of society have developed so far that they allow of the final destruction of class distinctions. Among savages and semi-savages there likewise often exist no class distinctions, and every people has passed through such a state. It could not occur to us to re-establish this state, for the simple reason that class distinctions necessarily emerge out of it as the productive forces of society develop. Only at a certain level of development of the productive forces of society, an even very high level for our modern conditions, does it become possible to raise production to such an extent that the abolition of class distinctions can be a real progress, can be lasting without bringing about stagnation or even decline in the mode of social production. But the productive forces have reached this level of development only in the hands of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie, therefore, in this respect also is just as necessary a precondition of the socialist revolution as the proletariat itself. Hence a man who will say that this revolution can be more easily carried out in a country, because, *although* it has no proletariat,

it has no bourgeoisie *either*, only proves that he has still to learn the ABC of socialism.

The Russian workers—and these workers are, as Mr. Tkachov himself says, “tillers of the soil and as such not proletarians but *owners*”—have, therefore, an easier task because they do not have to fight against the power of capital, but “only against the political power,” with the Russian state. And this state

“appears only at a distance as a power; . . . it has no roots in the economic life of the people; it does not embody the interests of any particular estate. . . . In your country the state is no imaginary power. It stands four square on the basis of capital; it embodies in itself (!!) certain economic interests. . . . In our country the situation is just the reverse—the form of our society owes its existence to the state, to a state hanging in the air, so to speak, one that has nothing in common with the existing social order, and that has its roots in the past, but not in the present.”

Let us waste no time over the confused notion that the economic interests need the state, which they themselves create, in order to acquire a *body*, or over the bold contention that the Russian “form of society (which, of course, must include also the communal property of the peasants) owes its existence to the state,” or over the contradiction that this same state “has nothing in common” with the existing social order which is supposed to be its very own creation. Let us rather examine at once this “state hanging in the air,” which does not represent the interests of even a single estate.

In European Russia the peasants possess 105 million dessiatins, the nobility (as I shall here term the big landowners for the sake of brevity) 100 million dessiatins of land, of which about half belong to 15,000 nobles, who consequently each possess on the average 3,300 dessiatins. The land of the peasants is, therefore, only a trifle bigger than that of the nobles. So you see, the nobles have not the slightest interest in the existence of the Russian state, which protects them in the possession of half the country! To continue. The peasants, from their half, pay 195 million rubles land tax annually, the nobles—13 million! The lands of the nobles are on the average twice as fertile as those of the peasants, because during the settlement for the redemption of the *corvée* the state not only took the greater part but also the best part of the land from the peasants and gave it to the nobles, and for this worst land the peasants had to pay the nobility the price of the best.* And the Russian nobility has no interest in the existence of the Russian state!

* The exception was Poland, where the government wanted to ruin the nobility hostile to it and to draw to its side the peasants. [Note to the text published in “*Der Volksstaat*”; in the 1875 and 1894 editions omitted.]

The peasants—taken in the mass—have been put by the redemption into a most miserable and wholly untenable position. Not only has the greatest and best part of their land been taken from them, so that in all the fertile parts of the country the peasant land is far too small—under Russian agricultural conditions—for them to be able to make a living from it. Not only were they charged an excessive price for it, advanced to them by the state and for which they now have to pay interest and instalments on the principal to the state. Not only is almost the whole burden of the land tax thrown upon them, while the nobility escapes almost scot-free—so that the land tax alone consumes the entire ground rent value of the peasant land and more, and all further payments which the peasant has to make and which we will speak of immediately are direct deductions from that part of his income which represents his wages. Then, in addition to the land tax, to the interest and amortisation payments on the money advanced by the state, since the recent introduction of local administration, there are the provincial and district imposts as well. The most essential consequence of this “reform” was fresh tax burdens for the peasant. The state retained its revenues in their entirety, but passed on a large part of its expenditure to the provinces and districts, which imposed new taxes to meet them, and in Russia it is the rule that the higher estates are almost tax exempt and the peasant pays almost everything.

Such a situation is as if specially created for the usurer, and with the almost unequalled talent of the Russians for trading on a lower level, for taking full advantage of favourable business situations and the swindling inseparable from this—Peter I long ago said that one Russian could get the better of three Jews—the usurer everywhere makes his appearance. When taxes are about to fall due, the usurer, the kulak—frequently a rich peasant of the same village community—comes along and offers his ready cash. The peasant must have the money at all costs and is obliged to accept the conditions of the usurer without demur. But this only gets him into a tighter fix, and he needs more and more ready cash. At harvest time the grain dealer arrives; the need for money forces the peasant to sell a part of the grain which he and his family require for their subsistence. The grain dealer spreads false rumours which lower prices, pays a low price and often even part of this in all sorts of high-priced goods; for the truck system is also highly developed in Russia. It is quite obvious that the great corn exports of Russia are based directly on the starvation of the peasant population. Another method of exploiting the peasant is the following: a speculator rents do-

main land from the government for a long term of years, and cultivates it himself as long as it yields a good crop without manure; then he divides it up into small plots and lets out the exhausted land at high rents to neighbouring peasants who cannot manage on the income from their allotment. Here we have exactly the Irish middlemen, just as above the English truck system. In short, there is no country in which, in spite of the pristine savagery of bourgeois society, capitalistic parasitism is so developed, so covers and entangles the whole country, the whole mass of the population, with its nets as in Russia. And all these bloodsuckers of the peasants are supposed to have no interest in the existence of the Russian state, whose laws and law courts protect their sleek and profitable practices!

The big bourgeoisie of Petersburg, Moscow, Odessa, which has developed with unheard-of rapidity during the last decade, chiefly due to the railways, and which cheerfully "went smash" along with the rest during the last swindle years, the grain, hemp, flax and tallow exporters, whose whole business is built up on the misery of the peasants, the entire Russian large-scale industry, which only exists thanks to the protective tariffs granted it by the state—have all these important and rapidly growing elements of the population no interest in the existence of the Russian state? To say nothing of the countless army of officials, which swarms over Russia and plunders it and here constitutes a real social estate. And when Mr. Tkachov assures us that the Russian state has "no roots in the economic life of the people," that "it does not embody the interests of any particular estate," that it "hangs in the air," methinks it is not the Russian state that hangs in the air, but rather Mr. Tkachov.

It is clear that the condition of the Russian peasants since the emancipation from serfdom has become intolerable and cannot be maintained much longer, and that for this reason alone if for no other a revolution is in the offing in Russia. The question is only: what can be, what will be the result of this revolution? Mr. Tkachov says it will be a social one. This is pure tautology. Every real revolution is a social one, in that it brings a new class to power and allows it to remodel society in its own image. But he wants to say it will be a socialist one, it will introduce into Russia the form of society aimed at by West European socialism, even before we in the West succeed in doing so—and that in a condition of society in which both proletariat and bourgeoisie appear only sporadically and at a low stage of development. And this is supposed to be possible because the Russians are, so to speak, the chosen people of socialism, and have artels and common ownership of land.

The artel, which Mr. Tkachov mentions only incidentally, but which we include here because since the time of Herzen it has played a mysterious role with many Russians—the artel in Russia is a widespread form of association, the simplest form of free co-operation, such as is to be found for hunting among hunting tribes. Word and content are not of Slavic but of Tatar origin. Both are to be found among the Kirghiz, Yakuts, etc., on the one hand, and among the Lapps, Samoyeds and other Finnish peoples, on the other.* That is why the artel developed originally in the North and East, by contact with Finns and Tatars, not in the South-West. The severe climate makes necessary industrial activity of various kinds, and so the lack of urban development and of capital is replaced, as far as possible, by this form of co-operation. One of the most characteristic features of the artel, the collective responsibility of its members for one another to third parties, was based originally on blood relationship, like the mutual liability [Gewere] of the ancient Germans, the blood vengeance, etc. Moreover, in Russia the word artel is used for every form of not only collective activity but also collective institution. The *Bourse* is also an artel. In workers' artels, an elder (*starosta*, *starshina*) is always chosen who fulfils the functions of treasurer, bookkeeper, etc., and of manager as far as necessary, and receives a special salary. Such artels are formed:

1. For temporary enterprises, after the completion of which they dissolve;
2. For the members of one and the same trade, for instance, porters, etc.;
3. For permanent enterprises, industrial in the proper sense of the word.

They are established by a contract signed by all the members. Now if these members cannot bring together the necessary capital, as very often happens, for instance, in the case of cheeseries and fisheries (for nets, boats, etc.), the artel falls a prey to the usurer, who advances the amount lacking at high interest, and thereafter pockets the greater part of the income from work. Still more shamefully exploited, however, are the artels which hire themselves in a body to an employer as wage-labourers. They direct their industrial activity themselves and thus save the capitalist the cost of supervision. The latter lets to the members huts to live in and advances them the means of subsistence,

* On the artel, compare *inter alia*: *Sbornik materialow ob Arteljach v Rossiji* [Collection of Material on Artels in Russia], St. Petersburg, 1873, Part I. [Note by Engels.]

which in turn gives rise to the most disgraceful truck system. Such is the case with the lumbermen and tar distillers in the Archangel *gubernia*, and in many trades in Siberia, etc. (Cf. Fleurovsky, *Polozenie rabočago klassa v Rossiji* [The Condition of the Working Class in Russia], St. Petersburg, 1869.) Here then the artel serves to considerably *facilitate* the exploitation of the wage-worker by the capitalist. On the other hand, there are also artels which themselves employ wage-workers, who are *not* members of the association.

It is thus seen that the artel is a co-operative society which has arisen spontaneously and is, therefore, still very undeveloped, and as such neither exclusively Russian nor even Slavic. Such societies are formed wherever the need for them exists. For instance, in Switzerland among the dairy farmers, in England among the fishermen, where they even assume a great variety of forms. The Silesian navvies (Germans, not Poles), who built so many German railways in the forties, were organised in complete artels. The predominance of this form in Russia proves, it is true, the existence in the Russian people of a strong impulse to associate, but is far from proving their ability to jump, with the aid of this impulse, from the artel straight into the socialist order of society. For that, it is necessary above all that the artel itself should be capable of development, that it shed its primitive form, in which, as we saw, it serves the workers less than it does capital, and rise *at least* to the level of the West European co-operative societies. But if we are to believe Mr. Tkachov for once (which, after all that has preceded, is certainly more than risky), this is by no means the case. On the contrary, he assures us with a pride highly indicative of his standpoint:

“As regards the co-operative and credit associations on the German (!) model, recently artificially transplanted to Russia, these have met with complete indifference on the part of the majority of our workers and have been a failure almost everywhere.”

The modern co-operative society has at least proved that it can run large-scale industry profitably on its own account (spinning and weaving in Lancashire). The artel is so far not only incapable of doing this; it must of necessity even be destroyed by big industry if it does not develop further.

The communal property of the Russian peasants was discovered about the year 1845 by the Prussian Government Councillor Haxthausen and trumpeted to the world as something absolutely wonderful, although Haxthausen could still have found survivals enough of it in his Westphalian homeland, and, as a government official, it was even part of his duty to know them

thoroughly.²⁶³ It was from Haxthausen that Herzen, himself a Russian landowner, first learned that his peasants owned the land in common, and he made use of the fact to describe the Russian peasants as the true vehicles of socialism, as born Communists in contrast to the workers of the aging, decayed European West, who would first have to go through the ordeal of acquiring socialism artificially. From Herzen this knowledge came to Bakunin, and from Bakunin to Mr. Tkachov. Let us hear the latter:

"Our people... in its great majority ... is permeated with the principles of common ownership; it is, if one may use the term, instinctively, traditionally communist. The idea of collective property is so closely interwoven with the whole world outlook (we shall see immediately how far the world of the Russian peasant extends) of the Russian people that today, when the government begins to understand that this idea is incompatible with the principles of a 'well-ordered' society, and in the name of these principles wishes to impress the idea of individual property on the consciousness and life of the people, it can succeed in doing so only with the help of the bayonet and the knout. It is clear from this that our people, despite its ignorance, is much nearer to socialism than the peoples of Western Europe, although the latter are more educated."

In reality communal ownership of the land is an institution which is to be found among all Indo-Germanic peoples on a low level of development, from India to Ireland, and even among the Malays, who are developing under Indian influence, for instance, in Java. As late as 1608, in the newly conquered North of Ireland, the legally established communal ownership of the land served the English as a pretext for declaring the land as ownerless and as escheated to the Crown. In India a whole series of forms of communal property has been in existence down to the present time. In Germany it was general; the communal lands still to be found here and there are a relic of it; and often still distinct traces of it, temporary divisions of the communal lands, etc., are also to be found, especially in the mountains. More exact references and details with regard to old German communal ownership may be consulted in the various writings of *Maurer*, which are classic on this question. In Western Europe, including Poland and Little Russia, at a certain stage in the social development, this communal ownership became a fetter, a brake on agricultural production, and was more and more eliminated. In Great Russia (that is, Russia proper), on the other hand, it has persisted until today, thereby proving in the first place that here agricultural production and the social conditions in the countryside corresponding to it are still very undeveloped, as is actually the case. The Russian peasant lives and has his being only in his village community; the rest of the

world exists for him only in so far as it interferes with his village community. This is so much the case that in Russia the same word "*mir*" means, on the one hand, "world" and, on the other, "peasant community." *Ves' mir*, the whole world, means to the peasant the meeting of the community members. Hence, when Mr. Tkachov speaks of the "*world outlook*" of the Russian peasants, he has obviously translated the Russian *mir* incorrectly. Such a complete isolation of the individual communities from one another, which creates throughout the country similar, but the very opposite of common, interests, is the natural basis for *Oriental despotism*, and from India to Russia this form of society, wherever it prevailed, has always produced it and always found its complement in it. Not only the Russian state in general, but even its specific form, tsarist despotism, instead of hanging in the air, is the necessary and logical product of Russian social conditions with which, according to Mr. Tkachov, it has "nothing in common"! Further development of Russia in a *bourgeois* direction would here also destroy communal property little by little, without any need for the Russian government to intervene with "bayonet and knout." And this all the more because the communally owned land in Russia is not cultivated by the peasants in common so that the product may then be divided, as is still the case in some districts in India; on the contrary, from time to time the land is divided up among the various heads of families, and each cultivates his allotment for himself. Consequently, great differences in degree of prosperity are possible among the members of the community, and actually exist. Almost everywhere there are a few rich peasants among them—here and there millionaires—who play the usurer and suck the blood of the mass of the peasants. No one knows this better than Mr. Tkachov. While he wants the German workers to believe that the "idea of collective ownership" can be driven out of the Russian peasants, these instinctive, traditional Communists, only by bayonet and knout, he writes on page 15 of his Russian pamphlet:

"Among the peasants a class of *usurers* (*kulakov*) is making its way, a class of people who *buy up* and *rent* the lands of peasants and nobles—a muzhik aristocracy."

These are the same kind of bloodsuckers as we described more fully above.

What dealt the severest blow to communal ownership was again the redemption of the *corvée*. The greater and better part of the land was allotted to the nobility; for the peasant there remained scarcely enough, often not enough, to live on. In ad-

dition the forests were given to the nobles; the wood for fuel, implements and building, which the peasant formerly might fetch there for nothing, he has now to buy. Thus the peasant has nothing now but his house and the bare land, without means to cultivate it, and on the average without enough land to support him and his family from one harvest to the next. Under such conditions and under the pressure of taxes and usurers, communal ownership of the land is no longer a blessing; it becomes a fetter. The peasants often run away from it, with or without their families, to earn their living as migratory labourers, and leave their land behind them.*

It is clear that communal ownership in Russia is long past its period of florescence and to all appearances is moving towards its disintegration. Nevertheless, the possibility undeniably exists of raising this form of society to a higher one, if it should last until circumstances are ripe for that, and if it shows itself capable of development in such manner that the peasants no longer cultivate the land separately, but collectively**; of raising it to this higher form without it being necessary for the Russian peasants to go through the intermediate stage of bourgeois small holdings. This, however, can only happen if, before the complete break-up of communal ownership, a proletarian revolution is successfully carried out in Western Europe, creating for the Russian peasant the preconditions requisite for such a transition, particularly the material conditions which he needs if only to carry through the revolution necessarily connected therewith of his whole agricultural system. It is, therefore, sheer bounce for Mr. Tkachov to say that the Russian peasants, although "owners," are "nearer to socialism" than the propertyless workers of Western Europe. Quite the opposite. If anything can still save Russian communal ownership and give it a chance of growing into a new, really viable form, it is a proletarian revolution in Western Europe.

Mr. Tkachov treats the political revolution just as lightly as he does the economic one. The Russian people, he relates, "protests incessantly" against its enslavement, now in the form

* On the position of the peasants compare *inter alia* the official report of the government commission on agricultural production (1873), and further, Skaldin, *W zacholusti i w Stolice* [In the Backwoods and in the Capital], St. Petersburg, 1870; the latter publication by a liberal conservative. [Note by Engels.]

** In Poland, particularly in the Grodno *gubernia*, where the nobility for the most part was ruined by the rebellion of 1863, the peasants now frequently buy or rent estates from the nobles and cultivate them unpartitioned and on their collective account. And these peasants have not had communal ownership for centuries and are not Great Russians, but Poles, Lithuanians and Byelorussians. [Note by Engels.]

of "religious sects . . . refusal to pay taxes . . . robber bands (the German workers will be glad to know that, accordingly, Schinderhannes* is the father of German Social-Democracy) . . . incendiarism . . . revolts . . . and hence the Russian people may be termed an instinctive revolutionist." And thus Mr. Tkachov is convinced that "it is only necessary to evoke an outburst in a number of places at the same time of all the accumulated bitterness and discontent, which . . . is always seething in the breast of our people." Then "the union of the revolutionary forces will come about *of itself*, and the fight . . . must end favourably for the people's cause. Practical necessity, the instinct of self-preservation," will then achieve quite of itself "a firm and indissoluble alliance among the protesting village communities."

It is impossible to conceive of a revolution on easier and more pleasant terms. One starts shooting, at three or four places simultaneously, and the "instinctive revolutionist," "practical necessity" and the "instinct of self-preservation" do the rest "of themselves." Being so dead easy, it is simply incomprehensible why the revolution has not long ago been made, the people liberated and Russia transformed into the model socialist country.

Actually, it is quite a different matter. The Russian people, this instinctive revolutionist, has, true enough, made numerous isolated peasant revolts against the *nobility* and against individual officials, but *never against the tsar*, except when a *false tsar* put himself at its head and claimed the throne. The last great peasant rising, under Catherine II, was only possible because Yemelyan Pugachov claimed to be her husband, Peter III, who allegedly had not been murdered by his wife, but dethroned and clapped in prison, and who had now escaped. The tsar is, on the contrary, the earthly god of the Russian peasant: *Bog vysok, Car daljok*—God is on high and the tsar far away, is his cry in the hour of need. There is no doubt that the mass of the peasant population, especially since the redemption of the *corvée*, has been reduced to a condition which more and more forces on it a fight also against the government and the tsar; but Mr. Tkachov will have to try to sell his fairy-tale of the "instinctive revolutionist" somewhere else.

And then, even *if* the mass of the Russian peasants were ever so instinctively revolutionary, even *if* we imagined that revolutions could be made to order, just as one makes a piece of flowered calico or a teakettle—even then I ask, is it permissible for one over twelve years of age to imagine the course of a revolu-

* Schinderhannes: nickname of Johann Bückler, a notorious German robber.—Ed.

tion in such an utterly childish manner as is the case here? And remember further that this was written after the first revolution made on this Bakunin model—the Spanish one of 1873—had so brilliantly failed. There, too, they let loose at several places simultaneously. There too it was calculated that practical necessity and the instinct of self-preservation would of themselves bring about a firm and indissoluble alliance between the protesting communities. And what happened? Every village community, every town only defended itself, there was no question of mutual assistance, and with only three thousand men Pavia overcame one town after another in a fortnight and put an end to the entire anarchist glory. (Cf. my *Bakuninists at Work*, where this is described in detail.)

Russia undoubtedly is on the eve of a revolution. Her financial affairs are in extreme disorder. Taxes cannot be screwed any higher, the interest on old state loans is paid by means of new loans, and every new loan meets with greater difficulties; money can now only be raised under the pretext of building railways! The administration, as of old, corrupt from top to bottom, the officials living more from theft, bribery and extortion than on their salaries. The entire agricultural production—by far the most essential for Russia—completely dislocated by the redemption settlement of 1861; the big landowners without sufficient labour power, the peasants without sufficient land, oppressed by taxation and sucked dry by usurers, agricultural production declining from year to year. The whole held together with great difficulty and only outwardly by an Oriental despotism whose arbitrariness we in the West simply cannot imagine; a despotism which not only from day to day comes into more glaring contradiction with the views of the enlightened classes and in particular with those of the rapidly developing bourgeoisie of the capital, but which, in the person of its present bearer, has lost its head, one day making concessions to liberalism and the next, frightened, cancelling them again and thus bringing itself more and more into disrepute. With all that a growing recognition among the enlightened strata of the nation concentrated in the capital that this position is untenable, that a revolution is impending, and the illusion that it will be possible to guide this revolution into a smooth, constitutional channel. Here all the conditions of a revolution are combined, of a revolution which, started by the upper classes of the capital, perhaps even by the government itself, must be rapidly carried further, beyond the first constitutional phase, by the peasants; of a revolution which will be of the greatest importance for the whole of Europe if only because it will destroy at one blow the last, so far intact, reserve

of the entire European reaction. This revolution is surely approaching. Only two events could still delay it: a successful war against Turkey or Austria, for which money and firm alliances are necessary, or—a premature attempt at insurrection, which would drive the possessing classes back into the arms of the government.

Written by Engels in April 1875

Published in *Der Volksstaat*
Nos. 43, 44 and 45, April 16,
18 and 21, 1875, and as
a separate pamphlet:

F. Engels, *Soziales aus
Rußland*, Leipzig, 1875;
as well as in the book:
F. Engels, *Internationales
aus dem "Volksstaat."*
(1871-1875), Berlin, 1894

Signed: F. Engels

Printed according to the
newspaper text, checked with
the text of the pamphlet

Translated from the German

AFTERWORD TO THE WORK,
"ON SOCIAL RELATIONS IN RUSSIA"²⁶¹

I must start with the correction that Mr. Pyotr Tkachov was, to be precise, not a Bakuninist, that is, an anarchist, but claimed to be a "Blanquist." The mistake was quite natural because the said Mr. Tkachov announced himself to Western Europe, according to the Russian émigré custom of the time, to be in sympathy with the whole body of Russian émigrés, and in a pamphlet of his²⁶² happened to speak out also in defence of Bakunin and company against my criticism, and did this in such a way as if it were directed against him personally.

The views of the Russian communist village community which he stood up for in his polemic with me were essentially those of Herzen himself. The latter, a Pan-Slavist writer, blown up into a revolutionary, had learned from Haxthausen's *Studies of Russia* that the serfs on his estates had no private property in land, and that from time to time they re-allotted among themselves the farmland and the meadows. Being a writer of fiction, he had no need to make a study of what soon became common knowledge, namely, that communal ownership of land was a form of tenure which in the primitive epoch had been prevalent among the Germans, the Celts, and the Indians, in short, among all the Indo-European peoples, which still exists in India, which was only recently forcibly destroyed in Ireland and Scotland and still occurs here and there in Germany even today, and that it is a

disappearing form of tenure which is, in fact, a phenomenon common to all peoples at a definite stage of development. But being the Pan-Slavist that he was, Herzen, a professing socialist at best, saw the village community as a fresh pretext for showing the rotten West, in an even stronger light, his "holy" Russia and her mission, which was to rejuvenate this thoroughly corrupt and antiquated West, and to revive it, even by force of arms, if the need arose. What the decrepit French and English had been unable, for all their effort, to do, the Russians had ready-made at home.

"To retain the village community and give freedom to the individual, to extend the self-government of the village and volost to the towns and the whole state, maintaining national unity—such is the question of Russia's future, i.e., the question of the very social antinomy whose solution occupies and worries minds in the West." (Herzen, Letters to Linton.)*

So, Russia may still be faced with a political question, but her "social question" has already been settled.

A blind adherent of Herzen, Tkachov took the same simple view. While he was no longer able in 1875 to assert that the "social question" in Russia had been settled, he did say that the Russian peasants, born communists all, were very much closer to socialism and, what is more, had a much better life than the poor, God-forsaken proletarians of Western Europe. While the French republicans, with a century of revolutionary activity behind them, regarded their people as the chosen people in political terms, many Russian socialists of the period declared Russia to be the chosen people in social terms; it was not the struggle of the West-European proletariat that was to bring renewal to the old economic world; no, this renewal was to come from the very entrails of the Russian peasantry. My criticism was aimed against this puerile view.

But the Russian village community had caught the attention and won the recognition of men who were head and shoulders above the Herzens and the Tkachovs. Among them was Nikolai Chernyshevsky, that great thinker to whom Russia owes so much and whose slow destruction by long years of exile among the Yakuts in Siberia will forever remain an ignominious stain on the memory of Alexander II, the "Emancipator."

Because of the intellectual barrier separating Russia from Western Europe, Chernyshevsky had not read any of Marx's works, and by the time *Capital* made its appearance he had long been among the Yakuts in Sredne-Vilyuisk. His spiritual develop-

* Quoted in Plekhanov's work *Our Differences*. See G. Plekhanov, *Selected Philosophical Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, p. 147.—Ed.

ment had to proceed entirely in the conditions created by that intellectual barrier. What the tsarist censorship did not let through was virtually or altogether non-existent as far as Russia was concerned, so that if we do find a weak spot in his writings here and there, and some narrowness of horizon, the amazing thing is that there is not much more of it.

Chernyshevsky also saw the Russian village community as a means of transition from the contemporary social form to a new stage of development, which is, on the one hand, higher than the Russian village community, and on the other, higher than West-European capitalist society, with its class antagonisms. That Russia had such a means, while the West had none, was, in Chernyshevsky's view, Russia's advantage.

"The introduction of a better order of things is greatly hindered in Western Europe by the boundless extension of the rights of the individual ... it is not easy to renounce even a negligible portion of what one is used to enjoying, and in the West the individual is used to unlimited private rights. The usefulness and necessity of mutual concession can be learned only by bitter experience and prolonged thought. In the West, a better system of economic relations is bound up with sacrifices, and that is why it is difficult to establish. It runs counter to the habits of the English and French peasants." But "what seems a utopia in one country exists as a fact in another ... habits which the Englishman and the Frenchman find immensely difficult to introduce into their national life exist in fact in the national life of the Russians.... The order of things to which the West is now striving by such a difficult and long road still exists in our country in the mighty national customs of our village life.... We see what deplorable consequences resulted in the West from the loss of communal landownership and how difficult it is to give back to the Western peoples what they have lost. The example of the West must not be lost on us." (Chernyshevsky, *Works*, Geneva Edition, Vol. 5, pp. 16-19; quoted from Plekhanov, *Nashi raznoglasiya*,* Geneva, 1885.)

He says the following about the Urals Cossacks, who still had a system of cultivation of land in common, with a subsequent division of the product among the individual families:

"If the people of the Urals live under their present system to see machines introduced into corn-growing, they will be very glad of the retention among them of a system which allows the use of machines that require big-scale farming embracing hundreds of dessiatins" (Ibidem, p. 131**).

What should be borne in mind, though, is that these Urals Cossacks, with their communal cultivation of land, which is being safeguarded out of military considerations (after all, we too have barrack-room communism over here), stand quite apart in Rus-

* *Our Differences*. See G. Plekhanov, *Selected Philosophical Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, p. 153.—Ed.

** Ibid., p. 152.—Ed.

sia, almost like our own household communities [*Gehöferschaften*] on the Moselle, with their periodic redistributions. And if the present order should remain intact until the introduction of machinery, it is not they but the Russian military fisc, whose servants they are, that will reap the benefits.

At any rate, the fact is this: whereas in Western Europe capitalist society is disintegrating and is threatened with destruction by the inescapable contradictions of its own development, in Russia almost one half of the cultivated land remains in the hands of the village communities as common property. If the resolution of antagonisms in the West through a new organisation of society implies, as a necessary condition, the transfer of all the means of production, and consequently of the land as well, into the ownership of society as a whole, what is the relation between this common property, which is still to be set up in the West, and the communal property, which already, or rather still, exists in Russia? Could it serve as a starting point for a popular movement which, leaping over the entire capitalist period, would instantly transform Russian peasant communism into a modern socialist communal property in all the means of production, enriching it with all the technical achievements of the capitalist era? Or as Marx formulated one of Chernyshevsky's ideas in a letter quoted below*: "Must Russia start, as her liberal economists wish, by destroying the village community so as to go over to the capitalist system, or can she, without undergoing the torments of the system, secure all its fruits, while developing her own historical endowments?"

The bald statement of the question shows where the answer lies. The Russian community has been in existence for centuries without once producing within itself an impulse to transmute itself into a higher form of communal property, just as has been the case with the German mark, the Celtic clan, and the Indian and other communities with their primitive communistic order. In the course of time, and under the influence of the production and exchange of commodities between families and individuals, which surrounded and developed inside them, and which gradually permeated them, they all came to shed more and more of their communistic character, falling apart into communities of landowners independent of each other. Consequently, if it is at all possible to ask whether or not a different or better future is in store for the Russian community, the reason does not lie within itself, but solely in the fact that in one of the European countries it has retained a relative viability until a time when, in

* See p. 406 of this volume.—Ed.

Western Europe, not only commodity production in general, but even its highest and final form—capitalist production—has run into contradiction with the productive forces it has itself created, when it has shown itself incapable of managing these forces, and when it is being ruined by these internal contradictions and the corresponding class conflicts. From this alone it follows that the initiative for such an eventual transformation of the Russian community can never come from itself but only from the industrial proletariat of the West. A victory by the West-European proletariat over the bourgeoisie and the consequent substitution of a socially managed economy for the capitalist production—there is the necessary precondition for the raising of the Russian community to the same stage of development.

In effect, nowhere has agrarian communism, come down from the tribal system, ever evolved anything out of itself except its own disintegration. By 1861, the Russian village community was itself a relatively weakened form of this kind of communism; the cultivation of land in common, still practised in some parts of India and in the Southern Slav family community (*zadruga*), a probable ancestor of the Russian community, has had to give way to farming by individual families, with the communal property still evident only in the recurrent redistributions of land carried out in various places at very different intervals. Once these redistributions lapse of themselves or in virtue of a special decree, you have a village of peasant small-holders.

But the bare fact that, while existing side by side with the Russian village community, capitalist production in Western Europe is approaching the point of its demise, and is itself suggesting a new form of production under which the means of production held as communal property are to be managed under a plan, this fact alone will not invest the Russian community with enough force to help it evolve into a new social form. How can it take over the vast productive forces of capitalist society, as communal property and social instrument, before capitalist society itself carries out this revolution? How can the Russian community show the world how to manage large-scale industry on social lines, when it has forgotten how to cultivate its own land on communal lines?

It is true that there are many people in Russia who have a good knowledge of Western capitalist society, with all its irreconcilable contradictions and conflicts, and have a clear idea of the way out of this apparent blind alley. But, firstly, the few thousand people who do understand this do not live in village communities, while the close to 50 million people in Great Russia

who still live under communal property in land have not the faintest idea of it all. They find the views of these few thousands just as strange and incomprehensible as the English proletarians of 1800-1840 found the plans Robert Owen invented for their salvation. Most of the workers Owen employed at his factory in New Lanark were men who had been reared under the order and customs of a disintegrating communistic tribal system, in Scotland's Celtic clans, but Owen says nothing about meeting with greater understanding among them. Secondly, it is a historical impossibility for a society at a lower stage of economic development to have to resolve the tasks and conflicts which have arisen, and could only have arisen, in a society at a much higher stage of development. All the tribal community forms arising before the emergence of commodity production and private exchange have only this in common with the future socialist society, that certain things, the means of production, are held as communal property and are in common use by certain groups. But this common feature alone does not yet enable the lower social form to grow into a future socialist society, that final product of capitalist society which it itself begets. Every given economic formation must tackle its own tasks, those which spring from its own bosom, and it would be utterly absurd to try to tackle the tasks facing another, totally alien formation. This equally applies to the Russian community as to the Southern Slav *zadruga*, to the Indian tribal community or to any other social form of the period of savagery or barbarity which is characterised by the communal ownership of the means of production.

However, it is not only possible but inescapable that once the proletariat wins out and the means of production pass into common ownership among the West-European nations, the countries which have just managed to make a start on capitalist production, and where tribal institutions or relics of them are still intact, will be able to use these relics of communal ownership and the corresponding popular customs as a powerful means of considerably shortening their advance to socialist society and largely sparing themselves the sufferings and the struggles through which we in Western Europe have to make our way. But an inevitable condition of this is the example and active support of the hitherto capitalist West. Only when the capitalist economy has been overcome at home and in the countries of its prime, only when the retarded countries have seen from their example "how it's done", how the productive forces of modern industry are made to work as social property for society as a whole—only then will the retarded countries be able to start

on this abbreviated process of development. But then their success will be assured. And this applies not only to Russia but to all countries at the pre-capitalist stage of development. However, this will be relatively easiest done in Russia, where a part of the native population has already assimilated the intellectual fruits of capitalist development, which will make it possible, in a period of revolution, to carry out her social transformation almost simultaneously with that of the West.

Marx and I said as much on January 21, 1882, in the Preface to the Russian Edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party, in a translation by Plekhanov. We wrote:

"But in Russia we find, face to face with the rapidly developing capitalist swindle and bourgeois landed property, just beginning to develop, more than half the land owned in common by the peasants. Now the question is: can the Russian *obshchina*, though greatly undermined, yet a form of the primeval common ownership of land, pass directly to the higher form of communist common ownership? Or, on the contrary, must it first pass through the same process of dissolution as constitutes the historical evolution of the West?"

