

THE HAGUE CONGRESS
OF THE FIRST
INTERNATIONAL

September 2-7. 1872

Reports and Letters

Workers of All Countries, Unite!

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

DOCUMENTS
OF THE FIRST
INTERNATIONAL

THE HAGUE CONGRESS
OF THE FIRST
INTERNATIONAL

Progress Publishers
Moscow

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

September 2-7, 1872

*Reports
and Letters*



Progress Publishers
Moscow

Translated by *Richard Dixon*

Designed by *Vladimir Yeryomin*

ГААГСКИЙ КОНГРЕСС ПЕРВОГО ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛА
2-7 сент. 1872 г.

Отчеты и письма

На английском языке

© Translation into English, Progress Publishers 1978

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Г $\frac{10301-294}{014(01)-78}$ 44-77

CONTENTS

Preface	15
I. ARTICLES, ACCOUNTS OF CORRESPONDENTS AND REPORTS OF CONGRESS DELEGATES	
ON THE HAGUE CONGRESS. <i>A Correspondents's Record of a Speech Made by Karl Marx</i>	33
REPORT OF THE FIFTH ANNUAL GENERAL CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION AT THE HAGUE SUBMITTED BY MALTMAN BARRY, FORMER MEMBER OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL AND THE BRITISH FEDERAL COUNCIL	36
REPORTS SENT TO <i>THE TIMES</i> BY THE ENGLISH DELEGATE J. G. ECCARIUS	68
ACCOUNTS OF THE GERMAN DELEGATES IN THE NEWSPAPER <i>DER VOLKSSTAAT</i>	
[<i>Adolf Hepner.</i>] On the Hague Congress of the Internation- al. Article I	103
[<i>Fredertck Engels.</i>] On the Hague Congress of the Interna- tional. Article II	105
[<i>Fritz Milke.</i>] On the Hague Congress	116
[<i>Adolf Hepner.</i>] On the Hague Congress of the Internation- al. Article III	119
[<i>Adolf Hepner.</i>] The Hague Congress of the International. Article IV (Concluding Article. Against the Bakuninists)	124
ARTICLES IN THE <i>NEUE FREIE PRESSE</i> NEWSPAPER	
[<i>Karl Marx.</i>] The Congress of the International	139
[<i>Heinrich Oberwinder.</i>] The Congress of the International	145
[<i>Karl Marx.</i>] The Congress of the International	156

ACCOUNT OF THE HAGUE CONGRESS IN THE VIENNA NEWS-PAPER <i>VOLKSWILLE</i> Congress of the International Working Men's Association at The Hague	160
[<i>Heinrich Scheu.</i>] ON THE CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION	170
REPORT OF THE FRENCH DELEGATE RAIMOND WILMART ON THE HAGUE CONGRESS	174
[<i>Edouard Vaillant.</i>] INTERNATIONAL AND REVOLUTION. <i>Written on the Occasion of the Hague Congress by Communard Emigrés, Formerly Members of the International's General Council</i>	177
ACCOUNT OF THE SWISS DELEGATE JOH. PH. BECKER OF THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION AT THE HAGUE	190
REPORT OF THE JURA FEDERATION DELEGATE JAMES GUILLAUME. <i>The Congress of the Hague</i>	219
ACCOUNT OF THE WORK AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE HAGUE CONGRESS BY THE BELGIAN DELEGATE PIERRE FLUSE	245
[<i>Frederick Engels.</i>] IMPERATIVE MANDATES AT THE HAGUE CONGRESS	280
REPORTS OF THE SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE DELEGATE PAUL LAFARGUE TO THE NEWSPAPER <i>LA EMANCIPACION</i> . <i>News from The Hague</i>	286
[<i>Frederick Engels.</i>] THE CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE. (<i>Letter to Enrico Bignami</i>)	295
[<i>Frederick Engels.</i>] <i>From the Article:</i> LONDON LETTERS	301
REPORT BY F. A. SORGE TO THE NORTH AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION	303
 II. FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE OF KARL MARX, FREDERICK ENGELS, FIGURES IN THE INTERNATIONAL AND OTHERS	
1872	
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Wilhelm Liebknecht, <i>January 2</i>	323
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Carlo Terzaghi, <i>January 14[-15]</i>	324
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Wilhelm Liebknecht, <i>January 18</i>	326
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Paul Lafargue, <i>January 19</i>	327

From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Theodor Cuno, <i>January 24</i>	327
From a Letter of Wilhelm Liebknecht to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>February 1</i>	329
From a Letter of Karl Marx to Ferdinand Jozewicz, <i>February 24</i>	329
Frederick Engels to Cesare Bert, <i>March 21</i>	330
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Wilhelm Liebknecht, <i>April 23</i>	331
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Wilhelm Liebknecht, <i>May 7</i>	331
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>May 9</i>	331
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to the Ferrara Workers' Association, <i>May 10</i>	332
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Wilhelm Liebknecht, <i>May 15[-22]</i>	332
Johann Philipp Becker to Frederick Engels, <i>May 20</i>	333
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Wilhelm Liebknecht, <i>May 27 [-28]</i>	336
From a Letter of Karl Marx to César de Paepe, <i>May 28</i>	336
From a Letter of Karl Marx to Nikolai Danielson, <i>May 28</i>	337
From a Letter of Nikolai Danielson to Karl Marx, <i>May 23 (June 4)</i>	337
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Wilhelm Liebknecht, <i>June 5 [-6]</i>	338
From a Letter of Wilhelm Liebknecht to Frederick Engels. [<i>about June 8</i>]	338
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Theodor Cuno, <i>June 10</i>	
Hermann Jung to Karl Marx [<i>June 12</i>]	340
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>June 14</i>	341
Frederick Engels to the <i>Emancipazione del Proletario</i> Society [<i>June 14</i>]	342
J. Patric MacDonnell to Frederick Engels [<i>June 15</i>]	343
Anselmo Lorenzo to the General Council, <i>June 19</i>	343
The Spanish Federal Council to the Belgian Federal Council [<i>June 19</i>]	344
Wilhelm Liebknecht to Frederick Engels, <i>June 20</i>	347
O. V. Suetendael to Karl Marx, <i>June 20</i>	348
Edouard Vaillant to Charles Longuet [<i>June 21</i>]	351

From a Letter of Karl Marx to Friedrich Adolf Sorge, <i>June 21</i>	352
Vladimir Baranov to Karl Marx, <i>June 10 (22)</i>	353
From a Letter of Jenny Marx (daughter) to Ludwig Kugelmann, <i>June 27</i>	354
Wilhelm Liebknecht to Frederick Engels, <i>June 29</i>	355
Adolf Hepner to Frederick Engels, <i>June 29</i>	356
Theodor Cuno to Frederick Engels, <i>June 29</i>	357
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Adolf Hepner, <i>July 2</i>	358
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Theodor Cuno, <i>July 5</i>	359
From a Letter of E. Glaser de Willebrord to Frederick Engels, <i>July 7</i>	361
The Romance Federal Committee to the General Council, <i>July 7</i>	362
Henri Perret to Hermann Jung, <i>July 7</i>	363
Hermann Greulich to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>July 8</i>	365
From a Letter of Karl Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann, <i>July 9</i>	366
A. Sabor to Karl Marx, <i>July 9</i>	367
Paul Stumpf to Frederick Engels, <i>July 10</i>	367
W. F. Cowell Stepney to Hermann Jung, <i>July 12</i>	368
L. Dagobert to Hermann Jung, <i>July 12</i>	368
Paul Lafargue to Frederick Engels, <i>July 12</i>	373
From a Letter of Wilhelm Eichhoff to Karl Marx, <i>July 14</i>	376
The Committee of the Jura Federation to the General Council, <i>July 15</i>	377
Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Karl Marx, <i>July 15</i>	378
Friedrich Bolte to Karl Marx, <i>July 16</i>	380
Friedrich Bolte to the General Council, <i>July 16</i>	381
Ludwig Kugelmann to Karl Marx, <i>July 16</i>	383
Frederick Engels to Ugo Bartorelli [<i>July 18</i>]	383
E. Glaser de Willebrord to Frederick Engels [<i>July 19</i>]	385
Wilhelm Liebknecht to Frederick Engels, <i>July 20</i>	387
O. V. Suetendael to Karl Marx, <i>July 20</i>	388
Paul Lafargue to Frederick Engels [<i>about July 21</i>]	389
Hendrick Gerhard to Frédéric Cournet, <i>July 21</i>	391
Eugène Dupont to Frederick Engels, <i>July 21</i>	393

Karl Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann, <i>July 23</i>	395
Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Karl Marx, <i>July 23</i>	396
Raymond Wilmart to Karl Marx, <i>July 24</i>	396
Carl Farkas to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>July 25</i>	397
Theodor Cuno to Frederick Engels [<i>July 26</i>]	398
Hermann Jung to Karl Marx, [<i>July 26</i>]	401
Karl Marx to Hermann Jung [<i>end of July</i>]	401
José C. Nobre-França to Frederick Engels, <i>July 27</i>	402
José Mesa to Frederick Engels [<i>July 28</i>]	405
The General Council's Reply to the Protest of the Jura Federation at the Convening of a Congress at The Hague, <i>July 28</i>	407
Karl Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann, <i>July 29</i>	408
William West to John Hales, <i>July 29</i>	408
Francisco Tomás to the General Council, <i>August 1</i>	409
From a Letter of Gustav Ludwig to Karl Marx, <i>August 2</i>	410
August Geib to Karl Marx, <i>August 2</i>	411
From a Letter of Wilhelm Bracke Jr. to Ludwig Kugelmann, <i>August 3</i>	413
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Adolf Hepner, <i>August 4</i>	414
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Theodor Cuno, <i>August 4</i>	414
Frederick Engels to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>August 5</i>	415
From a Letter of Carl Speyer to Karl Marx, <i>August 5</i>	418
From a Letter of Nikolai Danielson to Karl Marx, <i>July 20-25 (August 1-6)</i>	420
Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Karl Marx, <i>August 6</i>	420
From a Letter of Ludwig Kugelmann to Karl Marx, <i>August 6</i>	421
Wilhelm Fink to Frederick Engels, <i>August 7</i>	422
Paul Lafargue to Frederick Engels, <i>August 8</i>	423
E. Glaser de Willebrord to Frederick Engels, <i>August 9</i>	425
Hugo Heller to Karl Marx, <i>August 9</i>	427
Address of the Zurich Section of the International Working Men's Association, <i>August 9</i>	428
North American Federal Council to the General Council of the International Working Men's Association in London, <i>August 9</i>	430
Fr. J. Bertrand to Frederick Engels, <i>August 10</i>	431
L. Dagobert to Hermann Jung, <i>August 10</i>	433

From a Letter of Ludwig Kugelmann to Karl Marx, <i>August 11</i>	434
Paul Lafargue to Karl Marx, <i>August 12</i>	435
Th. Remy to Hermann Jung, <i>August 12</i>	437
Edward Jones to Frederick Engels, <i>August 13</i>	439
Nikolai Utin to Eleanor Marx, <i>August 14-19</i>	440
From a Letter of Karl Marx to Nikolai Danielson, <i>August 15</i>	448
From a Letter of Adolf Hepner to Frederick Engels, <i>August 15</i>	449
E. Glaser de Willebrord to Frederick Engels, <i>August 16</i>	450
Bruno Liebers to Karl Marx, <i>August 18</i>	451
Wilhelm Liebknecht to Frederick Engels, <i>August 18</i>	454
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to E. Glaser de Willebrord, <i>August 19</i>	455
Benjamin Le Moussu to the Secretary of the Editorial Board of the newspaper <i>Corsaire</i> , <i>August 19</i>	456
From a Letter of Louis Pio to Frederick Engels, <i>August 19</i>	457
Joseph Dietzgen to Karl Marx, <i>August 19</i>	457
Carl Kleist to the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, <i>August 19</i>	458
Nikolai Lyubavin to Karl Marx, <i>August 8 (20)</i>	459
G. Orpin to an Unknown, <i>August 20</i>	463
Nikolai Danielson to Karl Marx, <i>August 9 (21)</i>	464
Rudolf Schramm to Karl Marx, <i>August 21</i>	465
Adolf Hepner to Frederick Engels, <i>August 21</i>	466
J. Patric MacDonnell to Frederick Engels, <i>August 21</i>	467
E. Glaser de Willebrord to Frederick Engels, <i>August 21</i>	468
César de Paepe to Hermann Jung, <i>August 22</i>	469
Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Hermann Jung, <i>August 22</i>	470
Nikolai Utin to Eleanor Marx, <i>August 22</i>	471
E. Glaser de Willebrord to Karl Marx, <i>August 23</i>	472
José C. Nobre-França to Frederick Engels [<i>August 23</i>]	473
Paul Lafargue to Frederick Engels, [<i>after August 23</i>]	477
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Wilhelm Liebknecht, <i>August 24</i>	478
The Correspondence Commission of the Italian Federation to the Jura Federal Committee, <i>August 24</i>	478
J. Patric MacDonnell to Frederick Engels, <i>August 24</i>	480

José Mesa to Frederick Engels, <i>August 25</i>	480
E. Glaser de Willebrord to Frederick Engels [<i>August 25</i>] . . .	482
Karl Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann, <i>August 26</i>	483
José Mesa to Frederick Engels, <i>August 26</i>	483
Adolf Hepner to Frederick Engels [<i>August 26</i>]	484
Nikolai Utin to Theodor Duval [<i>August 27</i>]	485
E. Glaser de Willebrord to Frederick Engels [<i>August 27</i>] . . .	486
Maltman Barry to Karl Marx, <i>August 27</i>	487
O. V. Suetendaël to Karl Marx, <i>August 28</i>	488
J. Patric MacDonnell to Frederick Engels [<i>August 28</i>] . . .	490
J. Patric MacDonnell to Frederick Engels [<i>August 29</i>]	491
Friedrich Lessner to Frederick Engels, <i>August 29</i>	492
Friedrich Adolf Sorge, Victor Schily and Henri Bachruch to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>August 29</i>	492
Lewis Wingfield to Karl Marx, <i>August 29</i>	493
Edouard Vaillant to Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel, <i>August 30</i>	494
Hermann Jung to Karl Marx, <i>August 30</i>	497
Henri Perret to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>August 30</i>	498
Frédéric Cournet to the Belgian Federal Council, <i>August 30</i> . .	498
J. Patric MacDonnell to Frederick Engels [<i>August 30</i>]	499
Sergei Podolinsky to Pyotr Lavrov, <i>August 31</i>	500
Nikolai Utin to Karl Marx [<i>end of August</i>]	500
Arthur Barnekow to Frederick Engels [<i>end of August-beginning of September</i>]	501
Frederick Engels to Hermann Jung [<i>beginning of September</i>] . .	503
Hugo Speyer to the Brunswick Organisation, <i>September 1</i> . .	503
Eleanor Marx to Karl Marx [<i>September 1</i>]	504
J. Patric MacDonnell to Frederick Engels [<i>September 1</i>] . . .	505
Sergei Podolinsky to Pyotr Lavrov, <i>September 1</i>	505
Sergei Podolinsky to Pyotr Lavrov, <i>September 2</i>	507
José Mesa to Frederick Engels, <i>September 2</i>	508
Sergei Podolinsky to Pyotr Lavrov, <i>September 3</i>	509
Jules Johannard to Hermann Jung, <i>September 4</i>	510
Jules Johannard to Hermann Jung [<i>September 4</i>]	512
E. Glaser de Willebrord to Frederick Engels [<i>September 5</i>] . .	513

Jules Johannard, Eugène Dupont, Paul Vichard and Auguste Ser- raillier to Hermann Jung, <i>September 5</i>	514
Sergei Podolinsky to Pyotr Lavrov, <i>September 5</i>	516
Ivan Golovin to Karl Marx [about <i>September 5-7</i>]	518
Eugène Dupont to Karl Marx [<i>September 7</i>]	519
Sergei Podolinsky to Pyotr Lavrov, <i>September 7</i>	519
Sergei Podolinsky to Pyotr Lavrov, <i>September 7</i>	522
Carl Farkas to Karl Marx, <i>September 7</i>	523
Jules Johannard to Hermann Jung, <i>September 8</i> [7]	524
Natalie Liebknecht to Wilhelm Liebknecht [after <i>September 8</i>]	526
Adolf Hepner to Wilhelm Liebknecht [after <i>September 8</i>]	527
Edward Jones to Frederick Engels, <i>September 10</i>	528
Karl Marx to the Editor of the <i>Corsaire</i> newspaper, <i>September 12</i>	528
Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Frederick Engels, <i>September 13</i>	529
Adolf Hepner to Frederick Engels, <i>September 15</i>	530
Sergei Podolinsky to Pyotr Lavrov, <i>September 16</i>	531
J. Patric MacDonnell to Frederick Engels [<i>September 16</i>]	532
Karl Marx to the Editor of the <i>Daily News</i> newspaper, <i>Septem- ber 17</i>	533
Rudolph Seiffert to Frederick Engels, <i>September 17</i>	534
Thomas S. Townend to Karl Marx, <i>September 18</i>	534
José Mesa to Frederick Engels, <i>September 19</i>	535
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Friedrich Adolf Sorge, <i>September 21</i>	537
Adolf Hepner to Frederick Engels, <i>September 21</i>	540
Adolf Wegmann to Frederick Engels, <i>September 22</i>	541
Adolf Hepner to Karl Marx, <i>September 26</i>	543
Henry Van den Abeele to Karl Marx, <i>September 26</i>	544
Henry Van den Abeele to Karl Marx, <i>September 27</i>	544
Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Karl Marx, <i>October 1</i>	545
R. McNeill to Karl Marx, <i>October 1</i>	546
P. van der Willigen to Karl Marx, <i>October 2</i>	547
Charles Rochat to Karl Marx, <i>October 3</i>	548
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Friedrich Adolf Sorge, <i>Octo- ber 5</i> , ,	550

Charles Dobson Collet to Karl Marx, <i>October 5</i>	551
José Mesa to Frederick Engels, <i>October 5</i>	552
Adolf Hepner to Frederick Engels, <i>October 8</i>	554
Gabriel Ranvier to Karl Marx, <i>October 8</i>	556
Sigismund Borkheim to Frederick Engels, <i>October 9</i>	556
Peter Imandt to Karl Marx, <i>October 9</i>	557
Edouard Vaillant to Karl Marx, <i>October 10</i>	558
Raimond Wilmart to Frederick Engels [<i>October 11</i>]	559
José Mesa to Frederick Engels [<i>October 11</i>]	562
Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Karl Marx, <i>October 12</i>	564
Friedrich Lessner to Frederick Engels, [<i>October 12</i>]	568
Wilhelm Fink to Frederick Engels, <i>October 14</i>	568
J. Dumas to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>October 15</i>	569
W. E. Harcourt to Frederick Engels, <i>October 15</i>	570
Adolf Hepner to Frederick Engels, <i>October 17</i>	571
Karl Marx to the Editorial Office of the <i>Volksstaat</i> , <i>October 20</i>	572
Wilhelm Liebknecht to Frederick Engels, <i>October 21</i>	574
From a Letter of Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Frederick Engels, <i>October 25</i>	575
César de Paepe to Karl Marx, <i>October 26</i>	575
Frederick Engels to Theodor Cuno, <i>October 29</i>	576
Frédérique Potel to Paul Vichart [<i>October-November</i>]	578
From a Letter of Nikolai Utin to Karl Marx, <i>November 1</i>	579
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Friedrich Adolf Sorge, <i>November 2</i>	586
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Friedrich Adolf Sorge, <i>No- vember 16</i>	587
Gustav Ludwig to Karl Marx, <i>November 16</i>	589
Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Auguste Serrailier, Eugène Dupont, and Leo Frankel, Members of the Commission Appointed by the General Congress at The Hague for Revising the Congress Minutes and for Transmitting Books and Papers to the New General Council, <i>November 24</i>	590
From a Letter of Bruno Liebers to Adolf Hepner [<i>November 25</i>]	591
Wilhelm Liebknecht to Frederick Engels in London with Accom- panying Letter by Natalie Liebknecht, <i>November 26</i>	593

From a Letter of Friedrich Adolf Sorge to Karl Marx, <i>November 26</i>	593
Adolf Hepner to Frederick Engels [<i>beginning of December</i>]	594
A. Oldrini to Karl Marx, <i>December 2</i>	594
Hermann Greulich to Johann Philipp Becker, <i>December 5</i>	595
From a Letter of Karl Marx to Nikolai Danielson, <i>December 12</i>	596
From a Letter of Nikolai Danielson to Karl Marx, <i>December 15 (27)</i>	598

1873

Theodor Cuno to Karl Marx, <i>January 8</i>	598
From a Letter of Karl Marx to Nikolai Danielson, <i>January 18</i>	602
From a Letter of Nikolai Danielson to Karl Marx, <i>January 16(28)</i>	602
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to August Bebel, <i>June 20</i>	602
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Friedrich Adolf Sorge, <i>July 26</i>	605
From a Letter of Karl Marx to Nikolai Danielson, <i>August 12</i>	605
From a Letter of Frederick Engels to Friedrich Adolf Sorge, <i>November 25</i>	606

APPENDICES

REMINISCENCES OF DELEGATE TO THE HAGUE CONGRESS THEODOR FRIEDRICH CUNO	609
From a Letter to R. F. Barton in Leningrad	609
To the Toiling Millions of Russia	613
From the Manuscript: An Agitator's Reminiscences	626
REPORT ON THE MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL IN AMSTERDAM PUBLISHED IN THE <i>ALGEMEEN HANDELSBLAD</i>	634

NOTES AND INDEXES

Notes	645
Name Index	676
Index of Periodicals	688
Index of Geographical Names and Addresses	694

PREFACE

The Fifth Congress of the International Working Men's Association (First International) held at the Hague from September 2 to 7, 1872, has an important place in the history of the international working-class movement.