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

It should be borne in mind, however, that the said far-gone dissolution of Russian communal property has since then considerably advanced. The defeats in the Crimean War clearly showed the need for Russia's rapid industrial development. The primary need was for railways, and these cannot be had on a large scale without a domestic large-scale industry. The preliminary condition for the latter was the so-called emancipation of the peasants; this ushered Russia into the capitalist era, and thereby into an era of rapid erosion of the common ownership of land. Burdened with redemption payments and with higher taxes, but allowed worse and smaller land allotments, the peasants inevitably found themselves in the hands of the usurers, most of whom were members of the village community grown rich. For many once-remote areas, the railways opened up markets for their corn, but then the same railways brought in the cheap products of the large-scale industry and these displaced the peasants' cottage industries, which had until then been making similar articles partly for their own consumption and part-

* See present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 100-01.—Ed.

ly for sale. The ancient economic relations were disrupted, there ensued the disarray which always accompanies the transition from the natural to the money economy, great property distinctions appeared between the members of the community—the poor fell into the clutches of the rich. In short, the same process, which through the penetration of the money economy had led to the dissolution of the gens in Athens shortly before Solon's time,* began to erode the Russian community as well. To be sure, Solon had managed to release the debtors from bondage by simply cancelling their debts through a revolutionary intrusion into the still unfledged right in private property. But he had not been able to revive the ancient Athenian gens, and there is similarly no power on earth capable of restoring the Russian community, once its disintegration has reached a certain culminating point. Besides, the Russian government has prohibited the redistribution of land between community members oftener than once in 12 years, so as to break the peasant's habit of redividing the land and make him feel to be the private owner of his allotment.

Marx spoke in the same vein in a letter to Russia back in 1877.** A Mr. Zhukovsky, the same man who in his capacity as treasurer of the State Bank now appends his signature to Russian bank-notes, published something about Marx in *European Messenger* (*Vestnik Jevropy*), to which another writer*** replied in *Fatherland Notes* (*Otechestvennye Zapiski*).²⁶⁴ By way of correction to the latter, Marx wrote a letter to the editor of *Notes* which for a long time circulated in Russia in manuscript copies of the French original, and was then published in the *Messenger of the People's Will* (*Vestnik Narodnoj Voli*) in Geneva in 1886, and subsequently in Russia herself.²⁶⁵ Like everything else that Marx wrote, this letter attracted much attention in Russian circles and was given the most diverse interpretations, which is why I give here the gist of it.

Marx starts out by refuting the view ascribed to him by *Fatherland Notes*, alleging that like the Russian liberals he believes that Russia's most urgent task is to destroy the peasant communal property and plunge into capitalism. His brief mention of Herzen in a postscript to the first edition of *Capital* does not prove a thing. What he said was: "If the influence of capitalist production, which undermines the human race . . . continues to develop on the European continent, as it has done until now,

* See F. Engels, *The Origin of the Family*, etc., 5th ed., Stuttgart, 1892, pp. 109-13. (See present edition, Vol. 3.—Ed.)

** See Karl Marx, "Letter to the Editorial Board of the *Otechestvennyje Zapiski*."—Ed.

*** N. K. Mikhailovsky.—Ed.

going hand in hand with competition over the scale of the national soldiery, the national debt, taxes, refinements in the art of warfare, etc., the rejuvenation of Europe with the aid of the knout and the obligatory infusion of Kalmyk blood may ultimately become quite inevitable, as the half-Russian but full-blooded Muscovite Herzen has been so zealously prophesying (let us note, by the way, that it was not in Russia but in the works of the Prussian *Regierungsrat* Haxthausen that this novelist made his discoveries about "Russian communism") (*Capital*, Vol. 1, First German Edition, p. 763).²⁶⁶ Marx goes on: this passage "can in no sense be taken as a key to my views of the efforts" (the following quotation in the original is in Russian) "of the Russian people to find for their country a path of development which is distinct from the one Western Europe has been following," etc.—"In the Afterword to the Second German Edition of *Capital*, I speak of 'the great Russian scholar and critic'" (Chernyshevsky)* "with the high respect which he deserves. In his remarkable articles, this scholar has analysed the question—must Russia start, as her liberal economists wish, by destroying the village community so as to go over to the capitalist system, or can she, without undergoing the torments of the system, secure all its fruits, while developing her own historical endowments? He speaks out within the meaning of the latter."

"In short, because I do not like to leave 'anything to guess-work,' I shall speak without beating about the bush. To be in a position to pass knowledgeable judgement on Russia's economic development, I learned Russian and for many long years made a study of official and other publications relevant to the matter. I arrived at this conclusion. *If Russia continues to advance along the path she has followed since 1861, she will miss the best chance history has ever offered a people, and will have to undergo all the fatal vicissitudes of the capitalist system.*"**

Marx then clarifies a few other of his critic's mistakes; the only passage relevant to the matter we are considering reads:

"Now, what application to Russia could my critic make of this historical sketch?" (Meaning the primitive accumulation of capital.) "Only this: If Russia has a tendency to become a capitalist nation like those of Western Europe—and in the last few years she has taken great pains to do so—she will fail, unless she previously transforms a sizable part of her peasants into proletarians; once she has done that and finds herself in the bosom of the capitalist system, she will be subject to its inexorable laws, like all the other heathen peoples. That is all."

* See p. 94 of this volume.—Ed.

** Emphasis added by Engels.—Ed.

That is what Marx wrote in 1877. At the time, there were two governments in Russia: the government of the tsar, and the government of the secret executive committee (ispolnitel'nyj komitet) of the terrorist conspirators.²⁶⁷ The power of this secret collateral government was growing from day to day. Tsarism's overthrow appeared to be imminent; a revolution in Russia was to deprive all European reaction of its most solid support, its great reserve army, thereby giving the political movement in the West another powerful impetus, while creating much more favourable conditions for its struggle. No wonder then that in his letter Marx advised the Russians not to be in too much of a hurry to leap into capitalism.

There has been no revolution in Russia. Tsarism has triumphed over terrorism, which for the time being has even thrown all the "order-loving" propertied classes into the embrace of tsarism. In the 17 years since Marx wrote his letter, the development of capitalism and the dissolution of the village community in Russia have both taken enormous strides forward. What then is the state of affairs today, in 1894?

Considering that after the defeats in the Crimean War and the suicide of Emperor Nicholas I, the old tsarist despotism stood unchanged, there was only one way out; the swiftest possible change-over to capitalist industry. The army had been ruined by the empire's vast expanses, and the long marches to the theatre of military operations; these reaches had to be spanned by a network of strategic railways. But railways implied a capitalist industry and a revolutionising of the primitive agriculture. On the one hand, agricultural produce even from the remotest parts of the country come into direct contact with the world market; on the other, an extensive network of railways cannot be built and run without a domestic industry supplying rails, locomotives, waggons, etc. But it is impossible to create one branch of large-scale industry, without also introducing the whole system; the relatively modern textile industry, which had earlier taken root in Moscow and Vladimir gubernias and in the Baltic territory, was given a fresh impetus. The construction of railways and factories was followed by the enlargement of the existing banks and the establishment of new ones; the emancipation of the peasants from serfdom led to freedom of movement, and it was only to be expected that this would naturally be followed by the emancipation of a sizable part of these peasants from landownership as well. In this way, all the foundations of the capitalist mode of production were laid in Russia in a short time. But then the axe was also taken to the roots of the Russian village community.

There is no point in complaining about this now. Had direct parliamentary rule by the nobility and the bureaucracy been substituted for the tsarist despotism after the Crimean War, the process might have been somewhat slowed down, but it would surely have been accelerated if the budding bourgeoisie had come to power. In the circumstances, there was no other choice. With the Second Empire in France, and with capitalist industry flourishing in England, Russia could not very well be expected to plunge headlong into state-socialism experiments on the basis of her village community. Something had to happen. What was possible under the circumstances, did happen, with men acting for the most part only half consciously or altogether mechanically, unaware of what they were about, as is always and everywhere the case in the commodity-producing countries.

But then came the new period, ushered in by Germany, a period of revolutions from the top, and with it a period of rapid socialist growth in all the European countries. Russia took part in this general movement. As was to have been expected, her movement took the form of an assault to overthrow the tsarist despotism and win freedom of intellectual and political development for the nation. Faith in the magic power of the village community, from whose entrails social rebirth was to come—a faith from which, as we have seen, Chernyshevsky himself was not entirely free—that faith did its part by rousing and invigorating the heroic Russian front-rankers. With these men, numbering no more than a few hundreds, whose courage and dedication had brought tsarist absolutism to a point where it had to consider the possibility and the terms of a surrender, with these men we have no quarrel for believing that their own Russian people was the chosen people of the social revolution. But we certainly do not have to share their illusion. The time of chosen peoples has gone for good.

While this struggle was on, capitalism in Russia was boldly striking out, moving closer and closer to the goal the terrorists had failed to reach: to force tsarism to capitulate.

Tsarism was in need of money. Not only for the luxuries of the court, for the bureaucracy and above all for its army and its bribe-based foreign policy, but especially for its wretched financial system and the corresponding absurd railway policy. External sources were no longer either willing or able to cover all the tsar's deficits; help had to be sought at home. A part of the railway stock had to be placed in the country, and some of the loans had to be raised there too. The Russian bourgeoisie's first victory was the railway concessions, under which all the future profits were to go to the share-holders, while the state was to

bear any future losses. Then came subsidies and bonuses for the establishment of industrial enterprises, and protective tariffs for domestic industry, tariffs which eventually made the importation of many articles wellnigh impossible. With its immense debt, and almost ruined credit abroad, the Russian state has a direct fiscal interest in the hothouse development of domestic industry. It is constantly in need of gold to pay interest on its foreign debt. But in Russia there is no currency of gold, but only of paper. Some gold comes from the statutory levying of the customs revenue in gold, which, by the way, makes the tariffs 50 per cent higher. But the bulk of the gold should come from an excess of Russian raw material exports over the imports of foreign industrial products; the Russian government obtains gold by buying up and paying in paper money for the foreign drafts issued to that amount. So if the government does not want to contract fresh foreign loans to meet the interest on its foreign debt, it must see to it that Russian industry grows strong fast enough to satisfy all the domestic requirements. Hence, the demand that Russia should become a self-sufficient industrial country, independent of foreign sources; hence, the government's frantic efforts to bring Russia's capitalist development to a peak within a few years. Unless this happens, the only way out will be to tap the metal war fund amassed at the State Bank and the State Treasury, or to face the bankruptcy of the state. In either case, it would mean an end to Russian foreign policy.

One thing is clear: in these circumstances, the young Russian bourgeoisie has a strong hold on the state. On all important economic matters, the latter must do its bidding. It may still tolerate the despotic autocracy of the tsar and his officials, but only because the autocracy, apart from being moderated by the corruption of its bureaucracy, holds out greater guarantees than any changes, be they bourgeois-liberal in spirit, whose consequences in the present state of affairs in Russia no one can predict. So there continues this accelerated transformation of Russia into an industrial capitalist state, the proletarianisation of a large part of her peasantry, and the destruction of the old communist community.

I do not undertake to say whether this community is still sufficiently intact to become, when the occasion arises, and in combination with a revolution in Western Europe, the starting point for communist development, as Marx and I had still hoped in 1882. This much, however, is certain: if anything of this community is to be salvaged, the first requirement is the overthrow of the tsarist despotism, a revolution in Russia. The Russian revolution will not only wrest the greater part of the nation, the

peasants, from their isolation in the villages, constituting their *mir*, their universe; it will not only lead the peasants out into the large arena, where they will come to know the outside world and with it their own selves, their own condition, and the means of escape from their present misery—the Russian revolution will also give a fresh impulse to the labour movement in the West, creating for it new and better conditions for struggle and thereby advancing the victory of the modern industrial proletariat, a victory without which present-day Russia, whether on the basis of the community or of capitalism, cannot achieve a socialist transformation of society.

Written in the first half of 1894

Published in the book: F. Engels,
Internationales aus dem
"Volksstaat" (1871-1875),
Berlin, 1894

Printed according to the text
of the book

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

FROM COMMENTS ON BAKUNIN'S BOOK, *STATEHOOD AND ANARCHY*²⁶⁸

"For example, the «крестьянская чернь» the vulgar peasants, the peasant rabble, towards whom, it is common knowledge, the Marxists [are not] kindly disposed, and who, standing on the lowest level of culture, will probably be ruled by the urban and factory proletariat."

That means that wherever the peasant en masse exists as a private proprietor, where he even forms a more or less substantial majority, as is the case in all countries of the West-European continent, where he has not disappeared and has not been replaced by agricultural day labourers, as in England, the following may happen: either he prevents and wrecks every workers' revolution, as he has up to the present done in France, or else the proletariat (for the peasant-owner does not belong to the proletariat, and even where his position makes him belong to it, he thinks that he does not) in governing must take measures which lead to a direct improvement of his condition, and which, consequently, win him over to the side of the revolution. From the very outset these measures must facilitate the transition from private to collective landownership, so that the peasant himself comes to it through economic means; care should, however, be taken not to antagonise him, for example, by proclaiming the abolition of the inheritance right or of his property. The latter can be done only where the capitalistic tenant has ousted the peasant, and where the actual cultivator is just as much a proletarian, a wage-worker as the rural worker and, hence, has *directly*, not indirectly, identical interests with him; much less should landownership be strengthened by enlarging the parcel through the simple handing over of large estates to the peasants, as in Bakunin's revolutionary programme.

"Or, if we consider the question from a national viewpoint, then, we may presume, to the Germans the Slavs will for the same reason be in the same slavish dependence on the German proletariat in which the latter is on its own bourgeoisie" (p. 278).

Schoolboyish rot! A radical social revolution is connected with definite historical conditions of economic development; the

latter are its prerequisites. Therefore, it is possible only where, alongside with capitalist production, the industrial proletariat accounts for at least a considerable portion of the people. To have any chance of success it must be able *mutatis mutandis** to do directly for the peasants at least as much as the French bourgeoisie did for the then existing French peasants during its revolution. A pretty idea that that the rule of the workers involves oppression of agricultural labour! But this is where Mr. Bakunin's innermost thought is revealed. He has no idea of social revolution, knows only its political phrases; its economic conditions have no meaning for him. Since all previous economic forms, irrespective of whether they are developed or not, involved the enslavement of the worker (be it in the form of wage-worker, peasant, etc.), he believes that a *radical revolution* is equally possible under all these forms. He goes even further. He wants the European social revolution, whose economic basis is capitalist production, to be founded on the level of the Russian or Slav-ic farming and stock-breeding peoples, and that it should not exceed that level; he wants this even though he realises that *navigations* creates difference among brothers, but only *navigation*, because this is a difference known to all politicians! The *will*, not economic conditions, is the basis of his social revolution.

Written by Marx
in 1874-early 1875

First published in the magazine
Letopisi Marksizma (Chronicles
of Marxism) No. 11, 1926

Printed according to the
manuscript

Translated from the German

* With the necessary changes having been made.—Ed.

KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

LETTERS

MARX TO L. KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

[London], February 23, 1865

Dear Friend,

I received your, to me very interesting, letter yesterday and shall now reply to the separate points you raise.

First of all I shall briefly describe my attitude to *Lassalle*. While he was engaged in agitation relations between us were suspended: 1) because of his self-praise-exuding braggadocio, to which he added the most shameless plagiarism from my writings and those of others; 2) because I *condemned* his *political* tactics; 3) because, even *before* he began his agitation, I fully explained and "proved" to him here in London that direct *socialist* interference by a "State of Prussia" was nonsense. In his letters to me (from 1848 to 1863), as in our personal meetings, he always declared himself an adherent of the party which I represented. As soon as he had convinced himself, in London (end of 1862), that he could not play his games *with* me he decided to come out as the "workers' dictator" *against* me and the old party. In spite of all that I recognised his services as an agitator, although towards the end of his brief career even that agitation appeared to me to assume a more and more ambiguous character. His sudden death, old friendship, wailing letters from Countess Hatzfeldt, indignation over the *cowardly impertinence* of the bourgeois press towards one whom in his lifetime they had so greatly feared—all that induced me to publish a short statement against the wretched Blind,* which did not, however, deal with the *substance* of Lassalle's doings. (Hatzfeldt sent the statement to the *Nordstern*.²⁸⁹) For the same reasons, and in the hope of being able to remove elements which appeared dangerous to me, Engels and I promised to contribute to the *Social-Demokrat*¹² (it has published a translation of the *Address*** and at its request I wrote an article about Proudhon*** on the death of the latter)

* Karl Marx, "To the Editor of the Newspaper *Beobachter* in Stuttgart."
—Ed.

** See pp. 11-18 of this volume.—Ed.

*** See pp. 24-30 of this volume.—Ed.

and, after Schweitzer had sent us a *satisfactory programme of its editorial board*, we allowed our names to be given out as contributors. We had a further guarantee in the presence of *W. Liebknecht* as an unofficial member of the editorial board. However, it soon became clear—the proofs fell into our hands—that Lassalle had in fact *betrayed* the Party. He had entered into a regular contract with Bismarck (of course, *without* having *any* sort of guarantees in *his* hands). At the end of September 1864 he was to go to Hamburg and there (together with that crazy Schramm and the Prussian police spy Marr) “*force*” Bismarck to incorporate Schleswig-Holstein, that is, to proclaim its incorporation in the name of the “workers,” etc., in return for which Bismarck promised universal suffrage and a few socialist charlatanries. It is a pity that Lassalle could not play the comedy through to the end. It would have made him look damned ridiculous and foolish! And it would have put a stop for ever to all attempts of that sort.

Lassalle went astray in this fashion because he was a “Realpolitiker”^{*} of the type of Herr Miquel, but cut on a larger pattern and with bigger aims. (By the by, I had long ago seen through Miquel sufficiently to explain his public utterances by the fact that the National Union²⁷⁰ offered an excellent way for a petty Hanoverian lawyer to make his voice heard in Germany outside his own four walls, and thus cause the enhanced “*reality*” of himself to assert itself retroactively in his Hanoverian homeland, playing the “*Hanoverian*” Mirabeau under “*Prussian*” auspices.) Just as Miquel and his present friends snatched at the “*new era*”²⁷¹ inaugurated by the Prussian Prince Regent, in order to join the National Union and to fasten on to the “*Prussian top*,” just as they developed their “*civic pride*” generally under *Prussian auspices*, so Lassalle wanted to play the Marquis Posa of the proletariat with Philip II of the Uckermark,^{**} Bismarck acting as procurer between him and the Prussian kingdom. He only aped the gentlemen of the National Union. But while these invoked the Prussian “*reaction*” in the interests of the middle class, Lassalle shook hands with Bismarck in the interests of the proletariat. These gentlemen had greater justification than Lassalle, in so far as the bourgeois is accustomed to regard the interest immediately in front of his nose as “*reality*,” and as in fact this class has concluded a compromise everywhere, even with feudalism, whereas in the very nature of things the working class must be sincerely “*revolutionary*.”

* Practical politician.—Ed.

** Marquis Posa and Philip II—personages from Schiller's drama *Don Carlos*. By “Philip II of the Uckermark” is meant Wilhelm I.—Ed.

For a theatrically vain character like Lassalle (who was not, however, to be bribed by paltry trash like office, a mayoralty, etc.), it was a most tempting thought: an act directly on behalf of the proletariat, executed by Ferdinand Lassalle! He was in fact too ignorant of the real economic conditions required for such an act to be critical of himself. The German workers, on the other hand, were too "demoralised" by the despicable "practical politics" which had induced the German bourgeoisie to tolerate the reaction of 1849-59 and witness the stupefying of the people, not to hail such a quack saviour, who promised to get them at one bound into the promised land.

Well, to pick up again the thread broken off above. Hardly was the *Social-Demokrat* founded when it became clear that old Hatzfeldt at last wanted to execute Lassalle's "last will and testament." Through Wagener (of the *Kreuz-Zeitung*²⁷² she was in touch with Bismarck. She placed the "Workers' Association" (the *General Association of German Workers*²⁷³), the *Social-Demokrat*, etc., at his disposal. The annexation of Schleswig-Holstein was to be proclaimed in the *Social-Demokrat*, Bismarck to be recognised in general as patron, etc. The whole pretty plan was frustrated because we had Liebknecht in Berlin and on the editorial board of the *Social-Demokrat*. Although Engels and I were not pleased with the editorial board of the paper, with its lick-spittle cult of Lassalle, its occasional flirting with Bismarck, etc., it was, of course, more important to stand publicly by the paper for the time being in order to thwart old Hatzfeldt's intrigues and prevent the complete compromising of the workers' party. We therefore made *bonne mine à mauvais jeu*,* although privately we were always writing to the *Social-Demokrat* that they must oppose Bismarck just as much as they oppose the Progressives.²⁷⁴ We even put up with the intrigues of that affected coxcomb, Bernhard Becker—who takes the importance bequeathed him by Lassalle's testament quite seriously—against the *International Working Men's Association*.

Meanwhile Herr Schweitzer's articles in the *Social-Demokrat* became more and more Bismarckian. I had written to him earlier that the Progressives could be *intimidated* on the "question of combinations,"²⁷⁵ but that the *Prussian Government would never under any circumstances* concede the complete abolition of the Combination Laws, because that would involve making a breach in the bureaucracy, would make the workers legally of age, would shatter the rules governing servants,²⁷⁶ abolish the aristocracy's flogging of posteriors in the countryside, etc., etc.,

* The best of a bad bargain.—Ed.

which Bismarck could never allow and which was altogether incompatible with the Prussian *bureaucratic* state. I added that if the Chamber repudiated the Combination Laws, the government would have recourse to *phrases* (such phrases, for example, as that the social question demanded "more thoroughgoing" measures, etc.) in order to retain them. All this proved to be correct. And what did Herr von Schweitzer do? He goes and writes an article *for* Bismarck and saves all his heroics against such infinitely small people as Schulze, Faucher, etc.

I think that Schweitzer and the others have *honest* intentions, but they are "*practical politicians.*" They want to take *existing* circumstances into consideration and refuse to surrender this *privilege* of "practical politics" to the exclusive use of Messrs. Miquel et Comp. (The latter seem to want to reserve to themselves the right of intermixture with the Prussian Government.) They know that the workers' press and the workers' movement in Prussia (and therefore in the rest of Germany) exist solely by the grace of the police. So they want to take things as they are, and not irritate the government, etc., just like our "*republican*" practical politicians, who are willing to "take along with them" a Hohenzollern *emperor*. But since I am not a "practical politician" I together with Engels have found it necessary to give notice to the *Social-Demokrat* in a public statement (which you will probably soon see in one paper or another) of our intention to quit.

You will understand at the same time why at the present moment I can do nothing in Prussia. The government there has refused point-blank to reinstate me as a Prussian citizen.²⁷⁷ I should be allowed to agitate there only in a form acceptable to Herr v. Bismarck.

I prefer a hundred times over my agitation here through the *International Association*. Its influence on the *English* proletariat is direct and of the greatest importance. We are making a stir here now on the general suffrage question, which of course has a *significance here quite different* from what it has in Prussia.⁴¹

On the whole the progress of this "Association" is *beyond all expectation*, here, in Paris, in Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy. Only in Germany, of course, I am opposed by Lassalle's successors, who: 1) are stupidly afraid of losing their importance; 2) are aware of my avowed opposition to what the Germans call "practical politics." (It is this sort of "*practicalness*" that places Germany so far behind all civilised countries.)

Since anybody who pays one shilling for a card can become a member of the Association; since the French chose this form

of individual membership (ditto the Belgians), because the law prevents them from affiliating to us as an "association" and since the situation is similar in Germany, I have now decided to ask my friends here and in Germany to form small societies—the number of members in each locality being immaterial—and that each member is to take out an English membership card. Since the English society is *public*, nothing stands in the way of following such a procedure, even in France. I would be glad if you as well as the people closest to you were to get into touch with London in this way. . . .

First published in the journal
Sozialistische Auslandpolitik
No. 18, 1918

Printed according to the
manuscript

Translated from the German

MARX TO L. KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

London, October 9, 1866

. . . I had great fears for the first Congress at Geneva.²⁰⁶ On the whole however it turned out better than I expected. The effect in France, England and America was unhopd for. I could not, and did not want to go there, but wrote the programme for the London delegates.* I deliberately restricted it to those points which allow of immediate agreement and concerted action by the workers, and give direct nourishment and impetus to the requirements of the class struggle and the organisation of the workers into a class. The Parisian gentlemen had their heads full of the emptiest Proudhonist phrases. They babble about science and know nothing. They scorn all *revolutionary* action, that is, action arising out of the class struggle itself, all concentrated, social movements, and therefore also those which can be carried through by *political* means (for instance the *legal* shortening of the working day). Under the *pretext of freedom*, and of anti-governmentalism or anti-authoritarian individualism, these gentlemen—who for sixteen years have so quietly endured the most miserable despotism, and still endure it!—actually preach ordinary bourgeois economy, only Proudhonistically idealised! Proudhon did enormous mischief. His sham criticism and sham opposition to the utopians (he himself is only a petty-bourgeois utopian, whereas in the utopias of a Fourier, an Owen, etc., there is the anticipation and imaginative expression of a new world) attracted and corrupted first the "*jeunesse bril-*

* See pp. 77-85 of this volume.—*Ed.*

liante,"* the students, and then the workmen, particularly those of Paris, who as workers in luxury trades are strongly attached, without knowing it, to the old rubbish. Ignorant, vain, presumptuous, talkative, blusteringly arrogant, they were on the point of spoiling everything, for they rushed to the Congress in numbers which bore no relation whatever to the number of their members. In the report I shall, incidentally, rap them on the knuckles.

The American Workers' Congress at Baltimore,⁴⁰ which took place at the same time, caused me great joy. The slogan there was organisation for the struggle against capital, and remarkably enough, most of the demands which I drew up for Geneva were also put forward there by the right instinct of the workers.

The reform movement here, which our Central Council called into existence (*quorum magna pars fui***), has now reached immense dimensions and become irresistible.⁴¹ I have kept behind the scenes all the time and do not trouble myself further about the affair, now it has been set going. . . .

First published in the
journal *Die Neue Zeit*,
Bd. 2, No. 2, 1901-02

Printed according to the
manuscript

Translated from the German

MARX TO L. KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

London, July 11, 1868

. . . As for the *Centralblatt*,²⁷⁸ the man is making the greatest possible concession in admitting that, if one means anything at all by value, the conclusions I draw must be accepted. The unfortunate fellow does not see that, even if there were no chapter on "value"⁴⁶ in my book, the analysis of the real relations which I give would contain the proof and demonstration of the real value relation. All that palaver about the necessity of proving the concept of value comes from complete ignorance both of the subject dealt with and of scientific method. Every child knows that a nation which ceased to work, I will not say for a year, but even for a few weeks, would perish. Every child knows, too, that the masses of products corresponding to the different needs require different and quantitatively determined masses of the total labour of society. That this *necessity* of the *distribution* of

* Brilliant youth.—*Ed.*

** In which I played a great part (*Virgil, Aeneid, Book Two*).—*Ed.*

social labour in definite proportions cannot possibly be done away with by a *particular form* of social production but can only change the *mode of its appearance*; is self-evident. No natural laws can be done away with. What can change in historically different circumstances is only the *form* in which these laws assert themselves. And the form in which this proportional distribution of labour asserts itself, in a state of society where the interconnection of social labour is manifested in the *private exchange* of the individual products of labour, is precisely the *exchange value* of these products.

Science consists precisely in demonstrating *how* the law of value asserts itself. So that if one wanted at the very beginning to "explain" all the phenomena which seemingly contradict that law, one would have to present the science *before* science. It is precisely Ricardo's mistake that in his first chapter on value³⁷ he takes *as given* all possible and still to be developed categories in order to prove their conformity with the law of value.

On the other hand, as you correctly assumed, the *history of the theory* certainly shows that the concept of the value relation has *always been the same*—more or less clear, hedged more or less with illusions or scientifically more or less definite. Since the thought process itself grows out of conditions, is itself a *natural process*, thinking that really comprehends must always be the same, and can vary only gradually, according to maturity of development, including the development of the organ by which the thinking is done. Everything else is drivel.

The vulgar economist has not the faintest idea that the actual everyday exchange relations *can not be directly identical* with the magnitudes of value. The essence of bourgeois society consists precisely in this, that *a priori* there is no conscious social regulation of production. The rational and naturally necessary asserts itself only as a blindly working average. And then the vulgar economist thinks he has made a great discovery when, as against the revelation of the inner interconnection, he proudly claims that in appearance things look different. In fact, he boasts that he holds fast to appearance, and takes it for the ultimate. Why, then, have any science at all?

But the matter has also another background. Once the interconnection is grasped, all theoretical belief in the permanent necessity of existing conditions collapses before their collapse in practice. Here, therefore, it is absolutely in the interest of the ruling classes to perpetuate this senseless confusion. And for what other purpose are the sycophantic babblers paid, who have no other scientific trump to play save that in political economy one should not think at all?

But *satis superque*.* In any case it shows what these priests of the bourgeoisie have come down to, when workers and even manufacturers and merchants understand my book** and find their way about in it, while these "learned scribes" (!) complain that I make excessive demands on their understanding....

First published in abridged form in the journal *Die Neue Zeit*, Bd. 2, No. 7, 1901-02, and in full in Russian in the book: *Marx's Letters to Kugelmann*, 1928

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the German

MARX TO L. KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

London, April 12, 1871

... Yesterday we received the by no means tranquillising news that Lafargue (not Laura) was at present in Paris.

If you look at the last chapter of my *Eighteenth Brumaire*,*** you will find that I declare that the next attempt of the French Revolution will be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic military machine from one hand to another, but to smash it, and this is the preliminary condition for every real people's revolution on the Continent. And this is what our heroic Party comrades in Paris are attempting. What elasticity, what historical initiative, what a capacity for sacrifice in these Parisians! After six months of hunger and ruin, caused by internal treachery more even than by the external enemy, they rise, beneath Prussian bayonets, as if there had never been a war between France and Germany and the enemy were not still at the gates of Paris! History has no like example of like greatness! If they are defeated only their "good nature" will be to blame. They should have marched at once on Versailles after first Vinoy and then the reactionary section of the Paris National Guard had themselves retreated. They missed their opportunity because of conscientious scruples. They did not want to start a civil war, as if that mischievous abortion Thiers had not already started the civil war with his attempt to disarm Paris! Second mistake: The Central Committee surrendered its power too soon, to make way for the Commune. Again from a too "honourable" scrupulosity! However that may be, the present rising in Paris—even if it be

* Enough and to spare.—Ed.

** Karl Marx, *Capital*.—Ed.

*** See present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 474-87.—Ed.

crushed by the wolves, swine, and vile curs of the old society—is the most glorious deed of our Party since the June insurrection in Paris. Compare these Parisians, storming heaven, with the slaves to heaven of the German-Prussian Holy Roman Empire, with its posthumous masquerades reeking of the barracks, the Church, cabbage-Junkerdom and, above all, of the philistine.

A propos. In the *official publication* of the list of those receiving direct subsidies from L. Bonaparte's treasury there is a note that *Vogt* received 40,000 francs in August 1859! I have informed Liebknecht of this fact for further use.

You can send me the Haxthausen²⁷⁹ as *lately* I have been receiving undamaged various pamphlets, etc., not only from Germany but even from Petersburg.

Thanks for the various newspapers you sent me. (Please let me have more of them, for I want to write something about Germany, the Reichstag, etc.)

First published in abridged form in the journal *Die Neue Zeit*, Bd. 1, No. 23, Stuttgart, 1901-02, and in full in Russian in the book: *Marx's Letters to Kugelmann*, 1928

Printed according to the manuscript
Translated from the German

MARX TO L. KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

[London], April 17, 1871

Your letter duly received. Just at present I have my hands full. Hence only a few words. How you can compare petty-bourgeois demonstrations *à la* June 13, 1849,²⁸⁰ etc., with the present struggle in Paris is quite incomprehensible to me.

World history would indeed be very easy to make if the struggle were taken up only on condition of infallibly favourable chances. It would on the other hand be of a very mystical nature, if "accidents" played no part. These accidents naturally form part of the general course of development and are compensated by other accidents. But acceleration and delay are very much dependent upon such "accidents," including the "accident" of the character of the people who first head the movement.

The decisively unfavourable "accident" this time is by no means to be sought in the general conditions of French society, but in the presence of the Prussians in France and their position right before Paris. Of this the Parisians were well aware. But of this, the bourgeois *canaille* of Versailles were also well aware. Precisely for that reason they presented the Parisians with the alter-

native of either taking up the fight or succumbing without a struggle. The demoralisation of the working class in the latter case would have been a far greater misfortune than the succumbing of any number of "leaders." With the struggle in Paris the struggle of the working class against the capitalist class and its state has entered upon a new phase. Whatever the immediate outcome may be, a new point of departure of world-wide importance has been gained.

First published in abridged form in the journal *Die Neue Zeit*, Bd. 2, No. 23, Stuttgart, 1901-02, and in full in Russian in the book: *Marx's Letters to Kugelmann*, 1928

Printed according to the manuscript
Translated from the German

MARX TO F. BOLTE IN NEW YORK

[London], November 23, 1871

... The *International* was founded in order to replace the socialist or semi-socialist sects by a real organisation of the working class for struggle. The original Rules and the Inaugural Address* show this at a glance. On the other hand the *International* could not have maintained itself if the course of history had not already smashed sectarianism. The development of socialist sectarianism and that of the real working-class movement always stand in inverse ratio to each other. Sects are justified (historically) so long as the working class is not yet ripe for an independent historical movement. As soon as it has attained this maturity all sects are essentially reactionary. Nevertheless, what history exhibits everywhere was repeated in the history of the *International*. What is antiquated tries to re-establish itself and maintain its position within the newly acquired form.

And the history of the *International* was a *continual struggle of the General Council* against the sects and amateur experiments, which sought to assert themselves within the *International* against the real movement of the working class. This struggle was conducted at the *congresses*, but far more in the private negotiations between the *General Council* and the individual sections.

In Paris, as the Proudhonists (Mutualists²⁸¹) were cofounders of the Association, they naturally held the reins there for the first few years. Later, of course, collectivist, positivist, etc., groups were formed there in opposition to them.

* See pp. 11-18 of this volume.—Ed.

In Germany—the Lassalle clique. I myself corresponded with the notorious Schweitzer for two years and proved to him irrefutably that Lassalle's organisation was a mere sectarian organisation and, as such, hostile to the organisation of the *real* workers' movement striven for by the International. He had his "reasons" for not understanding.

At the end of 1868 the Russian Bakunin joined the *International* with the aim of forming inside it a *second International* under the name of "*Alliance de la Démocratie Socialiste*" and with himself as leader. He—a man devoid of all theoretical knowledge—laid claim to representing in that separate body the *scientific* propaganda of the International, and wanted to make such propaganda the special function of that second *International* within the *International*.

His programme was a hash superficially scraped together from the Right and from the Left—*equality of classes* (1), *abolition of the right of inheritance* as the *starting point* of the social movement (St. Simonist nonsense), *atheism* as a *dogma* dictated to the members, etc., and as the main dogma (*Proudhonist*): *abstention from the political movement*.

This children's primer found favour (and still has a certain hold) in Italy and Spain, where the real conditions for the workers' movement are as yet little developed, and among a few vain, ambitious, and empty doctrinaires in Latin Switzerland and in Belgium.

To Mr. Bakunin doctrine (the mess he has brewed from bits of Proudhon, St. Simon, and others) was and is a secondary matter—merely a means to his personal self-assertion. Though a non-entity as a theoretician he is in his element as an intriguer.

For years the General Council had to fight against this conspiracy (supported up to a certain point by the French Proudhonists, especially in the *South of France*). At last, by means of Conference Resolutions 1, 2 and 3, IX, XVI, and XVII, it delivered its long-prepared blow.²⁸²

It goes without saying that the General Council does not support in America what it combats in Europe. Resolutions 1, 2, 3 and IX now give the New York Committee the legal weapons with which to put an end to all sectarianism and amateur groups, and, if necessary, to expel them.

... The political movement of the working class has as its ultimate object, of course, the conquest of political power for this class, and this naturally requires a previous organisation of the working class developed up to a certain point and arising precisely from its economic struggles.

On the other hand, however, every movement in which the

working class comes out as a *class* against the ruling classes and tries to coerce them by pressure from without is a political movement. For instance, the attempt in a particular factory or even in a particular trade to force a shorter working day out of individual capitalists by strikes, etc., is a purely economic movement. On the other hand the movement to force through an eight-hour, etc., *law*, is a *political* movement. And in this way, out of the separate economic movements of the workers there grows up everywhere a *political* movement, that is to say, a movement of the *class*, with the object of enforcing its interests in a general form, in a form possessing general, socially coercive force. While these movements presuppose a certain degree of previous organisation, they are in turn equally a means of developing this organisation.

Where the working class is not yet far enough advanced in its organisation to undertake a decisive campaign against the collective power, i.e., the political power of the ruling classes, it must at any rate be trained for this by continual agitation against this power and by a hostile attitude toward the policies of the ruling classes. Otherwise it remains a plaything in their hands, as the September revolution in France²⁸³ showed, and as is also proved to a certain extent by the game that Messrs. Gladstone & Co. have been successfully engaged in in England up to the present time.

First published in abridged form in the book: *Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen von Joh. Phil. Becker, Jos. Dietzgen, Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx u. A. an F. A. Sorge und Andere*. Stuttgart, 1906, and in full in Russian in the *Works* of K. Marx and F. Engels, first edition, Vol. XXVI, 1935

Printed according to the manuscript and the text of the book

Translated from the German

ENGELS TO T. CUNO IN MILAN

London, January 24, 1872

... Bakunin, who up to 1868 had intrigued against the International, joined it after he had suffered a fiasco at the Berne Peace Congress²⁰⁵ and at once began to conspire *within it* against the General Council. Bakunin has a peculiar theory of his own, a medley of Proudhonism and communism. The chief point concerning the former is that he does not regard capital, i.e., the class antagonism between capitalists and wage workers which

has arisen through social development, but the *state* as the main evil to be abolished. While the great mass of the Social-Democratic workers hold our view that state power is nothing more than the organisation which the ruling classes—landowners and capitalists—have provided for themselves in order to protect their social privileges, Bakunin maintains that it is the *state* which has created capital, that the capitalist has his capital *only by the grace of the state*. As, therefore, the state is the chief evil, it is above all the state which must be done away with and then capitalism will go to blazes of itself. We, on the contrary, say: Do away with capital, the concentration of all means of production in the hands of the few, and the state will fall of itself. The difference is an essential one: Without a previous social revolution the abolition of the state is nonsense; the abolition of capital *is* precisely the social revolution and involves a change in the whole mode of production. Now then, inasmuch as to Bakunin the state is the main evil, nothing must be done which can keep the state—that is, any state, whether it be a republic, a monarchy or anything else—alive. Hence *complete abstention from all politics*. To commit a political act, especially to take part in an election, would be a betrayal of principle. The thing to do is to carry on propaganda, heap abuse upon the state, organise, and when *all* the workers, hence the majority, are won over, depose all the authorities, abolish the state and replace it with the organisation of the International. This great act, with which the millennium begins, is called *social liquidation*.

All this sounds extremely radical and is so simple that it can be learnt by heart in five minutes; that is why the Bakuninist theory has speedily found favour also in Italy and Spain among young lawyers, doctors, and other doctrinaires. But the mass of the workers will never allow itself to be persuaded that the public affairs of their countries are not also their own affairs; they are naturally *politically-minded* and whoever tries to make them believe that they should leave politics alone will in the end be left in the lurch. To preach to the workers that they should in all circumstances abstain from politics is to drive them into the arms of the priests or the bourgeois republicans.

Now, as the International, according to Bakunin, was not formed for political struggle but to replace the old state organisation as soon as social liquidation takes place, it follows that it must come as near as possible to the Bakuninist ideal of future society. In this society there will above all be no *authority*, for authority=state=absolute evil. (How these people propose to run a factory, operate a railway or steer a ship without a will that decides in the last resort, without single management, they of

course do not tell us.) The authority of the majority over the minority also ceases. Every individual and every community is autonomous; but as to how a society of even only two people is possible unless each gives up some of his autonomy, Bakunin again maintains silence.

And so the International too must be arranged according to this pattern. Every section, and in every section every individual, is to be autonomous. To hell with the *Basle resolutions*,²⁸⁴ which confer upon the General Council a pernicious authority demoralising even to itself! Even if this authority is conferred *voluntarily* it must cease just *because* it is authority!

Here you have in brief the main points of this swindle. But who are the originators of the *Basle resolutions*? Well, *Mr. Bakunin himself and Company*!

When these gentlemen saw at the *Basle Congress* that they would be unable to get through their plan to remove the General Council to Geneva, that is, to get it into their hands, they followed a different tack. They founded the *Alliance de la Démocratie Socialiste*, an international Society *within* the big International, on a pretext which you will encounter again today in the Bakuninist Italian press, for instance, in the *Proletario* and *Gazzettino Rosa*²⁸⁵: for the hotblooded Latin races, it is claimed, a more ardent programme is necessary than for the cool, slow-moving Northerners. This neat little scheme came to naught because of the resistance of the General Council, which of course could not tolerate any separate *international* organisation *within* the International. It has since reappeared in every shape and form in connection with the efforts of Bakunin and his crew surreptitiously to substitute the Bakunin programme for that of the International. On the other hand the reactionaries, from Jules Favre and Bismarck to Mazzini, always came down hard precisely upon the inane braggadocio of the Bakuninists when it was a question of attacking the International. Hence the necessity of my statement of December 5 against Mazzini and Bakunin, which was also published in the *Gazzettino Rosa*.

The nucleus of the Bakunin crowd consists of a few dozen people in the Jura whose whole following amounts to scarcely 200 workers. Their vanguard is made up of young lawyers, doctors and journalists in Italy who everywhere now act as spokesmen of the Italian workers; a few of their brand are in Barcelona and Madrid and every now and then you will find one—hardly ever a worker—in Lyons or Brussels; here* there is a single specimen, Robin.

* In London.—Ed.

The conference,* convoked under the pressure of circumstances in lieu of the congress that had become impossible, served them as a pretext; and since most of the French refugees in Switzerland went over to their side because they (being Proudhonists) found many a kindred soul among them and for personal reasons, they sallied forth on their campaign. Malcontent minorities and unrecognised geniuses may naturally be found everywhere in the International and these were counted upon, not without reason.

At present their fighting strength is as follows:

- 1) Bakunin himself—the Napoleon of this campaign.
 - 2) The 200 Jurassians and the 40-50 members of the French Section (refugees in Geneva).
 - 3) In Brussels Hins, editor of the *Liberté*,²⁸⁶ who however does *not* come out *openly* for them.
 - 4) Here, the remnants of the French Section of 1871,²⁸⁷ which we have never recognised and which has already split into three mutually hostile parts. Then there are about 20 Lassalleans of the type of Herr von Schweitzer, who had all been expelled from the German Section (because of their proposal to *withdraw from the International en masse*) and who, being advocates of extreme centralisation and rigid organisation, fit to a T into the league of Anarchists and autonomists.
 - 5) In Spain, a few personal friends and adherents of Bakunin, who have strongly influenced the workers, particularly in Barcelona, at least theoretically. The Spaniards, however, are very keen on organisation and quick to notice any lack of it in others. How far Bakunin can count on success here will not be seen until the Spanish Congress in April, and as workers will predominate there I have no grounds for anxiety.
 - 6) Lastly, in Italy, the Turin, Bologna, and Girgenti Sections have, as far as I know, declared in favour of convening the congress *ahead of time*. The Bakuninist press claims that 20 Italian sections had joined; I don't know them. At any rate, almost everywhere the leadership is in the hands of friends and adherents of Bakunin, and they are raising a terrific hubbub. But a closer examination will most likely disclose that their following is not numerous, for in the long run the bulk of the Italian workers are still Mazzinists and will remain so as long as the International is identified there with abstention from politics.
- At any rate, in Italy, for the time being, it is the Bakuninist crowd that has the main say in the International. The General

* Engels is referring to the Conference of the First International that took place in London in 1871.—Ed.

Council has no intention of complaining on that score; the Italians have the right to commit all the absurdities they choose and the General Council will counteract them only by way of peaceful debate. These people also have the right to declare for a congress in the Jurassian sense, although in any case it is exceedingly strange that sections which have only just affiliated and cannot be posted on anything should in such a matter at once take sides, especially before they have heard *both* parties to the dispute! I have told the Turinese the unvarnished truth about this matter and shall do the same with the other sections which have made similar declarations. For every such declaration of affiliation is indirectly an approval of the false accusations and lies made against the General Council in the Circular.²⁸⁸ Incidentally, the General Council will shortly issue a circular of its own in the matter.* If you can prevent the Milanese from making a similar declaration *until the circular appears* you will be fulfilling all our desires.

The funniest thing is that these same Turinese who declare in favour of the Jurassians and therefore reproach us here with authoritarianism, now suddenly demand that the General Council should take such authoritarian measures against the rival *Federazione Operaia* of Turin as it had never taken before, should excommunicate Beggelli of the *Ficcanaso*,²⁸⁹ who does not even belong to the International, etc. And all that before we have even heard what the *Federazione Operaia* has to say for itself!

Last Monday** I sent you the *Révolution Sociale*²¹⁹ with the Jura Circular, one issue of the Geneva *Égalité*¹⁰⁸ (unfortunately I have no copies left of the issue containing the answer of the Geneva *Comité Fédéral*,²⁹⁰ which represents twenty times as many workers as the Jura people) and one *Volksstaat*⁵¹ which will show you what the people in Germany think about the case. The Saxon Regional Meeting—120 delegates from 60 localities—declared *unanimously* for the General Council.²⁹¹

The Belgian Congress (December 25-26) demands a revision of the Rules, but at the *regular* congress (in September).²⁹² From France we are receiving daily statements expressing consent. Here in England, of course, none of these intrigues find any support. And the General Council will certainly not call an extraordinary congress just to please a few bumptious intriguers. So long as these gentlemen keep within legal bounds the General Council will gladly let them have their way. This coalition of the most diverse elements will soon fall apart; but as soon as

* See pp. 247-86 of this volume.—Ed.

** January 22.—Ed.

they start anything against the Rules or the Congress resolutions the General Council will do its duty.

If you reflect upon the fact that these people have launched their conspiracy precisely at the moment when a general hue and cry is being raised against the International, you cannot help thinking that the international sleuths must have a hand in the game. And so it is. In Beziers the Geneva Bakuninists have picked the central police commissioner* as their correspondent! Two prominent Bakuninists, Albert Richard from Lyons and Leblanc, were here and told a worker named Scholl, also from Lyons, to whom they had addressed themselves, that the only way to overthrow Thiers was to restore Bonaparte to the throne; and they were travelling about on *Bonaparte money* to conduct *propaganda* among the refugees in favour of a *Bonapartist restoration!* That is what these gentlemen call abstaining from politics! In Berlin the *Neuer Social-Demokrat*,²²⁹ subsidised by Bismarck, pipes the same tune. How far the Russian police is involved in this I shall leave as a moot question for the present, but Bakunin was deeply embroiled in the Nechayev affair (he denies it, of course, but we have the original Russian reports here and since Marx and I understand Russian he cannot put anything over on us²⁰⁸). Nechayev is either a Russian *agent provocateur* or anyhow acted as if he were. Moreover Bakunin has all kinds of suspicious characters among his Russian friends.

I am very sorry you lost your position. I had expressly written to you to prevent your doing anything that might lead to that, stating that your presence in Milan was much more important for the International than the small effect one could produce by *public utterances*, and that much could be accomplished clandestinely, too, etc. If I can be of assistance to you by getting you translations, etc., I shall do so with the greatest of pleasure. Just tell me *from* which languages and *into* which languages you can translate and how I can be useful to you.

So those police swine have also intercepted my photograph. I am enclosing another one for you and would ask you to send me two of yours, one of which is to serve the purpose of inducing Miss Marx to let you have a photograph of her father (she is the only one who still has a couple of good ones left).

I would also ask you to be rather discreet with *all* people connected with Bakunin. It is in all sects to stick together and intrigue. You may rest assured that *any information you give them* will immediately be passed on to Bakunin. It is one of his fundamental principles that keeping promises and the like are merely bourgeois prejudices, which a true revolutionary must

* Bousquet.—Ed.

treat with disdain to help along the cause. In Russia he says this openly, in Western Europe it is secret lore.

Write to me *real soon*. If we should succeed in preventing the Milan Section from joining in the chorus of the other Italian sections it would be a very good thing. . . .

First published in abridged form in the book: F. Engels, *Politisches Vermächtnis. Aus unveröffentlichten Briefen*, Berlin, 1920, and in full in the journal *Die Gesellschaft* No. 11, Berlin, 1925

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the German

ENGELS TO A. BEBEL IN HUBERTUSBURG

London, June 20, 1873

I am answering your letter first because Liebknecht's is still with Marx, who cannot locate it just now.

It was not Hepner but York's letter to him, signed by the Committee, which caused us here to be afraid that your imprisonment would be used by the Party authorities, which unfortunately are entirely Lassallean, to transform the *Volksstaat*⁵¹ into an "honest" *Neuer Social-Demokrat*.²²⁹ York plainly confessed to such an intention, and as the Committee claimed to have the right to appoint and remove the editors the danger was surely big enough. Hepner's impending deportation further strengthened these plans. Under these circumstances it was absolutely necessary for us to know what the situation was; hence this correspondence. . . .

With regard to the attitude of the Party towards Lassalleanism, you of course can judge better than we what tactics should be adopted, especially in particular cases. But there is also this to be considered. When, as in your case, one is to a certain extent in the position of a competitor to the General Association of German Workers,²⁷³ one is easily too considerate of one's rival and gets into the habit of always thinking of him first. But both the General Association of German Workers and the Social-Democratic Workers' Party together still form only a very small minority of the German working class. Our view, which we have found confirmed by long practice, is that the correct tactics in propaganda are not to entice away a few individuals and memberships here and there from one's opponent, but to work on the great mass, which is not yet taking part in the movement. The raw force of a single individual whom one has oneself reared

from the raw is worth more than ten Lassallean turncoats, who always bring the germs of their false tendencies into the Party with them. And if one could only get the masses without their *local leaders* it would still be all right. But one always has to take along a whole crowd of these leaders into the bargain, who are bound by their previous public utterances, if not by their previous views, and now must prove above all things that they have not deserted their principles but that on the contrary the Social-Democratic Workers' Party preaches *true* Lassalleanism. This was the unfortunate thing at Eisenach,²⁹³ which could not be avoided at that time, perhaps, but there is no doubt at all that these elements have done harm to the Party and I am not sure that the Party would not have been at least as strong today without that accession. In any case, however, I should regard it as a misfortune if these elements were to receive reinforcements.

One must not allow oneself to be misled by the cry for "unity." Those who have this word most often on their lips are the ones who sow the most dissension, just as at present the Jura Bakuninists in Switzerland, who have provoked all the splits, clamour for nothing so much as for unity. These unity fanatics are either people of limited intelligence who want to stir everything into one nondescript brew, which, the moment it is left to settle, throws up the differences again but in much sharper contrast because they will then be all in one pot (in Germany you have a fine example of this in the people who preach reconciliation of the workers and the petty bourgeoisie)—or else they are people who unconsciously (like Mülberger, for instance) or consciously want to adulterate the movement. For this reason the biggest sectarians and the biggest brawlers and rogues at times shout loudest for unity. Nobody in our lifetime has given us more trouble and been more treacherous than the shouters for unity.

Naturally every party leadership wants to see successes, and this is quite a good thing. But there are circumstances in which one must have the courage to sacrifice *momentary* success for more important things. Especially for a party like ours, whose ultimate success is so absolutely certain, and which has developed so enormously in our own lifetime and before our own eyes, momentary success is by no means always and absolutely necessary. Take the International, for instance. After the Commune it had a colossal success. The bourgeois, struck all of a heap, ascribed omnipotence to it. The great mass of the membership believed things would stay like that for all eternity. We knew very well that the bubble *must* burst. All the riff-raff attached themselves to it. The sectarians within it became arrogant and misused the International in the hope that the meanest

and most stupid actions would be permitted them. We did not allow that. Knowing well that the bubble must burst some time our concern was not to delay the catastrophe but to take care that the International emerged from it pure and unadulterated. The bubble burst at the Hague²³³ and you know that the majority of the Congress members went home sick with disappointment. And yet nearly all these disappointed people, who imagined they would find the ideal of universal brotherhood and reconciliation in the International, had far more bitter quarrels at home than those which broke out at the Hague. Now the sectarian quarrel-mongers are preaching reconciliation and decrying us as being cantankerous and dictators. And if we had come out in a conciliatory way at the Hague, if we had hushed up the breaking out of the split—what would have been the result? The sectarians, especially the Bakuninists, would have got another year in which to perpetrate, in the name of the International, even much greater stupidities and infamies; the workers of the most developed countries would have turned away in disgust; the bubble would not have burst but, pierced by pinpricks, would have slowly collapsed, and the next Congress, which would have been bound to bring the crisis anyhow, would have turned into the lowest kind of personal row, because *principles* would already have been sacrificed at the Hague. Then the International would indeed have gone to pieces—gone to pieces through “unity”! Instead of this we have now got rid of the rotten elements with honour to ourselves—the members of the Commune who were present at the last and decisive session say that no session of the Commune left such a terrible impression upon them as this session of the tribunal which passed judgement on the traitors to the European proletariat. For ten months we let them expend all their energies on lies, slander and intrigue—and where are they? They, the alleged representatives of the great majority of the International, now themselves announce that they do not dare to come to the next Congress. (More details in an article which is being sent off to the *Volksstaat** with this letter.) And if we had to do it again we should not, taking it all together, act any differently—tactical mistakes are always made, of course.

In any case, I think the efficient elements among the Lassalleans will fall to you of themselves in the course of time and it would, therefore, be unwise to break off the fruit before it is ripe, as the unity crowd wants to.

Moreover, old man Hegel said long ago: A party proves itself

* F. Engels, “Aus der Internationalen” (see Karl Marx/Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 18, S. 472-75, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1962).—Ed.

victorious by *splitting* and being able to stand the split.²⁹⁴ The movement of the proletariat necessarily passes through different stages of development; at every stage part of the people get stuck and do not join in the further advance; and this alone explains why it is that actually the "solidarity of the proletariat" is everywhere being realised in different party groupings, which carry on life-and-death feuds with one another, as the Christian sects in the Roman Empire did amidst the worst persecutions.

You must also not forget that if the *Neuer Social-Demokrat* for example has more subscribers than the *Volksstaat*, this is due to the fact that each *sect* is necessarily fanatic and through this fanaticism obtains, particularly in regions where it is new (as for instance the General Association of German Workers in Schleswig-Holstein), much greater momentary successes than the Party, which simply represents the real movement, without any sectarian vagaries. On the other hand, fanaticism does not last long.

I have to close my letter as the mail is about to close. Let me only add hurriedly: Marx cannot tackle Lassalle²⁹⁵ until the French translation* is finished (approx. end of July), after which he will absolutely need a rest as he has greatly overworked himself. . . .

First published in abridged form in the book: F. Engels, *Politisches Vermächtnis. Aus unveröffentlichten Briefen*, Berlin, 1920, and in full in Russian in the journal *Bolshevik* No. 10, 1932

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the German

ENGELS TO F. A. SORGE IN HOBOKEN

London, September 12[-17], 1874

. . . With your resignation²⁹⁶ the *old* International is anyhow entirely wound up and at an end. And that is well. It belonged to the period of the Second Empire, during which the oppression reigning throughout Europe prescribed unity and abstention from all internal polemics to the workers' movement, then just reawakening. It was the moment when the common cosmopolitan interests of the proletariat could come to the fore. Germany, Spain, Italy and Denmark had only just come into the movement or were just coming into it. Actually in 1864 the theoretical character of the movement was still very unclear everywhere in Europe, that is, among the masses. German communism did

* Of the first volume of *Capital*.—Ed.

not yet exist as a workers' party, Proudhonism was too weak to be able to trot out its particular hobby-horses, Bakunin's new balderdash had not so much as come into being in his own head, and even the leaders of the English Trade Unions thought the programme laid down in the preamble to the Rules* gave them a basis for entering the movement. The first great success was bound to explode this naive conjunction of all factions. This success was the Commune, which was without any doubt the child of the International intellectually, although the International did not lift a finger to produce it, and for which the International to a certain extent was quite properly held responsible. When, thanks to the Commune, the International had become a moral force in Europe, the row at once began. Every trend wanted to exploit the success for itself. Disintegration, which was inevitable, set in. Jealousy of the growing power of the only people who were really ready to continue working along the lines of the old comprehensive programme—the German Communists—drove the Belgian Proudhonists into the arms of the Bakuninist adventurers. The Hague Congress²³³ was actually the end—and for both parties. The only country where something could still be accomplished in the name of the International was America, and by a happy instinct the executive was transferred there. Now its prestige is exhausted there, too, and any further effort to galvanise it into new life would be folly and a waste of energy. For ten years the International dominated one side of European history—the side on which the future lies—and can look back upon its work with pride. But in its old form it has outlived its usefulness. In order to produce a new International after the fashion of the old, an alliance of all proletarian parties of all countries, a general suppression of the labour movement, like that which prevailed from 1849-64, would be necessary. For this the proletarian world has now become too big, too extensive. I believe the next International—after Marx's writings have produced their effect for some years—will be directly Communist and will proclaim precisely our principles. . . .

First published in abridged form in the book: *Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen von Joh. Phil. Becker, Jos. Dietzgen, Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx u. A. an F. A. Sorge und Andere*, Stuttgart, 1906, and in full in Russian in the *Works* of K. Marx and F. Engels, first edition, Vol. XXVI, 1935

Printed according to the manuscript and the text of the book
Translated from the German

* See pp. 19-20 of this volume.—Ed.

NOTES
INDEXES

NOTES

¹ On September 28, 1864 a big international workers' meeting was held in St. Martin's Hall, London. It founded the International Working Men's Association (subsequently known as the First International) and elected its Provisional Committee. Karl Marx became a member of that committee and was elected to a commission, appointed by the committee at its first meeting on October 5 to draw up the Association's programme documents. On October 20 the commission instructed Marx to edit a document prepared by it during Marx's illness. Written in the spirit of Mazzini's and Owen's ideas, the document was in fact rejected by Marx. Instead, he wrote two new documents—the *Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association* and *Provisional Rules of the Association*—which were approved by the commission at its meeting on October 27. On November 1, 1864 the Address and the Rules were unanimously adopted by the Provisional Committee which constituted itself as the leading body of the International Association. This body was generally referred to as the Central Council until the end of 1866 when it became known as the General Council of the International. Marx was its actual organiser and leader. He wrote numerous addresses, statements, resolutions and other documents.

In the Inaugural Address, the first programme document, Marx impresses on the working-class masses the idea that they must win political power, form an independent proletarian party and establish a fraternal alliance with the workers of other countries. The Address was first published in 1864 and was reprinted throughout the period of the First International which ceased to exist in 1876.—11.

² *Garrotters*—the name given in the 1860s to robbers who throttled their victims.—11.

³ The reference is to the "Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Operation of the Acts Relating to Transportation and Penal Servitude", Vol. I, London, 1863.—11, 89.

⁴ *The American Civil War* (1861-65) was waged between the industrial states of the North and the insurgent slave-owning states of the South. The working class of England came out against the policy of its bourgeoisie which supported the slaveowners, and prevented England's interference in the Civil War.—11, 23, 40, 88, 116, 156.

⁵ The struggle of the working class for the official restriction of the working day to ten hours began in England at the end of the eighteenth century, and from the 1830s onwards it had the support of the broad masses of the proletariat.

The Ten Hours' Bill for juveniles and women was passed by Parliament on June 8, 1847. Many factory-owners, however, did not apply it in practice.—16, 37.

- ⁶ *The General Rules* were adopted in September 1871 at the London Conference of the International Working Men's Association. They were based on the Provisional Rules drawn up by Marx in 1864, when the First International was founded (see Note 1). In September 1872 the Hague Congress adopted a resolution, drafted by Marx and Engels, on the inclusion in the Rules, after Article 7, of an additional article, 7a, summing up the content of Resolution IX of the London Conference of September 1871 on the political action of the working class (see the footnote on p. 270 of this volume). For the Hague Congress resolution on the inclusion in the Rules of Article 7a see p. 291 of this volume.—19.
- ⁷ *The Address* of the International Working Men's Association to Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America, on the occasion of his re-election as President, was written by Marx by decision of the General Council.—22.
- ⁸ The reference is to the *Declaration of Independence* which was adopted on July 4, 1776 at a congress in Philadelphia by delegates of the thirteen British colonies in North America. The Declaration proclaimed the separation of these colonies from Great Britain and the formation of an independent republic—the United States of America. It also proclaimed the freedom of the individual, citizens' equality before the law, people's sovereignty and other bourgeois-democratic principles. But from the start the American bourgeoisie and big landowners violated the democratic rights proclaimed in the Declaration, prevented the masses from participating in the political life of the country and preserved slavery which deprived the Negroes, who comprised a considerable part of the republic's population, of elementary human rights.—22.
- ⁹ *The cotton crisis* was brought about by the cessation of cotton deliveries from America because of the blockade of the southern slave-owning states by the fleet of the Northerners during the Civil War. Most of the cotton industries of Europe were paralysed, which greatly aggravated the workers' condition. But despite of all privations the European workers came out in active support of the northern states.—22.
- ¹⁰ *The American War of Independence* (1775-83)—the war of the North-American colonies against British rule caused by the striving of the emergent American bourgeois nation for independence and the abolition of obstacles to capitalist development. As a result of their victory an independent bourgeois state arose—the United States of America.—23, 88, 156.
- ¹¹ The article "*On Proudhon*" was written by Marx at the request of Schweitzer, the editor of the newspaper *Social-Demokrat*, in connection with Proudhon's death. Summarising, as it were, the criticism of Proudhon's philosophic, economic and political views which he gave in *The Poverty of Philosophy* and in his other works, Marx exposed the unfoundedness of Proudhonism. Touching upon Proudhon's practical projects for the "solution of the social question", Marx subjects to devastating criticism his idea of the "*crédit gratuit*" and the "people's bank", based on this, to use Marx's words, "utterly *philistine* fantasy" vigorously advertised by the Proudhonist school. In conclusion Marx characterises Proudhon as a typical ideologist of the petty bourgeoisie.—24.
- ¹² *Social-Demokrat*—organ of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers published under this title in Berlin from December 15, 1864 to 1871; in 1864-67 it was edited by Schweitzer.—24, 413.

- ¹³ The reference is to Proudhon's work *Essai de grammaire générale* published in the book: Bergier, *Les éléments primitifs des langues*, Besançon, 1837.—24.
- ¹⁴ This refers to Jean-Pierre Brissot de Warville's work *Recherches philosophiques. Sur le droit de propriété et sur le vol, considérés dans la nature et dans la société.*—25.
- ¹⁵ Ch. Dunoyer, *De la liberté du travail, ou Simple exposé des conditions dans lesquelles les forces humaines s'exercent avec le plus de puissance*, T. I-III, Paris, 1845.—28.
- ¹⁶ The reference is to the February Revolution of 1848 in France.—28.
- ¹⁷ This refers to Proudhon's speech at a session of the French National Assembly on July 31, 1848, where he put forward some proposals in the spirit of petty-bourgeois utopian doctrines (abolition of loan interest, etc.) and at the same time described the repressive measures against the participants in the Paris proletarian uprising on June 23-26, 1848, as a manifestation of violence and despotism.—28.
- ¹⁸ *The June uprising*—the heroic uprising of the Paris workers on June 23-26, 1848, severely put down by the French bourgeoisie. It was the world's first great civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.—28, 162, 180, 200, 206, 311.
- ¹⁹ The reference is to Thiers's speech on July 26, 1848 against Proudhon's proposals submitted to the finance commission of the French National Assembly.—28.
- ²⁰ *Gratuité du crédit. Discussion entre M. Fr. Bastiat et M. Proudhon*, Paris, 1850.—29.
- ²¹ P. J. Proudhon, *Si les traités de 1815 ont cessé d'exister? Actes du futur congrès*, Paris, 1863. In this work the author came out against the revision of the Vienna Congress (1815) decisions on Poland and against support by European democracy of the Polish national liberation movement, thereby justifying the policy of oppression pursued by Russian tsarism.—29.
- ²² This work is the report delivered by Marx at the meetings of the General Council of the First International in June 1865. In this report Marx set forth for the first time in public the basis of his theory of surplus value. Though the report was directed against the mistaken views of a member of the International, John Weston, who maintained that higher wages cannot improve the condition of the workers and that the trade unions' activity must be considered detrimental to their interests, it also dealt a blow at the Proudhonists, and at the Lassalleans, who had a negative attitude towards the economic struggle of the workers and the trade unions. Marx resolutely opposed the preaching of passivity and submissiveness of the proletarians in face of the capitalist exploiters; he provided a theoretical substantiation of the role and significance of the workers' economic struggle and stressed the necessity of its subordination to the ultimate aim of the proletariat—abolition of wage slavery. The manuscript of the report has been preserved. The report was first published in London in 1898 by Marx's daughter Eleanor under the title *Value, Price and Profit* with a preface by her husband Eduard Aveling. Aveling provided titles for the introduction and the first six chapters which had no headings in the manuscript. In the present edition all these headings except the main one have been retained.—31.
- ²³ Instead of the congress scheduled by the Provisional Rules for 1865 in Brussels, a preliminary congress was convened in London (see Note 39).—31.

- ²⁴ At the time of the French bourgeois revolution in 1793 and 1794 the Jacobin Convention introduced fixed maximum price limits on some commodities and fixed maximum wages.—38.
- ²⁵ *The British Association for the Advancement of Science* was founded in 1831 and exists to this day. Marx refers here to a speech delivered by W. Newmarch (whose name is misspelt by Marx) at a meeting of the economic section of the Association in September 1861.—38.
- ²⁶ See Robert Owen, *Observations on the Effect of the Manufacturing System*, London, 1817, p. 76.—38.
- ²⁷ This refers to the Crimean War of 1853-56.—39.
- ²⁸ In the middle of the nineteenth century the extensive demolition of dwellings in rural areas can to some extent be explained by the fact that the amount of the taxes paid by the landowners for the benefit of the poor largely depended on the number of poor people residing on their land. The landowners deliberately demolished those houses which were no use to them but which could still serve as a shelter for the "surplus" agricultural population.—39.
- ²⁹ *The Royal Society of Arts*—a bourgeois educationalist and philanthropic society founded in London in 1754. The paper referred to was read by John Chalmers Morton, son of John Morton.—39, 117.
- ³⁰ The so-called *Corn Laws*, aimed at restricting or prohibiting the importing of grain from abroad, were introduced in England to safeguard the interests of the big landlords. In 1838 Manchester factory-owners Cobden and Bright founded the Anti-Corn Law League which put forward the demand for unrestricted Free Trade. The League fought for the repeal of the Corn Laws with the aim of reducing workers' wages and weakening the economic and political position of the landed aristocracy. As a result of this struggle the Corn Laws were repealed in 1846, which signified the victory of the industrial bourgeoisie over the landed aristocracy.—40, 93.
- ³¹ Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1814, p. 93.—53.
- ³² This refers to the wars which England waged against France during the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the eighteenth century. At the time there was a reign of terror in England introduced by the government to suppress the people. For example, a number of revolts were crushed and laws prohibiting workers' unions were promulgated.—67, 133.
- ³³ Karl Marx refers here to a pamphlet by Malthus, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Progress of Rent, and the Principles by Which It Is Regulated*, London, 1815.—68.
- ³⁴ *Workhouses* were established in England in the seventeenth century. After the introduction of the Poor Law in 1834 the workhouses became the only form of aid to the poor; they were notorious for their rigid prison-like discipline and were called "bastilles for the poor" by the people.—68.
- ³⁵ *Juggernaut* (Jagannath)—one of the forms of the Indian god Vishnu. The priests of the temple of Juggernaut derived huge profits from mass pilgrimages, encouraging the prostitution of bayaderes, women living in the temple. The cult of Juggernaut was distinguished by magnificent ritual, and also extreme religious fanaticism which manifested itself in self-torture and suicide of the believers. At major festivals some of them would throw themselves under the wheels of the chariot carrying the image of Vishnu-Juggernaut.—69.