It inflicted an ideological and organisational defeat on the anarchists on the basic questions of the ways and means of the struggle for socialism and led to a clearly defined demarcation in the International between the genuinely proletarian revolutionary forces and the various shades of petty-bourgeois sectarianism, pseudo-revolutionism and bourgeois reformism. This was an immense step forward in the spreading of Marxism and its merger with the working-class movement.

A resolution of the Hague Congress set on record in the main programme document of the International—its General Rules—the most important principles of Marxism concerning the necessity for an independent working-class party and the dictatorship of the proletariat, principles which had already been formulated by Marx and Engels in the forties and had been confirmed in practice by the experience of the Paris Commune. Thus approval was given to the line of creating political parties of the working class in individual countries, and one of the principal stages in the struggle of Marx and Engels for a proletarian party was completed.

The very fact that such a representative international forum (65 delegates from 15 European and American countries) was convened and discussed the basic problems of

the working-class movement bore witness to the rising ideological level of the advanced workers who, under the leadership of Marx and Engels and the banner of the First International, in class battles and above all in the fire of the Paris Commune had been through a stern but necessary schooling in the theory and practice of the proletarian struggle.

The materials contained in this volume are directly connected with the official documents of the Congress, published in the book *The Hague Congress of the First International, September 2-7, 1872. Minutes and Documents*. The present volume consists of two sections: I. Reports, accounts of correspondents and articles by delegates to the Congress, including a number of articles by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels; II. Correspondence of Marx, Engels, active members of the First International and other persons over the period from January 1872 to November 1873. A considerable part of the materials in both sections are published here in English for the first time. These unique historical documents shed light on a most important stage in the struggle of Marxism against anarchism and petty-bourgeois sectarianism, and the experience they embody is still valuable today.

Section I opens with a record of Karl Marx's speech in Amsterdam on September 8, 1872. In a way this speech was a public report made by Marx, the acknowledged leader of the International Working Men's Association, to a broad working-class audience for the purpose of bringing to the general knowledge the principal decisions of the Congress which had just ended in The Hague. Marx dwelt in the first place on the inclusion in the General Rules of the International Working Men's Association of the new paragraph (7a) on the political activity of the working class, stressing that this meant the victory of the proletarian party principle over petty-bourgeois disorganisation and sectarianism. Such a decision barred anarchists from the international proletarian organisation.

An important step taken by the Congress, Marx said, was the extension of the powers of the International's leading body, its General Council. This strengthened the organisation of the proletariat directed against the anarchists

and also against all the bourgeois reformers acting in a bloc with them, who were trying to seize the leadership in the International.

In concluding Marx touched on the transfer of the General Council from London to New York. This Congress decision was dictated by the intensification of reaction in Europe and the necessity for removing the General Council from the influence of the British liberal trade unionists and of political emigrant elements in London. Marx especially emphasised the immediate significance of this step for strengthening the International and preserving unblemished the banner of the international proletarian organisation. Earlier, on July 29, 1872, Marx had drawn attention to the necessity "to guard the International against elements of disintegration" (p. 408).

The most important aspects in the work of the Hague Congress noted by Marx in his speech at the Amsterdam meeting are elucidated in one measure or another in the materials contained in this volume.

A number of accounts and reports on the Congress were written by Engels. As a delegate of the Breslau Section he sent the editorial board of the German Social-Democratic Party's paper *Der Volksstaat*, on its request, a detailed report on the Congress which was published in that paper without any signature (pp. 105-16). This document written by Engels is published here in English for the first time. In it Engels gives a detailed assessment of the work done by the Congress and notes that the decision it adopted on the political activity of the working class dealt a crushing blow at the anarchistic sectarians who called on the workers to abstain from active participation in the political struggle. "This decision," Engels pointed out, "has made it impossible for the abstentionists to spread the delusion that abstention from all elections and all political activity is a principle of the International" (p. 110).

Engels describes the question of extending the General Council's powers as an urgent one. The Congress rejected by an absolute majority the anarchistic proposal to abolish the General Council and to decentralise the International completely, which would have meant disarming the proletariat in face of the ruling classes. In examining the additions

to the General Rules proposed at the Congress Engels wrote: "The delegates of those countries where the International has to wage a real struggle against the state power, that is to say, those who take the International most seriously, the Germans, French, Austrians, Hungarians, Poles, Portuguese and Irish, were of the view that the General Council should have definite powers and should not be reduced to a mere 'post-box', a 'correspondence and statistics office' as the minority demanded" (p. 108). Engels gave a circumstantial justification of the General Council's transfer from London to New York. He pointed out that if it remained in London, the General Council could become a tool of conspiratorial groups of French *émigrés* or British reformist leaders. Engels devoted a lot of space to the checking of the Congress delegates' mandates, since this was far from being a mere formality. "Under the form of verifying the mandates nearly all the practical questions which had occupied the International for a year were examined and settled" (p. 107).

Engels noted the special importance of a resolution tabled by Paul Lafargue, one of Marx's closest followers, on the establishment of an international association of trade unions. This resolution emphasised the leading and directing role of a party and political organisation of the type of the International in setting up mass organisations of the working class, and formulated the principles governing the mutual relations between that party and the trade unions.

In his capacity as permanent representative of the new General Council for Italy and Spain, Engels sent his reports also to those countries. His article "Imperative Mandates at the Hague Congress" was printed in the Madrid newspaper *La Emancipacion*. Here Engels convincingly exposed the hypocrisy of the Spanish Bakuninists, who in words opposed any kind of authority but in deed appeared at the Congress with dictatorial powers. The Italian newspaper *Plebe*, which regularly published Engels' articles under the heading "Letters from London", also carried his shorter version of the above-mentioned report in *Der Volksstaat*.

Maltman Barry, an English journalist and member of the International, received directly from Marx on the very eve of the Congress detailed information on the state of affairs

in the International (see letter of Maltman Barry to Karl Marx of August 27, 1872). Barry made use of Marx's advice and help in writing his reports from The Hague which were published in the English *Standard* newspaper. His reports give the important speeches made by Marx, Engels, Vailant and others in greater detail than the minutes recorded by Le Moussu and Sorge. They clearly outline the situation in which the Congress took place and describe in particular the considerable interest shown by the Dutch workers in the work of the Congress. When his reports were republished as a separate pamphlet in 1873, Barry apparently took into account remarks made by Marx and Engels, in particular in the Preface, where he gave a general assessment of the work done by the Congress and emphasised the importance of giving broad publicity to its documents.

In his capacity as delegate of the Spanish and Portuguese Sections Paul Lafargue published a report on the Congress in *La Emancipation*. It contains the text of the most important resolutions passed by the Congress. Lafargue rendered a great service by unmasking the splitting activities of the Bakuninists in Spain, thus contributing substantially to the struggle against anarchism in the international working-class movement. The present volume contains a number of important letters written by Lafargue which expose the secret schemings of the Bakuninist Alliance. At the Congress he theoretically justified the extension of the General Council's powers and defended the organisational principles of Marxism. "Without a General Council," he said, "the Federal Councils would be left without control, and without Federal Councils the Sections would only become a disconnected multitude without any power" (p. 83).

One of the delegates to the Congress, the editor of *Der Volksstaat* newspaper, Adolf Hepner, gave a fitting rebuff to the slandering of the Congress by the bourgeois, Lassallean and Bakuninist press in his series of articles under the heading "On the Hague Congress of the International" which is published in Section I. The concluding article gives the full text of Hepner's brilliant speech containing a detailed justification of the political activity of the working class (pp. 133-38).

The present volume contains a short report written for

Der Volksstaat newspaper by the printer Fritz Milke, a delegate of the Berlin Section. He proved by the example of the German Lassalleans that the anarchists, supported by all reformist elements, were essentially enemies of the international working-class movement. "If the wishes of Messrs the anarchists had materialised," he wrote, "then, it is clear, the International would have ceased to be what it ought to be and is also in fact today: a power which stands opposed to the international power and exploitation of capital and to the international brotherhood of reaction—witness the suppression of the Commune and the meeting of the three emperors in Berlin—and which represents the solidarity of world working-class interests and organises and carries out in a planned manner the struggle against the forces of the old society" (p. 117).

The series of reports on the Hague Congress which appeared in the Vienna *Neue Freie Presse* (pp. 145-56) were written by the Austrian delegate Heinrich Oberwinder, a permanent contributor to that newspaper. Marx utilised this fact in order to publish two articles concerning most important questions of the ideological struggle in the International (pp. 139-45, 156-59). These two articles by Marx, the authorship of which had hitherto not been established, are published here in English for the first time.

The Austrian Social-Democrat Heinrich Scheu used the account in the *Neue Freie Presse* for a briefer report in the *Volkswille* newspaper of which he was editor. Moreover, Scheu, who was also a delegate to the Congress, was the author of a summing-up article outlining the concrete tasks of the Austrian workers in connection with the Congress resolutions. "The trend of scientific socialism," Scheu notes, "to which our young party in Austria also adheres, having freed itself from the traditions of the older socialism, won at The Hague a victory which must not be underestimated." He pointed out the enormous contribution the Congress had made to the complicated process of uniting scientific communism with the working-class movement: "Many a year will pass," he wrote, before the former "meets with the necessary recognition in all the countries of Europe, at least among the workers. The Congress in The Hague carried us some steps forward" (p. 170).

J. Ph. Becker, a veteran of the international working-class movement and a friend of Marx and Engels, represented the majority of the Swiss sections of the Association at The Hague. In his report in the *Tagwacht*, a newspaper of the German sections in Switzerland, he gives a historical outline of the struggle between the trends inside the International and shows the social roots of dogmatism and sectarianism in the working-class movement, particularly within the International. In a brilliant polemical form he exposes the anarchistic dogmas about autonomy, federalism and anti-authoritarianism. In criticising the anarchists he emphasises the distinction between the existing exploiter state and the future statehood of the victorious proletariat and unmasks the pseudo-revolutionary twaddle of the Bakuninists. Becker also devotes great attention to the question of strengthening the organisation of the proletariat, of achieving genuine unity of action based on principled foundation of scientific socialism, on an irreconcilable attitude to bourgeois ideology and to the various pre-Marxist petty-bourgeois conceptions. He stresses the importance of strengthening the authority of the Association's leading body, the General Council. "Indeed one must be really mad or have an uneasy conscience if one fears an authority which, being without bayonets or cannon, without gendarmes or soldiers, has only moral means at its command and can rely only on the agreement and the voluntary readiness of the Association's members." Becker wrote that the Congress had proved equal to the tasks it was faced with "in separating itself for ever from all trends incompatible with the task of the International Working Men's Association" (p. 214).

This volume contains the manuscript report presented by F. A. Sorge, a prominent figure in the working-class movement, to the North American Federation of the International, of which he was the leader. This report, not intended for publication, bears testimony to the strenuous work of Marx and Engels for rallying all the proletarian forces to the Marxist platform. Sorge tells about conferences at which he was informed in detail about the International's internal affairs when he was in London as the delegate of one of the International's biggest organisations. This first meeting of his with Marx and Engels led to a close friendship and

regular correspondence between Sorge and the founders of Marxism. The characterisation of the roots of anarchism which Sorge gives in his account and which coincides with some things said by J. Ph. Becker is evidence of the common position held by the proletarian nucleus of the International on this most important question, a position which was elaborated jointly with Marx and Engels.

Sorge notes that at the Congress "fighting raged against the so-called Federalists, Proudhonists, Alliance men and Bakuninists. These people preach revolution without organisation, association without laws, fight without leaders, society without cohesion, the body without a head, as well as without ideas" (p. 304). In analysing the character of the American bourgeois reformists' attacks on Marxism Sorge exposes the lack of principles of all the anti-proletarian forces who defended the anarchists; he notes that the Congress "has given us in bold outline unmistakably the directive for our future conduct" (p. 306).

All the above-mentioned authors shared the ideas of Marx and Engels and represented the so-called majority at the Congress. Both their accounts and their letters testify to the close links Marx and Engels maintained with the local organisations, to the influence of the ideas of Marxism and to the methods by which they were spread in the concrete conditions of the various countries.

The experience of the Paris Commune, which had already been summed up by Marx in *The Civil War in France* and in the resolutions of the London Conference in 1871, largely determined the character and trend of the fruitful activity of the Hague Congress. There was not a single question in discussing which the delegates to the Congress did not have recourse to this priceless experience. The spirit of the Commune permeated the preparations for the Congress, its course and its decisions. The Commune's revolutionising influence on the working-class and socialist movement in the various countries can be traced in the materials of both Sections I and II. To mark their respect for the Commune the Leipzig socialists asked the Communard Edouard Vaillant to accept a mandate from them (pp. 494-97). The General Council was informed by the North American Federation of the International that a former member of the Commune, Simon

Dereure, would be elected delegate to the Congress in token of "solidarity with its actions" (p. 371). Another sign of respect for the Commune was the fact that among the delegates to the Congress were the Communards Walery Wróblewski, Leo Frankel, Gabriel Ranvier and others. Every mention of the Commune and the Communards was greeted with applause. The Congress branded the Versailles hangmen and expressed gratitude to the countries and peoples which had given political asylum to the *émigrés* of the Commune. The best representatives of the proletariat assembled at The Hague acknowledged the Commune in France as their own cause, a magnificent initiative and an example for other countries.

An indisputable recognition of the historical significance of the Paris Commune was the fact that the delegates quoted its experience to justify the most important decisions taken by the Congress on the party and the dictatorship of the proletariat (speeches by Longuet, Vaillant and Hepner). In the polemic with the anarchists Hepner declared: "Moreover, I cannot understand how the 'anti-authoritarians', faced with the frightful lessons left to us by the Paris *Commune*, can expect the present Congress to abolish the leadership of the International or at least to paralyse it" (p. 135).

Marx referred to the lessons of the Commune in concluding his speech at the Amsterdam meeting and proclaiming the principle of proletarian unity: "The revolution must display solidarity, and we find a great example of this in the Paris Commune" (p. 35).

The letters published in Section II reveal the role of Marx and Engels as the leaders of the General Council in preparing for and conducting the Hague Congress. The General Council's reply drawn up by Marx to the protest of the Jura Federation against the Congress being convened at The Hague is of interest. At the time it was published over the signature of the corresponding secretary for Switzerland, Hermann Jung. Later Marx's authorship was proved and this document is published here for the first time in English as coming from Marx's pen.

The Hague Congress was prepared for in an atmosphere of active offensive on the part of the reactionary forces in Europe and America and acute struggle in the field of ideas

between the representatives of the proletariat's revolutionary wing adhering to the positions of Marxism and those of the sectarian, anarchistic and bourgeois reformist trends. In June 1872 Marx wrote to Sorge in Hoboken: "*At this Congress the life and death of the International are at stake*" (p. 352).

Just before the Congress the bourgeois press went to all extremes to forge all sorts of documents attributing the most criminal and callous activities to the International and its "supreme leader, Marx". As Marx put it, the lying power of the civilised world undertook a war of calumny against the International: "This war of calumny finds no parallel in history for the truly international area over which it has spread, and for the complete accord in which it has been carried on by all shades of ruling class opinion" (*The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 218). A torrent of calumny about the International and its forthcoming Congress was let loose by the French, British, German, Dutch and Belgian bourgeois press. The above-mentioned Fritz Milke noted in his report that "for weeks in advance all the bourgeois papers, led by the officious press (such as the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*), kept up an international concert of howling against the International" (p. 118). In unison with it was the Bakuninist press headed by the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*. In particular, issue No. 14 of the *Bulletin* on August 1, 1872 carried an editorial which ascribed the cause of the disagreements in the International to the "dictatorial pretensions of the German Social-Democrats". This article, permeated with the spirit of chauvinism, repeated the Germanophobic sallies of the French bourgeois press; the authors of this article called even the most important programme document of the international proletariat, the *Communist Manifesto*, the "manifesto of the German Communist Party".

In these circumstances the real causes of the disagreements within the International had to be explained. Marx and Engels deemed it possible, as in certain other cases, to use the progressive bourgeois press for this purpose.

On August 29, 1872, a few days before the Congress, the Vienna *Neue Freie Presse* published an unsigned article entitled "The Congress of the International". This article

gave a complete and clear picture of the state of affairs in the International Working Men's Association after the Paris Commune, analysed the causes of the struggle in the field of ideas and organisation which had developed before the Congress between the Marxist core and the Bakuninists in Switzerland, Belgium, Spain and Italy and also the reformist elements in Britain and the USA. The article rejected in a quiet tone all the calumnious accusations made by the editors of the *Bulletin*. The completeness and precision of the exposition and also the fact that information was given which, on the whole, was accessible at the time only to Marx, justify the opinion that he wrote the article, although formally it is close to the above-mentioned series of articles attributed to Oberwinder.

A number of letters published in Section II show that a group of Blanquist Communards who were members of the General Council of the International played a very active part in preparing for the Congress. Gabriel Ranvier, who had the honour to be chairman at a number of sittings of the Hague Congress, and Edouard Vaillant, Minister for Education in the Paris Commune and later a prominent figure in the French socialist movement, came close to the positions of scientific socialism and were of great support for Marx against the English reformist leaders on the General Council and against the Bakuninists. Vaillant in particular participated directly in drawing up the additions to the Association's General Rules and was the author of the first variant of the resolution on the political activity of the working class. But even the best of the Blanquists were distinguished by voluntarism, a tendency to adventurist tactics and petty-bourgeois revolutionism, owing to which they could not reconcile themselves to the General Council's transfer to New York. After this decision had been adopted by the Congress, all the Blanquist delegates demonstratively left the Congress, and by September 15, 1872 they had already drawn up a manifesto (written by Vaillant and signed by Antoine Arnaud, Frédéric Cournet and Gabriel Ranvier) in which they accused the Congress majority of "deserting the revolution".

A few weeks later the Blanquist manifesto appeared as the pamphlet *International and Revolution* the text of

which is given in this volume (pp. 177-89). This manifesto is of considerable interest, being a graphic proof of the pretensions and tactical inconsistency of the so-called Leftists who refuse to take into account the changed conditions of revolutionary struggle, display a regrettable impatience resulting in unnecessary victims, and substitute phrases for genuine struggle. The authors of the manifesto published as an appendix four documents of the Hague Congress, including the resolution on the political activity of the working class.

Published in this volume is the manuscript account made by the Belgian delegate Pierre Fluse, a representative of the Congress minority. It contains fairly detailed records of speeches made by delegates of the minority, in particular the only description of the last public evening sitting of the Congress on September 7, 1872 at which speeches were made by the Dutch delegates Dave and Van der Hout and the Belgian delegate Brismée.

Close in content to Fluse's account is that of James Guillaume, leader of the Bakuninist minority at the Congress, which was published in the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*. These two accounts expound the general anarchistic conception on the spontaneity of the historical process and the development of the working-class movement, a conception which recognises no organisational activity of the proletariat. Guillaume's account is spiced with calumnious attacks on the Congress majority, a circumstantial refutation of which is contained in the already mentioned article by Hepner.

Johann Georg Eccarius adhered to the same position as the minority delegates. An active figure in the International since its foundation and a delegate to all its congresses and conferences, he began to deviate from the revolutionary wing led by Marx and Engels in the spring of 1872 and joined the English reformist leaders, who were trying to assert themselves in the British Federation of the International. The decision to transfer the General Council from London to New York finally impelled him to form a bloc with the Bakuninists and to struggle actively against Marx. In his reports on the Congress, which were printed in four issues of *The Times* in September 1872, he did all he could, under cover

of feigned objectivity, to condemn the General Council's line and encourage its opponents, to whitewash the American petty-bourgeois reformists who were to blame for the split in the North American Federation. Being an experienced reporter and well informed about the affairs of the International, Eccarius quotes in his reports interesting facts which escaped the attention of other correspondents and cites word for word the texts of many documents. For instance, his report gives the exact words of the statement made by the Congress on the English authorities' inhuman treatment of Irish political prisoners (p. 102), which is neither in the Minutes nor in the reports by other delegates.

The correspondence of Marx, Engels, active members of the International and other persons from January 1872 to November 1873 which is included in Section II forms a substantial supplement to the materials in Section I. All the letters are given in chronological order and have a direct bearing on the Hague Congress, its preparation and work and the subsequent publication of its documents. The letters discuss a wide range of questions connected with the Congress, possible candidatures of delegates from individual sections and federations, information on these organisations, the question of the time and place of convening the Congress, the correlation of forces at it, measures for the safety of delegates from countries where the International was outlawed, and so on and so forth. In a number of letters the authors pin great hopes on the Congress, introduce concrete proposals for the agenda and express a desire for unity of action by the working class. Evidence that questions of organisation had become urgent for the working-class movement is provided by the proposals contained in some letters for a more exact formulation of some paragraphs of the General Rules and the Administrative Rules of the Association, for a more correct translation of terms and for regulation of membership subscriptions, accountancy, and so on.

This volume includes letters from prominent members of the General Council, members of local councils, sections and federations, participants in the Congress, friends and associates of Marx and Engels—P. Lafargue, J. Ph. Becker, H. Jung, A. Hepner, W. Liebknecht, A. Bebel, F. A. Sorge,

E. Dupont, J. Mesa, J. Nobre-França, G. Ranvier, A. Ser-raillier, E. Vaillant, L. Kugelmann, Th. Cuno and many others.

Letters of Marx's and Engels' Russian correspondents— N. F. Danielson, N. Utin, V. Baranov, N. Lyubavin, I. Golovin and others — are well represented. Many of them bear on the collection and publication of documents about the splitting activity of the Alliance men, the role of Bakunin, the Nechayev trial, and so on. Published for the first time in English is a group of letters sent by S. Podolinsky in The Hague to P. L. Lavrov in London. Their author was not a delegate to the Congress and the position he held at the time was close to that of the anarchists; his relation of events is noticeably tendentious. However, his first-hand impression of the course of the Congress, his vivid characterisation of the participants and exposition of the most important discussions impart a definite interest to his letters.

The letters written by the delegates and participants in the Congress considerably supplement the reports. For in stance, in a letter to Marx on January 8, 1873, Th. Cuno describes in detail the work of the commission to investigate the Alliance, of which he was chairman. Some of the letters reveal behind-the-scenes aspects of the Congress and in particular provide information on the factional meetings of the anarchists and reformists.

A number of the letters written after the Congress illustrate the struggle for recognition and propagation of its decisions in the localities and the struggle against their falsification by the hostile press. Some of the letters concern preparations, in accordance with the Congress decision, for publishing the Congress documents, including those of the commission to investigate the Alliance.

* * *

The Appendix contains three excerpts from the reminiscences of the Congress delegate Th. Cuno, which he sent from the USA in 1933 on the request of the direction of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. As he wrote the reminiscences many years after the Hague Congress at an advanced age, his memory occasionally failing him, it has been necessary

to formulate some passages more precisely. Naturally some formulations leave room for improvement and some facts are presented in a rather peculiar manner, but this is a reflection of the author's style and level of knowledge. His reminiscences are in general quite authentic and in many ways very interesting. This is the first time that Th. Cuno's reminiscences have been published at such length in English. Published for the first time in English in the Appendix is a detailed account given by the Dutch bourgeois newspaper *Algemeen Handelsblad* of the historical meeting of Congress delegates at Amsterdam on September 8, 1872. It reports on the content of the speeches made by all the speakers: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, F. A. Sorge, H. Gerhard, P. Lafargue, T. Duval, Van der Hout and J. Ph. Becker.

Many of the pieces in the two parts were first published in Russian in 1972 in the book "Гаагский конгресс Первого Интернационала. 2-7 сентября 1872 г. Отчеты и письма" (*The Hague Congress of the First International. September 2-7, 1872, Reports and Letters*) prepared for publication by Irene Bakh, Antonina Koroteyeva, and Tatyana Vasilyeva of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, under the general editorship of Irene Bakh.

The English edition has been prepared for publication by Natalia Karmanova, Margarita Lopukhina, Victor Schnitke, Anna Vladimirova and Ludgarda Zubrilova of the Progress Publishers.

*Institute of Marxism-Leninism,
C. C., C.P.S.U.*

I
ARTICLES,
ACCOUNTS OF CORRESPONDENTS
AND REPORTS
OF CONGRESS DELEGATES

ON THE HAGUE CONGRESS

A CORRESPONDENT'S RECORD OF A SPEECH MADE BY KARL MARX
AT A MEETING IN AMSTERDAM ON SEPTEMBER 8, 1872¹

In the 18th century, the speaker said, the kings and potentates were in the habit of assembling at The Hague to discuss the interests of their dynasties.

It is there that we decided to hold our workers' congress despite the attempts to intimidate us. In the midst of the most reactionary population we wanted to affirm the existence, the spreading and hopes for the future of our great Association.

When our decision became known, there was talk of emissaries we had sent to prepare the ground. Yes, we have emissaries everywhere, we do not deny it, but the majority of them are unknown to us. Our emissaries in The Hague were the workers, whose labour is so exhausting, just as in Amsterdam they are workers too, workers who toil for sixteen hours a day. Those are our emissaries, we have no others; and in all the countries in which we make an appearance we find them ready to welcome us, for they understand very quickly that the aim we pursue is the improvement of their lot.

The Hague Congress has achieved three main things:

It has proclaimed the necessity for the working classes to fight the old disintegrating society in the political as well as the social field; and we see with satisfaction that henceforth this resolution of the London Conference² will be included in our Rules.

A group has been formed in our midst which advocates that the workers should abstain from political activity.

We regard it as our duty to stress how dangerous and fatal we considered those principles to be for our cause.

One day the worker will have to seize political supremacy to establish the new organisation of labour; he will have to overthrow the old policy which supports the old institutions if he wants to escape the fate of the early Christians who, neglecting and despising politics, never saw their kingdom on earth.

But we by no means claimed that the means for achieving this goal were identical everywhere.

We know that the institutions, customs and traditions in the different countries must be taken into account; and we do not deny the existence of countries like America, England, and if I knew your institutions better I might add Holland, where the workers may achieve their aims by peaceful means. That being true we must also admit that in most countries on the Continent it is force which must be the lever of our revolution; it is force which will have to be resorted to for a time in order to establish the rule of the workers.*

The Hague Congress has endowed the General Council with new and greater powers. Indeed, at a time when the kings are assembling in Berlin³ and when from this meeting of powerful representatives of feudalism and the past there must result new and more severe measures of repression against us; at a time when persecution is being organised, the Hague Congress rightly believed that it was wise and necessary to increase the powers of its General Council and to centralise, in view of the impending struggle, activity which isolation would render impotent. And, by the way, who but our enemies could take alarm at the authority of the General Council? Has it a bureaucracy and an armed police to ensure that it is obeyed? Is not its authority solely moral, and does it not submit its decisions to the Federations which have to carry them out? In these conditions, kings, if they had no army, no police, no magistracy, would be feeble obstacles to the progress of the revolution, and

* In place of the preceding sentence *Der Volksstaat* has: "But this is not the case in all countries."—*Ed.*

were reduced to maintaining their power through moral influence and authority.

Finally, the Hague Congress transferred the seat of the General Council to New York. Many, even of our friends, seemed to be surprised at such a decision. Are they then forgetting that America is becoming the world of the workers *par excellence*; that every year half a million men, workers, emigrate to that other continent, and that the International must vigorously take root in that soil where the worker predominates? Moreover the decision taken by the Congress gives the General Council the right to co-opt those members whom it judges necessary and useful for the good of the common cause. Let us rely on its wisdom to choose men equal to the task and able to carry with a steady hand the banner of our Association in Europe.

Citizens, let us bear in mind this fundamental principle of the International: solidarity! It is by establishing this life-giving principle on a reliable base among all the workers in all countries that we shall achieve the great aim which we pursue. The revolution must display solidarity, and we find a great example of this in the Paris Commune, which fell because* there did not appear in all the centres, in Berlin, Madrid etc., a great revolutionary movement corresponding to this supreme uprising of the Paris proletariat.

For my part I will persist in my task and will constantly work to establish among the workers this solidarity which will bear fruit for the future. No, I am not withdrawing from the International, and the rest of my life will be devoted, like my efforts in the past, to the triumph of the social ideas which one day, be sure of it, will bring about the universal rule of the proletariat.

Published in *La Liberté*
No. 37, September 15, 1872;
Der Volksstaat No. 79,
October 2, 1872

Translated from the French

* Here *Der Volksstaat* has: "...because precisely this solidarity was lacking in the workers of the other countries".—*Ed.*

**REPORT OF THE FIFTH ANNUAL GENERAL
CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING
MEN'S ASSOCIATION AT THE HAGUE SUBMITTED
BY MALTMAN BARRY, FORMER MEMBER
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
AND THE BRITISH FEDERAL COUNCIL ⁴**

PREFACE

Considering the world-wide publicity given to this Report by its appearance in the columns of the *Standard*, it may be asked what are the reasons which render its republication necessary. They are briefly:—

- (1) The extraordinary character—extraordinary both in interest and importance—of the proceedings of the Congress.
- (2) The absence of any other truthful published record in the English language.
- (3) The fact that a few disappointed self-seekers, who have now seceded from the International, are striving to retard its action by misrepresenting the proceedings of the Congress.
- (4) Its bearing on the present Spanish Revolution.⁵

Moreover, there are two interesting features in this pamphlet—the text of the resolutions and the “division lists”—placed, for convenience, at the end, which were necessarily omitted in the hastily-written letters to the *Standard*.

Nearly all the great organs of this country are in the hands of the enemies of the working class. But there are enemies and enemies. While the “Liberal” press, the servile flunkies of the base *bourgeoisie*, calumniate and caricature; for the only fair and honest report of the proceedings of their Congress, the members of the International Working Men's Association are indebted to the leading Conservative journal.

Maltman Barry

74, Park Street, Gloucester Gate,
Regent's Park,
19th July, 1873

ANNUAL CONGRESS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

The Hague, September 2

I do not know that I am quite right in heading this letter as I do. Your readers will, no doubt, recollect that, in consequence of the disturbed state of the Continent, no Congress was held last year, but a private conference in London was substituted.⁶ However, the above is the official designation, and, therefore, I use it.

I was greatly surprised, on my arrival, to find how large a space the International fills in the popular mind here. Its Congress, begun to-day, has been the principal subject of conversation in all grades of society for months past, and has been looked forward to with the greatest interest. However flattering this attention may be interpreted by the Society and its friends, I am afraid it was not, at least in some measure, so intended. The Hague, being the place of Royal residence and the seat of the government of the country, may be safely trusted to possess a considerable number of enemies of Revolution. Indeed, so strong is the feeling in some quarters against the Society that the children of the town have been warned not to go into the streets with jewellery or articles of value upon them as

"The International is coming and will steal them".

On the other hand, I was somewhat surprised yesterday at the *table d'hôte*, by the landlord of our hotel calling upon us to drink "Success to the International"; and still more surprised by the enthusiasm with which the toast was drunk by the numerous and respectable company present.

I had only been in the Hague a few hours when, on Saturday evening, I was invited and conducted to the meeting of the local section. This section is not very strong, numbering only about twenty members; but I am told it is young and growing fast. The members seemed all decent working men, with intelligent faces and quiet decorous manner. Being a delegate to the congress, and also a member of the

general council, I was received with every manifestation of friendliness and courtesy.*

I had scarcely been five minutes in the room when some one announced that two gentlemen wished to be permitted to be present during the sitting. They were ushered in, and upon interrogation declared themselves to be correspondents of two Amsterdam papers—the *Dagblad* and *Standaard*. Subsequently, one introduced the other as the Secretary to the States Council of Holland. To their reminders of the “reactionary” character of the papers they represented they essayed the “mild answer”, which is reputed to “turn away wrath”. But neither their credentials nor their blandishments could avert their doom. In a few words, simple and dignified, the chairman gave them their *congé*. I stayed some time afterwards, but not long, as the business being transacted was only interesting to the local members, arranging for the accommodation of the great bulk of the delegates who were to arrive the next day, &c. Their arrival created quite a sensation in the town, considerable crowds following each batch of travellers to their respective hotels, the figure of Karl Marx attracting special attention, his name on every lip.

In the evening a preliminary meeting was held at the Concert Zaal, in Lombard Straat, where the congress will sit. It was almost wholly of a social and convivial nature, the only matters of business determined being the hour (nine o'clock) of meeting on Monday, and that, as the first business would be in connection with purely administrative affairs, the sittings would be open only to delegates and verified members of the International until that part was disposed of.

➤ On reassembling this morning sixty-two delegates were present; *Henry Van den Abeele*, Antwerp, in the chair. After considerable discussion the appointment of a committee on credentials was proceeded with. Seven was the number determined upon, and those elected were Dureure, Frankel, Gerhard, M'Donnell, Marx, Ranvier, and Roach. The sitting

* Here the newspaper reads: “...indeed, my latter qualification, whenever announced, seemed to be a veritable ‘open Sesame’ to all their hearts”.—*Ed.*

was suspended at two o'clock till seven, in order that the committee might examine credentials and then bring up their report thereon.

September 3

The reassembling of the delegates last night, appointed for seven o'clock, was delayed till about half-past eight in consequence of some members arriving in the interval whose credentials required examination.

The report, which was read by *Ranvier*, the reporter appointed by the committee itself, recommended the congress to accept and pass fifty-seven credentials, reserving for discussion about eight or nine others.

Eccarius, London, proposed the adoption of the committee's recommendation.

Guillaume, Bakouninist, proposed that the names be taken *seriatim*, and every credential discussed.

Barry, London, supported the motion of *Eccarius*. If the proposal of *Guillaume* was adopted the whole matter would require to be gone over again, and the committee's work wasted.

Lafargue, Spain, proposed that the entire list be read over; that the uncontested credentials be passed, and those to which there were objections be challenged as they were read, and reserved for discussion.

After a good deal of animated debate, the motion of *Lafargue* was carried.

The reporter (*Ranvier*) then read the list, and each contested credential was challenged by the particular objector in the case, and a separate list made of these.

The sitting was then suspended till this morning.

About 10 a.m. to-day the sitting was resumed. The first contested mandate was that of *Vaillant*.

Sauva, America, who had challenged it, formally withdrew his opposition.

Guillaume, Bakouninist, denounced *Vaillant* as a Royalist and *bourgeois*.

Vaillant briefly replied, and the congress then accepted his credentials.

The mandate of Dereure, New York, was next opposed by *Sauva*,* but ultimately accepted by the Congress.

Sauva moved the rejection of the credentials of *Sorge*, New York; but, after hearing *Sorge*, the Congress passed them.

Sorge then opposed the admission of *Sauva*, who claimed to represent sections 29 and 42 of New York. These sections had not paid their contributions, and had seceded from the local federation.

Sauva's credentials were accepted.**

The next mandate, that of Paul Lafargue, furnished the battle of the day. This man had exposed and denounced Bakounine's secret organisation (L'Alliance) inside the International Society in Spain. For this he was illegally expelled, in his absence, from the federation of Madrid, and now these emissaries of Bakounine had the most imperative orders to prevent his admission if at all possible.

Morago, Bakouninist, violently attacked Lafargue, denouncing him as a traitor.

Lafargue replied, accusing the Bakouninists of treachery.

The excitement and tumult at this point were extraordinary. The Bakouninists, as Lafargue unfolded his evidence, rushing wildly about, shrieking and howling interruptions. One, *Cyrille*, presenting himself with his hat on before the President, gesticulated dramatically, and, shouting as if he would burst a blood-vessel, rushed out. Finding, however, that nobody followed him, he subsequently slunk in again.

Engels, London (Spanish secretary), said the question was really whether the International in Spain was to be either domineered over or disorganised by a secret irresponsible body. The society would not allow either consummation.

After some more very warm words, the credentials of Lafargue were accepted by an overwhelming majority.***

* Here the newspaper has "a Spanish delegate" instead of "*Sauva*".—*Ed.*

** The newspaper further has: "This division was a most remarkable one. The Blanquist members of the general council, who, with the Bakouninists, believe in secret societies, passed over in a body to the minority, thus securing *Sauva's* admission."—*Ed.*

*** The newspaper has here: "...in fact, unanimously, as the handful of Bakouninists, conscious of their impotence for voting purposes, abstained".—*Ed.*

The sitting was then (about half-past one) suspended till half-past three.

On reassembling the mandate of Barry was discussed.

Sauva opposed, as the section Barry represented (Section 3, of Chicago), was already represented by *Sorge*.

Sorge replied that that was not the case. He (*Sorge*) represented the federation of New York, while of the three sections in Chicago, each entitled to representation, Section 3 only was represented.

Mottershead, London, had nothing to say against Barry, nor yet the mandate, but he just wanted to ask a question, and that was, how Barry came to represent a German-speaking section in Chicago. He (*Mottershead*) asserted that Barry was not a recognised leader of English working men. Also, he had been expelled from the British Federal Council.

Marx said no fault had been found in Barry, and the validity of the mandate had not been contested. The question of fitness was one for the section making the appointment. As to the accusation that Barry was not a recognised leader of English working men, that was an honour, for almost every recognised leader of English working men was sold to Gladstone, Morley, Dilke, and others. In regard to the expulsion of Barry from the British Federal Council, every one knew all about that.

Barry's credentials were then accepted, with only three dissentients.

The mandate of *Alerini*, for Marseilles, was rejected.

Joukowski, Geneva, the Bakouninist delegate from that city, was refused recognition.

The credentials of four Spanish delegates—*Alerini*, *Morago*, *Farga*, and *Marselau*—were contested because the Spanish Federation had not paid their contributions to the General Council.

They offered an instalment of the Spanish contribution; the General Council withdrew its opposition to the Spanish delegates, and they were then admitted.

The Hague, September 4

My letter of yesterday closed with the admission of the four Spanish delegates on depositing with the president of the sitting, *Van den Abeele*, an instalment of the contribu-

tions which they owed to the General Council. This admission did not, in any way, prejudice the question of the Alliance. That will be treated separately on a motion which Marx will propose for their expulsion from the Association.

The next contested mandate was that of Section 2 of New York, held by Sauva.

Its rejection was moved by *the reporter*,* inasmuch as the section had been suspended by the Federal Council of New York.