- ³⁶ In accordance with the *Poor Laws* that had existed in England since the sixteenth century each parish had to pay a special tax for the benefit of the poor. Those parishioners who were unable to support themselves received grants through the societies of aid to the poor.—72.
- ³⁷ David Ricardo, *On the Principles of Political Economy, and Taxation*, London, 1821, p. 479.—74, 419.
- ³⁸ These *Instructions* were drawn up by Marx for the delegates of the Provisional Central Council (later called the General Council) sent to the First Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held in Geneva on September 3-8, 1866. The Instructions provided answers to the questions which were to be discussed at the Congress. They proposed a number of measures designed to unite the working-class masses, to raise their class consciousness and draw them into the general struggle waged by the working class. Of the nine points formulated by Marx in the Instructions six were adopted as congress resolutions: on the international united action, reduction of the working day, juvenile and children's labour (both sexes), co-operative labour, trade unions, and standing armies.—77.
- ³⁹ The reference is to the *London Conference* held on September 25-29, 1865 and attended by General Council members and leaders of individual sections. The Conference heard the report of the General Council and approved its financial report and the agenda of the next congress. Marx directed the preparations for and the work of the London Conference which played an important role during the formation and organisation of the International.—77, 249.
- ⁴⁰ The establishment of the eight-hour working day by law was discussed at the American labour congress held in Baltimore from August 20 to 25, 1866. In addition, the Baltimore Congress discussed the following questions: political activity by the workers, co-operative societies, organisation of all workers into trade unions, strikes, etc.—79, 418.
- ⁴¹ This refers to the broad participation of the British trade unions in the general democratic reform movement of 1865-67.
On February 23, 1865, a meeting of electoral reformers, on the initiative and with the active participation of the International's General Council, passed a decision to found a Reform League, which was to be a political centre for guiding the mass reform movement of the British workers. On Marx's insistence the Reform League put forward the demand for universal manhood suffrage throughout the country. However, the League failed to follow the line worked out by the General Council owing to the waverings of the bourgeois radicals among the League's leaders, who became afraid of the mass movement, and to the conciliatory policy pursued by the opportunist trade union leaders. The British bourgeoisie managed to split the movement, and in 1867 a limited reform was carried out which granted suffrage only to the petty bourgeoisie and to top sections of the working class, leaving the bulk of the population without the right to vote as before.—83, 416, 418.
- ⁴² During the American Civil War, the American trade unions actively supported the northern states in their struggle against the slaveowners.—83.
- ⁴³ The Sheffield Conference met on July 17-21, 1866; it discussed how to fight lockouts.—83.
- ⁴⁴ *The Holy Alliance*—a reactionary association of European monarchs found-

ed in 1815 by tsarist Russia, Austria and Prussia for the purpose of suppressing the revolutionary movement in certain countries and preserving the feudal-monarchist regimes there.—84, 93.

⁴⁵ *Capital*—the outstanding Marxist classic. Marx began work on it early in the forties and continued right up till his death forty years later.

"Having recognised that the economic system is the foundation on which the political superstructure is erected, Marx devoted his greatest attention to the study of this economic system" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 25).

Marx began his systematic study of political economy at the end of 1843 in Paris. The fruits of his early research into this field are to be found in such works as *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, *The German Ideology*, *The Poverty of Philosophy*, *Wage Labour and Capital*, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, and others.

In 1857 and 1858 Marx wrote a manuscript comprising over 50 signatures, which was a rough draft of his future *Capital*. It was first published between 1939 and 1941 in German by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. under the title *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Oekonomie* (Principal Features of Criticism of Political Economy). At the same time he made the first outline of the entire work, which he elaborated in detail in the following months. In April 1858 he made up his mind to write this work in six books. Soon, however, Marx decided to issue his work in parts, in separate volumes.

In 1858 he began to write his first book which he entitled *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. The book was published in 1859.

In the course of his work Marx changed the original composition of the work to four volumes instead of the six originally planned. Between 1863 and 1865 he wrote a new comprehensive manuscript which was the first detailed draft of the three theoretical volumes of *Capital*. Only after the whole work had been written (January 1866) did Marx begin the final editing. Moreover, on Engels's advice, he decided to concentrate on preparing the first volume for publication and not the whole work at once. The final editing was carried out by Marx so thoroughly that the result was a new version of the first volume of *Capital*.

After the first volume had come out (in September 1867), Marx continued work on it preparing new editions in German and editing its translations into other languages. He introduced many changes into the second (1872) edition and gave detailed directions for the Russian edition which was published in St. Petersburg in 1872 and was the first translation of *Capital* into a foreign language. He made important revisions when editing the French translation which was printed in separate instalments from 1872 to 1875.

At the same time Marx continued to work on the remaining volumes with the aim of completing the entire work in a short time. However, he did not manage to achieve this because much of his time was taken up by his diverse activities in the General Council of the First International. He was also forced to interrupt his work more and more frequently because of ill health.

The next two volumes were prepared for the press and published by Engels after Karl Marx's death, the second volume in 1885 and the third in 1894. In carrying out this work Engels made an invaluable contribution to the treasure-store of scientific communism.—86.

⁴⁶ Marx refers here to the first chapter ("Commodities and Money") in the first German edition of *Capital*, Volume I. In the second and the following German editions of this volume Part I corresponds to this chapter.—86, 418.

- ⁴⁷ The reference is to Chapter 3 of Ferdinand Lassalle's work, *Herr Bastiat-Schulze von Delitzsch, der ökonomische Julian, oder: Kapital und Arbeit*, Berlin, 1864.—86.
- ⁴⁸ In the German original *Hochkirche*—High Church. It is a branch of the Anglican Church which had followers mainly from among the aristocracy. It preserved magnificent religious rites which emphasised its links with Catholicism.—89.
- ⁴⁹ S. Mayer, *Die Sociale Frage in Wien. Studie eines "Arbeitgebers"*, Wien, 1871.—92.
- ⁵⁰ In the fourth German edition of Volume I of *Capital* (1890) the first four paragraphs of this afterword are omitted. It is given in full in the present volume, as in the second edition.—92.
- ⁵¹ *Der Volksstaat* (People's State)—central organ of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Eisenachers), which was published in Leipzig from October 2, 1869 to September 29, 1876. Wilhelm Liebknecht carried out the general direction of the newspaper and August Bebel was its manager. Marx and Engels contributed to the newspaper and assisted in its editing. Until 1869 the newspaper appeared under the title *Demokratisches Wochenblatt* (see Note 87).
The reference is to Dietzgen's article "Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie von Karl Marx", Hamburg, 1867, published in *Demokratisches Wochenblatt* Nos. 31, 34, 35 and 36, 1868.—95, 168, 295, 304, 428, 430.
- ⁵² *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art*—British conservative weekly published in London from 1855 to 1938.—95.
- ⁵³ *Sankt-Peterburgskiy Vedomosti* (St. Petersburg Recorder)—Russian daily and official government organ; it appeared under this name from 1728 to 1914; from 1914 to 1917 it came out under the title *Petrogradskiy Vedomosti* (Petrograd Recorder).—95.
- ⁵⁴ The reference is to the journal *La Philosophie positive. Revue* published in Paris from 1867 to 1883. Its third issue for November-December 1868 carried a brief review of the first volume of Marx's *Capital* written by De Roberty, a follower of Auguste Comte's positive philosophy.—95.
- ⁵⁵ N. Sieber, *Teoriya tsennosti i kapitala D. Rikardo v svyazi s pozdneishimi dopolneniyami i razyasneniyami* (The Theory of Value and Capital of D. Ricardo in Connection with the Latest Additions and Explanations), Kiev, 1871, p. 170.—96.
- ⁵⁶ *Vestnik Yevropy* (European Messenger)—historico-political and literary monthly of the bourgeois-liberal trend; published in St. Petersburg from 1866 to 1918.—96.
- ⁵⁷ The reference is to the German bourgeois philosophers Büchner, Lange, Dühring, Fechner and others.—98.
- ⁵⁸ This refers to the sharp decline, beginning in the late fifteenth century, of the role of Genoa, Venice and other North-Italian cities in transit trade due to the great geographical discoveries of those days: the discovery of Cuba, Haiti and the Bahama Islands, the continent of North America, the sea routes to India around the southern extremity of Africa and, finally, the continent of South America.—103.
- ⁵⁹ J. Steuart, *An Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy*, Vol. I Dublin, 1770, p. 52.—104.

- ⁶⁰ "*Pauper ubique jacet*" ("The poor are everywhere deprived of their share")—the words from Ovid's *Fasti*, Book 1, Verse 218.—107.
- ⁶¹ The reference is apparently to an ukase on hunting out fugitive peasants issued in 1597, during the reign of Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich, when Boris Godunov was Russia's actual ruler. In accordance with this ukase, peasants who had run away from the unbearable oppression of their landowners were to be found within five years and forcibly returned to their former lords.—109.
- ⁶² *The "glorious revolution"*—the name given by English bourgeois historians to the coup d'état of 1688 as a result of which the Stuarts were dethroned and a constitutional monarchy, headed by William of Orange, was established in England (1689), based on a compromise between the land-owning nobility and the influential members of the bourgeoisie.—109.
- ⁶³ The reference is to the agrarian law of Licinius and Sextius, Roman tribunes of the people, passed in 367 B.C. as a result of the struggle which the plebeians waged against the patricians. According to this law a Roman citizen could not hold more than 500 yugers (approximately 309 acres) of state land.—112.
- ⁶⁴ Marx refers to the uprising of 1745-46 by the supporters of the Stuart royal dynasty who demanded that Charles Edward, the so-called "Young Pretender", be placed on the English throne. At the same time the uprising reflected the protest of the popular masses of Scotland and England against exploitation by the landlords and mass deprivation of land. Following the suppression of the uprising by English troops, the clan system in the highlands of Scotland began to disintegrate rapidly and the driving away of the peasants from the land intensified.—114.
- ⁶⁵ Under the clan system in Scotland, *Taksmen* was the name given to the elders subordinated directly to the clan chief—the *laird* ("big man"). The laird gave out to the elders for their care the land (*tak*) which was the property of the whole clan. In token of the recognition of the laird's power, they paid him a small tribute. In their turn, the taksmen distributed plots of land among their vassals. With the disintegration of the clan system the laird turned into a landlord and the taksmen in essence became capitalist farmers. Simultaneously the former tribute was replaced by ground rent.—114.
- ⁶⁶ *Gaels*—native population of the highlands of Northern and Western Scotland, descendants of the ancient Celts.—114.
- ⁶⁷ Marx is referring to his article "Elections—Financial Clouds—The Duchess of Sutherland and Slavery" published in *The New-York Daily Tribune* on February 9, 1853.
The New York Daily Tribune—progressive American bourgeois newspaper published from 1841 to 1924. Marx and Engels contributed to the newspaper from August 1851 to March 1862.—116.
- ⁶⁸ *The Thirty Years' War* (1618-48)—a general European war caused by the struggle between Protestants and Catholics. Germany was the chief scene of the fighting, an object of military plunder and the expansionist ambitions of the countries involved in the war.—117, 300.
- ⁶⁹ *The Economist*—British weekly concerned with economics and politics; has been published in London since 1843; organ of the influential industrial bourgeoisie.—118.

- ⁷⁰ *Petty sessions*—meetings of justices of the peace in England for trying petty offences and conducting preliminary inquiries into more serious offences.—121.
- ⁷¹ A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Vol. I, Edinburgh, 1814, p. 237.—122.
- ⁷² [Linguet, N.], *Théorie des loix civiles, ou Principes fondamentaux de la société*, T. I. Londres, 1767, p. 236.—122.
- ⁷³ The laws, prohibiting the formation and activity of any workers' organisations, were adopted by the British Parliament in 1799 and 1800. In 1824 the Parliament repealed these laws, confirming the act in 1825. However, even after this repeal the activities of workers' unions were greatly restricted. Even mere agitation for the workers' entry into unions and their participation in strikes was regarded as "compulsion" and "violence" and punished as a crime.—123.
- ⁷⁴ *Conspiracy laws* operated in England as far back as the Middle Ages. Under this law the workers' organisations and their class struggle were suppressed both prior to the adoption of the anti-coalition laws (see Note 73) and after their repeal.—125.
- ⁷⁵ The reference is to the government of Jacobin dictatorship in France from June 1793 to June 1794.—125.
- ⁷⁶ A. Anderson, *An Historical and Chronological Deduction of the Origin of Commerce, from the Earliest Accounts to the Present Time*. The first edition of the book came out in London in 1764.—128, 141.
- ⁷⁷ J. Steuart, *An Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy*, Vol. I, Dublin, 1770, First Book, Ch. XVI.—128.
- ⁷⁸ The Netherlands (the territory of modern Belgium and Holland) ceded from Spain as a result of the bourgeois revolution of 1566-1609; the revolution embraced both the struggle waged by the bourgeoisie and the popular masses against feudalism, and the national liberation war against Spanish rule. In 1609, following a number of defeats, Spain was compelled to acknowledge the independence of the bourgeois Dutch republic. The territory of modern Belgium remained a Spanish possession until 1714.—133.
- ⁷⁹ *Opium wars*—wars of conquest waged by Britain against China in 1839-42 and by Britain jointly with France in 1856-58 and 1860. The first war was sparked off by measures adopted by the Chinese authorities against the smuggling of opium by the British—hence the name.—133.
- ⁸⁰ *The East India Company*—the British trading company that existed from 1600 to 1858 and was an instrument of British expansionist colonial policy in India, China and other Asian countries. For a long time the Company enjoyed a monopoly in trade with India and carried on major functions of the country's administration. The Indian national liberation uprising of 1857-59 compelled Britain to change the form of colonial rule and liquidate the Company in 1858.—134.
- ⁸¹ Marx is quoting Gustav Gülich's work *Geschichtliche Darstellung des Handels, der Gewerbe und des Ackerbaus der bedeutendsten handelstreibenden Staaten unserer Zeit*, Bd. I, Jena, 1830, S. 371.—136.
- ⁸² Marx is apparently referring here to the English edition of the book *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Friesland* formerly ascribed to Jan de Witt; it was first published in Leiden in 1662. It has since been established that it was

written by Pieter von der Hore (Pieter de la Court), the Dutch economist and businessman, except for two chapters by Jan de Witt.—138.

⁸³ *The Seven Years' War* (1756-63)—a general European war caused by the expansionist policies of the feudal-monarchist powers and the colonial rivalry between France and Britain. As a result of the war France was forced to cede to Britain her major colonies (Canada, East-Indian possessions, etc.); Prussia, Austria and Saxony retained their pre-war frontiers.—139.

⁸⁴ The reference is to the *Treaty of Utrecht* which was concluded in 1713 between France and Spain on the one hand, and participants in the anti-French coalition (Britain, the Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia and Austrian Habsburgs) on the other, and which marked the end of the long war for the Spanish colonies (the War of the Spanish Succession, 1701-14). Under this treaty a number of French and Spanish colonies in the West Indies and North America, as well as Gibraltar, were ceded to Britain.

Asiento—the name of the treaties according to which in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries Spain granted special rights to foreign states and individuals to sell Negro slaves to her American colonies.—141.

⁸⁵ *Tantae molis erat* (cost so much labour)—an expression from Virgil's poem *Aeneid*, Book 1, Verse 33.—141.

⁸⁶ C. Pecqueur, *Théorie nouvelle d'économie sociale et politiques, ou Etudes sur l'organisation des sociétés*, Paris, 1842, p. 435.—143.

⁸⁷ This article was written by Engels for *Demokratisches Wochenblatt* and is one of his reviews of the first volume of Marx's *Capital* which were published in the columns of workers' and democratic papers with the aim of popularising the basic principles of this book. Here Engels shows the historic role of the working-class struggle and sets forth the doctrine of surplus-value which is, to use Lenin's words, "the corner-stone of Marx's economic theory" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 26). Apart from articles for the workers Engels wrote several anonymous reviews for the bourgeois press to break the "conspiracy of silence" with which official economists and the bourgeois press greeted this work of genius. In these articles Engels criticises the book from a "bourgeois point of view" using this weapon, as Marx called it, to make bourgeois economists discuss the work.

Demokratisches Wochenblatt (Democratic Weekly)—German workers' paper published in Leipzig from January 1868 to September 1869 under Wilhelm Liebknecht's editorship. The newspaper did much to help create the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party. At the Eisenach Congress of 1869 it was recognised as the Central Organ of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party and renamed *Volksstaat* (People's State). Marx and Engels contributed to the newspaper.—146.

⁸⁸ This *Address* was written by Marx and read by him at the General Council meeting of May 11 in connection with the threat of war between Britain and the U.S.A. in the spring of 1869. Marx exposes war preparations against Britain by the leaders of the U.S. Republican Party and calls on the workers to fight for preserving peace. He urges the working class to act as an independent political force in the national and the international arena. Unanimously adopted by the General Council, the *Address* was published in leaflet form and in several newspapers and magazines.

The National Labour Union was founded in the U.S.A. in August 1866 at a congress in Baltimore, with the active assistance of William Sylvis, a prominent figure in the American labour movement. From the day of its inception the Union came out in support of the International Work-

ing Men's Association and decided to join it in 1870. This decision was not implemented, however. Its leaders were soon carried away by the utopian projects of currency reform the aim of which was to abolish the bank system and secure cheap credit by the state. In 1870-71 the trade unions withdrew from the Labour Union and in 1872 it virtually ceased to exist. Despite its shortcomings the Union played an important role in developing the campaign for an independent policy by workers' organisations, for solidarity between the Negroes and white workers, for the eight-hour working day and the rights of working women.—156.

⁸⁹ "Shoddy aristocrats"—an American term for people who got rich quick on the civil war.—157.

⁹⁰ In the preface which he wrote in February 1870 to the second edition of *The Peasant War in Germany* Engels analysed the changes that had taken place in the economic and political life of the country since 1848 and the role of the different classes and parties during this period of German history. He elaborates the important theoretical and political conclusion on the necessity of the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry, which he and Marx formulated in a number of their works on the basis of the experience of the revolutions of 1848-49. Engels demonstrates the need for a discriminating approach to the peasantry and analyses which strata of the peasantry may become the proletariat's allies in the revolutionary struggle and for what reasons. While preparing the third edition of *The Peasant War in Germany* for the press in 1874, Engels supplemented the 1870 preface with important notes on the significance of theory in the socialist and working-class movement. Lenin referred to these notes as "recommendations to the German working-class movement, which had become strong, practically and politically" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 370). In this supplement Engels formulates the profound idea that the proletarian party can fulfil its historical task only if it equips itself with a revolutionary theory. He considers it the duty of party leaders to study theory constantly. He wrote: "Socialism, since it has become a science, demands that it be pursued as a science, that is, that it be studied" (see p. 170 of this volume). He also stresses the need for educating the masses in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

The supplement to the preface contains major theoretical directions on the character, tasks and forms of the struggle of the working class and its party. Engels defines the three interrelated fronts on which this struggle should be waged: the theoretical, the political and the economic-practical field (see p. 170 of this volume). Marx and Engels considered the winning over of the working-class masses to be the primary task of the German Workers' Party.—158, 165.

⁹¹ *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* (New Rhenish Gazette. Politico-Economic Review)—journal, theoretical organ of the Communist League, founded by Marx and Engels. Altogether six issues appeared between December 1849 and November 1850.—158.

⁹² The book referred to is W. Zimmermann's *Allgemeine Geschichte des großen Bauernkrieges*, in three volumes, published in Stuttgart in 1841-43.—158.

⁹³ This refers to the extreme Left wing in the all-German National Assembly which held its sessions in Frankfort-on-Main during the revolution of 1848-49. It represented mainly the interests of the petty bourgeoisie but also had the support of a section of the German workers. The chief task of the National Assembly was to put an end to the political disunity of

Germany and to work out a general Constitution. Because of the cowardice and vacillation of its liberal majority, however, the National Assembly failed to seize power into its hands and was unable to take a resolute stand on the principal questions of the German revolution. On May 30, 1849 the National Assembly had to move to Stuttgart. On June 18, 1849 it was dispersed by troops.—158.

⁹⁴ *The Austro-Prussian War of 1866* concluded the long struggle between Austria and Prussia for supremacy in Germany and paved the way for the unification of Germany under Prussia's hegemony.—159.

⁹⁵ *National-Liberals*—the party of the German bourgeoisie formed in the autumn of 1866. The National-Liberals made their main goal the unification of Germany under Prussia's hegemony. Their policy reflected the German liberal bourgeoisie's capitulation to Bismarck.—160.

⁹⁶ *The People's Party (Volkspartei)*, founded in 1865, consisted of the democratic elements from the petty bourgeoisie and, partly, of the bourgeoisie, chiefly from the South-German states. The *Volkspartei* opposed Prussian hegemony in Germany and advocated a "Greater Germany" that would include Prussia and Austria. By propagating the idea of a federative German state it actually opposed the unification of Germany as an integral centralised democratic republic.—161.

⁹⁷ In the mid-sixties of the nineteenth century a system of special licences (concessions) was introduced in a number of industries in Prussia without which it was forbidden to engage in industry. This semi-feudal law restricted the development of capitalism.—161.

⁹⁸ *The battle of Sadowa* (known also as the battle of Königgrätz, now Hradec Kralové) took place on July 3, 1866. It was a turning-point in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 which ended in victory for Prussia.—162, 165, 192.

⁹⁹ This refers to the *Basle Congress* of the International held from September 6 to 11, 1869. On September 10, the Basle Congress adopted the following resolution on landed property, which was submitted by Marx's adherents:

"1) The society is entitled to abolish private property on land and to transform it into communal property;

"2) It is essential to abolish private property on land and to transform it into communal property."

The Congress also adopted decisions on the unification of trade unions on a national and international scale, and a number of decisions on organisational measures aimed at strengthening the International and extending the rights of the General Council.—163, 248.

¹⁰⁰ *At the battle of Sedan* the French army led by Napoleon III was defeated by the Prussian troops and surrendered on September 2, 1870. The Emperor and the commanding staff were kept prisoner in Wilhelmshöhe (near Cassel), in a castle of the Prussian kings, from September 5, 1870 to March 19, 1871. The defeat at Sedan accelerated the downfall of the Second Empire and led to the proclamation of the republic in France on September 4, 1870. A new government, called the Government of National Defence, was set up.—165, 181, 195, 203, 253.

¹⁰¹ In referring to the Holy German Empire of the Prussian nation Engels is alluding to the mediaeval Holy Roman Empire of the German nation (see Note 130), emphasising that the unification of Germany took place under Prussia's hegemony and was accompanied by the Prussianisation of German states.—165.

¹⁰² *The North-German Union or Confederation* with Prussia at its head comprised 19 states and three free towns of North and Central Germany and was formed in 1867 on Bismarck's recommendation. Its formation marked a most decisive stage in the reunification of Germany under Prussia's hegemony. In January 1871 the Confederation ceased to exist as a result of the formation of the German Empire.—166, 198.

¹⁰³ This refers to the annexation of Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg and Hesse-Darmstadt by the North-German Confederation in 1870.—166.

¹⁰⁴ In the battle at *Spichern* (Lorraine) on August 6, 1870 the Prussian troops inflicted a defeat on the French. It has also gone down in history as the battle at Forbach.

At *Mars-la-Tour* (also known as the battle of Vionville) on August 16, 1870 the German troops succeeded in checking the retreat of the French Rhine army from Metz and, subsequently, in cutting it off.—168.

¹⁰⁵ On January 10, 1874, during the Reichstag elections, nine Social-Democrats were elected, among them Bebel and Liebknecht, who were serving prison sentences at the time.—169.

¹⁰⁶ *The Russian section of the First International* was founded in Switzerland in the spring of 1870 by a group of Russian political emigrants—young democratic people, commoners, brought up on the ideas of the great revolutionary democrats Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. A. A. Serno-Solovyovich, a member of the International, played an important part in organising this section. On March 12, 1870, the Committee of the Russian section sent its programme and rules to the General Council and a letter to Marx asking him to be their representative on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. The programme of the Russian section defined its tasks as follows: "1. To propagate in Russia by all available rational means . . . the ideas and principles of the International Association. 2. To promote the formation of international sections among Russian working-class masses. 3. To help establish firm ties of solidarity between Russia's working classes and those of Western Europe and, by rendering mutual aid, facilitate the more successful attainment of their common goal of emancipation" (*Narodnoye Dyelo*—People's Cause—No. 1, April 15, 1870).

At the General Council meeting held on March 22, 1870, the Russian section was admitted into the International and Marx agreed to represent it on the General Council. The members of the Russian section, N. Utin, A. Trusov, Y. Barteneva, G. Bartenev, Y. Dmitriyeva, A. Korvin-Krukovskaya, took an active part in the Swiss and international working-class movement. The section sought to establish contacts with the revolutionary movement in Russia. It ceased to exist in 1872.—172.

¹⁰⁷ "*Confidential Communication*" was written by Marx about March 28, 1870, at a time when the Bakuninists had intensified their struggle within the International against the General Council, Marx and his followers. As far back as January 1, 1870, at its extraordinary meeting, the General Council adopted a private circular letter on this question (also written by Marx) addressed to the Federal Council of the French-speaking part of Switzerland where the Bakuninists exerted a strong influence. The text of the letter was then communicated to Belgium and France. The circular letter was included in full in the "*Confidential Communication*" sent by Marx, as Corresponding Secretary for Germany, to the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Party.

This volume publishes points 4 and 5 of the "*Confidential Communication*" which show the General Council's attitude to the English working-

class and the Irish national liberation movement, points which were especially attacked by the Bakuninists.

Bearing in mind the role which the English working-class movement was playing at the time in the general struggle of the international proletariat, and the consequent need for the General Council to give guidance to the English working-class movement, Marx explains in Point 4 why it was not expedient to establish in England, as in other countries, a Federal Council of the International.

In Point 5, using Ireland and England as examples, Marx shows the link between the liberation struggle of the enslaved peoples and the proletarian revolution, the role of the oppressed nations as natural allies of the proletariat.—174.

¹⁰⁸ *L'Égalité* (Equality)—Swiss weekly, organ of the Romance Federation of the International, published in French in Geneva from December 1868 to December 1872. For some time it was under Bakunin's influence. In January 1870 the Romance Federal Council succeeded in withdrawing Bakuninists from the editorial board, after which the newspaper began to support the policy pursued by the General Council of the International.—174, 290, 428.

¹⁰⁹ *The Pall Mall Gazette*—London daily published from 1865 to 1920; in the 1860s and 1870s it was of conservative orientation; Marx and Engels contributed to the newspaper from July 1870 to June 1871.

The Saturday Review. See Note 52.

The Spectator—British weekly of liberal trend, published in London from 1828.

The Fortnightly Review—British bourgeois-liberal journal on history, philosophy and literature; issued under this title from 1865 to 1934.—179, 244.

¹¹⁰ *The Land and Labour League* was founded in London in October 1869 with the General Council's participation. Its programme included the following demands: the nationalisation of land, shorter working day, universal suffrage and establishment of agricultural colonies. However, by the autumn of 1870 bourgeois elements had prevailed in it and by 1872 it lost all contacts with the International.—175.

¹¹¹ The reference is to the *British-Irish Union* which came into force on January 1, 1801. It destroyed the last vestiges of Ireland's autonomy, dissolved the Irish Parliament and led to Ireland's complete enslavement by Britain.—175.

¹¹² *The Civil War in France*—a most important work of scientific communism, in which the main Marxist tenets in relation to the class struggle, the state, revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat were further elaborated on the basis of the experience of the Paris Commune. It was written as an address by the General Council of the International to all the Association members in Europe and the United States with the purpose of arming the workers of all countries with a clear understanding of the character and world-wide significance of the heroic struggle of the Communards and disseminating their historic experience to the entire proletariat.

In this work Marx corroborated and developed further his idea on the necessity for the proletariat to break up the bourgeois state machine, set forth in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (see present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 396-489). Marx drew the conclusion that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes" (see p. 217 of this volume). The proletariat should break it up and supersede it by a state of the Paris Commune type. Marx's view

of a new, Paris Commune type of state as the state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat constitutes the essence of his new contribution to revolutionary theory.

Marx's *The Civil War in France* was very widely circulated. In 1871 and 1872 it was translated into a number of languages and published in various European countries and the U.S.A.—178, 202.

- ¹¹³ This introduction was written by Engels for the third German edition of Marx's *The Civil War in France*, published in 1891 to mark the twentieth anniversary of the Paris Commune. Having emphasised the historical significance of the experience of the Paris Commune and Marx's theoretical analysis of it in *The Civil War in France*, Engels added a number of supplementary comments on the history of the Paris Commune and the activity of the Blanquists and Proudhonists. In this edition Engels included the first and second addresses of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian War written by Marx which were also included in the later pamphlet editions of this work in different languages.—178.
- ¹¹⁴ This refers to the national liberation war of the German people against Napoleon's rule in 1813-14.—178.
- ¹¹⁵ *The Exceptional Law* (or *the Anti-Socialist Law*) was introduced in Germany on October 21, 1878. Under this law all Social-Democratic Party organisations, mass workers' organisations and workers' publications were prohibited, socialist publications were confiscated and Social-Democrats persecuted. Under pressure from the mass labour movement the law was repealed on October 1, 1890.—178, 298.
- ¹¹⁶ In the 1820s in Germany this term was applied to the participants in the Opposition movement among the German intelligentsia, who came out against the reactionary political system in the German states and advocated the unification of Germany. "Demagogues" were ruthlessly persecuted by the authorities.—178.
- ¹¹⁷ The reference is to the bourgeois revolution of July 1830 in France.—180.
- ¹¹⁸ The reference is to the Legitimists, Orleanists and Bonapartists.
Legitimists—the party of the adherents of the Bourbon dynasty overthrown in France in 1792; it represented the interests of the influential landed nobility and high clergy. The Legitimists formed themselves into a party in 1830, after the second overthrow of this dynasty. In 1871 they joined the general counter-revolutionary campaign against the Paris Commune.
Orleanists—supporters of the House of Orleans, a branch of the Bourbon dynasty that came to power during the July revolution of 1830 and was overthrown by the revolution of 1848. They defended the interests of the financial aristocracy and the influential bourgeoisie.—180, 200, 209.
- ¹¹⁹ This refers to the coup d'état effected by Louis Bonaparte on December 2, 1851, which marked the beginning of the Bonapartist regime of the Second Empire.—180, 191, 216.
- ¹²⁰ The First Republic was proclaimed in 1792 during the Great French Bourgeois Revolution and was replaced by the First Empire of Napoleon Bonaparte (1804-14).—181.
- ¹²¹ This refers to the preliminary peace treaty between France and Germany signed at Versailles on February 26, 1871 by Thiers and Jules Favre, on the one hand, and Bismarck, on the other. According to the terms of this

treaty, France ceded Alsace and East Lorraine to Germany and paid it indemnities to the sum of 5,000,000,000 francs. The final peace treaty was signed in Frankfort-on-Main on May 10, 1871.—182, 209, 295, 350.

¹²² *Possibilists*—an opportunist trend in the French socialist movement led by Bruce, Malon and others who brought about a split in the French Workers' Party in 1882. Its leaders proclaimed the reformist principle of achieving only that which is "possible", hence the name.—187.

¹²³ When publishing Engels's Introduction in *Die Neue Zeit* (Bd. 2, issue No. 28, 1890-91) the editorial board of the journal changed the original text, substituting in the last paragraph the words "German philistine" for the expression "the Social-Democratic philistine" used in the manuscript. As can be seen from Fischer's letter to Engels of March 17, 1891, Engels disapproved of this arbitrary change but presumably to avoid discrepancies in concurrent publications of this work he retained the amended version in a pamphlet-form edition. In this volume the original wording has been restored.—189.

¹²⁴ *The First Address* on the International's attitude towards the Franco-Prussian War, written by Marx on the instructions of the General Council immediately after the outbreak of the war, as well as the *Second Address* written by him in September 1870 reflect the attitude of the working class towards militarism and war and the struggle which Marx and Engels were waging against wars of aggression and for the implementation of the principles of proletarian internationalism. Marx provided convincing proof in support of the most important propositions of his teaching on the social causes of predatory wars waged by the ruling classes for mercenary ends and pointed out that these wars were also aimed at suppressing the revolutionary working-class movement. He stressed, in particular, the unity of the interests of the German and the French workers and urged them to unite against the aggressive policy of the ruling classes of both countries.

In the First Address Marx pointed out with exceptional foresight that the establishment of workers' rule would put an end to all wars and that peace among nations would be a great internationalist principle of the future communist society.—190, 195.

¹²⁵ The *plebiscite* was conducted by Napoleon III in May 1870 for the alleged purpose of ascertaining the attitude of the masses to the empire. The questions were so worded that it was impossible to express disapproval of the policy of the Second Empire without at the same time declaring opposition to all democratic reforms. The sections of the First International in France exposed the demagogic manoeuvre and instructed their members to abstain from voting. On the eve of the plebiscite the Paris Federation members were arrested on a charge of conspiring against Napoleon III; this pretext was used by the government to launch a campaign of persecution and baiting of the members of the International in various towns of France. At the trial of the Paris Federation members which took place from June 22 to July 5, 1870, the framed charge of conspiracy was fully exposed; nevertheless a number of the International's members were sentenced to imprisonment merely for being members of the International Working Men's Association. The working class of France responded to these persecutions with mass protests.—190, 262.

¹²⁶ On July 19, 1870 the Franco-Prussian war broke out.—191.