Sauva, in reply, asserted that as the section had paid its contribution to the General Council, it was entitled to representation.

Dereure, New York, said the section had taken part in the American Congress, and afterwards repudiated the resolutions there passed. He thought, therefore, that they ought not to be considered members of the society at all.

Marx said the section had no legal existence. It had been turned out of the federation it belonged to, and since then it had not sought recognition by the General Council. It was, therefore, out of the International.**

After being opposed by *Sorge* and *Frankel*, the credentials of Section 2 were disallowed.

The sitting was then suspended till nine this morning.

The great American question was first on the programme, arising on the consideration of the mandate of Section 12 of New York, held by West.

A rule, submitted by *Engels*, had been laid down in one of the first sittings of the congress, to the effect that only four speakers—two for and two against—with five minutes each, should be allowed on each contested credential; but so important was the American question considered by the members of the General Council, and so anxious were they to afford Section 12 every opportunity of justification that the same delegate, *Engels*, proposed that for this case the aforesaid rule should be suspended. To this the congress assented.

* *Ranvier*.—*Ed*.

** The newspaper here reads: "*Marx* thought *Dereure* had proved too much. The fact of their admittance to participate in the meeting referred to showed that they were members, but the extinction of the autonomy of the section for misconduct was quite another matter. *Brismée*, Brussels, recommended the acceptance of the mandate."—*Ed*.

Marx, in the name of the Committee, himself conducted the case. He proposed the rejection of West's mandate for three reasons. Firstly, he (West) claimed to represent a suspended section. Secondly, he had participated in the Philadelphia Congress,⁷ which assembly had denied and disowned the authority of the General Council. And, thirdly, Section 12 had not paid its contributions. The whole question of the proper composition of the International, said Marx, would have to be considered in this case. Section 12 was well-known in America as an organisation got up primarily to forward the chances of Mrs. Victoria Woodhull for the Presidency of the United States of America; and, secondarily, to propagate those pet doctrines of her party, such as free love, spiritualism, &c. It was composed exclusively of bogus reformers, middle-class quacks, and trading politicians, and it denied the proposition laid down in the preamble to the general rules, that "the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves"; at least it interpreted it in such a way as to amount to a practical denial, for it said the meaning intended was that the working classes could not be emancipated against their own will, it even denied expressly that the International was a working men's organisation. When the division took place between the different sections in America, both appealed to the General Council. Section 12, moreover, privately applied to the General Council, asking to be allowed the lead of the movement in America. To these appeals the General Council replied, recommending union under one federal council, and that in future no section be formed which did not contain a proportion of at least two-thirds wage-paid labourers among its members. Section 12 not only disregarded these recommendations, but made the breach wider by setting forth this mongrel programme, and taking up a position of distinct hostility and rebellion towards the regularly constituted head of the association, the General Council. For these reasons he proposed that the delegation of Section 12 be not accepted.

West then rose. He began by saying that he was afraid he was already condemned, but he had come 4,000 miles just to tell the Congress the truth of the matter. There were three counts in the indictment against him, and to these he would

address himself *seriatim*. Dr. Marx had introduced much irrelevant matter, making foul accusations which he had no evidence to support. To these he would offer no reply. It was the custom in all countries where liberty existed for an accused person to be informed of the nature of the offence with which he was charged, and permitted to offer a defence before he was condemned. Neither of these conditions had been fulfilled in the case of Section 12. The first charge with which he (West) was assailed was that he was the delegate of a suspended section. It was quite true that he belonged to Section 12; he admitted it; he was proud of it. But Section 12 was illegally suspended; moreover, the suspension, granting its validity, only lasted till the meeting of the Congress. When the Congress assembled the suspension had expired, and the delegate of Section 12 was entitled to take his seat with the others. With respect to the second charge, he denied that the Philadelphia Congress had repudiated the General Council. All they had done was to refuse to support the Council in illegal measures; the legitimate and reasonable jurisdiction of the General Council had never been questioned. As to the third point, the contributions, he could only say that they were sent. True he had no receipts for them, and where the fault lay, or into whose hands the contributions fell, he could not tell, but that they were *sent* he was quite certain. These were the nominal and professed reasons for his rejection, but they were not the real ones. The hostility of the General Council to Section 12 was in consequence of its middle-class composition; because it had not bowed submissively to the despotic commands of the Council in respect of having two-thirds of its members wage-slaves; because its members, in their private capacity, held and advocated views outside the specific programme of the society, the section was to be cast out from the fold. West here entered upon that part of the question relating to Free Love, Woman's Rights, &c., and caused great merriment by his manner of treating it. "The preamble to the general rules lays down as the great aim of the society the emancipation of the working classes. Well, any emancipation of the working classes must comprehend the emancipation of working women. Sexual equality is the first step in the true path of

liberty. While women are enslaved, men will never be free. And why should the International bother itself about free love or social freedom? If a woman wished to change her husband and the other parties are agreeable I would like to know what right anybody else has to interfere. Would you pass a law forbidding a woman to have such a wish; and if you did, do you fancy you could enforce it?" As to the two-thirds idea, said West, that is a mistake. The best leaders are not the working men themselves, but those who, mixing more in intellectual society, see with a clearer eye the inequalities and vices of the present condition of things.

The foregoing is only a brief summary of West's speech. It lasted over an hour, some say an hour and a half. West, who is a little spare man, apparently about 50, with bald head, thin sharp features, peering eyes, and the usual American billy-goat beard, is in every way a representative Yankee. His delivery is spasmodic and gesticulatory, his voice rising and falling, now a shout, now a whisper, for all the world reminding one of a veritable Stiggins in the pulpit of an indubitable Bethel.

When we had recovered our composure, *Sorge*, of New York, replied, and in a dry, business-like manner he touched briefly upon all the irrelevant points of West's oration, demolishing each position as he slowly moved along. When West applied to have Section 12 recognised by the New York Council, he assured him (*Sorge*) that its members were all wage-paid workmen like himself (*West*). When they were going to be suspended, they were duly informed of the reasons and the fact beforehand, but refused to offer any explanation or defence. Instead of that they dragged the question of the dissensions into the public gaze, and paraded every little personal detail, however trivial or irrelevant, at their meetings and in their papers. But West himself, as if simply and insanely to show his capacity for double-dealing, came to him (*Sorge*), and privately assured him of his hostility to the Woodhull and Claflin party, at the same time making serious accusations against them. There was a man in that party called Elliot, who had made certain charges against him (*Sorge*). He wrote to Elliot undertaking to prove him a liar in five minutes before any committee of three, which

Elliot might himself appoint. To that he received no response. Woodhull and Claflin's lot (Section 12) were always trying to expose, by their foolish acts, to ridicule and discredit the real Internationalists in America. The French members, according to them, were all Communists (in the vulgar sense of the word), and the Germans Atheists. But they themselves, said Sorge, were all jobbers, loafers, and idlers, thorough Yankees in fact. Every one who knew anything about the character of the population of the United States knew that the working class there was composed of the following elements: first, the Irish; second, the Germans; third, the negroes; last of all came the native-born Yankees. Such being the case, the Irish were the most important element in any labour movement in America. Well, the Irish had a profound distrust of those classes, the middlemen, &c., represented by Section 12, and would not join with them for any purpose whatever. As to the contributions, said Sorge, in conclusion, "West's statement that they have been sent is mere assertion. Not only is there no evidence of the money being received, but there is no evidence of its having been sent".

After a few words from *Sauva* repeating some trivial things West had already treated us to, the credentials were rejected, 49 voting against, eight abstaining, and not one supporting. Approval of its action on the questions raised so unanimous and so thorough, exceeded the expectations of the General Council itself.

After this we were treated to a private letter, which Guillaume, one of the Bakouninists, had received from somebody somewhere.* It denounced Marx as a tyrant, and the members of the General Council as his servants. The only explanation of its production was that it served, counting its translation, to waste about an hour of the time of the Congress. These tactics were being pushed to such an extremity by the small knot of malcontents that a check was found to be absolutely necessary if the work of the

* This refers to Vespillier's letter. See *The Hague Congress of the First International. September 2-7, 1872. Minutes and Documents*, Moscow, 1976, pp. 50 and 137 (further referred to as *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*).—Ed.

Congress was to be got through by the appointed time. Irrelevant and disorderly speeches were frequently made, and when translations into English were requested we were told that what had been said was unimportant, irrelevant, &c., and consequently did not merit translation. To this we replied that that which was unworthy of translation ought not to be allowed expression, and appealed to the President to stop at the outset, all such interruptions to the business of the Congress.

The President promised compliance and did his best, but some members were literally unmanageable.

So Barry drew up the following formal protest, and having obtained the affixed signatures, handed it to the President, by whom it was read:

"To the President of the Congress,—We, the undersigned members of the Congress, protest against the manner in which the majority of the members of the Congress, themselves speaking other languages, disregard the simple rights of those members who only understand English. The difficulty, amounting almost to an impossibility, of obtaining a knowledge of the proceedings or a hearing of any question, renders our delegation a nullity and our presence a farce.—(Signed) *Barry, T. Roch, T. Mottershead, Sexton, J. P. M'Donnell.*"

Sexton said it was not so much the difficulty of knowing what was going on as the difficulty of obtaining the ear of the Congress. He had repeatedly sent up his name to the President when important questions were being discussed, but had not yet been afforded an opportunity of speaking.

The President explained that the close of the debate had always been demanded and declared before he got down to *Sexton's* name on his list; he disclaimed all partiality.

Barry was of opinion that against the President no charge of partiality was intended—certainly he made none. But what he did complain of was, as the protest set forth, the conduct of the majority of the members. The French-speaking members (and this term comprised the Spanish delegates) were always getting up and evading the rules of the Congress by pretending to rise to order, &c., making long speeches, and thus obstructing real business.

The subject then dropped, the good effect of the formal protest being very evident for some time after.

With the settlement of the American question the examination of credentials ceased. Other credentials besides those of Section 12 of New York (notably Section 2 of the same city) had been rejected, but as their holders all held other credentials, whose validity was allowed, West was the only individual rejected, he having no other mandate. As one looked up at him in the gallery to which he had been relegated, where he sat among the other non-delegate members of the society, looking wistfully down, one could not help a touch of pity for him in his long and fruitless errand.

The credentials being settled, the time had arrived for electing the President and other officers. The rule at these congresses is that the President of the local section presides till the credentials are examined, after which the Congress elects its own functionaries. In the present case Gerhard was consequently nominally President, but being a very quiet, diffident young man, he requested Henry Van den Abeele, of Antwerp, to officiate, while he (Gerhard) sat beside him.

The candidates were Ranvier, Sorge, Brismée, Dupont, and Gerhard. The greatest number of votes were recorded for Ranvier. After him, Brismée and Dupont were equal; but both of these, thinking perhaps that they ought to have been President, refused the post of Vice-President, whereupon Sorge and Gerhard accepted the office.

The various recording secretaries appointed were as follows:—For French, Le Moussu; English, J. P. M'Donnell; Spanish, Marselau; German, Hepner; Dutch, Van der Hout.

Kugelman (Germany) then moved a vote of thanks to the retiring President, which was cordially given and modestly acknowledged.

With this Wednesday's sitting ended.

On Thursday morning the public were admitted. The number measured by London audiences, was not large, but then the Hague has not a population of three and a half millions, and the meeting, it must be remembered, was held at ten o'clock in the forenoon, when working men are generally in their workshops.

As soon as some preliminaries had been got through, the President, *Ranvier*, delivered a short address. He sang the praises of sacred revolution in a high key, boasted of his delegation (section Ferré, of Paris) and urged the International to establish a permanent committee of barricades. I need not say that he was vehemently applauded.

After that came the following general report, written by Marx. It was read first in English by *Sexton*, next in French by *Longuet*, then in German by *Marx* himself, and finally in Flemish by *Van den Abeele*, and excited the greatest enthusiasm.*

"Citizens,—Since our last congress, two great wars have changed the face of Europe—the Franco-German war and the civil war in France. Both of these wars were preceded, accompanied, and followed up by a third war—the war against the International Working Men's Association.

"The Paris members of the International had told the French people publicly that voting the plebiscite was voting despotism at home and war abroad. Under the pretext of participation in a plot for the assassination of Louis Bonaparte, they were arrested on the eve of the plebiscite, on the 29th** April, 1870. Simultaneous arrests of Internationalists took place at Lyons, Rouen, Marseilles, Brest, and other towns. The men of the 4th of September published documentary evidence proving these facts. Ollivier, in a private circular, directly told his subordinates,

"The leaders of the International must be arrested, or else the voting of the plebiscite could not be satisfactorily proceeded with.'

"The plebiscite over, the men arrested were condemned simply on the ground of being Internationalists. Before war was declared the Internationalists, nothing daunted, denounced the intentions of the Government. They appealed to their 'brothers in Germany' to oppose the war in their country. That appeal was enthusiastically responded to, thus presenting a picture to the world unparalleled in history. This opens the vista of a brighter future. It proves that in contrast to old society, with its economical

* Below follows an incomplete text of the General Council's report to the Congress, sometimes freely rendered.—*Ed.*

** should read: 23rd.—*Ed.*

miseries and political delirium, a new society is springing up, whose international rule will be peace. The pioneer of that society is the International Working Men's Association.

"Up to the proclamation of the Republic the members of the Paris Federal Council remained in prison, while the other members were daily denounced to the mob as traitors in the pay of Prussia. With the capitulation of Sedan, when the Second Empire ended, as it had begun, by a parody, the Franco-German war entered upon its second phase. After the repeated solemn declarations to take up arms for the sole purpose of repelling foreign aggression, Prussia now dropped the mask and proclaimed a war of conquest. From that moment she found herself compelled not only to fight the Republic in France, but simultaneously the International in Germany. Immediately after the declaration of war the greater part of the territory of the North German Confederation—Hanover, Oldenburg, Hamburg, Brunswick, Schleswig-Holstein, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and the province of Prussia were placed in a state of siege. This was done nominally for protection from foreign invasion, but was used only against the Internationals in Germany. On the 5th September the Brunswick Central Committee of the German International issued a manifesto calling upon the people to oppose by all the means in their power the dismemberment of France. The manifesto denounced the proposed annexation of Alsace and Lorraine as a crime tending to transform all Germany into a Prussian barracks, and to establish war as a permanent European institution. On the 9th September, by order of Vogel Von Falkenstein, the members who issued that manifesto were arrested and marched off, a distance of 600 miles, to Lötzen, a Prussian fortress on the Russian frontier, where their ignominious treatment was to serve as a foil to the ostentatious feasting at Wilhelmshöhe. As the International continued to extend, despite the incessant persecutions to which its members were subjected, Falkenstein issued an ukase of September 21, interdicting all meetings. Leaving the cares of the war abroad to Moltke, William of Prussia directed that at home. By his personal order of October 17, Vogel Von Falkenstein was to send his Lötzen captives to the Brunswick district tribunal the which on its part was to find

grounds for their legal durance, or, failing that, return them to the safe keeping of the dread general.

"Falkenstein's proceedings were imitated in various parts of Germany, while Bismarck, in a diplomatic circular, mocked Europe by standing forth as the indignant champion of free speech, a free press, and free meetings on the part of the peace party in France. He imprisoned Bebel and Liebknecht, the representatives of the International in the German Parliament, to get them out of the way during the impending general election. His master supported him by prolonging the state of siege in Germany over the whole of the election period—in fact, for two months after the conclusion of peace with France. The stubbornness with which he was insisting upon the state of war at home proves the awe in which he, amidst the din of victorious arms, and the frantic cheers of the whole middle class, held the rising party of the Proletariat. It was the involuntary homage paid by physical force to moral power.

"On the 6th June, 1871, Jules Favre issued a circular to the foreign powers demanding the extradition of the refugees of the Commune as common criminals, and a general crusade against the International as the enemy of family, religion, order, and property, so adequately represented in his own person. Austria and Hungary caught the cue at once. On the 13th June a raid was made on the reputed leaders of the Pesth Working Men's Union; their papers were sequestered, their persons seized, and proceedings instituted against them for high treason. Several delegates of the Vienna International happening to be on a visit at Pesth were carried off to Vienna, there to undergo similar treatment. Beust asked and received from his parliament a supplementary vote of £ 30,000

"'on behalf of expenses for political information that had become more than ever indispensable through the dangerous spread of the International all over Europe'.

"In its last agonies the Austrian government anxiously clings to its old privilege of playing the Don Quixote of European reaction. On the 27th November, 1871, judgment was passed upon the members of the Brunswick Committee, being sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. At

Pesth the prisoners belonging to the Working Men's Union, after having undergone for nearly a year a treatment as infamous as that inflicted upon the Fenians by the British Government, were brought up for judgment on the 22nd April, 1872. In spite, however, of the appeal of the public prosecutor, the Court acquitted them. At Leipzig, on the 27th March, 1872, Bebel and Liebknecht were sentenced to two years' imprisonment in a fortress for attempted high treason. His Holiness Pope Pius IX said in an allocution to a deputation of Swiss Catholics,

"Your government, which is Republican, thinks itself bound to make a heavy sacrifice for what is called liberty, and it affords an asylum to a goodly number of individuals of the worst character. It tolerates that sect of the International which desires to treat all Europe as it has treated Paris. These gentlemen of the International, who are no gentlemen, are to be feared because they work for the account of the everlasting enemy of God and mankind. What is to be gained by protecting them? One must pray for them."

"Hang them first and pray for them afterwards."

"Supported by Bismarck, Beust, and Stieber, the Emperors of Austria and Germany met at Salzburg in the beginning of September, 1871, for the ostensible purpose of founding a Holy Alliance against the International Working Men's Association.

"Such an European alliance," declared the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Bismarck's private *Moniteur*, 'is the only possible salvation of State, Church, property, civilization—in one word, of everything that constitutes European states.'

"Bismarck's real object, of course, was to prepare alliances for an impending war with Russia, and the International was held up to Austria as the red rag. Lanza suppressed the International in Italy by simple decree. Sagasta declared it an outlaw in Spain. Russia found the general hue and cry a pretext for reaction. The Republican government of Switzerland itself has only been prevented by the agitation of the Swiss Internationalists from handing up to Thiers refugees of the Commune. Finally, the government of Mr. Gladstone, unable to act in Great Britain, set forth its good intentions by the police terrorism exercised in Ireland against our sections then in course of formation, and by ordering its representatives abroad to collect information

with respect to the International Working Men's Association. But all the measures of repression which the combined government intellect of Europe was capable of devising vanish into nothing when compared with the war of calumny undertaken by the lying power of the civilized world. Apocryphal histories and mysteries of the International, shameless forgeries of public documents and private letters, sensational telegrams followed each other in rapid succession; all the sluices of slander at the disposal of the venal respectable press were opened at once to set free a deluge of infamy in which to drown the execrated foe. When the great conflagration took place at Chicago, the telegraph, round the globe, announced it as the infernal deed of the International, and it is really wonderful that to its demoniacal agency has not been attributed the hurricane that ravaged the West Indies. Since the congress of Basle, in 1871,* the International has been extended to the Irish in England and to Ireland itself, to Scotland, Holland, Denmark, and Portugal; it has been firmly organised in the United States, and has established ramifications in Buenos Aires, Australia, and New Zealand. The difference between a working class without an International and a working class with an International becomes most evident if we look back to the period of 1848. Years were required for the working class itself to recognise the insurrection of June, 1848, as the work of its own vanguard. The Paris Commune was at once acclaimed by the universal Proletariat. Again, the delegates of the working class meet to strengthen the militant organisation of a society aiming at the emancipation of labour and at the extinction of national feuds. Almost at the same moment there met at Berlin the crowned dignitaries of the Old World in order to forge new chains and to hatch new wars."

The Hague, September 7

After the reading of the report Thursday's sitting ended. But before the public retired an incident occurred which I must mention, because of its sequence.

* should read: 1869.—Ed.

Cuno, addressing the gallery, said if Herr Schramm, Prussian Consul at Milan, was present, he would confer a favour on him (*Cuno*) by coming forward and showing himself. Otherwise he (*Cuno*) would brand him as a coward. This caused considerable tumult and excitement, but Schramm could not be seen anywhere; order was soon restored. On the following day, however, in the middle of our administrative sitting, Schramm forced his way past doorkeepers and landlord, and stood before us. He is a big, stout man, middle-aged, with typical German face, and the inevitable spectacles. He seemed terribly frightened, and spoke very loudly and rapidly. He said he chanced to be in the Hague just then, and had seen in the *Dagblad* that he had been denounced by *Cuno*, and condemned to death by the society. He was not afraid of death; he had fought before, and would fight again if necessary. But he wished to know what he had done to call down the condemnation of the International, and seeing Marx, he came forward, held out his hand, and appealed to him to clear his character before the congress. Meantime all the delegates had sprung up to their feet, and a Babel of voices ensued. *Marx* shook hands with Schramm, and told him there was a mistake somewhere; there was no condemnation to death. Ultimately *Cuno* and Schramm went out together.

Before the close of the sitting *Cuno* returned and read to the congress a declaration, written and signed by Schramm, condemning and disavowing the conduct of which *Cuno* complained, and acknowledging the justice of *Cuno's* indignation. *Cuno* also read a declaration, written and signed by himself, expressing his conviction that Schramm was innocent of the matter.*

I took an early opportunity of ascertaining from *Cuno* the particulars of the case, and they are as follows:—*Cuno*, a German engineer employed at Milan, was very active in the International movement there, on which account the Italian government arrested him and seized his papers and his money. He was subjected to the most brutal and infamous treatment, and after a month's detention brought in

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 82, 158, 278-79, and this volume, pp. 611 and 629-30.—*Ed.*

chains to the frontier and handed over to the Austrian authorities, who escorted him to the Bavarian frontier where at last he was set at liberty. While in prison he consulted the Milan directory and finding Schramm therein described as Prussian Consul, wrote requesting him to demand the restoration of his money and papers. To this and other succeeding similar requests, Cuno received no reply. Schramm now explained that at that time he was no longer Prussian Consul and absent from Milan, but declared that Cuno's letters ought to have been handed over to his successor, and that Cuno was perfectly justified in his indignation at the shameful treatment he received and at the inaction of his Consulate. It seems Schramm was one of the leaders of the Revolution of 1848; but in 1866, after Sadowa, Bismarck wanted as many old revolutionists as he could get, in order to help him in his manipulation of the people, and Schramm was afterwards Bismarck's consul at Milan.

I think I forgot to tell you that on Wednesday *Marx* asked for a commission of five to inquire into the secret "Alliance". He said he would prefer this course, as the papers were so voluminous and various that if laid before the whole congress they would never get through their discussion.

Guillaume (Bakounist) assented to *Marx's* proposal for a commission, but thought that it ought to comprise some members of the accused party.

Sauva differed from *Guillaume*. The commission ought to be composed entirely of neutrals.

Sauva's opinion was that of the General Council itself, as briefly expressed by one or two of its principal members, and a commission, fully embodying the principle, was at once appointed. It consists of Cuno, Spingard, Lucain, Walter, and Vichard. This commission is carrying on its labours in the intervals between the sittings, and will lay its report before the congress as soon as all the evidence is examined, and then *Marx* will propose its expulsion from the society.

There is a *sanctum* and a *sanctum sanctorum* in this "Alliance". Bakounine does not initiate all his disciples—in fact, only a few—into the innermost mysteries of the system he has devised. All his men at the congress assert that it was dissolved some time ago, which dissolution *Marx* declares

to have been a sham for the purpose of foiling the hunt. We await eagerly the report of the commission.

My friends of Saturday night, the secretary to the States Council of Holland and his companion, undaunted by their failure upon that occasion, tried their luck at our hotel the other night. A number of us were sitting round the table at supper, when they dropped in quite innocently, and ordering some refreshment, sat down at our table. I whispered to Marx, who sat next me, who and what they were, and passed the word round to prevent an unguarded expression. By and bye the secretary addressed himself to Marx, approaching him, as he no doubt supposed, on his weak side, by talking solely about Marx's great book on political economy, on which he has been engaged twenty-five years, and which was published in Germany in 1867, and is now being published in French. But the secretary is welcome to all he got out of Marx. His companion, recognising me, began to assure me that he had been misrepresented and traduced, but I pretended not to understand him (this was perfectly justifiable, his English was so atrocious), and went out with some others for a walk, in the course of which we were overtaken, passed, and repassed, by these two industriously inquiring young men. These are representative men. The manner in which Marx is pestered by requests for interviews from people of all countries and politics is perfectly ludicrous.

On reassembling yesterday morning a request was handed in from the Spanish delegates, asking the congress to devise some means whereby they might escape from the trammels imposed upon them. They said they were bound by an imperative mandate to abstain entirely from voting on any question whatever, until a new mode of taking the votes, proposed by their constituents, had been adopted by the congress, and they besought the congress to free them.

Engels said it was most remarkable to find men coming to a congress with their hands tied. These men had received their credentials from one source and their orders from another, and it was mere childishness to ask the congress to deliver them from authority which they had voluntarily sought and accepted.

An official communication was received from the section at Amsterdam inviting the members of the congress to a public meeting in that city on Sunday. This invitation was, after some conversation, accepted, and the section thanked by *the president* in the name of the congress.

The alterations in the general statutes proposed by the general council were then discussed.

The council proposed that Article 2 should declare that "The general council is bound to execute the resolutions of the congresses, and enforce upon all branches, sections, or federations strict observance of all the rules and regulations of the society." Article 6, as revised, declares, "The general council shall have power to suspend any branch, section, or federation till the following congress. Nevertheless, where federal councils exist, it shall be the duty of the general council to consult the same. Where a whole federation is suspended the general council shall apprise all the sections in the various countries of the same, and should a majority of the sections require it, the general council shall, within thirty days, convoke an extraordinary conference, consisting of one delegate from each nationality, to consider the question. And where a federal council is dissolved, any new federal council intended to replace it must be established within thirty days of said dissolution."

Brismée (Brussels) led off the attack. There were, he said, seven Belgian delegates in the congress. Some of these desired the total abolition of a general council, thinking the sections and federations could best do their work free from all interference whatever. Others wished to see the powers of the council diminished. None would agree to a continuance, much less such an increase as was proposed, of its authority.

Longuet (London) did not think the general council ought to exercise the functions of a government, but he did think it was necessary to have a central authority, empowered to mediate, and, if necessary, arbitrate, whenever and wherever dissensions arose.

Guillaume said they all understood each other; discussion was useless. The majority were there with matured plans, and it was idle to oppose them.

Serrailier (London) said such a taunt was unfortunate in the mouth of a delegate whose course was marked out

for him, and whose hands were tied by an imperative, an irrational mandate. It was the simple duty of the council to mature their plans before submitting them to the congress. Each delegate of the majority was free to follow, upon each question, the dictates of reason and conscience, and was not, as he (Guillaume) was, the supple tool of an unseen and irresponsible power. These abstentionists maintained that the International did not exist in France. He, as French secretary, had the written proofs with him that not only did it exist, but that it was fully organised in thirty out of the eighty-six departments of the country, and was, in fact, now stronger than it had ever been before. This speech was loudly cheered.

Morago (Bakouninist) protested against the interference of the general council with the sections.

Lafargue denounced the minority as obstructive and tyrannical.

The division on Article 2 was then called, with the following result:—Ayes, 44; Noes, 5; Abstentionists, 11. The article was therefore adopted.

In support of Article 6, as revised, *Marx* spoke next. He said—"The congress would understand that the general council, of which I am now speaking, and for which the increased powers are asked, is not the old council. That council's tenure of office expired simultaneously with the assembling of the congress. The council of which I now speak is that one whose election for 1872-3 will be one of your duties before you separate. Some have urged that the general council's powers should be reduced to being merely a centre of communication. Others recommend its abolition. Of the two the latter is to my mind preferable. It is, at least, logical; the other is both illogical and silly. You would constitute the council a letter-box where no letter-box was required, thus involving unnecessary expense, for what would be more simple and natural than for the sections and federations to correspond with each other direct; why pass the letters through the mechanical letter-box? If an attempt was made to conduct the affairs of the association in that way the result would be that the association would get into the hands of irresponsible men—the journalists; for every one knows that the association has

newspapers in all countries and in all languages, and it is clear that these papers would be able to communicate all International news quicker than this could be done by voluminous letters which the working men have not always the time to write. Thus there would be a letter-box but no letters at all, or only such containing stale news; the power taken from the responsible general council would pass over to the hands of the irresponsible journalists. We have been asked to limit the suspensory power of the council to foreseen and specified cases. That is impossible; it is just for the unforeseen that we most require provision. There are some who chafe under the authority of the general council, who nevertheless reveal their love of subjection by embracing a jurisdiction that is both illegal and immoral. Let them remember that the power of the general council of the International is not one of arms, of soldiers, nor the law. It is a moral power which shall increase in proportion as it retains the confidence of the members of the association,* with that confidence the council will be strong; without it, it will be powerless, even if you armed it with the most despotic attribute.

After some unimportant remarks by sundry delegates the article was adopted—Ayes, 36; Noes, 6; Abstentionists, 15.

The Hague, September 9

After the adoption of the two articles in their revised form there was a slight pause. It was the lull before the storm. Knowing what was coming, and whom it would most affect, I stood up and watched the operation.

Up got *Engels*, Marx's right hand, and said he would make a communication to the Congress. It was a recommendation from a number of members of the general council respecting the seat of the council for the next year. "Between two and three years ago before the Franco-German war broke out, Marx proposed to the general council the removal of

* This sentence in the newspaper reads: "It is a moral power, which shall increase in proportion to its morality, but which whenever it becomes immoral shall assuredly come to an end."—*Ed.*

its seat to Brussels. To this some members objected, and the federations being asked for an opinion on the matter, the unanimous reply was, 'Stay in London'. There certainly were many reasons, and good ones, for staying. London was, undoubtedly, the only place in Europe where the papers of the society were safe. London, moreover, possessed in its working population greater diversity of nationalities than any other town. This last peculiarity resulted in a truly international composition of the general council. If any one was led to suppose that there had been no discussions and conflicts in the council itself he would be in error. There had been almost all shades of socialist opinions represented in it, and the debates had, at times, been quite as excited as those of the present Congress. Moreover, its members had been so numerous that the council, from a mere administrative and executive body, had sometimes degenerated into a parliamentary assembly. This was especially the case when, after the defeat of the Commune, there was a very large addition of French members. Therefore, the number of the members of the council ought to be limited, and it was proposed to limit it to fifteen. Then, as to the seat of the future council, the continent of Europe is still out of the question. The delegates who have signed this recommendation have come to the conclusion that the interests of the association require the removal of the seat of the council, at least for one year, from London; and taking into account the considerations I have enumerated, they recommend New York."

Consternation and discomfiture stood plainly written on the faces of the party of dissension as he uttered the last words.

"New York," proceeded Engels, "furnishes the elements of safety and cosmopolitanism possessed by London, and if not in the same degree, at least more approximately than any other place. In going to New York the authority of the general council is not going into the hands of untried men. Although not long in the work, the members there show a capacity and a zeal which amply warrant us in trusting them. The recommendation is signed—Marx, Engels, M'Donnell, Sexton, Longuet, Lessner, Le Moussu, Serraillier, and Barry, members of general council."

It was some time before any one rose to speak. It was a *coup d'état*, and each one looked to his neighbour to break the spell.

At length *Vaillant* rose. He is an extreme Blanquist, and a member of the late general council. He opposed the change. "The International," he said, "had prospered exceedingly under its present leaders, and why should they be changed, even for a year? The appropriate place for the general council was close to the field of battle—France and Germany. If it were moved across the Atlantic its influence in Europe would be lessened. Moreover, there were dissensions in New York as well as in London (as had been amply demonstrated at that very Congress), and what security had the leaders of the society that the natural enemies of the people, the *bourgeois*, which swarmed so abundantly in that country, would not ultimately succeed in gaining possession of the government of the movement, when all hope of the emancipation of the proletariat would be lost. He besought those whose leadership had made the International Society the dread of kings and emperors, to continue their great sacrifices for the cause, sacrifices which, ere long, would surely be crowned with success."

Vaillant was followed by *Sauva*.

Sauva, who lives in New York, had no objection to the transfer of the seat of the general council to that city, but he would like the Congress to elect all the members itself, instead of appointing only a portion and leaving to it the filling up of the remainder.

I forgot to mention that, besides determining the seat of the council for next year, the proposition suggested that out of the fifteen members eight should be elected by the Congress, these eight to choose the other seven themselves.

Serraillier said the recommendation included three questions, which had better be discussed and voted upon separately. He suggested that they consider—first, should the seat of the council be removed from London; second, to where; and third, the composition of the council.

This was discredited by *Wilmot*, who endeavoured to show the Congress that, if it settled the second point, it settled the first at the same time. He therefore moved as

an amendment that the questions be divided into two instead of three.

But the Congress had been so thoroughly worried and badgered by idle obstruction that it would not listen to Wilmot's hairsplitting, as it evidently thought it to be, and overwhelmingly voted him a bore, and his amendment a nuisance.

The roll was then called upon the question—Should the council be removed from London? with the following result:—Ayes, 26; Noes, 23; Abstentionists, 9.

The astonishing number of noes represents Marx's oldest and most devoted followers, men who believe that his personal supervision and direction is absolutely essential. So strong is their conviction on this point that they broke away from his lead in this case, and tried to outvote him. The Ayes, for the same reasons, include a number of his enemies.

Marselau (Bakouninist) said he had been pained to hear some members laugh when he and his fellow-abstentionists answered "Abstain". They did not abstain from choice, but because of their imperative mandate, which strictly prohibited them from voting. It was, under these circumstances, he thought, unbrotherly to laugh at them, and he begged that it might not be continued.

This man, *Marselau*, seemed quite different from his companions; serious, conscientious, and quiet, he impressed one, if only by contrast, very favourably.

We then proceeded to fix upon a place to which the seat of the general council should be moved.

But before this could be done, *Johannard* wished to speak, protesting that the subject had not been sufficiently discussed.

The *President* pointed out that the discussion had been formally closed, but *Johannard* is not easily controlled. By-and-bye he consented to resume his seat, handing up to the President a brief speech in writing, to the effect that removal to New York would look like flight.

Undaunted by this dreadful contingency, the Congress voted—New York, 31; London, 14; Brussels, 1; Barcelona, 1; Abstentionists, 11. This division shows that the question of removal once decided in the affirmative, those who had

opposed it now voted for New York; in other words, if not London, then New York.

The sitting was then suspended till six in the evening, when the public were admitted. If any one was dissatisfied with the numbers of the first public meeting, there was, assuredly, no room for such feelings on Friday evening. An immense crowd blocked the street outside, making the ingress of members a work of no slight difficulty; and whenever the doors were opened it poured in like a flood. Soon every available spot was occupied, and some even that could not legitimately be expected to afford accommodation. Window-sills were not despised, and some lads clustered round the supporting iron pillars. The galleries also were crammed to suffocation. In the course of the evening the crowd in the body of the hall had so increased that its front rank was forced upon the barrier, which had to be shifted several yards forward.

Preliminaries over, *Van der Hout*, a member of a Dutch section, obtained permission to address the public upon a special question.

He is a young man, of, perhaps, twenty-five or thirty, with nothing remarkable about him but a good loud voice and a free action when speaking. The *Dagblad*, he said, the organ of the government of Holland, had printed that morning a shameful and scurrilous article on the meeting of the preceding day. It said that the delegates looked and smelt of blood—that they were an ill-looking, unwashed, badly-clad rabble. It did not even keep its ribald tongue off the three ladies present amongst the delegates (Mrs. Marx, her daughter, Madame Lafargue, and another delegate's wife), but called them *tricoteuses*.* The people of Holland, he said, knew the value which properly attached to anything the *Dagblad* said, but he thought it was their duty towards the men so foully aspersed and so shamelessly misrepresented to express that night, publicly, their repudiation of the *Dagblad* as the exponent of their views, and their contempt for its unscrupulous falsehoods. Pointing to the delegates, he asked if even in the outward description of these men

* *Tricoteuses*—knitting women—was a name given by the reactionary press to women of the people who attended revolutionary clubs.—*Ed.*

the *Dagblad* did not stand convicted of a misrepresentation which would be abominable if it was not ridiculous. The timeserving, unprincipled sycophancy of the *Dagblad* would be remembered by the people of Holland long after the delegates of the International Congress had returned to their homes.

This oration (for I can call it nothing else) was delivered with great fire and vigour, and evoked the most intense enthusiasm on the part of the audience, who interrupted the orator, from time to time, with great shouts of applause.

After this the two declarations of *Cuno* and *Schramm* were read to the people.

Then several delegates, including *Guillaume*, *Vaillant*, and *Longuet*, discussed the question of the political action of the working class, but nothing new or worthy of record was said. At the end an unseemly altercation arose between the president (Ranvier) and *Johannard*.

Johannard insisted on making a speech, and although *Ranvier* reminded him that all those had spoken whose names were inscribed for that purpose on his list, he would and did speak, amid the humiliation of the president, the irritation of the delegates, and the jeers of the audience, which, like all audiences, quickly showed its appreciation of the ludicrous. When he had done some reactionary, in the gallery started the Dutch national air, and, the humour being on them, the bulk of the audience caught it up instantly. To make matters worse, *Johannard*, of whom the audience had had enough, got on to a table, and, aided by a few feeble voices near him, attempted the *Marseillaise*. Of course this challenge was answered in such style as to literally drown him and cause an ignominious descent from his "bad eminence". The mob, now thoroughly roused, surged and roared at us, and we had enough to do to get out.

Next morning (Saturday) a considerable number of delegates left the Hague. Some went to a congress which was to open on Monday at Mayence⁸; others returned, for personal reasons, home to London. The last-mentioned batch comprised *Ranvier*, *Cournet*, *Roach*, *Vaillant*, *Sexton*, *Les-sner*, and *Arnould*. A number of these, before departing, left in writing their vote upon the composition of the new General Council.

There are three parties in New York—the federal council party, the opposition, and the go-between. The first of these, the really popular section, is the one into whose hands the old General Council proposed to pass its power. This party is represented in the Congress by Sorge, and if it possesses one or two more men like him the affairs of the Association will not suffer mismanagement in consequence of the incapacity of its officers. When the approved list was proposed, a hot and angry discussion ensued. Now were linked together all the previously discordant elements of opposition. The Spaniards were more riotously obstructive than ever. The two or three discontented Englishmen who, for their own purposes, wished the Council to remain in London, thought they descried an opportunity of virtually reversing the previous decision of the Congress on that question. And, most curious of all, at least to those who did not know the men, was the spectacle of Dereure, the whimsical and erratic, leagued for once, with the implacable and irreconcilable Sauva in support of a counter "ticket" which comprised both their own names! But all this motley combination was unable to do more than postpone, while they spoke, the action resolved upon. The federal council list was voted almost intact; the only alteration being the elimination of two of the least important names, and the substitution, therefore, of Dereure and another, Sauva being peremptorily rejected.

On the motion of Marx it was agreed that the federation, instead of those members of the General Council now elected, as at first proposed, should appoint the remainder of the number (15) specified.

In the evening the Commission appointed to inquire into the secret "Alliance" brought up its report. The evidence of its existence was overwhelmingly conclusive. The documentary proofs submitted by Marx and Engels left no room for further doubt. Even those members of the Commission friendly to the parties implicated acknowledged the completeness of the evidence. Those members of the Alliance, such as Marselau, who honestly believed it to have been dissolved, were let off on a formal renunciation of it and its chief; but with respect to three, Schwitzguébel, Bakounine, and Guillaume, the Committee proposed their expulsion

from the Association. The vote was taken. Bakounine and Guillaume were cast out, but Schwitzguébel, about whom some members were in doubt, escaped by the skin of his teeth. So ends a great conspiracy. Unmolested, it would have diverted and broken the course of the International. The ability and persistency with which it was devised and propagated have only been excelled by the power that crushed it.