¹²⁷ *Le Réveil* (Awakening)—Left republican newspaper published under the editorship of Louis Charles Delescluze in Paris from July 1868 to January

1871. It carried the documents of the International and other material on the working-class movement.—191, 262.
- ¹²⁸ *La Marseillaise*—Left republican daily newspaper published in Paris from December 1869 to September 1870. It carried reports on the activities of the International and on the working-class movement.—191, 262.
- ¹²⁹ This refers to the *Society of December 10*—a secret Bonapartist society organised mainly from among déclassé elements, political gamblers, representatives of the military, etc.; its members assisted Louis Bonaparte's election as President of the Republic of France on December 10, 1848 (hence the name of the society).—192.
- ¹³⁰ Until August 1806 Germany was part of the so-called Holy Roman Empire of the German nation founded in the tenth century and constituting a union of feudal principalities and free towns which recognised the supreme authority of the Emperor.—196.
- ¹³¹ In 1618 the Electorate of Brandenburg united with the Prussian duchy (East Prussia), which had been formed early in the sixteenth century out of the Teutonic Order possessions and which was still a feudal vassal of the Kingdom of Poland. The Elector of Brandenburg, a Prussian duke at the same time, remained a Polish vassal until 1657 when, taking advantage of Poland's difficulties in the war against Sweden, he secured sovereign rights to Prussian possessions.—196.
- ¹³² This refers to the separate *Treaty of Basle* concluded by Prussia, a member of the first anti-French coalition of the European states, with the French Republic on April 5, 1795.—197.
- ¹³³ *The Treaty of Tilsit* was concluded on July 7-9, 1807 between Napoleonic France and the participants of the fourth anti-French coalition, Russia and Prussia, who had sustained a defeat in the war. The peace terms were very onerous for Prussia who lost a considerable part of her territory. Russia suffered no territorial losses but had to recognise the consolidation of France's position in Europe and to take part in the blockade of England (the so-called continental blockade). The predatory Treaty of Tilsit imposed by Napoleon I aroused bitter indignation among the population of Germany and sowed the seeds of the national liberation movement against the rule of Napoleon, which started in 1813.—198.
- ¹³⁴ Marx refers here to the triumph of feudal reaction in Germany after the downfall of Napoleon. The feudal disunity of Germany was restored, the feudal-monarchist system was established in the German states, which retained all the privileges of the nobility and intensified the semi-feudal exploitation of the peasantry.—199.
- ¹³⁵ The reference is to the *Tuileries Palace* in Paris, a residence of Napoleon III.—200.
- ¹³⁶ Marx is referring to a campaign by English workers to secure recognition of the French Republic proclaimed on September 4, 1870. On September 5 a series of meetings and demonstrations began in London and other big cities, at which resolutions and petitions were passed demanding that the British Government immediately recognise the French Republic. The General Council of the First International took a direct part in the organisation of this movement.—201.
- ¹³⁷ Marx is alluding to England's active part in forming a coalition of feudal monarchies which started a war against revolutionary France in 1792, and also to the fact that the English oligarchy was the first in Europe to

- recognise the Bonapartist regime in France, established as a result of the coup d'état by Louis Bonaparte on December 2, 1851.—201.
- ¹³⁸ During the American Civil War (1861-65) between the industrial North and the slave-owning South, the English bourgeois press took the side of the South, i.e., defended the slave-owning system.—201.
- ¹³⁹ *Journal Officiel de la République Française*—official organ of the Paris Commune, which was published from March 20 to May 24, 1871; the newspaper retained the name of the official organ of the government of the French Republic which had appeared in Paris from September 5, 1870 onwards (at the time of the Paris Commune the Thiers government at Versailles put out a newspaper under the same title). The issue for March 30 came out under the title *Journal Officiel de la Commune de Paris*. Simon Guidé's letter was published in the newspaper on April 25, 1871.—203.
- ¹⁴⁰ On January 28, 1871 Favre, on behalf of the Government of National Defence, and Bismarck signed a Convention on the Armistice and the Capitulation of Paris—this ignominious act amounted to the betrayal of the national interests of France. Under this Convention Favre agreed to humiliating terms demanded by the Prussians, i.e., to pay a 200 million francs indemnity within a fortnight, to surrender the greater part of the Paris forts and to hand over the field artillery and munitions of the Paris Army to the Prussians.—203.
- ¹⁴¹ *Capitulards*—a contemptuous nickname for those who advocated the capitulation of Paris during the siege of 1870-71. Subsequently, it came to denote anyone who favoured surrender in general.—203.
- ¹⁴² *L'Etendard* (The Standard)—French newspaper of Bonapartist leanings; it was published in Paris from 1866 to 1868. Its publication was discontinued after the discovery of fraud to acquire more funds.—204.
- ¹⁴³ *Société Générale du Crédit Mobilier*—a large French joint-stock bank founded in 1852. Its main source of income was speculation in securities. The bank was closely linked with the government circles of the Second Empire. In 1867 it went bankrupt and was liquidated in 1871.—204.
- ¹⁴⁴ *L'Electeur Libre*—Right republican organ published in Paris from 1868 to 1871. During 1870 and 1871 it was associated with the Ministry of Finance of the Government of National Defence.—204.
- ¹⁴⁵ On February 14 and 15, 1831 the Paris mob plundered the church of Saint Germain l'Auxerrois and Archbishop Quélen's palace in protest against the Legitimist demonstration during the requiem mass for the Duke de Berry. Thiers who was present when the rioting crowd was committing excesses in the church and the Archbishop's palace persuaded the National Guards not to interfere.
- In 1832, by the order of Thiers, who was at that time Minister of the Interior, the Duchesse de Berry, mother of the Comte de Chambord, the Legitimist pretender to the French throne, was arrested and subjected to a humiliating medical examination aimed at giving publicity to her secret marriage and in this way ruining her political career.—205.
- ¹⁴⁶ An allusion to the ignominious role of Thiers, then Minister of the Interior, in suppressing the people's insurrection in Paris against the July monarchy on April 13-14, 1834. The insurrection was put down with savage brutality by the military who, for example, massacred the inhabitants of one of the houses on Rue Transnonain.
- September Laws*—reactionary laws against the press introduced by the French Government in September 1835. They provided for imprisonment

- and large fines for publications criticising the existing social and political system.—205.
- 147 In January 1841 Thiers submitted to the Chamber of Deputies a plan for building a ring of military fortifications around Paris. Revolutionary-democratic sections saw this move as a preparatory step for the crushing of popular demonstrations. The plan provided for the building of particularly strong fortifications in the vicinity of the workers' districts.—205.
- 148 In April 1849 France in conjunction with Austria and Naples organised an intervention campaign against the Republic of Rome in order to crush it and restore the Pope's temporal power. French troops severely bombarded Rome. Despite heroic resistance, the Republic was crushed and Rome occupied by French troops.—206.
- 149 *The Party of Order*—a party of the influential conservative bourgeoisie founded in 1848. It was a coalition of the two French monarchist factions—the Legitimists and Orleanists (see Note 118); from 1849 till the coup d'état of December 2, 1851, it held the leading position in the Legislative Assembly of the Second Republic.—206, 239.
- 150 On July 15, 1840, England, Russia, Prussia, Austria and Turkey signed the London convention, without the participation of France, on rendering aid to the Turkish Sultan against the Egyptian ruler Mohammed Ali, who enjoyed the support of France. As a result, a threat of war arose between France and the coalition of European powers, but King Louis Philippe did not dare begin hostilities and abandoned his support of Mohammed Ali.—207.
- 151 In order to suppress the Paris Commune Thiers appealed to Bismarck for permission to supplement the Versailles army with French prisoners of war most of whom had been serving in the armies that surrendered at Sedan and Metz.—207.
- 152 *Chambre introuvable*—Chamber of Deputies in France in 1815 and 1816 (during the early years of the Restoration), which consisted of extreme reactionaries.—209.
- 153 *Landlord Chamber, the Assembly of "Rurals"*—nickname of the National Assembly of 1871, which met in Bordeaux and was largely made up of reactionary monarchists: provincial landlords, officials, rentiers and traders elected in rural districts. There were about 430 monarchists among the Assembly's 630 deputies.—209, 249.
- 154 On March 10, 1871, the National Assembly passed a law on the deferred payment of overdue bills; under this law the payments of debts on obligations concluded between August 13 and November 12, 1870 could be deferred; as for payments on obligations concluded after November 12, no deferment was granted. Thus, the law of March 10 dealt a heavy blow at the workers and poorer sections of the population and led to the bankruptcy of many minor industrialists and traders.—210.
- 155 *Décembriseur*—participant in the Bonapartist coup d'état of December 2, 1851 and supporter of acts in the spirit of this coup.—210.
- 156 According to the newspapers, the internal loan, which the Thiers government wanted to float, gave Thiers and members of his government over 300 million francs "commission". On June 20, 1871, after the suppression of the Paris Commune, the law on the loan was passed.—210.
- 157 *Cayenne*—town in French Guiana (South America), penal settlement and place of exile.—211.

- ¹⁵⁸ *Le National*—French daily published in Paris from 1830 to 1851; organ of the moderate bourgeois republicans.—213.
- ¹⁵⁹ *On October 31, 1870*, upon the receipt of news that the Government of National Defence had decided to start negotiations with the Prussians, the Paris workers and the revolutionary sections of the National Guard rose up in revolt. They seized the Town Hall and set up their revolutionary government—the Committee of Public Safety, headed by Blanqui. Under pressure from the workers the Government of National Defence had to promise to resign and schedule elections to the Commune for November 1. The Paris revolutionary forces, however, were not sufficiently well organised and there were disagreements among the leaders of the uprising—the followers of Blanqui and the petty-bourgeois Jacobin democrats. The government took advantage of the situation and, with the aid of some loyal battalions of the National Guard, seized the Town Hall and re-established its power.—213.
- ¹⁶⁰ *Bretons*—Breton Mobile Guard which Trochu used as gendarmes to put down the revolutionary movement in Paris.
Corcicans—constituted a considerable part of the gendarme corps during the Second Empire.—213.
- ¹⁶¹ *On January 22, 1871*, the Paris proletariat and the National Guards held a revolutionary demonstration initiated by the Blanquists. They demanded the overthrow of the government and the establishment of a Commune. By order of the Government of National Defence, the Breton Mobile Guard, which was defending the Town Hall, opened fire on the demonstrators. After suppressing the revolutionary movement by terrorist methods, the government began preparations to surrender Paris.—214.
- ¹⁶² *Sommations* (a preliminary demand to disperse)—under the laws of a number of bourgeois states the demand was repeated three times, following which the authorities were entitled to resort to force. *The Riot Act* was introduced in England in 1715. It prohibited “rebel gatherings” of more than 12 people, giving the authorities the right to use force if the crowd did not disperse within an hour after the reading out of a special warning three times.—214.
- ¹⁶³ *On October 31* (see Note 159), Flourens prevented the members of the Government of National Defence from being shot, as had been demanded by one of the insurrectionists.—216.
- ¹⁶⁴ The reference is to the decree on hostages adopted by the Commune on April 5, 1871. (Marx gives the date of its publication in the English press.) Under this decree, all persons found guilty of being in contact with Versailles were declared hostages. By this decree the Commune sought to prevent Communards from being shot by the Versaillists.—216.
- ¹⁶⁵ *The Times*—English conservative daily published in London since 1785.—217, 248.
- ¹⁶⁶ *Investiture*—a system of appointing officials, under which persons in the lower rungs of the hierarchy were fully dependent on higher officials.—221.
- ¹⁶⁷ *Girondins*—the party of the influential bourgeoisie during the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the eighteenth century. (The name is derived from the Department of Gironde.) It came out against the Jacobin government and the revolutionary masses which supported it, under the banner of defending the departments’ right to autonomy and federation.—222.
- ¹⁶⁸ *Kladderadatsch*—illustrated satirical weekly first published in Berlin in 1848.—222, 325.

- 469 *Punch, or the London Charivari*—English bourgeois-liberal humorous weekly published in London since 1841.—222.
- 470 The reference is to the Paris Commune's decree of April 16, 1871, providing for payment of all debts in instalments over three years and abolition of interest on them.—224.
- 471 On August 22, 1848, the Constituent Assembly rejected the bill on "amiable agreements" ("*concordats à l'amiable*") aimed to introduce the deferred payment of debts. As a result of this measure, a considerable section of the petty bourgeoisie were utterly ruined and found themselves completely dependent on the creditors from among the rich bourgeoisie.—225.
- 472 *Frères Ignorantins* (ignorant brothers)—nickname of a religious order, founded in Rheims in 1680, whose members pledged themselves to educate the children of the poor. The pupils received a predominantly religious education and very scanty knowledge in other fields.—225.
- 473 This refers to the *Alliance républicaine des Départements*—a political association of petty-bourgeois representatives from the various departments of France, who lived in Paris; it called on the people to fight against the Versailles government and the monarchist National Assembly and to support the Commune throughout the country.—225.
- 474 This refers to the law of April 27, 1825 on the payment of compensation to the former émigrés for the landed estates confiscated from them during the French bourgeois revolution.—225.
- 475 *The Vendôme Column* was erected between 1806 and 1810 in Paris in honour of the victories of Napoleonic France; it was made out of the bronze from captured enemy guns and crowned by a statue of Napoleon. On May 16, 1871, by order of the Paris Commune, the Vendôme Column was pulled down.—227.
- 476 In the Picpus nunnery cases of nuns being incarcerated in cells for many years were exposed and instruments of torture were found; in the Church of Saint Laurent a secret cemetery was found attesting to the murders that had been committed there. These facts were made public in the Commune's newspaper *Mot d'Ordre* on May 5, 1871, and also in the pamphlet *Les Crimes des congrégations religieuses*.—228.
- 477 The chief occupation of the French prisoners of war in Wilhelmshöhe (see Note 100) was making cigars for their own use.—228.
- 478 *Absentees*—rich landowners who hardly ever visited their estates which were managed by land agents or leased to middlemen who, in their turn, sub-leased them at high rents.—229.
- 479 *Francs-fileurs* (literally: "free absconders")—nickname given to the Paris bourgeois who fled from the city during the siege. The name sounded all the more ironical as a result of its resemblance to the word "*francs-tireurs*" ("free sharpshooters")—French guerrillas who actively fought against the Prussians.—230.
- 480 *Coblentz*—a city in Germany; during the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the eighteenth century it was the centre where the landlord-monarchist émigrés made preparations for intervention against revolutionary France. Coblentz was the seat of the émigré government headed by the rabid reactionary de Calonne, a former minister of Louis XVI.—230.
- 481 This name was given to the Versailles soldiers of royalist sympathies recruited in Brittany, by analogy with those who took part in the counter-

- revolutionary royalist insurrection in North-Western France during the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the eighteenth century.—231.
- ¹⁸² Under the impact of the proletarian revolution in Paris which led to the establishment of the Commune, revolutionary mass actions of a similar nature took place in Lyons and Marseilles. However, mass revolutionary demonstrations were brutally crushed by government troops.—232.
- ¹⁸³ Under the law concerning the procedure of military courts, submitted by Dufaure to the National Assembly, it was ruled that cases were to be investigated and sentences carried out within 48 hours.—233.
- ¹⁸⁴ This trade treaty between England and France was concluded on January 23, 1860. Under its terms France was to abandon her prohibitive customs policy and replace it by introducing new import duties. As a result of the influx of English goods to France, competition in the home market sharply increased, causing much dissatisfaction among French manufacturers.—234.
- ¹⁸⁵ This refers to the reign of terror and bloody repression in Ancient Rome at the various stages of the crisis of the slave-owning Roman Republic in the first century B. C. *Sulla's dictatorship* (82-79 B.C.). *The first and second triumvirates* (60-53 and 43-36 B.C.)—periods of dictatorship by the Roman generals: Pompey, Caesar and Crassus—the first triumvirate; Octavian, Antonius and Lepidus—the second triumvirate.—235.
- ¹⁸⁶ *Journal de Paris*—weekly newspaper of monarchist-Orleanist views; its publication started in Paris in 1867.—236.
- ¹⁸⁷ In August 1814, during the war between Britain and the United States, British troops seized Washington and burnt the Capitol, the White House and other public buildings.
In October 1860, during the war waged by Britain and France against China, British and French troops pillaged and then burnt down the summer palace of the Chinese Emperors near Peking, a treasure-house of Chinese art and architecture.—237.
- ¹⁸⁸ *Praetorians*—in Ancient Rome the privileged life-guards of the general or emperor; they constantly took part in internal disturbances and not infrequently enthroned their henchmen. Later the word "praetorians" became the symbol of the mercenary, tyrannical nature of the militarists.—239.
- ¹⁸⁹ This is what Marx called the Prussian Assembly by analogy with the French *Chambre introuvable* (see Note 152). The Assembly elected in January and February 1849 consisted of two chambers: the first was a privileged aristocratic "chamber of the gentry"; the composition of the second was determined by two-stage elections in which only the so-called "independent" Prussians took part. Elected to the second chamber, Bismarck became one of the leaders of the extremely reactionary Junker group.—239.
- ¹⁹⁰ *The Daily News*—English liberal newspaper, organ of the industrial bourgeoisie, published in London from 1846 to 1930.—242, 335.
- ¹⁹¹ *Le Temps*—French conservative daily, organ of the influential bourgeoisie; it was published in Paris from 1861 to 1943.—242.
- ¹⁹² *The Evening Standard*—the evening edition of the *Standard*, an English conservative newspaper (founded in 1827); was published in London in 1857-1905; later on, it appeared as a separate newspaper.—242.

¹⁹³ The authors of this letter were Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.—242.

¹⁹⁴ *The London Conference* of the First International met between September 17 and 23, 1871. Since the Conference convened at a time of harsh repressions against the members of the International, which set in after the defeat of the Paris Commune, its numbers were rather depleted: it was attended by 22 delegates with the right to vote and 10 delegates with voice but no vote. Countries that could not send their delegates were represented by corresponding secretaries of the General Council. Marx represented Germany, Engels—Italy.

The London Conference marked an important stage in the struggle which Marx and Engels waged for the foundation of a proletarian party. The Conference adopted a resolution on the "Political Action of the Working Class", the main part of which, on the decision of the Hague Congress of the International, was incorporated in the General Rules of the International Working Men's Association. Many important tactical and organisational principles of the proletarian party were formulated in the Conference resolutions, which dealt a heavy blow at sectarianism and reformism. The London Conference played a major role in upholding the principles of proletarian partisanship over anarchism and opportunism.—245, 258, 291, 292.

¹⁹⁵ *Fictitious Splits in the International*—private circular of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association the major propositions of which were set forth by Marx at the Council meeting of March 5, 1872. In this document Marx and Engels exposed Bakuninism as a manifestation of sectarianism hostile to the mass working-class movement and characterised by theoretical backwardness, isolation from the mass revolutionary movement, dogmatism and "revolutionary" adventurism. They revealed the social roots of sectarianism lying in the impact of petty-bourgeois mentality on the working class and emphasised that the latter should have its own mass revolutionary organisation to counterbalance sects. This organisation was the International, the genuine and militant association of the proletariat of all countries. Acceptance of the Bakuninist demand to reduce the General Council's function to that of a mere correspondence and statistical bureau would mean the refusal of the proletariat to found its own disciplined and ideologically united organisation. The struggle waged by Marx and Engels on the question of the General Council's functions was essentially the struggle for the organisational principles of the proletarian party. By the unanimous decision of the Council this circular was published in French at the end of May 1872.—247.

¹⁹⁶ From the end of the 1850s one of the basic demands of the English workers was that of the introduction of the nine-hour working day. In May 1871 a big strike of building workers and engineers started in Newcastle. It was headed by the Nine Hours' League which, for the first time, had drawn into the struggle workers who did not belong to the trade unions. Barnett, the League's president, addressed the General Council of the International requesting it to prevent the import of blacklegs into England which had begun. The import was prevented thanks to the effective support by the General Council. In October 1871 the strike was a success, the workers having obtained a 54-hour working week.—248.

¹⁹⁷ On July 25, 1871, the General Council adopted Engels's proposal to convene in London, in September 1871, a closed conference of the International. From that time on Marx and Engels made intensive organisational and theoretical preparations for the conference; they drew up the agenda and draft resolutions which were discussed at General Council meetings

and were then submitted to the London Conference (concerning the Conference see Note 194).—248.

- ¹⁹⁸ Jules Favre's circular letter of May 26, 1871 proposed to the diplomatic representatives of France abroad that European governments should be persuaded to arrest and extradite Commune refugees as mere criminals.

Dufaure submitted a bill drawn up by a special commission of the French National Assembly and passed on March 14, 1872. Under this law affiliation with the International was punishable by imprisonment.—249.

- ¹⁹⁹ In the summer of 1871 Bismarck and Beust, the Austro-Hungarian Chancellor, initiated a joint struggle against the working-class movement. On June 17, 1871 Bismarck sent Beust a memorandum on the measures taken in Germany and France against the activities of the International.

The German and Austrian emperors met in Gastein in August 1871, 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.

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.—249.

- ²⁰⁰ The London Conference instructed the General Council, on Marx's proposal, to form a Federal Council for England since the General Council itself had been performing the functions of such a council until the autumn of 1871. In October 1871 the British Federal Council was founded, composed of representatives of the English section of the International. But from the start a group of reformers headed by Hales wormed its way into the Council's leadership and began a campaign against the General Council and its policy of proletarian internationalism on the Irish question. In their struggle Hales and other reformers collaborated with the Swiss anarchists, U.S. bourgeois reformers, etc. Following the Hague Congress the reformist wing of the British Federal Council refused to recognise the Congress decisions and, jointly with the Bakuninists, launched a slanderous campaign against the General Council and Marx. The reformers were opposed by the other members of the Federal Council who actively supported Marx and Engels. Early in December 1872 there was a split in the Federal Council; some members of the Council true to the Hague Congress decisions constituted themselves as the British Federal Council and established direct ties with the General Council whose seat was transferred to New York. The reformers' attempt to gain leadership of the British Federation of the International thus ended in failure.

The British Federal Council actually existed until 1874 when it ceased its activities following the end of the activity of the International as a whole and the temporary victory of opportunism in the British working-class movement.—250.

- ²⁰¹ This refers to Resolution II of the London Conference of 1871—"Designations of National Councils, etc."—which barred various sectarian groups from the International.—250.

- ²⁰² This refers to Bakunin's manifesto "To the Russian, Polish and All Slav Friends" published in a supplement to *Kolokol* No. 122-23, of February 15, 1862.

Kolokol (The Bell)—Russian revolutionary-democratic newspaper

- published in 1857-67 by Alexander Herzen and Nikolai Ogaryov in Russian, and in 1868-69 in French with Russian supplements; printed in London until 1865 and then in Geneva.—250.
- ²⁰³ *The League of Peace and Freedom*—bourgeois-pacifist organisation founded in Switzerland in 1867 by various petty-bourgeois and bourgeois republicans and liberals.—250.
- ²⁰⁴ *The Brussels Congress* of the International was held on September 6-13, 1868. Marx took an active part in the preparations of the Congress but did not attend it. Nearly 100 delegates were present at the Congress representing the workers of Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy and Spain. The Congress adopted a major decision on the necessity of transferring railways, mineral resources, mines, forests and arable land into public ownership. This decision testified to the fact that the majority of French and Belgian Proudhonists had adopted the standpoint of collectivism, and marked the victory, in the International, for the ideas of proletarian socialism over petty-bourgeois reformism. The Congress also adopted resolutions proposed by Marx on the eight-hour working day, on the use of machinery, on the attitude towards the Berne Congress (1868) of the League of Peace and Freedom (see Note 203), as well as a resolution submitted by Lessner, in the name of the German delegation, recommending the workers of all countries to study Marx's *Capital* and to promote its translation from German into other languages.—250, 290.
- ²⁰⁵ The reference is to Bakunin's attempt to secure at the congress of the League of Peace and Freedom (see Note 203), held in Berne in September 1868, the adoption of the muddled socialist programme drawn up by him (the "social and economic equalisation of classes", the abolition of the state and the right of inheritance, etc.). When his project was rejected by a majority vote, Bakunin withdrew from the League and founded the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy.—251, 424.
- ²⁰⁶ *The Geneva Congress* of the International met from September 3 to 8, 1868 and was attended by sixty delegates from the General Council sections and workers' societies of Britain, France, Germany and Switzerland. Marx read the "Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council. The Different Questions" (see pp. 77-85 of this volume) as the General Council's official report. Despite the Proudhonists participating in the Congress, most of the points of the Instructions were endorsed as Congress resolutions. The Geneva Congress likewise adopted the Rules and the Regulations of the International Working Men's Association.—251, 417.
- ²⁰⁷ *The Lausanne Congress* of the International held on September 2-8, 1867 heard the General Council's report and reports from the localities attesting to the strengthening of the International's organisations in different countries. In spite of the General Council the Proudhonists imposed their own agenda; the Congress once again discussed co-operation, female labour and education, as well as other minor questions which distracted the Congress's attention from vital questions proposed by the General Council. Though the Proudhonists managed to secure the adoption of some of their resolutions, they failed to take over the leadership of the International. The Congress re-elected the General Council with its former composition and voted to keep its seat in London.—251.
- ²⁰⁸ *The Nechayev trial*, the trial of students charged with secret revolutionary activities, was held in St. Petersburg in July-August 1871. As far back

as 1869 Nechayev established contacts with Bakunin and developed activities directed at founding, in a number of Russian cities, a secret society called the Narodnaya Rasprava (People's Retribution) which preached the anarchist ideas of "absolute destruction". Revolutionary-minded students and middle-class intellectuals entered the Nechayev organisation because they were attracted by its sharp criticism of the tsarist regime and by the appeals to wage a resolute struggle against it. Nechayev had received from Bakunin the credentials of a representative of the so-called European Revolutionary Union and used them to pass himself off as a representative of the International, thereby misleading the members of his organisation. In 1871 the Nechayev organisation was broken up and its adventurist methods were made public at the trial of its members.

The London Conference instructed Utin to draw up a brief report on this trial. Instead of such a report, Utin sent Marx in late August 1872, for the Hague Congress of the International, a detailed confidential report on the anti-International activities conducted by Bakunin and Nechayev.—255, 429.

- ²⁰⁹ *Le Progrès*—Bakunist newspaper published in French in Locle, under the editorship of Guillaume, from December 1868 to April 1870.—255.
- ²¹⁰ *Le Travail* (Labour)—weekly newspaper of the Paris sections of the International; published in Paris from October 3 to December 12, 1869.—256.
- ²¹¹ This association of feudal gentry was founded in France late in 1464 and opposed the policy of Louis XI to unite France in a single centralised state. The League members acted for the "common good" of France.—256.
- ²¹² *La Solidarité*—Bakunist weekly newspaper published in French in Neuchâtel from April to September 1870, and in Geneva from March to May 1871.—256.
- ²¹³ That is, the workers engaged in the production of watches and jewellery carried on in large and small workshops in Geneva and its environs; also home-producers of these articles.—257.
- ²¹⁴ 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*.—258.
- ²¹⁵ *The Lyons uprising* began on September 4, 1870, on receipt of the news of the defeat at Sedan (see Note 100). Bakunin arrived in Lyons on September 15 and 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.—258.
- ²¹⁶ In April 1870, Paul Robin, a follower of Bakunin, suggested to the Paris Federal Council that it should recognise the Federal Committee formed by the anarchists at a congress in La Chaux-de-Fonds as the Romance Federal Committee. After the General Council had explained the meaning of the split in Switzerland to the members of the Paris Federal Council the latter decided that it had no right to interfere in the matter since it came within the competence of the General Council.—259.
- ²¹⁷ B. Malon, *La troisième défaite du prolétariat français*, Neuchâtel, 1871.—259.
- ²¹⁸ This section was founded on September 6, 1871 in place of the Geneva

- section called the "Alliance of Socialist Democracy" which was dissolved in August of the same year. Besides former members of this section, Zhukovsky, Perron and others, some French refugees, including Jules Guesde and Benoit Malon, took part in organising the new "Socialist Revolutionary Propaganda and Action Section."—259.
- ²¹⁹ *La Révolution Sociale*—French weekly published in Geneva from October 1871 to January 1872; from November 1871, official organ of the anarchist Jura Federation.—260, 428.
- ²²⁰ *Le Figaro*—French reactionary newspaper appearing in Paris since 1854 and connected with the government of the Second Empire.
Le Gaulois—daily newspaper of conservative-monarchist views, organ of the influential bourgeoisie and aristocracy; came out in Paris from 1867 to 1929.
Paris-Journal—reactionary daily with police connections; published by Henri de Pène in Paris from 1868 to 1874. It slandered the International and the Paris Commune.—260.
- ²²¹ The reference is to Resolution 2 from Section XIII "Special Votes of the Conference" declaring that "the German working men have done their duty during the Franco-German war"; for the London Conference of 1871 see Note 194.—265.
- ²²² *Journal de Genève national, politique et littéraire*—conservative newspaper appearing since 1826.—269.
- ²²³ *Chartism*—a mass revolutionary movement of the British workers in the 1830s and 1840s. In 1838 the Chartists drew up a petition (People's Charter) to be presented to Parliament, demanding universal suffrage for men over 21, a secret ballot, repeal of the property qualifications for Parliamentary candidates, etc. The movement began with big meetings and demonstrations, its slogan being the struggle for the implementation of the People's Charter. On May 2, 1842 the Chartists sent a second petition to Parliament, which this time contained a number of social demands (a shorter working day, higher wages, and the like). The petition was rejected by Parliament. In reply the Chartists organised a general strike. In 1848 they planned a mass march to Parliament with a third petition, but the government brought in the troops and prevented it. The petition was examined many months later and rejected. After 1848 the Chartist movement began to decline.
 The main reason for the failure of the Chartist movement was the absence of a clear programme and tactics and the lack of consistently revolutionary proletarian leadership. However, the Chartists had a tremendous influence on the political history of Britain and on the international working-class movement.—271.
- ²²⁴ 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 made on February 5, 1872 on behalf of the commission engaged in the examination of the Dufaure law (see Note 198). The General Council's statement apropos of Favre's circular was written by Marx and Engels.—272.
- ²²⁵ 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.—273.
- ²²⁶ 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'Associa-*

tion Internationale des Travailleurs, tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866, Genève, 1866, pp. 13-14.—275.

- 227 *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, a secret police agent, headed this society until February 1872.

Il Proletario—Italian newspaper published in Turin from 1872 to 1874; it supported the Bakuninists and opposed the General Council and the London Conference resolutions.—275.

- 228 In November 1871 Stefanoni, a bourgeois democrat, put forward a plan for founding a Universal Rationalist Society whose programme was a mixture of bourgeois-democratic views and petty-bourgeois utopian socialism (the setting up of agricultural colonies for solving the social question, etc.). The purpose of the society was to divert the workers' attention from the International and curb its influence in Italy. Simultaneously Stefanoni declared his solidarity with the Alliance of Socialist Democracy. Statements made by Marx and Engels exposing Stefanoni's true aims and the anarchists' direct ties with the bourgeois democrats, as well as by some leaders of the Italian working-class movement against Stefanoni's plan, foiled his attempts to subject the Italian working-class movement to bourgeois influence.—283.

- 229 *Neuer Social-Demokrat*—German newspaper published in Berlin from 1871 to 1876, organ of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers; it waged a campaign against Marxist leaders of the International and the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party, supporting the Bakuninists and other anti-proletarian trends.—283, 429, 430.

- 230 "*White shirts*" or "*white blouses*"—the bands organised by the police of the Second Empire. Composed of déclassé elements claiming to be workers, they organised provocative demonstrations and disturbances, in order to furnish the authorities with pretexts for persecuting genuine workers' organisation.—283.

- 231 The General Council meeting of February 20, 1872 adopted Jung's proposal to mark the first anniversary of the Paris Commune by holding a mass meeting in London on March 18. The meeting did not take place because at the last moment the owner of the premises refused to provide the hall. Nevertheless, on March 18 members of the International and former Communards held a meeting to celebrate the anniversary of the first proletarian revolution. This meeting adopted three brief resolutions specially written for the occasion by Marx.—287.

- 232 This manuscript, "*The Nationalisation of the Land*", is a major Marxist document on the agrarian question. It was written in connection with a discussion of the nationalisation of the land question in the Manchester section of the International. In his letter to Engels of March 3, Dupont described the confusion in the views of the section members on the agrarian question and invited Marx and Engels to make their comments on the five points of his future report, so that he could take them into account prior to the section meeting. Marx provided a detailed exposition of his views on the nationalisation of the land which Dupont made full use of in his report. Marx held that the nationalisation of the land, this great problem, as he referred to it, was inseparably linked with the tasks

of the proletarian revolution and the socialist transformation of society as a whole.—288.

- ²³³ *The Hague Congress* of the International Working Men's Association took place between September 2 and 7, 1872. It was attended by 65 delegates from 15 national organisations, including Marx and Engels who directed the entire work of the Congress. The Congress witnessed the culmination of the struggle which Marx, Engels and their followers had been waging for many years against all kinds of petty-bourgeois sectarianism in the working-class movement. The sectarian activities of the anarchists were denounced and their leaders expelled from the International. The decisions of the Hague Congress paved the way for the foundation of independent political parties of the working class in various countries.—291, 432, 434.
- ²³⁴ After the Hague Congress (see Note 233) Marx and other delegates left for Amsterdam to visit the local section of the International. On September 8 he addressed the meeting with a speech on the results of the Hague Congress. Indefatigably defending the idea of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, Marx demonstrated in this speech a creative approach to the problem of the forms of transition in different countries from capitalism to socialism, showing that these depended on concrete historical conditions, the balance and correlation of class forces. He advanced the thesis that side by side with violence—which in those conditions was an unavoidable means of establishing and retaining the proletarian dictatorship in most countries—in some countries (England, the U.S.A. and possibly the Netherlands), because of their prevailing historical conditions (absence of a well-organised bureaucratic and militarist apparatus), the proletariat could achieve political rule without resorting to revolutionary violence.—292.
- ²³⁵ The reference is to the meeting of the three emperors—Wilhelm I, Franz-Josef and Alexander II—in Berlin in September 1872.—293.
- ²³⁶ Engels's work *The Housing Question* is directed against petty-bourgeois and bourgeois social-reformers who sought to conceal the ills of bourgeois society. Engels criticises the Proudhonists' plans for solving the housing question and proves that it cannot be solved under capitalism. The victorious proletariat alone, he says, by solving the vital problems of building socialism will also settle the housing question.
Of particular importance are Engels's ideas expressed in this work on the socialist transformation of the countryside and the abolition of the antithesis between town and country which will be possible only in a communist society.—295.
- ²³⁷ Six articles by Mülberger entitled "*Die Wohnungsfrage*" (The Housing Question) were published unsigned in *Der Volksstaat* on February 3, 7, 10, 14 and 21 and March 6, 1872. Later on these articles were printed as a pamphlet *Die Wohnungsfrage. Eine sociale Skizze*. Separat-Abdruck aus dem *Volksstaat*, Leipzig, 1872.—296, 305, 357, 367.
- ²³⁸ E. Sax, *Die Wohnungszustände der arbeitenden Classen und ihre Reform*, Wien, 1869.—296, 324.
- ²³⁹ Mülberger's answer to Engels's articles was published in *Der Volksstaat*, on October 26, 1872, under the heading: *Zur Wohnungsfrage (Antwort an Friedrich Engels von A. Mülberger)*.—296, 353.
- ²⁴⁰ *The New Madrid Federation* was formed in July 1872 by members of the International and the editors of the newspaper *La Emancipacion* expelled

- by an anarchist majority from the Madrid Federation for having exposed the activities of the secret Alliance of Socialist Democracy in Spain. The New Madrid Federation waged a vigorous campaign against anarchist influences in Spain, propagated the ideas of scientific socialism and fought for an independent workers' party in Spain. Engels contributed to the Federation's press organ, *La Emancipacion*. Certain members of the New Madrid Federation did much to found the Socialist Workers' Party of Spain in 1879.—297.
- ²⁴¹ *Katheders-Socialism* (socialism of the chair)—a trend in bourgeois ideology between the 1870s and 1890s. Its representatives, primarily professors of German universities, preached bourgeois reformism under the guise of socialism from their university chairs (*Katheders*) (this trend was ironically called "Kathedersozialismus"). They (A. Wagner, G. Schmoller, L. Brentano, W. Sombart and others) claimed that the state was a supra-class institution, which was able to reconcile the hostile classes and gradually introduce socialism without infringing on the interests of the capitalists. Their aim was to better the condition of the workers by organising insurance against sickness and accident and by passing factory acts. They held that well-organised trade unions make political struggle and a working-class party superfluous. This trend was one of the ideological forerunners of revisionism.—298.
- ²⁴² The reference is to the famine of 1882 which very heavily struck the peasants of Eifel (Rhenish Province of Prussia).—299.
- ²⁴³ Engels is referring ironically to the expression "to long for the fleshpots of Egypt" which comes from the biblical legend; according to it during the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt the faint-hearted among them were driven by the hardships of the journey and hunger to long for the days of captivity when at least they had enough to eat.—311.
- ²⁴⁴ Engels is referring to the so-called bazaars for the fair exchange of labour products which were founded by Owenite co-operative workers' societies in various towns of England. The products were exchanged there through the medium of labour notes, whose unit of value was a single hour of work. These enterprises, however, soon went bankrupt.—316.
- ²⁴⁵ *La Emancipacion*—Spanish workers' weekly published in Madrid from 1871 to 1873, organ of the sections of the International; from September 1871 to April 1872, organ of the Spanish Federal Council; waged a campaign against anarchist influences in Spain. In 1872 and 1873 it printed works by Marx and Engels.—316.
- ²⁴⁶ *Illustrated London News*—British weekly appearing ever since 1842.—325.
- ²⁴⁷ *Ueber Land und Meer* (On Land and Sea)—German illustrated weekly, published in Stuttgart from 1858 to 1923.—325.
- ²⁴⁸ *Gartenlaube* (Arbour)—German petty-bourgeois weekly journal concerned with literature; appeared in Leipzig from 1853 to 1903 and in Berlin in 1903-43.—325.
- ²⁴⁹ *Fusilier August Kutschke*—pseudonym of the German poet Gotthelf Hoffmann, author of the nationalistic soldiers' song of the period of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71.—325.
- ²⁵⁰ *Le Socialiste*—French weekly, organ of the Workers' Party (1885-1902), organ of the Socialist Party of France (1902-05); from 1905 on, organ

- of the French Socialist Party. Engels contributed to the newspaper. For the articles on the colony in Guise see the paper for July 3 and 24, 1886.—334.
- 251 *Harmony Hall*—communistic colony founded by English utopian socialists, headed by Robert Owen, at the end of 1839; it existed until 1845.—334.
- 252 See V. A. Huber, *Sociale Fragen. IV. Die Latente Association*, Nordhausen, 1866.—335.
- 253 Engels is referring to Wagner's statements in some of his books and speeches to the effect that the revival of the conjuncture in Germany after the Franco-Prussian war and particularly as a result of the 5,000-million indemnity would considerably improve the condition of the working class.—350.
- 254 The reference is to the negotiations of the German and Austrian emperors and their chancellors in Gastein in August 1871 and in Salzburg in September of the same year. Engels calls these conferences Stieberian after Stieber, chief of the Prussian political police, thereby emphasising their reactionary police character.—350.
- 255 See Hegel, *Wissenschaft der Logik*, Part I, Section 2.—355.
- 256 This refers to the administrative reform of 1872 in Prussia which abolished hereditary patrimonial power of the landowners in the countryside and introduced certain elements of local self-administration such as elected headmen in the communities, district councils under the Landtags, etc.—366.
- 257 In his article "On Authority" Engels provides a profound criticism of the views held by the Bakuninists who denied all authority, and gives foundation to the Marxist views on the question of the attitude of the proletarian revolution to the state. Engels exposes the anti-scientific and anti-revolutionary essence of the anarchist idea of the "abolition of the state" prior to the abolition of those social relations that have begotten it. He also subjects anarchist dogmatism and sectarianism to annihilating criticism.—376.
- 258 This is Article II from Engels's series *Flüchtlingsliteratur* (Emigré Literature) published in *Der Volksstaat* from June 1874 to April 1875. Describing the new trends in the development of the French socialist movement, Engels reveals the major shortcomings of the Blanquist Commune emigrants which were reflected in the pamphlet *Aux Communeux* (To Communards) published by them. While noting a considerable change in the views of the Blanquist emigrants in London (their rapprochement to scientific communism), Engels at the same time sharply criticised their conspiracy tactics, voluntarism, complete denial of all compromises in the course of the proletarian revolutionary struggle.—380.
- 259 *Le Père Duchesne*—French newspaper published in Paris in 1790-94 by Jacques Hébert; expressed the views of the urban semi-proletarian masses.
Le Père Duchêne—French daily published by Eugen Vermersch in Paris from March 6 to May 21, 1871; took a similar line to the Blanquist press.—382.
- 260 "Kulturkampf" ("struggle for culture")—the name given by bourgeois liberals to a system of measures implemented in the 1870s by Bismarck's government under the banner of a campaign for secular culture. It was directed against the Catholic church and the party of the Centre which

supported the separatist and anti-Prussian tendencies of the landowners, the bourgeoisie and certain sections of the peasantry in the Catholic regions of Prussia and South-Western German state. Under the pretext of the anti-Catholic struggle Bismarck's government also intensified the national oppression of the Polish lands which had fallen under Prussia's sway. This policy likewise aimed at distracting the workers from the class struggle by fanning religious fervour. In the early 1880s, in view of the growing working-class movement, Bismarck repudiated the greater part of these measures in order to consolidate reactionary forces.—384.

²⁶¹ In his article "On Social Relations in Russia" Engels pointed out the decisive factors behind the intensifying revolutionary situation in Russia: the emergence of the Russian working class into the political arena and the inevitable growth of the mass peasant movement provoked by the robbery of the peasants after the abolition of serfdom. In this article and the afterword to it written in 1894, the author criticised the main trends in the Russian Narodism of the early 1870s represented by its ideological leaders Pyotr Lavrov and Pyotr Tkachov, and especially the liberal Narodism of the 1880s and 1890s. Engels reveals the idealistic, voluntarist view on history characteristic of the Narodniks, their failure to understand the material basis of social development. A general analysis of social relations in Russia after 1861 led Engels to the conclusion that capitalism was increasingly developing in Russia and that due to this communal ownership in the countryside was disintegrating. He sharply criticised the Narodniks' idealisation of the peasant community and pointed to the accelerated transformation of Russia into an industrial-capitalist country, the proletarianisation of peasants and the "destruction of the old communist community" (see p. 409 of this volume). He noted with satisfaction the appearance of people in the Russian revolutionary movement who had abandoned Narodnik views and assimilated the theory of scientific communism.—387, 398.

²⁶² Here and elsewhere Engels quotes Tkachov's pamphlet *Offener Brief an Herrn Friedrich Engels* published in Zurich in 1874.—387, 398.

²⁶³ Engels has in mind Haxthausen's book *Studien über die innern Zustände, das Volksleben und insbesondere die ländlichen Einrichtungen Rußlands* that appeared in three parts in Hanover and Berlin in 1847-52.—393.

²⁶⁴ The reference is to Julius Zhukovsky's article "Karl Marks i yego kniga o kapitale" (Karl Marx and His Book on Capital) in *Vestnik Yevropy* (see Note 56), Book 9 for 1877, and to Nikolai Mikhailovsky's reply to it in *Otechestvenniye Zapiski* No. 10, 1877, entitled "Karl Marx pered sudom J. G. Zhukovskogo" (Karl Marx Judged by J. G. Zhukovsky).

Otechestvenniye Zapiski (Fatherland Notes)—literary and political magazine that began publication in St. Petersburg in 1820; in 1839 it became one of the best progressive journals at that time. The journal was constantly persecuted by censors and in April 1884 was closed down by the tsarist government.—405.

²⁶⁵ *Vestnik Narodnoi Voli* (Messenger of the People's Will)—journal published in Geneva in 1883-86 by members of the Executive Committee of the People's Will organisation who emigrated from Russia. Altogether five issues appeared.

In the Russian legal press Marx's letter was printed in October 1888 in the journal *Yuridichesky Vestnik* (The Legal Messenger).—405.

²⁶⁶ This passage was omitted by Marx in the second German and subsequent editions of *Capital*.—406.

- ²⁶⁷ This apparently refers to the leading bodies of the Narodnik organisations: the Land and Freedom (autumn 1876-autumn 1879) and the People's Will (August 1879-March 1881), the latter proclaiming terrorism as the basic method of the political struggle.—407.
- ²⁶⁸ These comments on Bakunin's book *State and Anarchy* (*Staatlichkeit und Anarchie*), the latter being published in 1873, form a peculiar critical and polemic work combining the profound criticism of anarchist doctrines and the development, in contrast to them, of major propositions of scientific communism: on the state, the historical necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the alliance of the working class and the peasantry as an indispensable condition for the victory of the socialist revolution. These propositions are made by Marx in his insertions into the manuscript of the commentary, one of which is published in this volume.—411.
- ²⁶⁹ *Nordstern* (Northern Star)—German weekly newspaper published in Hamburg in 1860-66; in 1863 it adopted a Lassallean line.—413.
- ²⁷⁰ *The National Union* was founded on September 15-16, 1859, at a congress of bourgeois liberals of German states in Frankfort-on-Main. Its organisers set themselves the task of uniting the whole of Germany, except Austria, under Prussia's hegemony. After the establishment of the North-German Confederation, on November 11, 1867, the Union declared itself to be dissolved.—414.
- ²⁷¹ In 1858 the Prussian Prince Regent dismissed Manteuffel's ministry and called the moderate liberals to power; in the bourgeois newspapers this course was given the high-sounding name of the "new era"; as a matter of fact, however, Wilhelm's policy was directed exclusively at strengthening the positions of the Prussian monarchy and Junkers. The "new era" actually paved the way for the dictatorship of Bismarck who came to power in September 1862.—414.
- ²⁷² *Kreuz-Zeitung* (Cross Newspaper)—the name given to the German daily *Neue Preussische Zeitung* (New Prussian Gazette) because of the cross—the emblem of the Landwehr—printed in the heading; it began publication in Berlin in June 1848 as the organ of the counter-revolutionary Court clique and the Prussian Junkers.—415.
- ²⁷³ *The General Association of German Workers*—political organisation of German workers founded in 1863 with the active participation of Lassalle. The association existed until 1875, when at a congress in Gotha the Lassalleans and Eisenachers (the party headed by Liebknecht and Bebel) united into the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany.—415, 430.
- ²⁷⁴ *The Progressives*—members of the Prussian bourgeois party which was formed in June 1861. They demanded the unification of Germany under Prussia's hegemony, the convocation of an all-German Parliament and the establishment of a liberal ministry responsible to the Chamber of Deputies.—415.
- ²⁷⁵ This question was discussed in the Prussian Landtag in January 1865 following workers' demonstrations demanding the abolition of those clauses in the producers' regulations which prohibited associations and strikes. The Progressives demanded the repeal of Clause 181 prohibiting the factory-owners from stopping production to make the workers come to heel and, in order to win popular support, they also demanded the repeal of Clause 182 punishing workers for incitement to strike. On

- February 14, 1865, the Landtag repealed only clauses 181 and 182, leaving the workers' demands unsatisfied.—415.
- 276 This is the ironical name Marx gave to the then operating producers' regulations in Prussia. The so-called rules governing servants were feudal rules in force in Prussian provinces in the eighteenth century, sanctioning complete power of the Junkers over serf peasants.—415.
- 277 In the spring of 1861 Marx made an attempt to reinstate himself as a Prussian citizen but the Prussian authorities refused on the pretext that in 1845 he had "voluntarily" abandoned Prussian citizenship.—416.
- 278 *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* (Central Literary Review for Germany)—German scientific-information and critical weekly published in Leipzig in 1850-1944.—418.
- 279 The reference is to Haxthausen's book *Über den Ursprung und die Grundlagen der Verfassung in den ehemals slavischen Ländern Deutschlands im allgemeinen und des Herzogthums Pommern im besondern*, Berlin, 1842.—421.
- 280 On June 13, 1849 in Paris the Montagne, a petty-bourgeois party, organised a peaceful demonstration in protest against the dispatch of French troops for the suppression of the revolution in Italy. The demonstration was dispersed by troops, many of the Montagne leaders being arrested, exiled or forced to leave France.—421.
- 281 *Mutualists*—this is what the Proudhonists called themselves in the 1860s because they put forward the reformist petty-bourgeois plan of liberating the working people by organising mutual aid (establishment of co-operatives, mutual aid societies, etc.).—422.
- 282 The reference is to the following resolutions of the London Conference of 1871: "Designations of National Councils, etc." (Resolution II, clauses 1, 2, 3), "Political Action of the Working Class" (Resolution IX), "The Alliance of Socialist Democracy" (Resolution XVI), and "Split in the French-Speaking Part of Switzerland" (Resolution XVII).—423.
- 283 On September 4, 1870, upon the receipt of news of the defeat of the French army at Sedan, the Paris people organised revolutionary demonstrations which led to the fall of the Second Empire and the proclamation of a republic. However, the emergent Provisional Government included monarchists, as well as moderate republicans. This government headed by Trochu, military Governor of Paris, and Thiers, its actual inspirer, reflecting the defeatist sentiments of the French bourgeoisie and land-owners and their fear of the masses, entered upon the path of national betrayal and collusion with the foreign enemy.—424.
- 284 The reference is to the Basle Congress (see Note 99) resolutions on organisational questions extending the powers of the General Council.—426.
- 285 *Il Proletario*. See Note 227.
Gazzettino Rosa (Red Newspaper)—Italian daily, organ of the Left-wing Mazzinists; appeared in Milan between 1867 and 1873; in 1871 it came out in support of the Paris Commune and published the International's documents; from 1872 onwards, it was under the influence of the Bakuninists.—426.
- 286 *La Liberté*—Belgian democratic newspaper published in Brussels from 1865 to 1873; from 1867—one of the press organs of the International in Belgium.—427.

- ²⁸⁷ *The French Section of 1871* was formed in London in September 1871 by French refugees. Its leaders established close contacts with the Swiss Bakuninists and joined forces with them in their attacks against the organisational principles of the International. This section was not admitted to the International, since some clauses of its rules contradicted to the General Rules of the International Association. Subsequently it split into several groups.—427.
- ²⁸⁸ The reference is to the “*Circular to All Federations of the International Working Men’s Association*” adopted at the congress of the Bakuninist Jura Federation held in Sonvillier on November 12, 1871. The circular rejected the London Conference decisions and the General Council’s powers and suggested that all federations should demand an immediate convocation of a congress for revising the General Rules of the International and denouncing the General Council.—428.
- ²⁸⁹ *Ficcanaso* (Intrusive Person)—Italian republican satirical daily, organ of the Left-wing Mazzinists, published in Turin from 1868 to 1872.—428.
- ²⁹⁰ Engels is referring to the “Answer of the Committee of the Romance Federation to the Circular of the Sixteen Participants in the Sonvillier Congress”—428.
- ²⁹¹ *The Saxon Congress* of Social-Democrats met in Chemnitz on January 6-7, 1872. Among other items (universal suffrage, the organisation of trade unions) the congress discussed the Sonvillier Circular (see Note 288) and the anti-anarchist struggle within the International. The congress unanimously supported the General Council and approved the resolutions of the London Conference of 1871.—428.
- ²⁹² *The Congress of the Belgian Federation of the International*, which met in Brussels on December 24-25, 1871, in discussing the Sonvillier Circular, did not support the Swiss anarchists’ demand for the immediate convocation of a general congress but instructed the Belgian Federal Council to prepare the new draft Rules of the International Association for discussion at the Hague Congress (see Note 233).—428.
- ²⁹³ *In Eisenach*, at an all-German Congress of the Social-Democrats of Germany, Austria and Switzerland held on August 7-9, 1869, the German Social-Democratic Workers’ Party was founded whose programme was generally speaking in the spirit of the demands presented by the International.—431.
- ²⁹⁴ G.W.F. Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, “Die Wahrheit der Aufklärung”.—433.
- ²⁹⁵ In 1872-73 Liebknecht and Hepner repeatedly requested Marx to write a pamphlet or article for *Der Volksstaat* containing a criticism of Lassalle’s views.—433.
- ²⁹⁶ Sorge resigned from the General Council in August 1874, and informed Engels to this effect on August 14, 1874; his official resignation followed on September 25, 1874.—433.

NAME INDEX

A

- Ackroyd*—English manufacturer, Liberal—337.
- Addington, Stephen* (1729-1796)—English priest, author of several textbooks—111.
- Affre, Denis Auguste* (1793-1848)—French clergyman, Archbishop of Paris (1840-48), was shot by order of the revolutionary government during the June 1848 uprising—239.
- Aikin, John* (1747-1822)—English physician, radical publicist—133, 140, 141.
- Alexander II* (1818-1881)—Russian Emperor (1855-81)—198, 399.
- Alexandra* (1844-1925)—daughter of Christian IX, King of Denmark; in 1863 she married Edward, Prince of Wales, who in 1901 became King Edward VII of Great Britain—214.
- Anderson, Adam* (c. 1692-1765)—Scotch bourgeois economist—128, 141.
- Anderson, James* (1739-1808)—English bourgeois economist—112, 114, 128.
- Anna* (1665-1714)—Queen of Great Britain (1702-14)—121.
- Appian* (end of the 1st cent.-the 70s of the 2nd cent.)—ancient Roman historian—112.
- Arbuthnot, John*—English farmer, author of the book *An Inquiry into the Connexion Between the Present Price of Provisions and the Size of Farms, etc.*—113.
- Ashton*—English manufacturer, Liberal—337, 339.
- Ashworth*—English manufacturer, Liberal—337, 339.
- Augier, Marie*—French journalist, author of articles on economic questions—142.
- Aurette de Paladines, Louis Jean Baptiste* (1804-1877)—French general. Clerical, commander-in-chief of the Paris National Guard (March 1871), deputy of the National Assembly of 1871—210, 211, 212.
- Avrial, Augustin* (1840-1904)—active participant in the French working-class movement, Left-wing Proudhonist, member of the International, member of the Paris Commune, an émigré—266.

B

- Bacon, Francis, de Verulam* (1561-1626)—great English philosopher, founder of English materialism—105, 106.
- Bakunin, Mikhail Alexandrovich* (1814-1876)—Russian revolutionary and publicist, one of the ideologists of anarchism; participant in the revolution of 1848-49 in Germany; came out as a sworn enemy of Marxism within the International; at the Hague Congress (1872) was expelled from the International for his schismatic activities—169, 250, 254-58,

- 261, 270, 276, 279, 282, 284, 296, 354, 393, 398, 411, 412, 423-27, 429, 434.
- Barton, John* (end of the 18th-beginning of the 19th century)—English economist, representative of classical bourgeois political economy—74.
- Bastelica, André* (1845-1884)—active participant in the French and Spanish working-class movement, member of the International, follower of Mikhail Bakunin—257, 258, 262, 267.
- Bastiat, Frédéric* (1801-1850)—French vulgar economist, preached the theory of harmony of class interests in bourgeois society—29, 94.
- Bebel, August* (1840-1913)—leading figure in the German and international working-class movement; from 1887, President of the League of German Workers' Unions; member of the First International, deputy of the Reichstag (from 1867); one of the founders and leaders of the German Social-Democratic movement; friend and associate of Marx and Engels; active member of the Second International—430-33.
- Becker, Bernhard* (1826-1891)—German publicist, Lassallean, President of the General Association of German Workers (1864-65)—415.
- Beecher-Stowe, Harriet Elizabeth* (1811-1896)—famous American authoress—115.
- Beghelli, Giuseppe* (1847-1877)—Italian journalist, took part in Garibaldi's campaigns, editor of several republican newspapers—428.
- Bergeret, Jules Victor* (1839-1905)—prominent figure in the Paris Commune, general of the National Guard, later an émigré—214.
- Berry, Marie Caroline Ferdinande Louise, Duchess of* (1798-1870)—mother of Count of Chambord, Legitimist pretender to the French throne; in 1832 she tried to provoke an uprising in Vendée to overthrow Louis Philippe—205.
- Bervi, Vasily Vasilyevich* (pseudonym of N. Flerovsky) (1829-1918)—Russian economist and sociologist, representative of Narodnik utopian socialism, author of the book *The Condition of the Working Class in Russia*—172, 173, 392.
- Beslay, Charles* (1795-1878)—French entrepreneur and politician, member of the International, Proudhonist; as a member of the Finance Committee in the Paris Commune and delegate to the Bank of France he pursued a policy of abstention from its nationalisation and non-interference in its internal affairs—208.
- Beust, Friedrich, Count* (1809-1886)—Saxon and Austrian reactionary statesman, Foreign Minister (1866-71) and Chancellor of Austria-Hungary (1867-71)—249.
- Bismarck, Otto, von Schönhausen*, Prince (1815-1898)—statesman and diplomat of Prussia and Germany, championed the interests of Prussian Junkers; Minister-President of Prussia (1862-71), Chancellor of the German Empire (1871-90)—178, 181, 192, 198, 203, 205, 207, 208, 210, 222, 228, 230, 233, 234, 239, 240, 243, 249, 260, 280, 337, 346, 349, 384, 414-16, 426, 429.
- Blakey, Robert* (1795-1878)—English bourgeois philosopher—108.
- Blanc, Gaspard*—French road-builder; Bakuninist, participant in the Lyons rising of 1870—256-58, 261, 283.
- Blanchet, Stanislas* (real name *Pourille*) (b. 1833)—French monk, police agent provocateur, he made his way into the Paris Commune

- but was exposed and arrested—228.
- Blanqui, Louis Auguste* (1805-1881)—French revolutionary, utopian communist, organiser of a number of secret societies and plots, active participant in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848; leader of the French proletarian movement, was several times sentenced to imprisonment—184, 210, 213, 239, 380, 381.
- Blind, Karl* (1826-1907)—German journalist, petty-bourgeois democrat, participant in the revolution of 1848-49; in the 1850s, one of the leaders of the German petty-bourgeois émigrés in London; from 1860s on, National-Liberal—413.
- Block, Moris* (1816-1901)—French economist, representative of vulgar political economy—96.
- Bolingbroke, Henry* (1678-1751)—English deist philosopher and politician, a leader of the Tories—137.
- Bolte, Friedrich*—prominent figure in the American labour movement, German-born; Secretary of the Federal Council of North-American sections of the International (1872), member of the General Council (1872-74); in 1874, expelled from the General Council—422-24.
- Bousquet, Abel*—French anarchist; expelled from the International as a police official—429.
- Bright, John* (1811-1889)—English manufacturer, advocate of Free Trade, one of the founders of the Anti-Corn Law League; from the end of the 1860s, a leader of the Liberal Party; Minister in several Liberal cabinets—94, 132, 161.
- Brissot, Jean Pierre* (1754-1793)—prominent leader of the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century; at first Jacobin, then the leader and theoretician of the Girondists—25.
- Brougham, Henry Peter* (1778-1868)—English jurist and man of letters, Whig, Lord Chancellor (1830-34)—141.
- Brunel, Antoine Magloire* (b. 1830)—French officer, Blanquist, member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and the Paris Commune; in May 1871 was seriously wounded by Versailles troops—242.
- Brutus, Marcus Junius* (c. 85-42 B.C.)—Roman political figure; headed conspiracy against Julius Caesar—382.
- Buchanan, David* (1779-1848)—English bourgeois economist, follower and commentator of Adam Smith—114, 115.
- Buche, Philippe Benjamin Joseph* (1796-1865)—French political figure and historian, bourgeois republican, an ideologist of Christian socialism—126.
- Bücker, Johann* (c. 1780-1803)—notorious robber, known under the name of Hans the Flayer—396.
- Burke, Edmund* (1729-1797)—English politician, reactionary, author of several works on economic questions—110, 142.
- Byles, John Barnard* (1801-1884)—English lawyer, Tory, author of the book *Sophisms of Free Trade*, etc.—122.

C

- Cabet, Etienne* (1788-1856)—French publicist, outstanding representative of utopian communism, author of *Travels in Icaria*—28, 243.
- Cagliostro, Alessandro* (real name Giuseppe Balsamo) (1743-1795)—Italian adventurer—255.
- Calonne, Charles Alexandre de* (1734-1802)—French statesman,

- during the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century was one of the leaders of counter-revolutionary émigrés—230.
- Camélinat, Zéphyrin* (1840-1932)—prominent figure in the French working-class and socialist movement, one of the leaders of the Paris sections of the International, member of the Paris Commune, member of the Communist Party of France from 1920—266.
- Carey, Henry Charles* (1793-1879)—American bourgeois economist, author of the book *The Slave Trade* and several other works—116, 132.
- Catherine II* (1729-1796)—Russian Empress (1762-96)—396.
- Cavaignac, Louis Eugène* (1802-1857)—French general and politician, moderate bourgeois republican; War Minister since May 1848; displayed great cruelty in suppressing the June uprising of the Paris proletariat; head of executive power (June-December 1848)—239.
- Chalain, Louis Denis* (b. 1845)—French worker, member of the Paris Commune and its commissions; later on, an émigré, member of the French Section in London (1871); subsequently joined the anarchists—265.
- Changarnier, Nicolas Anne Théodule* (1793-1877)—French general and bourgeois politician, monarchist; after June 1848, commander of the garrison and the National Guard of Paris; took part in dispersing a demonstration in Paris on June 13, 1849—215.
- Charlemagne*—see Charles the Great.
- Charles I* (1600-1649)—King of Great Britain (1625-49), was executed during the 17th-century bourgeois revolution in England—106, 107.
- Charles the Great* (Charlemagne) (c. 742-814)—King of the Franks (768-800) and Emperor (800-814)—112.
- Charles V* (1500-1558)—Emperor of the so-called Holy Roman Empire (1519-56) and King of Spain (1516-56) under the name of Charles I—121.
- Charles X* (1622-1660)—King of Sweden (1654-60)—110.
- Charles XI* (1655-1697)—King of Sweden (1660-97)—110.
- Chautard*—French spy, member of the French Section of 1871 in London; was exposed and expelled from the section—262.
- Cherbuliez, Antoine Elisée* (1797-1869)—Swiss economist, follower of Sismondi—74.
- Chernyshevsky, Nikolai Gavrilovich* (Tschernyschewsky) (1828-1889)—great Russian revolutionary democrat, scientist, writer and literary critic; one of the outstanding forerunners of Russian Social-Democracy—94, 173, 399-401.
- Chevalley, Henri*—Swiss tailor, anarchist—257.
- Child, Josiah* (1630-1699)—English economist and banker, adherent of mercantilism—141.
- Cobbett, William* (1762-1835)—English politician and publicist; author of *A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland*, etc., petty-bourgeois radical—107, 136, 138.
- Cobden, Richard* (1804-1865)—English manufacturer, one of the Free Traders' leaders and founders of the Anti-Corn Law League; M.P.—94.
- Coëtlogon, Louis Charles Emmanuel*, Count (1814-1886)—French official, Bonapartist, one of the organisers of the counter-revolutionary action in Paris on March 22, 1871—214.
- Colbert, Jean Baptiste* (1619-1683)—French statesman, adherent of

- mercantilism, general controller of finance—139.
- Comte, Auguste* (1798-1857)—French philosopher, founder of positivism—96.
- Comte, Charles* (1782-1837)—French vulgar bourgeois economist, author of the book *Traité de Législation*—134.
- Corbon, Claude Anthime* (1808-1891)—French politician, republican, member of the Constituent Assembly (1848-49); subsequently, mayor of a district in Paris and member of the National Assembly of 1871—203.
- Cousin-Montauban, Charles Guillaume Marie-Appolinaire-Antoine, Comte de Palikao* (1796-1878)—French general, Bonapartist; in 1860, commanded Anglo-French expeditionary forces in China; War Minister and head of the government (August-September 1870)—210.
- Cromwell, Oliver* (1599-1658)—leader of the bourgeoisie and bourgeoisified nobility in the English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century; from 1653, Lord Protector of England, Scotland and Ireland—107, 108, 131.
- Culpeper, Thomas* (1578-1662)—English bourgeois economist, advocate of mercantilism—141.
- Cuno, Friedrich Theodor* (1846-1934)—prominent figure in the German and international working-class movement, socialist; active member of the First International; subsequently, one of the leaders of the American labour organisation "Knights of Labour"; contributor to the *New Yorker Volkszeitung*—424, 428-29.
- D**
- Dąbrowski, Jaroslaw* (1836-1871)—Polish revolutionary democrat, participant in the Polish national liberation movement of the 1860s; general of the Paris Commune; from the beginning of May 1871, Commander-in-Chief of all the armed forces; was killed on the barricades—227.
- Dante, Alighieri* (1265-1321)—great Italian poet—90, 377.
- Darboy, Georges* (1813-1871)—French theologian, Archbishop of Paris from 1863; in May 1871 was shot by the Commune as a hostage—184, 239.
- De Paepe, César* (1842-1890)—prominent figure in the Belgian working-class and socialist movement, member of the International, delegate to its several congresses; after 1872, for some time, supported the Bakuninists; one of the founders of the Belgian Workers' Party—290.
- Desmarêt*—French gendarme officer, murderer of Gustave Flourens—216.
- Dietzgen, Joseph* (1828-1888)—German worker, self-taught philosopher, who independently arrived at main premises of dialectical materialism, Social-Democrat—95.
- Dollfus, Jean* (1800-1887)—big Alsatian factory owner, bourgeois philanthropist, Mayor of Mulus—317, 367.
- Dunoyer, Charles* (1786-1862)—French vulgar economist and bourgeois politician—28.
- Douay, Félix* (1816-1879)—French general, taken prisoner at Sedan, one of the hangmen of the Paris Commune, a commander of the Versailles army—235.
- Doubleday, Thomas* (1790-1870)—English publicist and economist, bourgeois radical—138.
- Ducpétiaux, Edouard* (1804-1868)—Belgian publicist and statistician, bourgeois philanthropist; inspector of prisons and philanthropic institutions—325.
- Dufaure, Jules Armand Stanislas*

- (1798-1881)—French lawyer and statesman, Orleanist, Minister of the Interior (1848 and 1849), Minister of Justice (1871-73, 1875-76 and 1877-79), a hangman of the Paris Commune, Chairman of the Council of Ministers (1876, 1877-79)—210, 215, 231, 232, 249, 286.
- Dunning, T. J.* (1799-1873)—British trade union leader and publicist, author of the book *Trades' Unions and Strikes; Their Philosophy and Intention*—142.
- Durand, Gustave* (b. 1835)—French jeweller, police spy, in October 1871 was exposed and expelled from the International—262, 267.
- Duval, Émile Victor* (1841-1871)—prominent figure in the French working-class movement; founder by trade; member of the International, member of the Central Committee of the National Guard and Paris Commune, general of the National Guard; on April 4, 1871, was taken prisoner and shot by Versailles troops—215.
- E**
- Eden, Frederick Morton* (1766-1809)—English bourgeois economist, author of the book *The State of the Poor*—108, 110, 112, 113, 139, 141.
- Edward III* (1312-1377)—King of England (1327-77)—122.
- Edward VI* (1537-1553)—King of England (1547-53)—119, 120.
- Elizabeth* (1533-1603)—Queen of England (1558-1603)—107, 120, 123, 124.
- Engels, Friedrich* (Frederick) (1820-1895)—(biographical data)—158, 159, 168, 178, 293, 296, 298, 311, 324, 335, 337, 350, 353, 356, 358, 369, 373, 406, 413-21, 428-34.
- Ensor, George* (1769-1843)—English publicist, author of *An Inquiry Concerning the Population of Nations Containing a Refuta-*
- tion of Mr. Malthus's Essay on Population*—115.
- Espartero, Baldomero* (1793-1879)—Spanish general and statesman, Regent of Spain (1841-43) and Premier (1854-56), leader of the Progressist Party—206.
- Eudes, Émile Desirée François* (1843-1888)—French revolutionary, Blanquist, general of the National Guard and member of the Paris Commune, after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to Switzerland and then to England; upon his return to France (under the amnesty of 1880) became an organiser of the Central Revolutionary Committee of the Blanquists—184.
- F**
- Faucher, Julius* (1820-1878)—German publicist, advocate of Free Trade, author of works on the housing question, Progressist—325, 416.
- Favre, Jules* (1809-1880)—French lawyer and politician, one of the leaders of moderate bourgeois republicans; as Foreign Minister (1870-71) he conducted negotiations on the capitulation of Paris and peace with Germany; hangman of the Paris Commune and instigator of struggle against the International—191, 202, 204, 207, 210, 213, 228, 234, 242-43, 245, 249, 272, 426.
- Fawcett, Henry* (1833-1884)—English bourgeois economist and politician, Whig—132.
- Ferdinand II* (1810-1859)—King of Naples (1830-59), nicknamed "King Bomba" for bombarding Messina in 1848—206.
- Ferré, Theophile Charles* (1845-1871)—French revolutionary, Blanquist; member of the Paris Commune, member and then leader of the Committee of Public Safety and Deputy-Procurator of the

- Commune; shot by Versailles—260.
- Ferry, Jules François Camille* (1832-1893)—French lawyer, publicist and politician, one of the leaders of moderate bourgeois republicans, member of the Government of National Defence, Mayor of Paris (1870-71), took an active part in the struggle against the revolutionary movement, Chairman of the Council of Ministers (1880-81 and 1883-85), pursued colonial policy—205.
- Feuerbach, Ludwig* (1804-1872)—great German materialist philosopher of the pre-Marxian period—24.
- Fielden, John* (1784-1849)—English factory owner, philanthropist—139, 140.
- Flerovsky*. See *Bervi, Vasily Vasilyevich*.
- Fletcher, Andrew* (1655-1716)—Scotch politician, fought for the independence of Scotland—108.
- Flourens, Gustave* (1838-1871)—French revolutionary and naturalist, Blanquist, leader of the Paris uprisings on October 31, 1870 and January 22, 1871; member of the Paris Commune; was killed by the Versailles in April 1871—210, 213, 216.
- Forster, Nathaniel* (c. 1726-1790)—English priest, author of the book *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Present High Price of Provisions* and others—111, 112.
- Fortescue, John* (c. 1394-c. 1476)—English jurist, author of the book *Laudibus legum Angliæ*—104, 105.
- Fourier, Charles* (1772-1837)—great French utopian socialist—24, 146, 169, 333, 417.
- Frankel, Leo* (1844-1896)—prominent figure in the Hungarian and international working-class movement, member of the Paris Commune where he headed the Labour and Exchange Commission, member of the General Council of the First International (1871-72); one of the founders of the General Workers' Party of Hungary; comrade-in-arms of Marx and Engels—227.
- Franklin, Benjamin* (1706-1790)—outstanding American politician, scientist and diplomat, bourgeois democrat, participant in the American War of Independence—50.
- Frederick II* (the Great) (1712-1786)—King of Prussia (1740-86)—117, 129, 244.
- Freytag, Gustav* (1816-1895)—German bourgeois writer—123.