The next morning (Sunday) we went to Amsterdam to partake of the hospitality of our friends there. Congratulatory speeches were made by *Marx*, *Sorge*, *Longuet*, *Lafargue*, and *Serraillier*. There was some carping amongst the Adullamites, because they were not allowed an opportunity of showing the good people of Amsterdam that there were some details on which there was a difference of opinion. But their complaints were addressed to unsympathetic ears. The meeting at Amsterdam was a great success, the people listening eagerly to the enunciation of the principles of the International, and responding enthusiastically to Marx's invitation to membership.

There is nothing more to be recorded. The Congress, which has just ended, has been both eventful and significant. In degree of importance, after the intensely satisfactory spread of the propaganda reported in the branches and sections everywhere, comes the increase of the powers of the General Council, and removal of its seat to New York, and the extinction of Bakounine's secret alliance. Such a record is one of which the late General Council need not be ashamed. Of these the question which will probably most interest the English public is the removal from London of the General Council. This step was found absolutely necessary. The time and thought which the affairs of the General Council exacted of Marx, when added to his labours of translating the various editions of his great book, and general supervision of the Association, were found exhausting and injurious to his health. During the last year or so, since the accession to the Council of a number of "representative" Englishmen, it has taxed all his efforts (and these have sometimes failed) to keep the Council to its legitimate work. If he retired from the Council, and it still remained in London, it would be in great danger of falling into the hands of

men who would make it either a pothouse forum or an electioneering machine.

Marx is quite certain that somewhere, probably in the provinces, there are Englishmen, not only capable, but honest and well fitted to lead the movement in this country. In the course of a twelvemonth these men may come to the front; but meantime there is not a sufficient number of them in London to protect the organisation from "falling among thieves".

However, it is of little consequence where the General Council is. Given freedom of action its work will be done. The principles of the International are independent of geographical conditions; and these will guide the complex forces of the proletariat to their ultimate goal.*

Published in the *Standard*,
September 6, 7, 9, 10, 12
and 13, 1872 and in the
pamphlet *Report of the Fifth
Annual General Congress of the
International Working Men's
Association, held at the Hague,
Holland, September 2-9,
1872, London [1873]*

Printed according to the
pamphlet

* Then follows the full text of the Congress resolutions. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 282-91.—Ed.

REPORTS SENT TO *THE TIMES*
BY THE ENGLISH DELEGATE
J. G. ECCARIUS ⁹

The Hague, September 2

The good people of this courtly little town seem to be put rather out of the way, if not positively alarmed, at having the Internationals among them. Though the Government has resolved not to interfere with the Congress, the local papers have made a good deal of noise to terrify the people at the monsters they were to see in the first week of September, and accordingly they were on the tiptoe of expectation when the delegates arrived. The largest batch came from England, all by the same train, and they were followed through the streets wherever they went. What made matters worse was that the resident Internationals, who are very few in number, had either met with little success or been afraid to engage lodgings beforehand, and, in consequence of this, the delegates had to divide themselves into groups and travel the streets till they could find shelter, which, between want of a will and want of room to take them in, was no small difficulty. At every house where a stop was made the surrounding crowd quickly increased, but the guardians of the public peace, the policemen, took care that no harm was done. A few attempts were made at hissing, but they fell flat, and met with no response from the crowd. The game was ended at last by the delegates turning into a house and leaving their bags, and engaging guides to go in search of quarters by twos.

In the evening a rendezvous was held at the place where Congress holds its meetings, the Concordia Hall, Lange Lom-

bard Straat, 3d Afdeeling, between the delegates and the local members and friends.

☞ *The President of the Hague section** addressed the delegates in French, and bid them a hearty welcome on the hospitable soil of Holland. At a time when the Association was persecuted, prosecuted, and calumniated everywhere on the Continent of Europe, he was proud, as a Dutchman, to declare that the delegates of the proletarians of the world could find such a place as Holland where they could freely ventilate and deliberate upon their common grievances, and this not by virtue of any special grace or permission of the Ministry, but by virtue of the free laws of the land. Being rather inexperienced, never having attended a Congress himself, the President then invited some of the older delegates present to state how things had been managed at former Congresses, the reply to which was that the usual course had been, after the compliment of the reception and welcome expressed by the local members, to turn the night preceding the official opening of the Congress into a convivial meeting. This was approved by some, but not by all.

One of the young ones, who seems to have a deal of work in him, objected, and was of opinion that the fact of the night of the arrival of the delegates having always been turned into a convivial meeting was no reason why it should be done this time, as there was so much work to do. He therefore proposed that business should be proceeded with at once.

The first objection raised to this was that all the delegates had not yet arrived, and if anything was done it might have to be undone in the morning. The second objection was of greater weight. It was that the Congress had been convened for the second day of September and not for the first, and it was agreed that no business of any kind should be transacted, but that the delegates should assemble at 9 o'clock this morning.

At 9 o'clock this morning there was an immense crowd of women and children collected round the door of the Concordia Hall, interspersed with a few men, whom want of work more than curiosity had probably induced to come and stare at the delegates.

* Gerhard.—*Ed.*

The crowd pressed so close that several policemen were required to keep a passage along the wall on one side of the entrance to the hall, just sufficient for one man to go through at a time. This passage was left in such a way that the delegates had to walk all round the crowd outside to get to the entrance. The passage was left on the off side of the door, the side in the direction whence the delegates came being literally choked up. At noon the crowd had increased, but was still of the same character as in the morning. It consisted of women and children and a few men.

Half-a-dozen delegates, who wanted to buy postage stamps, on going towards the Post Office, were received with a loud cry of "*Lumpen-pack*" from the first-floor window of a respectable house in an adjoining street, but no further insult was offered. In another part of the town, however, a similar group, on the way to dinner, was hooted and hissed by a crowd following till the police dispersed the mob. In the evening the Lange Lombard Straat wore quite a martial aspect. At the corner of the street is a large prison in which both civil and military offenders are confined, and at the back of the premises, facing the Lange Lombard Straat, is a guardhouse where a goodly number of soldiers are always in attendance, and a row of polished muskets is bristling at the entrance. The whole street and the approaches to the street were full of soldiers, and in front of the Concordia Hall soldiers about four deep formed a passage through the crowd of women and children. To protect the delegates the Government has doubled the military and police force of the Hague while the Congress is in session. Some of the Continental delegates interpret this precaution as a provocation to riot, but there is not the slightest fear. The Dutch soldier and the policeman do not look daggers at you, like their *confrères* in the great Imperial cities; they are quiet, unassuming fellows. The difference between Holland and other places is that while the German and the French soldiers and policemen exercise the powers of masters of the people, the Dutch soldiers and policemen are the servants of the people and behave as such. The crowd in the Lange Lombard Straat is as good-natured as the soldiers and policemen who watch it, and consequently there is no cause for fear. What little hooting and hissing there has been was

amply atoned for by the crowd tonight, which cheered some of the more prominent members of the Congress on their approach to the Hall.

The more advanced portion of the Dutch workmen say that Holland is the China of Europe, a stagnant and stationary place, in which the work-people would rather lie down quietly and die than make a row and revolt when they are hard pressed for the means of subsistence; but they have every hope that the presence of the Internationals will wake them up and raise their energy.

The Congress was formally opened at 9 o'clock this morning, the *President of the local section* in the chair. There being present many members of the Association who were not delegates, besides reporters of the Press, it was proposed that all who were not delegates should leave the room and go into the gallery during the business connected with the verification of the credentials.

The proposition was carried against two.

The non-delegates having left the room, it was agreed that the Committee on Credentials should consist of seven members. About the composition of the Committee there was a difference of opinion. One side insisted that the members should be selected from among the delegates without any respect to nationality, while the other was bent upon having the different federations represented. The difference was very explicitly stated to be that taking the members of the Committee without any distinction of nationality presupposed that the Association was a unity directed by a central organ, while the system of electing according to sections and federations vindicated the sovereignty of the federations which co-operated in the common work of the Congress.

The proposition that the Committee be elected without distinction of nationality was carried by 48 against 11, three of the Spanish delegates abstaining. The reason of the abstention was stated to be a strict injunction from their constituents not to take part in the Congress unless the votes were taken by sections and federations, or in proportion to the numbers represented by the delegates. Until that question was decided they could not vote.

At noon the election of the Committee was completed, the credentials were handed in, and the meeting adjourned till 7 o'clock in the evening.

The report of the Committee in the evening was to the effect that the credentials of nearly 60 delegates were in order, while about half a dozen were contested on various grounds. The number of delegates representing the different countries were respectively—America five, Australia one, Belgium nine, Bohemia one, Denmark one, France nine, Germany 11, Holland three, Hungary one, Ireland one, Spain one (three being contested), and Switzerland six.

The delegates of the English sections are—Eccarius, West-end Bootclosers' Society; Hales, Hackney-road Branch of the International; Mottershead, Bethnal-green Branch; Roche, British Federal Council. The General Council is represented by Dr. Marx, General Wróblewski, Dr. Sexton, Cournet, Serrailier, and Dupont. Lessner represents the Londoner Arbeiter Verein, and P. M'Donnell the Irish sections. Barry, of London, represents a German section of Chicago, U. S., and all the delegates representing French sections are residents of London, exiled from France.

The list of delegates accepted by the Committee having been read, a proposition was carried that it should be read again, and that individuals challenged by any of the delegates should be set aside, those who were not objected to being put to the vote *en bloc*. In this way the credentials of 50 delegates were verified, and the *Chairman* declared the Congress open.

The discussion on the disputed credentials was postponed till the morning, and the meeting adjourned at 11 o'clock.

The Hague, September 4

The time has at last arrived when reporters and the public are to be admitted to see the International Working Men's Congress at work. Two days have been spent in deciding who was to be admitted as a delegate and who was not.

There is said to be a conspiracy at work against the General Council, both in the Old World and the New, and the contending parties are trying for mastership. The head of

that conspiracy is said to be the notorious Bakounine, who has established a secret Alliance, which works within the Association, against the London Council. It is alleged that proofs have been found to convict those who belong to it of treason against the Association, and a committee is to be appointed to inquire into the matter. This famous Alliance was launched three years ago at Geneva, and is said to extend over the Jura mountains, the South of France, Spain, and Italy. During the last two years it has constantly denounced the General Council as despotic and arbitrary, because it has endeavoured as much as possible to counteract this Alliance. Publicly its votaries advocate the sovereignty of the Federal Councils and the independence of the sections. An official document to unmask them, of more than 30 pages, has been published in French,¹⁰ but the Alliance continues to flourish, and is master of the Association in many places. In the Federal Council of Valencia the members of the Alliance are in the majority, and by a manoeuvre have succeeded in getting their men elected as delegates to the Congress. They were publicly denounced to the uninitiated members of the Association in a Madrid journal,* but it was too late. The document—an official document—in which they were denounced contains passages like the following¹¹:—

“The International recognizes but one kind of members, with equal rights and duties for all; the Alliance divides itself into two classes, the initiated and the profane, the latter destined to be led by the former by means of an organization, the existence of which they must ignore. The International requires its adherents to recognize truth, justice, and morality as the basis of their conduct towards all men; the Alliance imposes upon its adepts as their first duty to deceive the profane Internationals about the existence of the secret organization, about the motives and the aims of their words and deeds...

“It has been resolved to put a stop to their dark manoeuvres, and for this purpose the Council calls your attention to what it will present to the Congress of the Hague:—1. A list of all the members of the Alliance in

* *La Emancipación*.—Ed.

Spain, with a designation of the duties they discharge in the International. 2. An inquiry on your behalf about the character and the doings of the Alliance, as well as about its organization and ramifications in the interior of Spain. 3. A copy of your private circular of the 7th of July, 1872. 4. An explanation of the manner in which you reconcile your duty towards the International with the presence among you of three notorious members of the Alliance."

As a matter of course, each party has done its best to send delegates, and to send as many as possible. The Valencia delegates are proud of having belonged to the Alliance, but they stoutly deny its existence now, and maintain that it was dissolved last April. They say that it has been the harbinger of the International in Spain, and that but for the Alliance the society would never have obtained a footing there, but that it was dissolved when the International was strong enough to take care of itself.

But, besides those who are accused of belonging to the Alliance, there are other opponents of the Council. In America, notably at New York, there are three parties, a Council party, a hostile party, and a go-between party. Three sections adhering to the go-between party have sent a delegate* charged with special instructions to disturb the peace of the Congress by challenging all American credentials and playing the part of an obstructive generally.

To defeat opponents is, under such circumstances, but natural; and, as every vote tells, the fight has in the first instance commenced on the verification of credentials. Challenges and counter-challenges have been made wherever there was the slightest opening, and so two days have been spent before the Congress could enter upon the transaction of the business for which it was convened. The Opposition will have it that it is a packed Congress, and that bogus delegations have been manufactured to sustain the London Council against its enemies. I must say that the charge looks very suspiciously true, considering the large number of Council members representing sections abroad. One of the Council members presenting credentials from La

* Sauva,—*Ed.*

Chaux-de-Fonds, where the Alliance is strong, had nothing better to say when he was told that there was no section outside the Jura Federation than that he did not know whether there was a section or not—he had accepted the credentials to defend the *Federation Romande*, which holds with the London Council against the Jura Federation, which is heart and soul for Bakounine. Another suspicious case is that of an English Council member representing a German section in Chicago.* The American peace disturber challenged the validity of the delegation in a rather silly way, which the chief of the New York Council party** could easily turn to ridicule. Upon this an Englishman rose and pointedly asked how a man who had got into the Council by a side wind, and was not looked upon by English working men as a representative man, obtained German credentials from Chicago.

The reply of the defence was that the interrogator had no right to ask such a question. The question was not how the credentials were obtained or who obtained them, but whether the German section of Chicago had a right to issue them, and did issue them. As a retort it was added that not being an English working-man leader was all in the *mandataire's* favour, since the English working-men leaders were for the most part sold to the Gladstones and the Morleys, and instead of being an honour it was rather a disgrace to belong to them.***

To this a stout English voice shouted, "Your man is sold too." "I don't know that," rejoined the accuser; the reply was, "You ought to know, and you do know."

In the dispute between M. *Sauva* and Herr *Sorge*, of New York, the latter justified the charge that his Congress had passed a resolution to invite the sections to furnish credentials to well-known advocates of the cause of labour in Europe, to enable them to attend the Congress at the Hague to put down the opposition.

With all this fighting, however, only one delegate, William West, from Section 12, New York (Woodhull and Claflin's

* Barry.—*Ed.*

** Sorge.—*Ed.*

*** Summary of Marx's speech. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 37 and 124.—*Ed.*

section), has been unseated. Mr. West had come 3,000 miles to defend his section before the Congress, because it had been suspended by the General Council until the Congress. The reasons given by the Committee on Credentials for annulling his credentials were that he was accredited by a section which had been suspended till the Congress for raising issues foreign to the aims of the Association—to wit, Spiritualism, Free Love, and Women Suffrage. In the modification of this charge it was stated that, as long as three years ago, Mrs. Woodhull had agitated for the Presidency, and that she had joined the International only to use it for that purpose. The second charge was that Mr. West had been a delegate at the Philadelphia Congress,¹² which had repudiated the authority of the General Council; and the third, that he had been a member of the Spring-street Council, which had refused to pay contributions.

On the first charge Mr. West maintained that the section had only been suspended till the Congress, and that it had been illegally suspended. He denied that Section 12 had ever tried to make the foreign issues the programme of the International; but asked what right the Association had to trouble about the religious opinions of its members, and he wanted to know whether the Congress was ready to proclaim that the members of the International would not love their wives and live with them if they were not compelled by law. As to female suffrage, he maintained that, inasmuch as the emancipation of the working class was the aim of the International, women must be included, because the working women did belong to the working class. On the second charge, he said that the repudiation of the Philadelphia Congress only referred to arbitrary acts not based upon the rules or Congress resolutions, and the Council had been guilty of such acts. The sacred right of rebellion must be guarded, and it might become necessary to revolt against despotism in the International. On the third charge, he could only say that for the sake of peace and harmony he had been turned out of Spring-street, and that he knew only that Section 12 had paid the contributions.

Herr Sorge, in replying, showed that the people of Section 12 were middle-class reformers who only tried to profit by the workpeople. The great bulk of the workpeople in America

were Irish; then came the Germans, then the niggers. The natives did not work; they were speculators, making profit out of other people's labour. It was no use combining with them; they formed only a small part of the population. The great point was to get the Irish into the society, and they would not come as long as people of the sort of Section 12 were in the Association.

Before West's credentials were put to the vote a resolution was entertained to forbid the formation of *bourgeois* sections.* On being put to the vote some abstained, and had to give their reasons for it. One Englishman innocently stated that he had feared if the resolution were carried half the members of the General Council would be turned out for not being working men.

Mr. West's credentials were rejected by 49 against 9 abstentions and 8 absent; no one voted for him.

This closed the preliminaries and the morning sitting.

In the evening the officers of the Congress were appointed. Presidents and Vice-Presidents were balloted for at once, the highest number to be the President, the next two Vice-Presidents. Ranvier, delegate of Section Ferré, of Paris, polled 36, and therefore becomes President; Dupont, of London, and Gerhard, of the Hague, 27; Brismée, of Brussels, 26; Sorge, of New York, 25. Both Dupont and Brismée refused to accept, so the office of Vice-President devolved upon Gerhard and Sorge.

The unanimity which used to prevail at these Congresses has vanished. Elections and such like matters are settled at the Hôtel Pico, where Dr. Marx is to be seen, and at the Café National, where the Federalists talk matters over. The Pico ticket was Ranvier, Sorge, Gerhard; the Café National ticket was Brismée, Dupont, Gerhard. Dupont is neutral, but enjoys the confidence of the Opposition.

The German delegates then proposed that the seat of the General Council, election of the General Council, time and place of the next Congress, and the revision of so much of the rules as related to these should have precedence of other business, as they wanted to leave on Friday night.

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 51 and 137.—Ed.

After some speeches for and against, it was carried.*

It was then announced that the Congress should meet from 9 to 10 o'clock to-morrow morning in private to settle programme, order of the day, &c., and at 10 o'clock the public are to be admitted. It is suspected that as soon as the indispensables mentioned above are settled the French and German delegates will take French leave together.

The Hague, September 6

The Congress was attended by a crowded audience of visitors yesterday morning. At the hour of 10 the doors were opened, and after a few minutes' grace, to enable reporters and visitors to settle down in their places, the President, M. *Ranvier*, Delegate of Section Ferré, Paris, declared the meeting opened. He proceeded to say that the obstacles in the way of holding a Congress for the last two years had been the Franco-Prussian war, the events of Paris, and the persecutions and prosecutions following them. Men who had violated every rule of civilized government had after their triumph refused to accord to the vanquished the right of being treated as political offenders. They had been stigmatized as incendiaries and murderers, while the Versailles party were the men who had burnt the houses down over people's heads. However, they had found hospitality in England and Switzerland, whose Governments had refused to give up the Communal refugees as common criminals. The real criminals were Favre and Trochu. But all these things together had failed to impede the progress of the Association, which was, on the contrary, rapidly growing. The President then read a letter from the Amsterdam Section, inviting the members of the Congress to a convivial meeting on Sunday next.**

Dr. *Sexton*, of the General Council, was called upon to read the address of the General Council.*** The address recounted the deeds of the various Sections to oppose the *Plé-biscite*, the war, &c., and the prosecutions and persecutions

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 55 and 141-42.—*Ed.*

** *Ibid.*, p. 276.—*Ed.*

*** *Ibid.*, pp. 211-19.—*Ed.*

the Association had been subjected to since the Basle Congress, and mentioned that at this moment the three members¹³ were in consultation about further measures. The Continental Governments are sharply criticized for their wanton prosecutions—the high treason trials and condemnations in Germany to wit—and the British Prime Minister gets a cut for having called upon the British Consuls abroad to furnish information about the Association and for permitting police terrorism in Ireland in connexion with the Sections of Dublin and Cork.¹⁴ The Press is severely censured for the calumnies with which it has endeavoured to deluge the Association. The telegram sent round the world that the Association had set Chicago on fire is denounced as an “infamy that finds no parallel in history”. About the present state of the Association nothing is said beyond the announcement that Sections have been established among the Irish in England as well as in Ireland, and that in the United States the Association is firmly established. The closing words are, “Long live the International.”