G

- Gallifet, Gaston Alexandre Auguste, Marquis de* (1830-1909)—French general, one of the hangmen of the Paris Commune—216, 217, 241, 242.
- Gambetta, Léon* (1838-1882)—French statesman, bourgeois republican, member of the Government of National Defence (1870-71)—203.
- GanESCO, Gregori* (c. 1830-1877)—French journalist; Rumanian by birth; during the Second Empire, Bonapartist, then advocate of Thiers's government—226.
- Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, Étienne* (1772-1844)—French zoologist, evolutionist, author of the book *Synthetic, Historical and Physiological Understanding of Natural Philosophy*—128.
- George II* (1683-1760)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1727-60)—123, 124.
- George III* (1738-1820)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1760-1820)—124.
- Gisborne, Thomas* (1758-1846)—English theologian, author of the book *Enquiry into the Duties of Men in the Higher Rank and Middle Classes of Society in Great Britain*—140.

- Gladstone, William Ewart* (1809-1898)—English statesman, a leader of the Liberal Party in the second half of the 19th century, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852-55 and 1859-66) and Prime Minister (1868-74, 1880-85, 1886, 1892-94)—11, 13, 124, 424.
- Godunov, Boris Fyodorovich* (c. 1551-1605)—Russian tsar (1598-1605)—109.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang* (1749-1832)—great German writer and thinker—370.
- Gorchakov, Alexander Mikhailovich, Prince* (1798-1883)—Russian statesman and diplomat, ambassador to Vienna (1854-56), Minister of Foreign Affairs (1856-82)—198.
- Greg, Robert* (1795-1875)—English manufacturer, Liberal—337, 339.
- Grün, Karl* (1817-1887)—German petty-bourgeois publicist, one of the chief representatives of "True Socialism" in mid-40s; follower of Proudhon—26.
- Guillaume, James* (1844-1916)—Swiss teacher, member of the International and participant in its congresses, Bakuninist; was expelled from the International by decision of the Hague Congress (1872)—257, 266, 277, 282.
- Guiod, Alphonse Simon* (b. 1805)—French general, Chief Commander of artillery troops during the siege of Paris in 1870-71—203.
- Guizot, François Pierre Guillaume* (1787-1874)—French bourgeois historian and statesman, actually directed French home and foreign policy from 1840 to 1848—206.
- Gülich, Gustav* (1791-1847)—German bourgeois economist and historian, author of works on the history of national economy—92, 136.
- H**
- Hales, John* (b. 1839)—British trade union leader, member of the General Council of the International (1866-72) and its Secretary; member of the Reform League and of the Land and Labour League, in early 1872 began to head the reformist wing of the British Federal Council, waged a struggle against Marx and his followers with a view to taking over the leadership of the International's organisations in England—244.
- Hans the Flayer*. See *Bückler, Johann*.
- Hanseman, David* (1790-1864)—big German capitalist and banker, one of the leaders of the Rhenish liberal bourgeoisie; Prussian Minister for Finance (March-September 1848)—328.
- Harrison, William* (1534-1593)—English priest, author of several works on the history of England—105, 126.
- Hastings, Warren* (1732-1818)—first British Governor-General of India (1774-85), pursued brutal colonialist policy—135.
- Hatzfeldt, Sophie von* (1805-1881)—friend and follower of Lassalle—413, 415.
- Haussmann, Eugène Georges* (1809-1891)—French politician, Bonapartist, prefect of the Seine Department (1853-70); directed work on the reconstruction of Paris—227, 238, 240, 307, 350.
- Harthausen, August* (1792-1866)—Prussian official and writer, author of a book on survivals of communal system in land relations in Russia—392, 398, 406, 421.
- Hébert, Jacques René* (1757-1794)—active participant in the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century, leader of Jacobins' Left Wing—382.
- Heeckeren, Georges Charles d'Anthès, Baron de* (1812-1895)—French politician, murderer of Alexander Pushkin; Bonapartist from 1848, one of the organisers

- of the counter-revolutionary action in Paris on March 22, 1871—214.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich* (1770-1831)—outstanding representative of classical German philosophy, objective idealist—24, 25, 96, 98, 169, 355, 432.
- Heine, Heinrich* (1797-1856)—great German revolutionary poet—382.
- Helvétius, Claude Adrien* (1715-1771)—outstanding French philosopher, atheist, representative of mechanistic materialism—28.
- Henry VII* (1457-1509)—King of Great Britain (1485-1509)—105, 106, 119.
- Henry VIII* (1491-1547)—King of Great Britain (1509-47)—105, 119, 120.
- Hepner, Adolf* (1846-1923)—German Social-Democrat, editor of the *Volksstaat*, delegate to the Hague Congress of the International (1872), subsequently a social-chauvinist—430.
- Hervé, Edouard* (1835-1899)—French publicist, one of the founders and editor-in-chief of the *Journal de Paris*, bourgeois liberal, Orleanist after the fall of the Second Empire—236.
- Herzen, Alexander Ivanovich* (1812-1870)—great Russian revolutionary democrat, materialist philosopher, publicist and writer; in 1847, Herzen emigrated abroad where he organised "Free Russian Printing Shop" and published the periodical *Polyarnaya Zvezda* (Polar Star) and the newspaper *Kolokol* (The Bell)—250, 391, 393, 398, 399, 406.
- Hins, Eugène* (1839-1923)—Belgian teacher, Proudhonist and, later on, Bakuninist, one of the founders of the Belgian section of the International—427.
- Hobbes, Thomas* (1588-1679)—prominent English philosopher, representative of mechanistic materialism—55.
- Hodgskin, Thomas* (1787-1869)—English economist, author of the book *The Natural and Artificial Right of Property Contrasted*, criticised capitalism from the standpoint of utopian socialism—133.
- Hoffmann, Gotthelf* (pseudonym August Kutschke) (1844-1934)—German poet—325.
- Hohenzollerns*—dynasty of Brandenburg electors (1415-1701), Prussian kings (1701-1918) and German emperors (1871-1918)—192, 227, 416.
- Hole, James*—English bourgeois publicist, author of a book on the workers' housing conditions—325.
- Holinshed, Raphael* (died c. 1580)—English historian—120.
- Horace* (Quintus Horatius Flaccus) (65-8 B.C.)—great Roman poet—87.
- Horner, Francis* (1778-1817)—English economist and politician, Whig—140.
- Howitt, William* (1792-1879)—English writer, author of the book *Colonisation and Christianity* and others—134.
- Huber, Victor* (1800-1869)—German publicist and historian of literature, conservative—325, 334, 335.
- Hunter, Henry Julian*—English physician, author of several reports on the miserable conditions of the workers' life—107.
- Huxley, Thomas Henry* (1825-1895)—British naturalist, close adherent of Charles Darwin and populariser of his theory, inconsistent materialist—224.

J

James I (1566-1625)—King of Great Britain and Ireland (1603-25)—107, 121, 123.

Jacquemet—French priest, General Vicar of the Archbishop of Paris in 1848—239.

Jaubert, Hippolyte François, Count (1798-1874)—French politician, monarchist, Minister of Public Works (1840), deputy of the National Assembly of 1871—240.

John II the Good (1319-1364)—King of France (1350-64)—122.

Jones, Richard (1790-1855)—English bourgeois economist; his works reflect the decline and disintegration of the classical school of political economy; at the same time, on some points of political economy he surpassed David Ricardo—74.

K

Kant, Immanuel (1724-1804)—founder of classical German philosophy, idealist—25, 26.

Kaufman, Illarion Ignatyevich (1848-1916)—Russian bourgeois economist, author of the article "Karl Marx's Viewpoint of Politico-Economic Criticism" and several works on questions of money circulation and credit—96.

Kent, Nathaniel (1737-1810)—English farmer, author of several works on agriculture—112.

Krupp, Alfred (1812-1887)—big German owner of steel and armaments works—338.

Kugelmann, Ludwig—(1830-1902)—German physician, participant in the 1848-49 revolution, member of the International, attended several congresses of the International; friend of Marx's family—91, 413, 418, 420, 421.

L

Lafargue, Laura (1845-1911)—prominent figure in the French working-class movement, wife of Paul Lafargue, Marx's daughter—420.

Lafargue, Paul (1842-1911)—prominent figure in the international working-class movement and propagator of Marxism, member of the General Council of the International, Corresponding Secretary for Spain (1866-69); took part in organising 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 in France; disciple and associate of Marx and Engels—420.

Laffitte, Jacques (1767-1844)—big French banker and politician, Orleanist—205.

Landeck, Bernar (b. 1832)—French jeweller, member of the International and of the French section—266.

Lassalle, Ferdinand (1825-1864)—German petty-bourgeois publicist and lawyer; in 1848-49, participated in the democratic movement in Rhenish Province; early in the 1860s, joined the German working-class movement, one of the founders of the General German Workers' Union (1863); supported the unification of Germany "from above" under the hegemony of Prussia, instigator of the opportunist trend in the German working-class movement—86, 87, 364, 413-19, 433.

Lavoisier, Antoine Laurent (1743-1794)—great French chemist, refuted phlogistic doctrine, he also worked on problems of political economy and statistics—153.

Leblanc, Albert Félix (b. 1844)—member of the Paris section of the International, joined Bakuninists, member of the Paris Commune; as the Commune's delegate in Lyons he took part in an attempt to proclaim a Commune there; after the suppression of the Commune emigrated to England, Bonapartist—429.

- Le Chapelier, Isaac René Guy* (1754-1794)—French political figure, reactionary, author of the law prohibiting workers' unions and strikes (1791); executed during the Jacobins' dictatorship—125.
- Lecomte, Claude Martin* (1817-1871)—French general; on March 18, 1871, was shot by the insurgent soldiers after the Thiers government's failure to seize the artillery of the National Guard—213, 214, 217, 232-34.
- Le Flô, Adolphe Emmanuel Charles* (1804-1887)—French general and politician, representative of the Party of Order; deputy of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies during the Second Republic—214, 217.
- Lefrançais, Gustave* (1826-1901)—French teacher, member of the International and of the Paris Commune, Left-wing Proudhonist; emigrated to Switzerland where he joined anarchists—267, 269, 283.
- Léo, André* (real name *Leoni Champseix*) (1829-1900)—French authoress, participant in the Paris Commune; an émigré, supported Bakuninists—260.
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim* (1729-1781)—great German writer, critic and philosopher, one of the 18th-century prominent Enlighteners—98.
- Levi, Leone* (1821-1888)—British bourgeois economist, statistician and jurist—117.
- Licinius* (Gaius Licinius Stolo)—Roman statesman of the first half of the 4th cent. B.C.; as a people's tribune, together with Sextius, passed laws in the interests of the plebeians—112.
- Liebig, Justus* (1803-1873)—outstanding German scientist, one of the founders of agricultural chemistry—368.
- Liebknecht, Wilhelm* (1826-1900)—leader of the German and international working-class movement, participant in the 1848-49 revolution; member of the Communist League and of the First International; one of the founders and leaders of German Social-Democracy; friend and associate of Marx and Engels—414, 415, 421, 430.
- Lincoln, Abraham* (1809-1865)—prominent American statesman, U.S. President (1861-65); one of the founders of the Republican Party; assassinated by the slave-owners' agent in April 1865—22-23, 156.
- Linguet, Simon Nicolas Henri* (1736-1794)—French lawyer and economist, subjected bourgeois liberties and property to profound criticism—30, 122.
- Linton, William James* (1812-1897)—English engineer, poet and publicist, republican, publisher of the journal *English Republic* where Herzen's articles were printed, in 1866 emigrated to the U.S.A.—399.
- Louis Bonaparte*. See *Napoleon III*.
Louis Napoleon. See *Napoleon III*.
Louis XIV (1638-1715)—King of France (1643-1715)—259.
- Louis XVI* (1754-1793)—King of France (1774-1792), executed during the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the eighteenth century—121, 184.
- Louis Philippe* (1773-1850)—Duke of Orleans, King of France (1830-48)—14, 180, 181, 205, 206, 207, 213, 222, 232, 381.
- Lucraft, Benjamin* (1809-1897)—English worker, one of the trade union leaders, reformist, member of the General Council of the International (1864-71); in 1871 opposed the Paris Commune, withdrew from the General Council which denounced him as a renegade—247.
- Luther, Martin* (1483-1546)—prominent figure in the Reformation period, founder of Protestantism

(Lutheranism) in Germany; ideologist of the German burghers—135.

M

- Macaulay, Thomas Babington* (1800-1859)—British bourgeois politician, Whig; author of the book *History of England* and others—103, 108.
- MacCulloch, John Ramsay* (1789-1864)—British bourgeois economist, author of the book *The Literature of Political Economy* and other works; vulgariser of Ricardo's economic doctrine—112.
- MacMahon, Marie Edme Patrice Maurice* (1808-1893)—French reactionary military and politician, Bonapartist; taken prisoner at Sedan; one of the hangmen of the Paris Commune; Commander-in-Chief of the Versailles' army; President of the Third Republic (1873-79)—235, 239.
- Malon, Benoit* (1841-1893)—French socialist member of the International and of the Paris Commune; then an émigré, joined anarchists; subsequently, one of the Possibilist leaders—259, 260, 265, 267, 269, 280, 283, 380.
- Malou, Jules* (1810-1886)—Belgian statesman, Minister for Finance (1844-47, 1870-78), Chairman of the Council of Ministers (1871-78); member of the Catholic Party—249.
- Malthus, Thomas Robert* (1766-1834)—English clergyman and economist, advocate of the malthusian theory of population—25, 68.
- Markovskiy*—agent of the tsarist government in France; in 1871, an official of Thiers—227.
- Marr, Wilhelm* (1819-1904)—German petty-bourgeois publicist; in 1865-66, editor of the newspaper *Beobachter an der Elbe*; early in the 1860s, supported Bismarck's policy—414.
- Marx, Eleanor* (Tussy) (1855-1898)—Marx's youngest daughter; prominent figure in the English and international working-class movement; wife of Edward Aveling from 1884—317.
- Marx, Jenny* (1844-1883)—Marx's eldest daughter, active participant in the international working-class movement, wife of Charles Longuet—429.
- Marx, Karl* (1818-1883) (biographical data)—24, 25-28, 31, 38, 75, 86, 87, 88-92, 95-99, 116, 147, 149-55, 158, 159, 172, 178, 179, 186, 267, 294, 297, 298, 310, 323, 355, 363, 374, 401, 404-07, 409, 413-22, 429, 430, 432-34.
- Maurer, Georg Ludwig* (1790-1872)—prominent German bourgeois historian, researcher into the social system of ancient and mediaeval Germany—393.
- Mazzini, Giuseppe* (1805-1872)—Italian revolutionary, bourgeois democrat, one of the leaders of the national liberation movement in Italy, head of the Provisional Government of the Roman Republic (1849); in 1850, was an organiser of the Central Committee of European Democracy in London; when the First International was being founded he sought to bring it under his influence; hampered the development of the independent working-class movement in Italy—426.
- Meissner, Otto Karl* (1819-1902)—Hamburg publisher, printed several works by Marx and Engels—146.
- Mendelssohn, Moses* (1729-1786)—German reactionary philosopher, deist—98.
- Menenius Agrippa* (d. 493 B.C.)—Roman patrician—84.
- Mikhailovsky, Nikolai Konstantinovich* (1842-1904)—Russian sociologist, publicist and literary critic, prominent ideologist of Narodism; an editor of the magazine

- Otechestvenniye Zapiski* (Fatherland Notes) and *Russkoye Bogatstvo* (Russian Wealth)—405.
- Mill, John Stuart** (1806-1873)—English bourgeois economist and positivist philosopher, epigone of classical school of political economy—94, 132.
- Miller, Joseph (Jo)** (1684-1738)—popular English comic—204.
- Millière, Jean Baptiste** (1817-1871)—French journalist, Left-wing Proudhonist, shot by the Versailles in May 1871—204, 244.
- Miquel, Johannes** (1828-1901)—German politician, member of the Communist League in the 1840s; subsequently, National-Liberal, Prussian Minister for Finance in the 1890s—414, 416.
- Mirabeau, Honoré Gabriel** (1749-1791)—prominent leader of the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the eighteenth century; expressed the interests of the big bourgeoisie and landowners who became bourgeois; author of the book *De la Monarchie Prussienne sous Frédéric le Grand*—104, 117, 129, 139, 206, 414.
- Monteil, Amans Alexis** (1769-1850)—French bourgeois historian, author of *Traité des matériaux manuscrits de divers genres d'histoire*, etc.—128.
- Montesquieu, Charles** (1689-1755)—great French bourgeois sociologist, economist and writer, representative of the 18th-century bourgeois Enlightenment, theoretician of constitutional monarchy—137, 222.
- More, Thomas** (1478-1535)—English politician, one of the early representatives of utopian communism, author of *Utopia*—106, 120.
- Morton, John Chalmers** (1821-1888)—English agronomist and author of several works on agriculture—39.
- Mülberger, Arthur** (1847-1907)—German physician, petty-bourgeois publicist, Proudhonist—296, 307, 310-11, 313, 318, 320, 322, 353-63, 366-75, 431.
- Münzer, Thomas** (c. 1490-1525)—great German revolutionary, leader and ideologist of the poor peasant camp during the Reformation and the Peasant War of the 1525, preached the ideas of utopian equalitarian communism—158.

N

- Napoleon I Bonaparte** (1769-1821)—Emperor of the French (1804-14 and 1815)—30, 183, 187, 193, 198, 207, 226, 326, 427.
- Napoleon III** (Louis Napoleon Bonaparte) (1808-1873)—nephew of Napoleon I, President of the Second Republic (1848-51), Emperor of the French (1852-70)—29, 30, 161, 178, 181, 190, 192, 195, 196, 198, 200, 201, 203, 207-09, 211-13, 218, 222, 226-27, 230, 232, 257, 261, 272, 284, 317, 336, 339, 346, 349, 350, 421, 429.
- Nechayev, Sergei Gennadievich** (1847-1882)—Russian revolutionary conspirator, participant in the student movement in St. Petersburg in 1868-69; in 1869-71, was closely connected with Bakunin, founded a secret organisation called the People's Retribution (1869); in 1872, was extradited to the Russian Government by the Swiss authorities; died in the Peter and Paul Fortress in St. Petersburg—255, 429.
- Nero** (37-68)—Roman Emperor (54-68)—14.
- Newman, Francis William** (1805-1897)—English bourgeois radical, author of several works on religious and economic problems—38, 109, 114.
- Newmarch, William** (1820-1882)—English bourgeois economist and statistician—38.

Nicholas I (1796-1855)—Russian Emperor (1825-55)—407.

O

Odger, George (1820-1877)—English shoemaker, one of the trade union leaders, reformist, member of the General Council of the International (1864-71), its President (1864-67); in 1871 came out against the Paris Commune; withdrew from the General Council which condemned him as a renegade—247, 253.

Orleans—royal dynasty in France (1830-1848)—227, 232.

Owen, Robert (1771-1858)—famous British utopian socialist—17, 38, 146, 169, 333, 334, 403, 417.

P

Palikao. See *Cousin-Montauban*.

Palmerston, Henry, John Temple, Viscount (1784-1865)—British statesman, Tory; from 1830 on, one of the Whig leaders; Foreign Secretary (1830-34, 1835-41 and 1846-51), Home Secretary (1852-55) and Prime Minister (1855-58 and 1859-65)—17.

Pavia y Rodriguez, Manuel (1827-1895)—Spanish general and politician; in 1873 commanded the republic's troops against the Carlists, put down the Cantonalists' revolt in Andalusia—397.

Pecqueur, Constantin (1801-1887)—French economist and utopian socialist—143.

Peel, Robert (1750-1830)—big English manufacturer, Tory, M.P.—140.

Peel, Robert (1788-1850)—English statesman, leader of the moderate Tories, Home Secretary (1822-27 and 1828-30), Prime Minister (1834-35 and 1841-46); supported by Liberals he abolished the Corn Laws (1846), son of the former—94, 140.

Pène, Henri de (1830-1888)—French journalist, monarchist, one of the organisers of the counter-revolutionary action in Paris on March 22, 1871—214.

Pereire, Isaac (1806-1880)—French banker, Bonapartist; in 1852, together with his brother Emille Pereire, found *Crédit Mobilier*—a joint-stock bank—349.

Peter I (1672-1725)—Russian tsar from 1682. Emperor of the whole of Russia from 1721—29, 389.

Peter III (1728-1762)—Russian Emperor (1761-62)—396.

Pic, Jules—French journalist, Bonapartist, responsible publisher of the newspaper *L'Etendard*—204.

Picard, Ernest (1821-1877)—French lawyer and politician, moderate bourgeois republican, Finance Minister in the Government of National Defence (1870-71), Home Minister in the Thiers government (1871), one of the hangmen of the Paris Commune—204, 210, 215.

Picard, Eugène Arthur (b. 1825)—French politician and stock-broker, moderate bourgeois republican, brother of Ernest Picard—204.

Pietri, Joseph Marie (1820-1902)—French politician, Bonapartist, prefect of the Paris police (1866-70)—192, 231, 266.

Pindar (c. 522-c. 442 B.C.)—Greek poet—141.

Pitt, William, Junior (1759-1806)—English statesman, Prime Minister (1783-1801 and 1804-06), one of the Tory leaders—124.

Plekhanov, Georgi Valentinovich (1856-1918)—prominent figure in the Russian and international working-class movement, philosopher and propagator of Marxism in Russia, founder of the Emancipation of Labour group—the first

- Russian Marxist organisation; in the 1880s and 1890s, he combated Narodism, opposed opportunism and revisionism in the international working-class movement; subsequently became Menshevik; social-chauvinist during the First World War—400, 404.
- Pouyer-Quertier, Auguste, Thomas* (1820-1891)—big French manufacturer and politician. Minister for Finance (1871-72)—210, 234.
- Price, Richard* (1723-1791)—English radical publicist, economist and moralist philosopher—112, 113.
- Priestley, Joseph* (1733-1804)—famous English chemist, materialist philosopher and progressive public figure—153, 154.
- Proudhon, Pierre Joseph* (1809-1865)—French publicist, economist and sociologist, ideologist of the petty bourgeoisie and one of the founders of anarchism—24-30, 186, 187, 296-98, 305, 307, 308-11, 312, 313, 315-17, 318, 319, 321, 323, 327, 329, 353-55, 357, 358, 361-66, 368, 370-72, 375, 413, 414, 417, 423.
- Pugachov, Yemelyan Ivanovich* (c. 1742-1775)—leader of the biggest anti-feudal peasant and Cossack uprising in Russia in the 18th century—396.
- Pyat, Félix* (1810-1889)—French publicist and petty-bourgeois democrat, participant in the revolution of 1848; émigré (from 1849); for a number of years he carried on a slander campaign against Marx and the International using for this end the French section in London; member of the Paris Commune—245, 261.
- Q**
- Quesnay, François* (1694-1774)—great French economist, founder of the physiocratic school—94.
- R**
- Raffles, Thomas Stamford* (1781-1826)—English official. Governor of Java (1811-16), author of the *History of Java*—134.
- Ramsay, George* (1800-1871)—English economist, one of the last representatives of classical bourgeois political economy—74.
- Raumer, Friedrich* (1781-1873)—German reactionary historian and politician—30.
- Reschauer, Heinrich* (b. 1838)—Austrian bourgeois writer and journalist, Liberal—367.
- Ricardo, David* (1772-1823)—English economist, representative of classic bourgeois political economy—27, 47, 73, 74, 93, 95, 140, 155, 419.
- Richard, Albert* (1846-1925)—French journalist, one of the leaders of the Lyons section of the International, member of the secret Alliance, participant in the Lyons uprising of 1870; after the defeat of the Paris Commune became Bonapartist—256-58, 261, 283-85, 429.
- Rigault, Raoul* (1846-1871)—French revolutionary, follower of Blanqui, 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 Versailles—260.
- Robert, Fritz*—Swiss teacher, member of the International, Bakunist—257, 277.
- Roberts, George* (d. 1860)—English bourgeois historian, author of *The Social History of the People of the Southern Counties of England in Past Centuries* and other books—107.
- Roberts, Henry* (d. 1876)—English architect, bourgeois philanthropist—325.
- Robespierre, Maximilien* (1758-1794)—outstanding leader of the

French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century, Jakobin leader, head of the revolutionary government (1793-94)—38, 386.

Robin, Paul (b. 1837)—French teacher, Bakuninist, 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—258, 266, 267, 426.

Robinet, Jean François Eugène (1825-1899)—French historian, Positivist, mayor of a Paris *arrondissement* during the city's siege in 1870-71—241.

Rodbertus, Johann Karl (1805-1875)—German vulgar economist and politician, preacher of reactionary ideas of Prussian "state socialism"—153, 154.

Rogers, James Edwin Thorold (1823-1890)—English bourgeois economist, author of *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England* and other works—108, 132.

Roscoe, Henry Enfield (1833-1915)—English chemist, author of several manuals on chemistry—153.

Rose, George (1744-1818)—British statesman, Tory, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1782-83 and 1784-1801)—72.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1712-1778)—outstanding French Enlightener, democrat, ideologist of the petty bourgeoisie, deistic philosopher, author of *Discours sur l'Économie Politique* and other works—30, 129.

Roux-Lavergne, Pierre Célestin (1802-1874)—French bourgeois historian, idealist philosopher—126.

Russell, John (1792-1878)—British statesman, Whig leader, Prime Minister (1846-52 and 1865-66)—110.

S

Sacase, François (1808-1884)—French official, monarchist; from 1871, deputy of the National Assembly—272, 286.

Saint-Simon, Henri (1760-1825)—great French utopian socialist—24, 146, 169, 423.

Saisset, Jean (1810-1879)—French admiral and politician, monarchist, Commander of the Paris National Guard (March 20-25, 1871); attempted to unite the reactionary forces to crush the proletarian revolution of March 18; deputy of the National Assembly of 1871—215.

Sax, Emil (1845-1927)—Austrian bourgeois economist—296, 324-26, 328-41, 344-47.

Scheele, Karl Wilhelm (1742-1786)—Swedish chemist—153, 154.

Schiller, Friedrich (1759-1805)—great German writer—414.

Schneider, Eugène (1805-1875)—big French industrialist, owner of metallurgical works in Creasot—338.

Scholl—French worker, member of the Lyons section of the International, an émigré in London; in 1872, supported the Bonapartist plans for restoring the empire—429.

Schorlemmer, Karl (1834-1892)—prominent German organic chemist, adherent of dialectical materialism; member of the German Social-Democratic Party; friend of Marx and Engels—153.

Schramm, Karl August—German Social-Democrat, reformist, one of the editors of *Jahrbuch für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*; in the 1880s, left the party—414.

Schulze-Delitzsch, Franz Hermann (1808-1883)—German politician and vulgar bourgeois economist; deputy of the Prussian National

- Assembly (1848); a leader of the bourgeois Progressist Party in the 1860s; sought to divert the workers from the revolutionary struggle by organising co-operative societies—86, 368, 416.
- Schweitzer, Johann Baptist* (1833-1875)—one of the prominent exponents of Lassalleism in Germany, President of the General German Workers' Union (1867-71), hindered the affiliation of German workers to the First International, waged a struggle against the Social-Democratic Workers' Party; in 1872 was expelled from the Union for his ties with the Prussian authorities—24, 414-15, 422, 427.
- Schwitzguebel, Adhémar* (1844-1895)—Swiss engraver, member of the International, one of the leaders of the secret Alliance and the Jura Federation; anarchist expelled from the International in 1873—277.
- Seeley, Robert Benton* (1798-1886)—English publisher, author of the book *The Perils of the Nation*, bourgeois philanthropist—113.
- Senior, Nassau William* (1790-1864)—English vulgar bourgeois economist—16, 37, 116.
- Serrailier, Auguste* (b. 1840)—active participant in the French and international working-class movement, member of the General Council of the International (1869-72), Corresponding Secretary for Belgium (1870) and France (1871-72); member of the Paris Commune; associate of Marx—265.
- Shakespeare, William* (1564-1616)—great English writer—72, 127.
- Shaw, Robert* (d. 1869)—active participant in the British working-class movement, member of the General Council of the International (1864-69) and its Treasurer (1867-68), Corresponding Secretary for America (1867-69)—253.
- Sieber, Nikolai Ivanovich* (1844-1888)—well-known Russian economist, one of the first propagandists of Marx's economic works in Russia—96.
- Simon, Jules* (1814-1896)—French statesman, moderate bourgeois republican, Minister of Public Education (1870-73), an instigator of struggle against the Commune; Chairman of the Council of Ministers (1876-77)—212.
- Sismondi, Jean-Charles Simonde de* (1773-1842)—Swiss economist, petty-bourgeois critic of capitalism—74, 93, 143.
- Skaldin*, pseudonym of *Yelenev, Fyodor Pavlovich* (1828-1902)—Russian writer, publicist, representative of the bourgeois liberalism of the 1860s; contributed to *Otechestvenniye Zapisky* (Fatherland Notes), author of the well-known book *In the Backwoods and in the Capital*; subsequently reactionary—395.
- Sloane, Hans* (1660-1753)—English naturalist, collector of books and manuscripts; his collection (together with other private collections) provided the basis for founding the British Museum—109.
- Smith, Adam* (1723-1790)—English economist, one of the great representatives of classic bourgeois political economy—47, 53, 74, 95, 100, 114, 115, 122, 141.
- Smith, Edward* (c. 1818-1874)—English physician.—12.
- Smith, Goldwin* (1823-1910)—English bourgeois historian and economist; Liberal; from 1871 lived in Canada—132.
- Solon* (c. 638-c. 558 B.C.)—famous Athenian legislator; under pressure from the popular masses carried out a number of reforms directed against the aristocracy—405.
- Somers, Robert* (1822-1891)—English bourgeois publicist, author of *Letters from the Highlands*—116.

- Sorge, Friedrich Adolph* (1828-1906)—prominent figure in the American and international working-class and socialist movement, participant in the 1848 revolution; an active member of the International, 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—433.
- Spinoza, Baruch* (Benedictus) (1632-1677)—outstanding Dutch materialist philosopher, atheist—98.
- Stafford, William* (1554-1612)—English economist, representative of early mercantilism—127.
- Stefanoni, Luigi* (1842-1905)—Italian writer, petty-bourgeois democrat, supporter of Bakuninists—282.
- Steuart, James* (1712-1780)—English economist, advocate of mercantilism—104, 114, 128.
- Stieber, Wilhelm* (1818-1882)—Prussian police officer, chief of Prussian political police (1850-60), one of the organisers of the Cologne Communist trial; in 1870-71, chief of military police—350.
- Strousberg, Bethel Henry* (1823-1884)—big German railway contractor; in 1873, went bankrupt—349.
- Strype, John* (1643-1737)—English priest and historian, author of *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurrences in the Church of England*—120.
- Stuarts*—royal dynasty that ruled in Scotland (from 1371) and in England (1603-49, 1660-1714)—109.
- Sulla, Lucius Cornelius* (138-78 B.C.)—Roman general and statesman, consul (88 B.C.) and dictator (82-79 B.C.)—208, 235.
- Susane, Louis* (1810-1876)—French general; Chief of the Artillery Department in the War Ministry; author of several works on the history of the French army—203.
- Sutherland, Elizabeth, marchioness Stafford, Duchess* (from 1833) (1765-1839)—big Scottish landowner, mother-in-law of the following—115.
- Sutherland, Harriet Elizabeth Georgiana, Duchess* (1806-1868)—big Scottish landowner—116.

T

- Tacitus, Publius Cornelius* (c. 55-c. 120)—Roman historian, author of the works *Germany, Histories* and *Annals*—236.
- Taillefer*—took part in machinations connected with the publication of the Bonapartist paper *Étendard*—204.
- Tamerlane*. See *Timur*.
- Tamisier, François Laurent Alphonse* (1809-1880)—French General and politician, republican; Commander of the Paris National Guard (September-November 1870), deputy of the National Assembly of 1871—213.
- Terzaghi, Carlo* (born c. 1845)—Italian lawyer, secretary of the workers' society *Emancipazione del proletario* in Turin; in 1872 became a police agent—276.
- Theisz, Albert* (1839-1880)—French worker, Proudhonist, member of the Paris Commune, an émigré, member of the General Council of the International and its Treasurer (1872)—262, 266.
- Thiers, Adolphe* (1797-1877)—French bourgeois historian and statesman, Orleanist, Chairman of the Council of Ministers (1871), President of the Republic (1871-73); hangman of the Paris Commune—28, 100, 182, 184, 191, 202, 205-12, 214-17, 218, 220, 225-28, 230-35, 237-39, 241, 262, 283, 286, 287, 420, 429.

- Thomas, Clément* (1809-1871)—French politician, general, moderate bourgeois republican; participant in the suppression of the June 1848 uprising in Paris; Commander of the Paris National Guard (November 1870-February 1871), sabotaged the city's defence; on March 18, 1871, he was shot by the insurgent soldiers—213, 214, 217, 232-34.
- Thornton, William Thomas* (1813-1880)—English bourgeois economist—72, 105.
- Timur* (Tamerlane) (1336-1405)—Central Asian general and conquerer, founder of a large state in the East—216.
- Tkachov, Pyotr Nikitich* (1844-1885)—Russian revolutionary, publicist, one of the ideologists of Narodism—387, 388, 390, 391, 392-94, 398, 399.
- Tolain, Henri Louis* (1828-1897)—French engraver, Right-wing Proudhonist, one of the leaders of the Paris section of the International, delegate to the London Conference (1865) and several congresses of the International; deputy of the National Assembly in 1871; during the Paris Commune went over to the side of Versailles and was expelled from the International—217.
- Tooke, Thomas* (1774-1858)—English bourgeois economist, belonging to the classical school; critic of Ricardo's theory of money—38, 54.
- Tremenheere, Hiew Seumur* (1804-1893)—English official, was very often a member of government commissions to investigate the labour conditions of workers—13.
- Trochu, Louis Jules* (1815-1896)—French general and politician, Orleanist; head of the Government of National Defence, Commander-in-Chief of the Paris armed forces (September 1870-January 1871), sabotaged the defence of Paris; deputy of the National Assembly of 1871—202, 203, 208, 212, 213, 238.
- Tschernyschewsky, N.*—see *Chernyshevsky*.
- Tucker, Joshua* (1712-1799)—English priest and economist—142.
- Tuckett, John Debell* (d. 1864)—English historian, author of *A History of the Past and Present State of the Labouring Population*—107, 131.
- Tudors*—royal dynasty in England (1485-1603)—131.