Reading the address in four languages occupied upwards of two hours. M. *Longuet*, of Caen, Normandy, read it in French; Dr. *Marx* in German; and *Van den Abeele*, of Antwerp, in Flemish. To stand all this time packed as closely as herrings about ten deep subjected the visitors to a trial of patience. The great drawback for the visitors was the absence of a Flemish translation. *Van den Abeele* had to read from the French manuscript, translating as he went on, which was rather tedious, and by which intonation and emphasis, the necessary accompaniments of public reading, were lost.

*The President** called upon the Congress to show its sense of approbation or the contrary, and it was adopted by acclamation and cheers.

Brismée, of Brussels, proposed a resolution expressive of the sympathy and admiration felt by the representatives of the proletarians of the world for all who are now suffering in consequence of the part they have taken in the recent great struggles, and are at this moment in the clutches of the

* *Ranvier*.—*Ed.*

despotic Governments of France, Italy, Germany, and Denmark.*

It was carried by acclamation.

Herr *Sorge*, of New York, proposed that the proceedings should be suspended for 15 minutes, and that then the Congress should resume for a private meeting, and that another public meeting should be held at night.

Johannard, of London, objected. He was so fatigued that he could not stand it, and he thought there were others like him. He wanted an adjournment for an hour.

At this moment *Cuno*, a German engineer, who was lately expelled from Milan for being an Internationalist, and had to pay the expense of his police escort out of his own pocket, jumped up, and, addressing himself to the gallery, said something in Italian in a very excited manner. When he had done, the cry of "*Traduire!*" was raised, and he spoke as follows:—

"If a certain gentleman, by name Schramm, Imperial Consul for Germany at Milan, should happen to be in this room, he is requested at the close of the sitting to meet me at the door, otherwise I shall publicly call him a thief."

The incident caused a good deal of amusement and excitement, as possibly not more than about a dozen individuals in the room were privy to the relations between *Cuno* and His Imperial Majesty's Milan representative. Everybody looked to espy the Consul, but *Cuno* refrained from finger pointing.

The next thing was a letter of sympathy and congratulation from the Federal Congress of Geneva, which contained a few autograph lines from one of the Communal refugees at Geneva to his companions in arms who might be present at the Congress.**

It was then agreed to adjourn till 4 o'clock and meet publicly at that hour.

At the opening of the adjourned meeting, Vice-President *Sorge* communicated a letter from *Dietzgen* and *Scheu*, declaring that business had compelled them to depart, and

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 181-82.—*Ed.*

** *Ibid.*, pp. 271-72.—*Ed.*

expressing a hope that those left behind would make up for their absence by increased zeal and energy.*

The President read a letter of considerable length from Section Ferré, in which allusions were made to the differences existing in the ranks of the Internationalists and in which the names of Bakounine, Malon, Richard, and Caspar Blanc were mentioned.**

When translation was called for, *Wilmot*, of Normandy, objected that it contained only instructions of the Section to its Delegate Ranvier, and did not concern the Congress. If every Delegate were to read his instructions, and all were to be translated, it would take up the rest of the week. He moved that the Congress take no notice of it.

M. *Guillaume*, of Neuchâtel, said the letter had evidently been written by an honest man, but he had the bad taste of jumbling up the names of honourable men with dishonourable men. He protested against Bakounine and Malon being coupled with Richard and Blanc.

Longuet thought it would have been better if the letter had not been read, but having been read it ought to be translated in substance.

Amid some noise and confusion, which seems to be part and parcel of these Babylonian gatherings, something was read from the chair about proletarian representatives and repudiation of working men forming alliances with the *bourgeois* radicals.***

Before the affair could be made intelligible to all, *Dupont* rose to order. He said the regulations laid down by former Congresses provided that all communications should be entrusted to a committee, who should report once a day, and he moved that a committee be appointed at once.

The motion was carried, and a committee of seven was appointed.

The President then declared that the question on the order of the day was the General Council and its attributes.

* *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 147, 182.—*Ed.*

** *Ibid.*, pp. 237-41.—*Ed.*

*** The reference is to the address of Ed. Vaillant, Ant. Arnaud and others requesting the Congress to place the question of political activity of the working class on the order of the day of the next congress. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 183-85.—*Ed.*

Herman, of Liége, demanded *la parole*. He said that there existed a difference of opinion in the different countries where the International existed, and where the Federal Councils were completely organized as to the necessity of a General Council at all. It was held that the International correspondence might be carried on without the intervention of a central power. The Belgian Federation had discussed the question seriously, and the conclusion arrived at by all but two Sections was to preserve the General Council, but not as a Council invested with political authority. The Council ought to be elected by the Congress, and have no power to add to its numbers. Suppose 12 good men were elected, and some succeeded in adding six to back up a particular crotchet of theirs, the Council would become unworkable. The workpeople had great resistance to encounter from the capitalists in strikes and so forth, and it would not be well to have no central body, but its authoritative attributes ought to be diminished; it ought not to meddle with the internal affairs of the Federations.

Lafargue thought it useless to talk about the attributes of the General Council before it was settled whether there was to be a Council at all. He proposed that the existence of a General Council be put on the order of the day, because many delegates, the Valencia delegates to wit, had *mandats impératifs* on the question.

Dave, of the Hague, observed that the revision of the rules was on the order of the day, and that *Herman* had simply given information of what was going on in Belgium.

Longuet opposed *Lafargue*, who had misunderstood *Herman*. He proposed that the general discussion should proceed, and that two for and two against only should be allowed to speak.

Dupont insisted that the order of the day had been fixed the previous night, and no one had a right to speak to order and make new propositions. The limit of time was provided in the printed regulations. Every speaker was allowed to speak twice, ten minutes the first time and five minutes the second time, in reply to objections and observations.

The President said if there was no objection he should call on *Lafargue*, who would speak for the maintenance of the Council.

Lafargue said his instructions were printed in a newspaper, but it would take too long a time to read; he must therefore confine himself to a few points. The slavery of the working class consisted in their economical subjection to those who possessed the means of labour. To emancipate the working class completely required the transformation of the means of labour, which were now private, into common property. That meant the nationalization of the land and other changes necessary to place the means of labour at the disposal of the people. To accomplish this it was necessary that the workpeople should acquire political power and they must separate themselves completely from all other political parties. For the every-day struggle of labour against capital, an International Trades' combination was necessary, and for all this a directing central authority was required. If the General Council did not already exist, they would have to set to work to establish one. Without a General Council the Federal Councils would be left without control, and without Federal Councils the Sections would only become a disconnected multitude without any power. Even the Belgians could not do without a Federal Council to control the Local Councils, and these controlled the Sections. The General Council must be to the Federal Councils what these were to the Local Councils and Sections, it must have the relative powers reserved.

Guillaume was called upon to speak against. He said there were at this moment two strong currents of ideas running through the Association. One was that the International was the conception of some clever man with an infallible social and political theory, and the upholders of that theory went so far as to deny anybody the right to propagate another opinion. If a combination of a number of men, with an authoritative Central Council at the head, for the purpose of maintaining this orthodox idea was an International, they had one. But he and those who were on his side denied that the International was the conception of a brain. The idea of an International combination of labour was the out-growth of the economical conditions that surrounded us. Without these conditions no Council in the world whatever its attributes could produce the idea and fructify it; but if the conditions existed as they did exist, the tie of

union and combination existed, and it required no central head to organize it and guard it against heresy. If the Swiss had been left alone and not interfered with like the Belgians, they might probably have come to the same conclusion as the Belgians respecting the preservation of the General Council. An idea prevailed in several places that the General Council had made bad use of the power with which it had been invested. It had done so in Switzerland and America, and therefore it must be deprived of that power. If the General Council was preserved, it must not be preserved as an authoritative Council. As the great majority of the Belgians considered its maintenance necessary, it would no doubt remain, and he and his friends were willing to accept it, provided its attributes of authority were abolished and the Council converted into a central agency for communications, correspondence, statistics, &c. It was contended that the International was like an army, and an army could not be without a commander; it required a strong central body—a head.¹⁵

Now, the social and political struggle was an every-day struggle, and arose out of the every-day contest. The social struggle manifested itself in the strikes, the political struggle in Germany and other places in working men endeavouring to elect men of their own into Parliament. In France the political struggle manifested itself in revolutions. What use was the General Council in these? Did it go or send agents to build barricades, or canvass for votes? On the contrary, it would be repudiated if it tried to do anything of the sort. If a strike became for any reason necessary, did the General Council go to organize it or bring it about? No. The strike at Geneva had shown that it had been made without the Council, and the workmen had protested when the capitalists had reproached them with having received orders from London. The General Council had provided money by appealing to the London Unions; but for this no political authority was required, it required not even a General Council—a deputation, or an English Federal Council could have done the same. He spoke from experience, and his experience was that no General Council was necessary. It was not because there was a General Council that men combined; the General Council never did anything towards

it; it was only when the sections or societies had been already formed that the Council stepped in to regulate them. He concluded with the declaration that if an International combination was the product of a brain, no power in the world could make it succeed; if, on the other hand, it was necessitated by the surrounding conditions, it would succeed without a central power.

Sorge ridiculed *Guillaume's* experience in the Jura mountains, and asked what backers he had, and what army of workmen he had behind him. To the assertion that the General Council was of no use in strikes, *Sorge* pointed to the Paris bronze workers and the Newcastle engineers, who had applied to the General Council to help them.¹⁶ In America even workmen who did not trouble themselves about politics had found out that the General Council was of some use. When the Eight Hours Movement began last spring, the sewing-machine makers of New York came to the Council there and applied for the assistance of the General Council in London to stop the competition the American sewing-machine makers had to sustain against Scotland and Berlin. He insisted that the International was an army and could not be without a head, and a head with a good deal of brains in it. What would an organized body be without a head?—a creature of the lowest type of animal existence. He quoted an article in the New York Platform¹⁷ which could not be put in practice without a strong head, and he too had a *mandat impératif* to demand increased powers for the General Council, and a strong centralization for the International.

Morago, of Valencia, said his instructions were that the Council as it now existed should cease; that, if continued as a part of the Association, it should not have any power whatever over the Federal Councils or Sections, but should only be a central agency for collecting statistics and for correspondence. The feeling for the suppression of the General Council pervaded the whole Federation which he represented—they were unanimous. The General Council did nothing in organizing. The regional groups developed themselves in the regions as the Sections in the localities, without the aid of any central power; and to establish one over them to exercise authority would in his opinion be criminal. If the Congress would strip the General Council of its autho-

ritative attributes, the Spanish Federation would accept it whatever name might be given to it, but not otherwise. The Spanish delegation had imperative instructions to declare—that for them the General Council as it now was no longer existed.

Notwithstanding, however, all this manifestation of independence, the Federalists to-day betrayed their promises. After repeated declarations that they should consider the bond of union broken if the powers of the General Council were augmented, they are still undecided what to do, and continue to attend the meetings, to beat the wind and be outvoted. The Hôtel Pico is better led and better disciplined than the Café National. After the discussion in public last night on the attributes of the General Council, the Federalists, as well as other *profane* members, some of whom are old Council members, were surprised to hear this morning that the question with which the public had been amused in the evening had over night grown into such urgent importance that all else must be set aside to deal with it. The simple-minded people who have for the last 6 months prepared themselves to show cause to the assembled representatives of the proletariat of the world why no central despotism should be permitted in the International were outwitted. Pico had found that discussion would not improve its position, but that, on the contrary, it might lead to unfavourable opinions outside Schuyvers Jaal, and having a disciplined majority at command, which must reduce itself on the morrow for various reasons, the cardinal point was brought on this morning, the Federalists were defeated, and it serves them right.

At the Basle Congress it was Bakounine and his friends who insisted that the General Council must have the power to suspend sections till the next Congress, and, by getting that resolution passed and incorporated in the rules, Bakounine dug his own grave, for the new powers were used against him and his *Alliance* first. The Basle resolution hardly covers three lines of print, and is Art. 6 of the General Rules, as follows:—"The General Council has the right of suspending till the meeting of the next Congress any branch of the International." The rule has only been applied twice, once to turn Bakounine's *Alliance Internationale de la*

Démocratie Socialiste, the mother section of Geneva, out, and the second time to free the International from the pollution of spiritualists, free lovers, universal language fabricators, &c., all of whom are comprised in Section 12 of New York, Woodhull and Claflin's section.

But since the fall of the Commune the cancer of dissension has touched the core of the International. The French and the Germans, Democrats though they be, are like their masters, Thiers and Bismarck. Neither will tolerate difference of opinion, not to mention opposition, and as there is both difference of opinion on, and opposition to the authority of Dr. Marx wielded in the Council, there is no other remedy but to strike opponents down and kick them out. To do this increased power is required for the General Council—the sword of Dr. Marx.

Article 6 is accordingly amended. The amended version carried this morning amounts to this—The General Council has to watch the Federations and sections that they do not diverge from the true, but very narrow path of proletarian orthodoxy, and whenever they overstep the line, and do not immediately repent in sackcloth and ashes, the General Council has the right and the power to suspend them. The guarantees against abusing this power, guarantees proposed by those who ask for these arbitrary powers, are:—If a section makes itself disagreeable in any part of the world, the General Council suspends it, and if it should form part of a Federation, the Federation is notified of the fact, and the section has the right of appeal to the next Congress, like Section 12 of New York, who sent Citizen William West for that purpose, and with what result I have already communicated.

The new powers will enable the General Council to suspend Federal Councils, but the sections represented at such Councils must be duly advertised of the fact, and they must, within the space of a month, proceed to a new election. If the sections are in sympathy with their delegates who composed the suspended Council, they will re-elect them, and then the whole Federation will be looked upon as corrupt. Then the General Council has the power to dissolve the Federation subject to immediately communicating their intention to all the other Federations, and if two-thirds

of the Federations demand an inquiry the General Council must convene a special conference of one delegate from each Federation to give an account of its doings. I shall leave the readers of *The Times* to form their own opinions of what these guarantees amount to, and proceed with the next thing which came before the Congress this morning.

At the last meeting of the old Council in London, I am credibly informed a proposition was brought forward to recommend to the Congress at The Hague the removal of the General Council from London. The signatories of that recommendation included some of the oldest Council members. The reasons urged in favour of the removal were that the General Council had remained too long in the same hands and place, which had bred suspicion in many quarters, a suspicion that could only be cured by the removal, and that the dissensions in the Association had reached the General Council itself, which was but a committee of mutual distrust and suspicion. The only valid objection raised against the proposition was that on the continent of Europe no place was safe against a seizure of papers at any moment, and the recommendation was rejected.

Great was, therefore, the surprise this morning when Dr. Marx proposed the removal of the General Council. It was carried by a vote of 26 ayes, 23 noes, and 9 abstentions, which means that it was absolutely carried by a minority. Then came the place where the General Council was to be moved to, but Hôtel Pico had provided for that.

Mr. *Engels* proposed that the seat of the General Council for the ensuing year should be at New York, and a list of eight names was appended to the resolution, the owners of which were to form the nucleus of a Council of 15, and that it should be left to them to add seven to their number.

Serraillier, of London, objected, and proposed that the resolution should be divided into three,—to wit, the place of the Council, the number of members, and who the members were to be.

The proposition was accepted, and the places proposed as the seat of the General Council were London, Brussels, and New York. The result of the vote was New York, 31; London, 14; Brussels, 1; abstentions, 9. That the number of Council members should be 15 was agreed to, but the list

did not meet with such a cordial reception that it could be voted for in the lump, and the meeting decided that time should be taken for consideration.

It was close upon 3 o'clock, and the delegates being fatigued and hungry, the Congress adjourned till 7 o'clock to resume in public.

The opposition in the Café National had a meeting in the afternoon, but it came to nothing. They threatened all the week, particularly the Valencia delegates, that they should sever their connexion if that fatal proposition conferring more power on the General Council should be carried; but now that it has been carried they hesitate to fulfil their promises. They have a vague idea that shifting the dreaded monster of a Council across the Atlantic is virtually a dignified retreat. The Spanish delegates would have made good their words by drawing up a manifesto to repudiate the Acts of the Congress on the spot; but the Belgians are not for extremes, they want to be left alone and be on good terms with everybody. The prevailing opinion is that for all practical purposes the General Council at New York will not exist for Europe. They have a faint notion that the central box of the International may be hung up at the 10th Ward Hotel, New York, and that the centre of action may be in Maitland-park, Haverstock-hill, and that they had better keep on good terms by sending reports and so on, and see what the chapter of accidents may turn up.

The question submitted for consideration was by what means a regular correspondence, independent of the General Council, could be established among the European Federations.

Brismée opined that the thing which everybody had thought the General Council would be instrumental in establishing, an International Trades' Federation, had not been brought about, and therefore the main thing for which a General Council was needed was still left undone. If the various trades of different countries could be brought into communication with each other, so that each trade formed a union of its own throughout Europe, it would not be difficult to ally the trades in Federations, and society would ultimately be grouped according to occupations.

The go-between from New York was of opinion that on no account must they dissociate themselves altogether from

that International whose office would in future be at New York. Who could tell but that next year the General Council might again take its seat in the old world, and the friction of the next 12 months might wear out the Marx and Sorge party?

Guillaume seemed to estimate the situation at its true value. He asked the trimmers if they were not disposed to break at once, what guarantees they had they would not be excommunicated before the year was over, and then they would be driven to revolt? But this found very little echo, and the hour for meeting in public to amuse the curious having arrived the meeting broke up.

On the road, having a goodly distance to walk, the malcontents gathered in threes and fours, separating from each other as they went along, so that they might enter just like the gentlemen of Hôtel Pico. But the chief of Hôtel Pico knew all about their naughty tricks. When Dr. Sexton entered, Dr. Marx called him aside and told him enough to convince him that a spy had been at the Café National.

The public performance at its very commencement bade fair for an exciting scene. There was an immense pressure from the back of the crowd of the visitors, everybody wanted to peep at the Internationals, and there was no chance for any one below 5 ft. 8 in. in height standing further back than three deep. The crowd began to sway to and fro, but preserved sufficient decorum not to step over the barrier.

The chairman having declared the sitting opened, *Vaillant* proposed the close of the debate on the attributes of the General Council.

Hepner had nothing to object, but wanted to know whether those who had anything to say in reply to some of the statements made on the previous night should be allowed to speak.

The chair ruled that after the vote in the morning it would be foolish to continue the discussion.

Heim observed that those who had anything to say might bring it on in the discussion on the attitude of the International with regard to politics.

Mynher Van der Hout seized the opportunity to call the attention of the Congress and the visitors to the disgraceful conduct of the editor of the *Dagblad* and fairly brought

down the house. Instead of taking his seat in the reporter's gallery, the representative of the *Dagblad* had skulked about the corners making ugly remarks on the delegates, and stating in his report that there was a smell of blood in the Assembly. Van der Hout denounced such conduct and was greatly applauded by the visitors, for which *the chairman* gracefully thanked the good people of the Hague. He told them that the delegates on their arrival had been convinced that they would be protected by the laws of the land and the intelligence of the people, and the manner in which the visitors had shown their approbation of Van der Hout's remarks proved that the estimate had been correct.

The chairman then announced that the adjourned question of the previous evening had been set at rest by the morning's resolution. He further announced that Citizen Cuno had a statement to make respecting the occurrence of the previous night, which he, the chairman, would not have allowed had he understood Cuno's remarks.

Cuno read a letter from Consul Schramm, in which the writer stated that he was not the person who was responsible for the outrages committed against Cuno, but that it was Consul Mack, a person whom Schramm considered utterly unfit for the post he occupied. Cuno expressed his regret at the mistake he had made and thanked Consul Schramm for setting him right.