U

- Ure, Andrew* (1778-1857)—British chemist, vulgar economist—16, 37.
- Urquhart, David* (1805-1877)—British diplomat, reactionary publicist and politician, Turkoflle; M.P. (1852)—40, 116, 131, 132.
- Utin, Nikolai Isaakovich* (1845-1883)—Russian revolutionary, participant in the student movement, an émigré, one of the founders of the Russian section of the International, member of the *Narodnoye Dyelo* (People's Cause) editorial board (1868-70), fought against Bakuninists, left the revolutionary movement in the middle of 1870s—265.

V

- Vaillant, Edouard Marie* (1840-1915)—French socialist, follower of Blanqui; member of the Paris Commune and of the General Council of the First International (1871-72); participant in the International Socialist Workers' Congress of 1889; one of the founders of the Socialist Party of France (1901); during the First World War adopted the standpoint of social-chauvinism—186, 386.
- Valentin, Louis Ernest*—French Bonapartist general, prefect of the Paris police on the eve of the uprising of March 18, 1871—210, 231.

- Varlin, Eugène* (1839-1871)—prominent in the French working-class movement, Left-wing Proudhonist; one of the leaders of the sections of the International in France; member of the Central Council of the National Guard and the Paris Commune, shot by Versaillists—266.
- Vermersch, Eugène* (1845-1878)—French petty-bourgeois journalist and publisher—382.
- Vésinier, Pierre* (1826-1902)—French petty-bourgeois publicist, member of the International and the Paris Commune; came out against Marx and the General Council of the International—266.
- Victor-Emmanuel II* (1820-1878)—King of Sardinia (1849-61), King of Italy (1861-78)—249.
- Vinoy, Joseph* (1800-1880)—French general, Bonapartist, took part in the coup d'état of December 2, 1851; Governor of Paris since January 22, 1871; one of the executioners of the Commune, commander of Versailles army—210, 212, 214, 216, 420.
- Virgil* (Vergil) (Publius Vergilius Maro) (70-19 B.C.)—great Roman poet—418.
- Vogt, Gustav* (1829-1901)—Swiss economist, bourgeois pacifist, one of the organisers of the League of Peace and Freedom, brother of Karl Vogt—250.
- Vogt, Karl* (1817-1895)—German naturalist, vulgar materialist, petty-bourgeois democrat; participant in the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; in the 1850s and 1860s, while in emigration, was Louis Bonaparte's paid agent—204, 421.
- Voltaire, François Marie* (Arouet) (1694-1778)—great French satirist and historian of the Enlightenment, deist philosopher—216.
- W**
- Wade, Benjamin Franklin* (1800-1878)—American politician belonging to the Left wing of the Republican Party; Vice-President of the United States (1867-69)—89.
- Wagner, Adolph* (1835-1917)—German vulgar economist, representative of the so-called socio-legal school in political economy, Katheder-Socialist—350.
- Wagener, Hermann* (1815-1889)—German publicist and politician, editor of *Neue Preussische Zeitung* (1848-54), one of the founders of the Prussian Conservative Party, follower of Bismarck—415.
- Wales, Princess*. See *Alexandra*.
- Weston, John*—prominent figure in the British working-class movement, follower of Robert Owen; member of the General Council of the International (1864-72), delegate to the London Conference of the International (1865); member of the British Federal Council, of the Executive Committee of the Reform League, one of the leaders of the Land and Labour League—31-34, 36-37, 39-47, 73.
- Whitbread, Samuel* (1758-1815)—English politician, Whig—124.
- Wilhelm I* (William) (1797-1888)—King of Prussia (1871-88), Emperor of Germany (1871-88)—195, 234, 287, 414.
- William III, prince of Orange* (1650-1702)—supreme governor of the Netherlands (1672-1702), King of England (1689-1702)—109.
- Witt, Jan de* (1625-1672)—Netherlands statesman, advocate of the big commercial bourgeoisie—138.
- Wróblewski, Walery* (1836-1908)—Polish revolutionary democrat, general of the Paris Commune, member of the General Council of the International and Corresponding Secretary for Poland (1871-72), took an active part in the struggle against the Bakuninists—227.

Y

York, Theodor (d. 1875)—outstanding figure in the German working-class movement, Lassallean; in 1871-74, Secretary of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany—430.

Z

Zhukovsky, Julius Galaktionovich (1822-1907)—Russian vulgar bourgeois economist and publicist; Manager of the State Bank; author of the article "Karl Marx

and His Book on Capital", in which he attacked Marxism—405.

Zhukovsky, Nikolai Ivanovich (1833-1895)—Russian anarchist, émigré, one of the leaders of the secret Alliance—260.

Zimmermann, Wilhelm (1807-1878)—German historian, petty-bourgeois democrat, participant in the 1848-49 revolution; deputy of the Frankfurt National Assembly, belonged to its Left wing; author of *The History of the Peasant War in Germany* published in 1841-43—158.

INDEX
OF LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

- Damocles*—according to a Greek legend, a courtier of the Syracusan tyrant Dionysius (4th cent. B.C.). He was invited to a banquet by Dionysius, who placed him at his throne with a sword suspended over his head by a single horse hair, so that Damocles, who envied Dionysius, might learn the insecurity of man's happiness. Hence the expression "sword of Damocles"—synonym of constant, immediate and serious threat—179.
- Don Carlos*—the son of Philip II of Spain (1545-1568), a character idealised in several literary works; was persecuted for opposition to his father and died in prison—207.
- Hecate* (Greek myth.)—goddess of moonlight with three heads and three bodies, mistress of monsters and ghosts of the underworld, patron of evil and enchantment—237.
- Hercules*—Roman name of Heracles, popular hero of Greek mythology known for his manly strength and super-human deeds—200.
- Job* (Bible)—image of a long-suffering poor man whom God rewarded for his patience and meekness—207.
- Joshua* (*Yehoshua ben Nun*) (Bible)—hero who ruined the walls of Jericho by the sounds of sacred trumpets and cries of the warriors—215.
- Juggernaut* (*Jagannath*) (Indian myth.)—a form of Vishnu—69.
- Leviathan* (Bible)—sea monster—269.
- Medusa* (Greek myth.)—monster which had the power of changing its onlooker to stone—88.
- Megaera* (Greek myth.)—one of the three goddesses of vengeance, embodiment of wrath and envy; used figuratively—a malicious shrew—237.
- Moloch*—God of the Sun in the religion of Ancient Finikia and Carthage, an idol to whom men were sacrificed; subsequently the name became a symbol of ferocious all-absorbing force—16.
- Mōros*—personage from Schiller's poem—382.
- Perseus* (Greek myth.)—son of Zeus and Danae; performed many deeds, cut off Medusa's head—88.
- Philip II*—personage from Schiller's tragedy *Don Carlos*—412.
- Pistol*—character from Shakespeare's *Henry IV*, *Henry V* and *Merry Wives of Windsor*; cheat, coward and braggart—242.
- Posa, marquis*—character from Schiller's tragedy *Don Carlos*; image of a noble and free-thinking courtier—414.
- Pourceaugnac*—chief character from Molière's comedy *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*, image of a dull and ignorant provincial noble—209.
- Uncle Bräsig*—chief character of humorous stories of Reuter—364.

SUBJECT INDEX

A

- Abstraction* (as a method of research)—87
- Accident* (chance)—421
- Accumulation of capital*—73-74, 150-51, 354—its historical tendency—142-45
- Africa*—133
- Agrarian question*—163-64, 372-73
- Agriculture*—288-89
- Alliance of Socialist Democracy*—250-61, 266-69, 271-72, 275, 276-80, 283-85, 380, 422-23, 426, 427
- Alsace and Lorraine*—178, 196, 197, 199
- America*—United States of America—22-23, 37, 40, 72-73, 79, 83, 89, 135, 138, 141, 156, 157, 176, 187-88, 248, 276, 280, 293, 317-18, 418, 427—War of Independence—22, 23, 88, 157—Civil War—11, 23, 40, 88, 156, 157
- Amortisation of the means of production*—50
- Anarchists*—259, 285, 297, 376, 378-79, 397, 425-27
- Anarchy of capitalist production*—223, 419
- Ancient world*—25-26, 112
- Annexation*—179
- Antagonism*—14, 81, 88, 176, 289
- Anti-Jacobin War*—67, 71-72, 133, 201

- Anti-Socialist (Exceptional) Law in Germany*—178, 298
- Aristocracy*—94, 109, 110, 157
- Arming of the proletariat*—84-85
- Army*—84-85, 176
- Artel* (in Russia)—390-93
- Atheism*—382-83, 423
- Austria*—159, 160, 248, 249, 275, 350
- Austro-Prussian War of 1866*—160, 161, 162, 165, 181, 198
- Average rate of profit*—35, 72

B

- Bakuninism (Bakuninists)*—250-51, 253, 256-58, 270, 280, 285, 380, 383, 395, 396-98, 411, 422-32, 434
- Banks*—41, 137-138
- Basis and superstructure*—26-27, 87, 88, 217-18, 288, 290, 364-66, 385
See also *Law, Philosophy, Religion, State*
- Belgium*—248, 269, 297, 355, 416, 423
- Blanquism (Blanquists)*—185-87, 355, 380-86
- Bonapartism*—166, 167, 181, 226, 283, 307, 348, 349, 429
- Bourgeois democracy*—221, 222
- Bourgeois-republican party in France* (party of National)—180, 200, 218-19
- Bourgeoisie*—161, 237, 287, 384, 487-88, 415
—history of its development—157, 161, 179-81

- and proletariat—145, 161, 176, 180, 219, 269-70, 271, 280, 324, 385, 419
 - and the state—218, 219
 - big—323
- Bureaucracy*—187, 349, 416

C

Capital

- general characteristic—29, 69, 82, 141-42, 146-47, 154-55, 217, 318-19, 331, 424, 425
 - conversion of money into capital—100-01, 154-55
- “*Capital*” by Karl Marx (history of its writing and dissemination)—86, 89, 91, 94, 95, 98, 146, 297, 374, 399, 418, 419, 433

Capitalist mode of production

- general characteristic—19, 56-57, 58, 62, 68, 70, 74-76, 79, 81, 82, 87, 93, 94, 101, 121, 144-46, 148, 150-52, 174, 223, 235, 240, 306, 310, 315, 325-27, 333, 345, 352-53, 361, 371, 376, 384, 400-02, 405, 418, 419
- relations of production—62, 288-89, 418-19
- its historically transient character—89, 144, 287, 290, 306, 361-62, 402

See also *Bourgeoisie*, *Capital*, *Competition*, *Economic crises*, *Industry*, *Labour power*, *Proletariat*, *Property*, *Wage Labour*, *Wages*, *World market*

Centralisation—137-138, 143-44

Chartism—15, 271, 356

Chauvinism—181, 183-84, 386

Chemistry—52, 153, 154

Child labour—79-81

China—133, 134

Christianity—240, 433

“*Civil War in France, The*” by Karl Marx (history of its creation)—178, 179, 243, 256, 355

Clan—114-15, 118, 401, 403

Classes

- their antagonism—179-80, 217-18
- their abolition—19, 94-95, 222-23, 245, 253, 271, 285, 287, 290, 291, 312-13, 384, 387, 388

Class struggle—235, 240, 417

- under capitalism—72, 74, 75, 77-78, 82-83, 94, 95, 144, 235, 270-271, 421-24
- economic—31, 72, 74-76, 77-78, 270, 271, 292
- political—72, 268, 271, 292, 355, 356, 417
- and conquest of political power—289
- dependence of its forms on the level of production—144

“*Class Struggles in France, The*”, by Karl Marx (history of its creation)—159

Classical German philosophy—25, 168-69

Colonial system—133-36, 139

Colonies—14, 72-73, 135, 136
See also *India*

Colonisation—73

Commodity—49-50, 155, 359

Communes, mediaeval—82, 222

Communism (teaching)

- scientific—168-70, 297, 354, 360-62, 375, 384, 386, 387, 434

Communism (socio-economic system)—193

- production—16, 17, 79, 145, 186, 223-24, 290, 312-14, 377, 402, 418
- distribution—369-70, 373, 418-19
- consumption—368-70
- material premises—75, 81, 152, 290, 402
- productive forces—312, 403
- relations of production—145, 290, 402, 404
- agriculture—372-73
- and abolition of private property—144, 145, 223, 384, 401-03
- labour—16, 17, 193, 222-23, 418-19
- abolition of the antithesis be-

- tween town and country—317, 333, 367, 368
- abolition of classes—19, 94-95, 222-23, 245, 253, 271, 285, 287, 290, 291, 312-13, 384, 387, 388
- and the state—81, 187-89, 223, 285, 378-79
- necessity of the transition period between capitalism and communism—373
- Community*—110, 393, 398, 401, 403
- Community* (Russian)—388, 392-95, 398-405, 407-10
- Competition*—47, 82, 145, 149, 301
- Concentration of capital*—52, 136, 143-44, 354
- Conspiracies, secret activities*—187, 380, 381-82
- Contradiction*—144, 147
- between relations of production and productive forces—288-89, 402
- between labour and capital—217-18, 219, 223, 323, 325-26, 412, 424
- "*Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, A*", by Karl Marx (history of its creation)—86
- Co-operative movement*—16, 17, 81-82, 223, 392
- Co-operative societies*—143, 145
- Corvée system*—149
- Country*. See *Town and country*
- Credit*—29, 136-38, 322
- Crimean War*—404-05, 407
- Crises of overproduction*. See *Economic crises*
- Cult*—415
- Czarism* (as a stronghold of reaction in Europe)—406, 408
- D**
- Denmark*—433
- Despotism*—393-94, 397, 407, 408
- Dialectical materialism*. See *Dialectics, Materialism*
- Dialectics*
- idealistic—26, 30, 97, 98
- materialistic—26, 30, 79, 95-98
- See also *Method of Marxist Political Economy*
- Dictatorship of the proletariat*—94-95, 144, 188-89, 222, 317-18, 356, 357, 380-82, 423-25
- Diplomacy*—18
- Distribution*—416
- Division of labour*—49, 52, 312, 364-65
- Dogmatism*—44, 46, 47
- E**
- East India Company*—134
- Economic crises*—14, 15, 70, 93-94, 98, 223, 330, 389-90
- Economic laws*
- character of their implementation in antagonistic formations—16, 88-89, 121, 408, 418
- character of their implementation under communism—16
- the law of correspondence of relations of production to the character of productive forces—387, 388
- Education*—79-81
- "*Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, The*" by Karl Marx (history of its creation)—159, 178
- Emigration*—380
- England* (Great Britain)—11-15, 17, 18, 29, 37, 38, 41-43, 67, 69, 72-74, 83, 87-90, 93-95, 150, 160-61, 162, 165, 174, 175, 176, 201, 222, 248, 257, 271, 280, 282, 293, 299, 300, 302, 311, 315, 324, 334-48, 389, 390, 391, 392, 424, 428
- classical country of capitalism—174, 175, 407
- bourgeoisie—161, 175, 176, 336-37, 348
- working class—11-14, 15, 18, 37-39, 72, 123, 150, 156, 174-77, 193, 201, 263, 311, 315, 403, 416
- agriculture and agrarian rela-

- tions—72, 102-03, 108-09, 126-27, 131, 174, 289, 299, 411
 —colonial policy—73, 133-36, 138
 —primary accumulation of capital—102-27, 133-41
 —slave-trade—140
 —legislature—107, 110-11, 118-21, 122-25
- English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century*—106, 109, 131
- Essence and appearance*—419
- Exchange*—128, 137, 191, 219, 348, 391
- Exchange value*—27, 47, 359, 419
- Exploitation*—306, 310-11, 314, 384
- Expropriation*
 —of direct producers—102, 103, 107-08, 110-21, 143, 303, 310-11
 —of expropriators—144, 223, 317-18, 333

F

- Factory laws*—15-16, 37-38, 69, 78-79, 80
- Family*—129-31, 384-85
- Fencing off of the communal land*—109-13
- Feudalism*—25-26, 101-04, 117-19, 127-28, 217-18
- Feuerbachianism*—24-25
- Fixed capital*—155
- Foreign policy*—190
- Formal subjection of labour by capital*—122
- Form and content*—419
- France*—17, 29, 40, 41, 89, 93, 108, 121, 122, 124-25, 128, 161, 174, 179-81, 187, 190, 191, 196-98, 200-01, 206, 208, 209, 211, 217-19, 222, 226, 228, 239, 240, 249, 256, 261, 275, 276, 284, 297, 299, 300, 302, 332, 336, 338, 348, 354, 381, 383, 399, 416, 422, 428
 —proletariat—179-80, 191, 200, 201, 211, 297, 386
 —bourgeoisie—161, 209, 348
 —petty bourgeoisie—224-25
 —peasantry—225-26, 289, 411
 —the July monarchy—180, 204-06
 —Second Empire—180, 190-92, 195, 198, 199, 207, 209, 212, 218, 219, 224-28, 336, 407
 —declaration of a republic on September 4, 1870 and the Government of National Defence—181, 182, 183, 195, 199-200, 202, 204-05, 208-12, 215-17, 230-37, 424
 See also *Paris Commune, Revolution of 1848 in France*
- Franco-Prussian War of 1871*—168, 178, 180-82, 191-96, 208-10, 219, 234, 240, 248-49, 257, 265, 280, 420
- Free Traders*—93
- French philosophy of the 18th century*—383

G

- General Association of German Workers*—431
- General law of capitalist accumulation*—144, 151-52
- Germany*—17, 84, 87-89, 92, 93, 94, 103, 117, 122-124, 158-62, 164-69, 172, 178, 192-94, 196-98, 226, 239-40, 248, 249, 257, 271, 276, 280, 282, 295, 296, 298-303, 324, 339, 347-50, 372, 392, 393, 398, 408, 414, 415, 416, 420, 422, 433
 —working class—150, 160, 162, 167-70, 199, 200, 265, 298, 299, 301, 348, 415, 430
 —bourgeoisie—159, 161, 162, 167, 196, 200, 302, 347-48, 414, 415
 —unification of—165, 166
 —working-class movement—414-16, 430
 —peasantry—164-65, 299-300, 302
- Gold (and silver)*—43
- Great French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century*—22, 37, 124-25, 197, 217-18, 225, 230, 385, 412
- Greece (Ancient)*—405
- Ground rent*—61, 126, 148, 289, 314-15, 321, 358, 359, 371
- Guilds (mediaeval)*—101-02, 132, 133, 217

H

- Hegelianism*. See *Classical German Philosophy*
- Historical materialism*. See *Materialism, Materialist conception of history*
- History* (as a science)—168, 421
- Holland*—121, 133, 134, 136, 138, 293
- Holy Alliance*—84, 93
- Housing question*
—under capitalism—295, 296, 298, 299, 305-09, 323-24, 326-28, 340, 346-47, 350
—bourgeois solution of the housing question—298, 303-04, 316, 317, 323-27, 329-47, 350-53
—Proudhonist solution of the housing question—298, 303-04, 306-09, 310, 314-18, 321-23, 329, 367, 371
—its solution by the proletarian revolution—305, 306, 317, 333, 353
- "*Housing Question, The*" by Frederick Engels (history of its creation)—295-98

I

- Idealism*—24-25, 26, 97-98
- Impoverishment of the working class*—11, 12, 147, 151-52, 157, 219, 311
—relative—13-15, 66-67
—absolute—144
- India*—133-35, 393, 394, 398, 401
- Industrial capital*—102, 131-32
- Industrial cycle*—69-71, 93-94, 98
- Industrial revolution*—296, 302, 303, 312
- Industrial training*—79, 80-81
- Industry*—218, 311, 312, 376
- Inheritance*—254-55
- Instruments of production*—50-51
- Intensification of labour*—69

Interest—35, 36, 54, 61-64, 72, 142, 146-47, 148, 301, 315, 318-19

- International Working Men's Association*—11, 18-21, 31, 77, 78, 81, 83, 156, 172, 174, 176, 185, 190, 191, 192, 193, 201, 240-41, 243, 244, 247-55, 256-57, 260-63, 267, 270-71, 274, 276, 277, 279, 280, 282, 283, 286, 287, 293, 297, 383-84, 415, 416, 422, 426-28, 432-34
—General Council—174, 175, 247-52, 255, 257, 258, 260-62, 263-65, 267-70, 272-77, 279, 282, 380, 417, 422, 423, 426-28
—Geneva Congress—264, 265, 274, 416-17
—Lausanne Congress—270, 275
—Brussels Congress—251, 252, 266, 276, 289
—Basle Congress—164, 246, 254, 258, 260, 261, 267, 268, 269, 273, 275-77, 279, 426
—London Conference of 1871—248-50, 258, 259, 261, 265-68, 271, 282, 285, 291, 423
—Hague Congress—292-94, 432-34
—Rules of—19-21, 77, 159, 253, 261, 263-65, 267, 268, 269-72, 273, 274, 291, 422
—Russian section—172-73

Internationalism, proletarian—17-20, 22-23, 77, 78, 156-57, 170, 172, 176, 182-83, 191, 192, 193, 226-27, 253, 257, 270-71, 273, 276, 433, 434

Inventions—52

Ireland—11, 84, 113-14, 138, 163, 175-77, 299, 301, 302, 389, 393, 398

Italy—17, 41, 102, 198, 249-50, 256, 261, 282-83, 416-17, 423, 425, 427, 433

J

Japan—104

L

Labour (work)—49-52, 59, 61-65, 70, 146, 149, 155, 312, 318, 320, 418

Labour power—55, 68, 147, 155, 306, 308, 314, 325

- its value—55-57, 58-59, 65, 69,
71-72, 74-75, 147-49
- as a commodity—55
- Labour productivity*—14, 51, 52
- Landed property*—94, 103-05, 107,
125-26, 128-29, 175-76, 288, 404
- Landowner*—61, 88, 125-26, 223
- Landownership*—94, 373
- Large-scale industry*—93-94, 131,
139, 144-45, 186, 311, 312, 354,
371, 407
- Lassalleanism*—86, 271, 413-15, 416,
422, 427, 430-31, 433
- Law (private)*—128, 240, 288, 364-65
- Law (judicial)*—288, 364, 365
- Lease*—126-28
- Legitimists (in France)*—210, 211,
231
- Lumpenproletariat*—163

M

- Machinery*—15, 52, 74, 303, 312, 376
- Malthusianism*—364
- Man*—364
- "*Manifesto of the Communist Party*"
(history of its writing and circula-
tion)—297, 384, 404
- Manufacture*—129-31, 133, 138, 139,
303
- Mark (German community)*—302,
401
- Market, Home*—128-31
- Marxism (history)*—374, 405, 434
See also "*Capital*", by Karl Marx;
"*Civil War in France, The*" by
Karl Marx; "*Class Struggles in
France, The*", by Karl Marx;
"*Contribution to the Critique of
Political Economy*", by Karl Marx;
"*Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis
Bonaparte, The*", by Karl Marx;
"*Housing Question, The*", by
Frederick Engels; *International
Working Men's Association*;
Manifesto of the Communist Party

- Materialism*
—materialist world outlook—383
—historical—96, 97-98, 159, 362-
63
- Materialist conception of history*—
26, 87-90, 97, 152, 159, 363-64, 384,
403
- Means of production*—61, 101
- Merchants*—132
- Metaphysics*—95
- Method of Marxist political economy*,
—91, 95-98
See also *Abstraction, Dialectics*
- Mexico*—135
- Middle Ages*—82, 101-03, 127, 132,
133, 136, 217-18, 279
- Migration of capital*—35, 36
- Monarchy*—187, 188, 222
—absolute—166, 217, 348, 349
—bourgeois—166, 348, 349
- Money*—40-44, 86, 87, 101, 155
—banknotes—42
—credit—137-38
- Monopoly*—17, 144

N

- Narodism*—387-89, 390, 392, 394-96,
398-99, 406, 408
- Nation*—88
- Nationalisation of land*—164, 288-90,
371
- National debt*—136, 157
- National question*—18, 176, 260
- National wealth*—136, 137
- Natural science*—323
- Needs*—288-89
- Negation of negation*—144

O

- Organic composition of capital*—74,
122
- Orleanists (in France)*—200, 209,
229

Overpopulation—73

Overproduction—301

P

Pan-Slavism—398-99

Paris Commune

—its historical significance—170, 179, 182-88, 212-17, 219-29, 231, 235-39, 240-41, 246, 247, 275, 280, 287, 297, 354-55, 379, 383, 385, 420-21, 430, 434

—Commune as a new type of state—184, 187-89, 217-18, 219-25
—economic and political measures—182, 183, 185, 186, 220-21, 224, 227, 354-55

—its mistakes and reasons for its defeat—186, 214, 215, 284, 293, 326-27, 420

—Communards after the Commune's defeat—248, 249, 259, 266, 267, 380

Pauperism—11, 39, 81, 107, 152, 157

Peace—156-57, 194

Peasantry—102-05, 108-10, 113, 129-31, 138, 163-65, 219, 303, 330, 368, 372, 411-12

"*Peasant War in Germany, The*" by Frederick Engels (history of its creation)—158

Petty-bourgeoisie—27-30, 145, 224, 298, 323, 356-57

Philistines—29, 298, 299

Philosophy—288

See also *Classical German philosophy*, *Feuerbachianism*, *Idealism*, *Materialism*

Physics—87

Poland—18, 84, 172, 198, 388, 393, 395

Political economy—25, 26, 146, 147, 155

—Marxist—16, 147, 152, 155

—classical—47, 93, 154, 418

—vulgar—16, 17, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31-34, 37, 38, 43-47, 94, 95, 100-01, 152, 288, 318, 418-19

Politics—245, 247, 269-70

Population—288

Portugal—133, 240

Press, periodical—253, 268-69

Price—45-47, 52-54

Primitive accumulation of capital—56, 100-03, 113, 141-45, 406
—origin of capital—125-27, 129-40, 141

—emergence of the proletariat—104-13, 118-19, 121-22, 129-31, 141, 142

—forceful driving away of the peasants from the land—102-19

Primitive communism—401-03

Production—143, 288, 290

Production relations—25, 26, 101-02, 141, 142, 326

See also *Economic laws*

Productive forces—152, 361, 387

See also *Economic laws*

Profit—35, 36, 54, 61-64, 72-73, 142, 146-147, 148, 301, 315, 318-19

Proletariat—199, 325-26, 388, 412
—history of its development—104-12, 119, 121-22, 129-30, 141, 142, 144, 145, 157, 240, 269-71, 287, 301-302, 305, 310, 311, 375, 433
—antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—145, 161, 180

—class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—161, 180, 240-41, 270, 271, 280, 387, 421

—and communist world outlook—297, 310, 311, 361-62

—its demand to abolish classes—19, 94, 222-23, 246, 253, 271, 285, 287, 290, 291, 312-13, 384, 387, 388
—its historical mission—19, 144, 152, 223-24

—and conquest of political power—17, 187-89, 217-18, 246, 270, 271, 285, 291, 293, 378-79, 423-25

—proletarian internationalism—17-20, 22-23, 77, 78, 156-57, 170, 176, 182, 191, 192, 193, 226-27, 253, 257, 271, 273, 276, 433, 434
—forms of its struggle—268-69, 289, 291, 421, 422

- necessity of its alliance with the peasantry—163-65, 303, 304, 411, 412
 See also *Dictatorship of the proletariat, Working Class*
- Propaganda*—248, 430-31
- Property*—22, 25-27
 —private—142, 143, 288, 289, 384
 —private property based on the producers' own labour—103-04, 142, 143, 145
 —private property based on the exploitation of other people's labour—100-02, 104, 107, 142-45
 —public—142, 145
 —communal—103-04, 109, 110
 —ancient—25-26
 —feudal—25-26
 —bourgeois—26, 143-45
 —state—110
 —necessity of the abolition of private property—144, 145, 223, 384-85, 401-03
- Prostitution*—229
- Proudhonism*—24-30, 169, 186, 297, 305, 308-13, 315, 316, 318-23, 354, 355, 358, 360-66, 370-72, 375, 417, 422, 423, 427, 434
- Prussia*—179, 255, 412, 413-14
- Q**
- Quitrent*—104
- R**
- Railways*—407
- Rate of profit*—35, 36, 63, 64, 318-20
- Rate of surplus value*—58, 318-20
- Real subjection of labour by capital*
 —121
- Religion*—29, 32-33, 89, 128, 183, 184, 220, 228, 258, 383
- Rent*—305, 309, 310, 314, 321, 331, 358-61
- Rent. See Ground rent*
- Reproduction*—101, 150-51
- Republic*
 —bourgeois—187-89, 218
 —parliamentary—218
- Revolution*—27, 56, 81, 174, 179-80, 218, 229, 245, 385, 390, 403
 —its premises and conditions—174, 175, 224, 310, 311, 361, 410, 418
 —socialist—75, 76, 94-95, 144, 174, 176, 179-180, 223-24, 245, 271, 287, 291, 293, 297, 303, 306, 311, 318, 353, 361, 368, 377, 379, 387-88, 395, 412, 425
 —proletarian revolution will take place simultaneously in all advanced countries—19, 293-94
 —its victory in Western Europe will facilitate the victory of revolution in Russia—395, 397-98, 402-04, 406, 410
 —possibility of its victory in a peaceful way—293
 —ways of transition to socialism in backward countries—403-04
 See also *English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century, Great French bourgeois revolution at the end of the 18th century, Revolution of 1848-49, Revolution of 1848 in France*
- Revolutionary democrats of Russia*
 —399, 400
- Revolution of 1848-49*—15, 17, 94, 180
- Revolution of 1848 in France*—28, 180, 215, 224, 233, 303
 —February revolution—206, 213, 218, 219
 —June insurrection of the proletariat—180, 200, 207, 213, 238, 239, 420-21
- Rome, Ancient*—14, 102, 112, 176, 180, 433
- Russia*—18, 29, 39, 40, 109, 156, 172-73, 179, 193-94, 198, 199, 255, 299, 387-89, 390, 392, 393, 396, 397, 399-401, 402-07, 408-410
 —peasantry—388-91, 394, 395, 397, 404, 407, 410
 —nobility—388, 389, 396
 —export of grain—389
 —development of capitalism—390-91, 394, 397, 404, 406-09

—1861 reform—389, 394, 397, 404, 407
 —possibility for the victory of socialist revolution—395, 397-98, 402-03, 406-07, 410
 See also *Artel (in Russia)*, *Community (Russian)*, *Narodism*, *Revolutionary democrats of Russia*

S

Savages—387
Science—15, 26, 52, 54, 87, 144, 169, 220, 271, 418, 419
Sectarianism—270-72, 274, 375, 422, 423, 429, 431-33
Securities—42, 137
Serfs—16, 59, 101-04, 108, 112, 142, 149
Shares (joint-stock companies)—82, 137, 320
Slavery—16, 22, 23, 59, 70, 132, 141, 149, 156
Slave-owning system—143
Small-holding agriculture—289, 395
Socialism—28
 —scientific—169-70, 175, 285, 372-73, 387, 388, 390, 408
 —utopian—17, 24, 25, 27, 28, 154, 169, 271, 333, 403, 417
 —bourgeois—254, 298
 —petty-bourgeois—27, 169-70, 185-87, 298, 306-08, 357, 359
Social-Democratic Party of Germany—189, 298, 356, 383, 386, 425, 430-33
Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany (Eisenachers)—430-431
Socially necessary labour—50-52
Society—88
Socio-economic formation—224, 403
Speculation (philosophic)—26, 27
Spain—133, 141, 248, 249, 256, 269, 279, 397, 423, 425, 427, 433
State—133, 187-89, 217-19, 222, 285,

289, 290, 319, 347-48, 364-65, 421, 425
 —its origin—218, 388
 —bourgeois—80, 121-26, 133, 217-19, 221, 348
 —its role in class society—121-22, 133
 —seizure of state power by the proletariat—82, 187-89, 218, 379
 —necessity of breaking the state machinery in the proletarian revolution—187-89, 218, 221, 222, 420
 —withering away of the state—285, 378

State boundaries—197
State debt—136, 137, 138
State loan—133, 138
State socialism—407-08, 413
Statistics—78, 79, 88, 278
Stock Exchange—128, 137, 219, 348, 391
Strike—276, 424
Suffrage (universal)—150, 160, 188, 221-22, 416
Superstructure. See Basis and superstructure
Supply and demand—16, 34, 45, 53, 73
Surplus value—56-58, 61-63, 147-49, 153-55, 301, 306, 308, 314-15, 318-20
Sweden—110
Switzerland—41, 248, 269, 380, 392, 417, 423, 426-27

T

Tactics of the workers' party—424, 430-32
Taxation—83, 84, 133, 138-40, 148, 289, 315, 323
Theory—169, 170, 253, 271, 418-19
Thinking—419
Time—68
Town and country—102

- antithesis between town and country—222, 332-34, 367
 —abolition of the antithesis between town and country under communism—317, 334, 368, 369
- Trade unions*—75, 76, 82-83, 124-25, 170, 174, 175, 248, 271, 276, 434
- Transport*—52
- Turkey*—132
- U**
- Unemployment*—327
- Use value*—359
- Usury*^m—389
- V**
- Value*—27, 45, 47-54, 60-61, 65, 70, 87, 146, 155, 419
 —of labour power—55-57, 58-59, 65, 69, 71-72, 74, 147, 148, 155
- Variable capital*—122, 129, 155
- Violence, its role in history*—101, 133, 138, 139, 270
- W**
- Wage labour*—16, 59, 74-75, 83
- Wages*—29, 34, 36, 37, 45, 46, 64-66, 69, 72-73, 75, 78, 155, 199, 301, 326-27, 331
 —real—14, 29
 —relative—66
 —struggle for its rise—29, 32, 65-67, 70, 71
 —its regulation by law—121-26
- War*—156-57, 178, 179, 192, 198-99, 201, 237
 —civil—212, 215, 225, 239, 240, 420
 —the proletariat's attitude towards it—168-69, 191-93, 198-99, 201
- Worker* (in capitalist society)—69-71, 80
- Working class*—19, 22, 82, 121-22, 151-52, 156-57, 199, 223-24, 247-48, 271, 288, 291, 321, 331
 See also *Proletariat*
- Working-class (labour) movement*—21, 156, 168-70, 200-01, 274, 296-97, 302-03, 354-55, 422
- Working-class party*—17, 245, 271, 285, 291, 356, 423, 424, 433
- Working day*—67-69, 71, 84, 149
 —struggle for its reduction—15, 16, 38, 68, 69, 72, 78-80, 150, 417
- World Market*—102, 132, 144, 300-01, 407

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