The crowd outside the line of demarcation pressed severely, a woman fainting had to be pulled out and seated inside, Mynher *Van der Hout* had every now and then to say something in Dutch till at last he became as excited as the crowd.

At last the business of the evening was brought forward. It was a discussion on the attitude of the International in politics.

Vaillant opened the debate and proposed the following resolution:—

"In its struggles for emancipation the working class cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from and opposed to all old parties formed by the propertied classes; this constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the triumph of the social revolution and its ultimate

end, the abolition of all classes. The combination of forces which the working class has already effected by its economic struggles ought at the same time to serve as a lever for its struggles against the political power of landlords and capitalists. In the militant state of the working class, its economical movement and political action are indissolubly united."

Vaillant said that the *bourgeoisie* possessed all the power that wealth and property could confer, and every time the working class assumed a menacing attitude this force was made use of to strike them down. It required no further demonstration than to point to the slaughter of the Commune. The force by which the *bourgeoisie* maintained their position was a material power which was employed against the working classes by means of the political power wielded by the rich. Against this nothing but organization and discipline would avail, until the workpeople themselves had conquered that political power to wield it for their own benefit. There were two kinds of opponents to contend against. The first were those who abstained from politics on principle, and who fancied that the International was the embryo of a future state of society. The strangest thing of all was that most of those who preached abstention were mostly men who lived on politics, and they generally found their way into the service of the police. The other opponents were middle-class Radicals who would never do anything, and it was the worst thing working-men could do to enter into alliances with them. The labour party ought to be internationally organized, so that if anything occurred in one country the people of every country would assist. The Commune would have to be avenged, and when that was done other countries would follow. In this way the *bourgeois* state could be destroyed. He proposed that the resolution be incorporated in the general rules, so that in future no one be admitted as a member who did not adhere to it.

Hepner had not intended to speak, but, having heard something last night to which he wished to reply, he availed himself of the opportunity. Political abstinence led to the police-office, as Vaillant had said; it was the same in Germany. Schweitzer, the man of political abstinence, had been found out to be a police agent, and had been turned

out by his own friends. The men of political abstinence were usually very ignorant and very great patriots. When the late war broke out, the German abstainers had all been mad for the war, while the politicians had been for peace. The other party had discovered their mistake after Sedan. They had no communication with other countries, and did not know what was going on. The Spiritualists* were better than they were; they did communicate. It had been said the previous night that the General Council tried to impose a doctrine on the Association, and he wanted to know what the Council had imposed. All its official documents had been joyfully received by the working-men. Of the civil war address no less than 8,000 copies had been disposed of in Germany, and the workpeople joyfully took to the imposition. How any one could talk of despotism was more than he could comprehend. If the General Council was stripped of authority, then the Federal Councils must be stripped, and the sections would lose themselves and become *philister* societies.

Guillaume said there was a misunderstanding. He and his friends were politicians as well as the others, but they would have nothing to do with the *tripotage* of Government and Parliamentarism. They were negative politicians, and wanted the destruction of the State in any form—they wanted the Federal system of the Commune. As to the delight of the German workpeople at the Council documents, that was easily explained, because those documents expressed their own ideas, which were not acceptable to every country. He protested against the insinuation that abstinence led to the police-office. The working-men of the Empire had not been spies, nor had Proudhon been a police agent. The working-men who entered into political alliances with the *bourgeoisie* in Switzerland were Internationals, and they were as ready to ally themselves with Reactionists as with Radicals to gain an election. The object of this political action was to carry into practice the Communistic manifesto published by Marx in 1848. It was simply to destroy one State in order to supplant it by another.

* Should read: Social-Democrats. See this volume, p. 135.—*Ed.*

Longuet said if the Paris working-men had been constituted as a political party on the 4th of September* they would have known better what to do. They did not possess the skill to wield the authority which had dropped into their hands, and, therefore, they had failed, and they must prepare for future contingencies.

Just as *Longuet* wound up his speech the crowd rushed into the middle of the room, a patriotic song was sung, and the delegates left as fast as they could.

The Hague, September 8

Yesterday morning's sitting commenced with the announcement that urgent private business had obliged the President to depart, in consequence of which Vice-President *Sorge* had to occupy the chair.

A number of letters were read from delegates, who, like the President, were obliged to leave that morning. Most of them gave their votes in writing on the questions of contributions, the list, and the political question, probably with a view to be counted as proxies.

Dumont, a Paris delegate, observed that three delegates had spoken for the political question on the previous evening and only one against, and the Frenchmen who had spoken had expressed opinions differing greatly from the opinions held by the bulk of the Paris members. He moved the continuance of the debate.

Morago, of Valencia, announced that he had deposited an amendment to the proposition of electing a certain number to form the new General Council, but the President had omitted to give notice of it, and had to tell him after the meeting that he must bring it on in the morning.

The chairman ruled that *Dumont* would be in order when the political question came up, and *Morago* on the election of the Council.

Dumont objected that he should like to make his statement on behalf of his constituents, but if he was not allowed to do it at once he would not get the chance, as he had to leave.

* 1870.—*Ed.*

A vote was taken, when 25 voted that Dumont should speak and three against.

The drift of the contents of a paper of some length read by Dumont was that the Paris workmen were not at present in a condition to launch a political party agitation, and he was requested by the sections he represented to declare that they did not agree with the Blanquists, who wanted to force the political organization, and cared very little for the social question. The Blanquists wanted to use the people. His sections were against the abstentionists, but preferred to hold aloof for the present from political action until the trades and other working men's societies were in a more efficient state. He wished it to be distinctly understood that they repudiated any connexion with the men known as Blanquists. They had not a word to say against Blanqui himself, for whom they had every respect, and who was not to be identified with the doings of his reputed followers.

On the question that the election of the General Council be proceeded with, M. *Engels* proposed that it should consist of 15 members, and that the list of eight already submitted should form the nucleus appointed by the Congress, with power to add seven to their number.

Alerini wished that the different federations should elect their own representatives.

Dr. *Marx* proposed that the American Federal Council, consisting of nine members, should be appointed, with power to appoint six others to complete the Council.

Alerini proposed as amendment that each federation should elect two delegates, who should constitute the Council, and that the Federations should alone have the power to revoke their appointment. He said he had been surprised at the ignorance constantly displayed in the correspondence carried on with Spain. It was necessary to have full confidence in the members of the General Council, and that could not be while such mistakes were made as had been the case. It was, perhaps, their own fault, because they had not informed the correspondent sufficiently, but if the Federations appointed their own representatives they would know what they were about.

Serraillier was against the Federations appointing the members of the Council. In some countries they had two

Federations, and in some none at all. If the proposal were accepted, Switzerland would have six members, and France, Austria, and Germany, where no Federation existed, would have none. Article 3 of the rules provided that the Congress should elect the General Council; until that was repealed the proposition of Alerini could not be admitted.

Engels, as corresponding secretary for Spain, repudiated the accusations of Alerini. He had never meddled with the internal affairs of Spain but once, in the letter accusing the Valencia Federal Council of treason,¹⁸ and that had shown that he knew too much about Spain instead of being ignorant.

The amendment was rejected by 29 against 9, and 8 abstentions.

Sauva opposed the proposition of Dr. Marx, on the ground that the people he proposed to compose the General Council represented only 23 sections, of which 56 existed in the United States. It was the German party, or more properly speaking the Marx party, that would form the council, to the exclusion of all other shades of opinions, and if accepted the General Council would be more authoritative than ever, and keep the great bulk of the American members outside the association. Dereure and himself disagreed almost upon every point, but they had agreed to present a list of 12, leaving three to be added, to be substituted for the list proposed by Dr. Marx.

Sorge repudiated the insinuation of his party being the German party; there were two Irishmen, a Swede, an Italian, a Frenchman, and only three Germans on the list.

Dr. *Marx* said there were three parties in the United States,—1, the working men's party, represented by the list; 2, the American *bourgeois* party, headed by Section 12, which was the humbug party; and 3, the clever party, to whom *Sauva* belonged. When *Sauva* had arrived in London he had declared himself in favour of the General Council, and now he took the other side. He was surprised at Dereure making common cause with him, because Dereure had received imperative instructions to retire in case the credentials from Section 2, presented by *Sauva*, should be accepted. The men of Section 2 belonged to the 1848 school of revolutionists, and did not understand the present move-

ment. They were the wise men who knew everything better than anybody else, and stood aloof and did nothing. The rest of the sections were hole-and-corner sections, not worth talking about. According to the rules the General Council had the right of adding to its numbers without a special vote of the Congress, but he would concede that the Federation, not the Council, should elect the six. He made that concession to show that there was no desire to shut out the sections from having a voice in the matter.

Several Frenchmen rose together to express displeasure; they wanted Pilon added to the list, but *the chairman* ruled them out of order, and insisted that the vote should be proceeded with.

After a great deal of noise and excitement, during which the chairman hammered away with a big stick to get a hearing, the roll was called over.

The result was—Ayes, 19; noes, 6; abstentions, 19.

The chairman was about to declare the list carried, when *Johannard* sprung to his feet to protest against the vote being considered valid.

Dave asserted that the abstentions did not count, but *Guillaume* said they had counted at Basle, when the abstentions and the noes together had been more than half the voters present.

Dupont read from the Basle Congress Report that on the abolition of the right of inheritance, 30 had voted for, out of 68 present, the noes and abstentions exceeding the ayes by eight, and the proposition had been lost.¹⁹

Eccarius moved that the Basle decision be taken as a precedent, which was carried by a majority of two.

Dr. *Marx* then proposed that the vote be reconsidered. Carried. He divided the original motion in two,—1, that the actual American Federal Council be appointed as part of the General Council; 2, that the Federation should elect the other six.

Dereure said that his mouth had been shut on the question of the General Council. He objected to taking the Council as suggested by Dr. *Marx*. Cetti was no use, and another was going to retire. He was against appointing dummies. He moved the list of 12 agreed to between Sauva and himself, which contained both.

Sorge was sorry for the defection of his colleague *Dereure*, but it was like him, he always compromised. He would not agree to a list that contained four Frenchmen and only three Germans. To *Sauva* he objected altogether as one who would not work. The Congress imposed a difficult task on the American Federation, and men must be chosen who would work.

Lafargue proposed that 12 members should be elected by the Congress and three by the American Federation, and that the sitting be suspended for ten minutes to give time for making up the lists. Agreed.

The votes were then taken by ballot, and the following were declared duly elected:—*St. Clair*, *Kavanagh* (Irish), *Laurel* (Swede), *Fornaccieri* (Italian), *David*, *Levièle*, *Dereure* (French), *Osborne Ward* (American), *Bolte*, *Carl*, *Bertrand*, *Speyer* (German).

Serraillier then proposed that all mandates given by the old Council to agents to enrol members in countries where the association was forbidden should be cancelled.

Carried without discussion.

A dispute arose on the political question.

Some maintained that the close of the debate had been voted on the previous night, but *Johannard* showed that the visitors had stopped proceedings when he had risen to speak against the close.

The stick had again to be applied to restore calm, and then the resolution was read from the chair and the announcement made that the roll would be called over.

The result was—Ayes, 28; noes, 5; abstentions, 8; protests, 2. It was agreed that the delegates on committee work should be asked to give their votes on their return.

The President then read a telegram from *Giessen*, in Germany, with a "Long live the Congress", to set aside all dissension—union was power.

Lafargue proposed that the Congress should instruct the new General Council to take steps to found International trades' societies, so as to combine the trades of the different countries within the International, and to publish for this purpose a circular in all languages to prepare the ground that the next Congress might take action. Carried by a show of hands of 22, none to the contrary.

The question of contributions came next. This was a point on which three different opinions existed among the London delegation. The extreme party wanted to raise the contributions to the General Council from a penny a year to a penny a month. The moderate party was content with monthly payments, and a rise of whatever amount, the conservative party was for things as they are. Neither party had obtained sufficient votes in London to make a recommendation to the Congress.

Brismée was opposed to an increase, and would rather have the contributions reduced to a half-penny per year. The penny was not much when an individual was called upon to pay it in his house, but when he had to pay first to the section, or Trade Society, to which he belonged, then to the Local Council, the Federal Council, and the General Council, and the societies had to hand over the lump sum, it amounted to a great deal. Some day, when the Federations were directly represented in the General Council, the contributions might be raised, but not before.

Dupont, *Serraillier*, *Mottershead*, and *Eccarius* proposed that the contributions should remain as fixed by the rules.

Frankel moved that they should be increased and paid monthly. He said he wanted to curtail the expenditure of the Federations; he did not want cliques to make propaganda on their own account. If they had more to pay to the General Council they would have less to spend themselves. At the present moment the General Council ought to have agents travelling in every country to organize sections. His credentials gave instructions to vote for an increase. There were Federations who never paid till the last moment at the Congress; and to prevent that, the payments must be made monthly. The Council ought to have sufficient money to print pamphlets in all languages. This could be done when any member wrote a good thing and sent it to the General Council; the General Council, if it approved it, should then have the means and the power to publish it in all languages. It ought also to have newspapers, which would do away with the competition and rivalry that every town and country wanted a paper of its own.

Dupont said the question of contributions was the most important that could come before the Congress. The first

question asked by Trades Societies when they were invited to join was, "What are your contributions?" If the present rate was altered, the idea of affiliating Trades Societies must be at once abandoned. With 1s. per member a year the contributions would rise to an amount which no society would pay. The contributions were ample if they were paid in proper time, and if all that was due was paid. The General Council had no business with literature, its business was to carry out the resolutions of the Congress. Pamphleteering and journalism was the business of the members and Sections.

The proposition of Dupont, &c., was carried by 17 against 15.

The report on the balance-sheet was then submitted, signed by the Delegates of eight Federations as correct, and was unanimously adopted.

The next Congress is to be held in Switzerland.

In consequence of the crowd outside, it was thought advisable to have no public display in the evening, but the local section was against it. Arrangements had been made with the police authorities to prevent a similar occurrence to that of Friday night, and disappointment was likely to lead to disturbances. The doors were, therefore, thrown open at 7, and the Flemish-speaking members were instructed to make speeches on the aims, prospects, &c., of the International without translation, and everything went on satisfactorily.

The proceedings concluded at 9 o'clock; and after the room was cleared, the Congress resumed, for the last time, to finish its business.

This business was the report of the Committee of Inquiry on the conspiracy of the *Alliance de la Démocratie Socialiste*. The documentary evidence furnished by the London Council was so voluminous that to give details would have been impossible; but the committee established sufficient to prove that the conspiracy did exist; that Bakounine was its chief, and Guillaume his right arm; and that the Valencia Delegates present had been members of it.

One member of the Committee of Inquiry dissented from the recommendation of all the others, which was that Bakounine, Guillaume, and Schwitzguébel be expelled. The

first two were expelled, Schwitzguébel escaped by a few votes, and the Valencia Delegates escaped on their word of honour that they had left the Alliance in April last. With this ended the official proceedings of the Fifth Congress of the International Working-men's Association, that was founded in 1864, at St. Martin's-hall, Long-acre.

This morning the delegates yet remaining at the Hague proceeded to Amsterdam to pay a visit to the section there. A public meeting was held in the Hall of the Dalrust Van Aus den Steenemolen, close to the People's Glass Palace; *Gerhard* in the chair. The speakers were Dr. *Marx*, *Sorge*, *Lafargue*, *Becker Ph.* and *Duval* (Geneva), and *Dupont*.

Dr. *Marx* explained what the Congress had done, and what it had been done for. The first point was the increase of the power of the General Council, which was necessary for the control of sections. The sections were independent in their local affairs, but if they refused to act up to the resolutions of the Congress, then the General Council would step in to enforce these resolutions. The centralization of the movement was absolutely necessary, and was in the interest of the workpeople themselves. He therefore invited those present who did not already belong to the association to join. The second point carried by the Congress was political action on the part of the working class. Before the working people could do anything effectively for their social regeneration they must acquire political power, and use it for their own purposes. This made the constitution of a separate political labour party, opposed to and distinct from all other political parties, indispensable. The emancipation of the working class depended on separate political action. The third point was the removal of the General Council to New York. This had been necessary to secure the independence of the General Council, by freeing it from the factions which had disturbed Europe since the fall of the Commune.

He represented these decisions as the undisputed verdict of the Congress, the opposition not being allowed to speak. Of course, the other speakers followed in the same strain.

The opposition is an incongruous crew. The Valencia delegation, which paid £12, as the contribution of its Federation, has, with the exception of a little sparring, put up with all the charges made against it, and accepted

its acquittal on a declaration of having abandoned the evil ways of former days. The Jura delegates, Guillaume and Schwitzguébel, have protested by their votes on all the essential points. Guillaume has spoken a good deal of truth, but he and his colleague have sanctioned the proceedings by their presence and by taking part in them. The Belgians are in the opposition because they object to being annoyed. They will neither submit nor revolt. It is not the opposition that has necessitated the removal of the Council, it is the faction fight that has been going on for some time past at the London Council Board, which made the formation of a London Council impossible. Sorge with his stick, as he appeared yesterday, was the Prussian Corporal to a T; he will not retrieve the falling fortunes of the society with ukases and decrees sent from the other side of the Atlantic. Dr. Marx, I am told, is going to leave things to take their chance for a time, and devote his leisure to the producing of an English version of his masterpiece *Das Kapital*.

An extra congressional declaration has gone the round to be signed by the delegates in their individual capacity as follows:—

“That this assemblage of delegates of the different nationalities cannot separate without expressing its marked abhorrence at the conduct of the English Government in still retaining in prison the Irish political prisoners. Seeing that their objects have failed before the English power, they can no longer be deemed dangerous to its rule; and as their error consisted only in devotion to their enslaved country, which they have long since expiated, the danger to the government being also past, their further retention becomes a crime, and the delegates declare the action of the English Government against them simply infamous.”

Published in *The Times*
Nos. 27474, 27476, 27478, 27479,
September 5, 7, 10 and 11, 1872

Printed according to *The Times*

ACCOUNTS OF THE GERMAN DELEGATES
IN THE NEWSPAPER *DER VOLKSSTAAT* ²⁰

[A D O L F H E P N E R]

ON THE HAGUE CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ²¹

ARTICLE I

In time one gets used to everything—and so the International too has already become hardened against the stormy tide of calumny that keeps breaking over it.

The International is like a universal mirror in which the abysmal baseness and stupidity of the anti-socialist part of the world is reflected. When a year and a half ago a girl in Paris accidentally spilled a bottle of petroleum, the General Council in London was alleged to have wanted to burn Paris to ashes; when it subsequently emerged that the International was only represented on the Paris Central Committee by a few men and had no part at all in the fire, it was called a society of "simpletons" (cf. "Herr Bernstein, the 'Bird of Ill-Omen'" in issue No. 71 of this paper)²² because it included no "incendiaries". When the people assemble somewhere for a demonstration, telegrams are immediately despatched speaking of *mob* gatherings; and when an inquisitive crowd of street boys, apprentices and servant-girls gape at the delegates of the International there are reports that "the *population* threatens to *disperse* the Congress". At least that is what Biedermann writes in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* and we know that the only difference between him and Thiers is that he has only told an untruth once in his life (so he says at least in his autobiography published in the early sixties) whereas Thiers "never *lied* to his fatherland and never *will*" (*ipsissima ver-*

ba).* A reporter for *Berlin* newspapers who calls himself "Social-Democrat" even lyingly informed the world at large that *Marx* had been pelted with mud in the street. The fact of the matter is that in pious The Hague, whose population consists largely of very rich aristocratic Philistines, the people of the so-called lower classes have been terribly incited against the International by the black-coats, whom one meets here in large numbers at every turn; and those to whom the church sermons have not made clear enough the danger with which the International threatens god-fearing The Hague found further information in the *Dagblad* (*Daily Tablet*), a vile paper which warned the inhabitants against letting their wives and daughters go out in the streets alone during the Congress and called for the closing of the jewellers' shops.

So when the dawdlers realised that the Internationals neither stole jewels nor raped girls, vexed at the deception of which they had been victims, they indulged now and then in catcalling and whistling in front of the building where the Congress had assembled, though this demonstration (of mere street boys) implied no intention of a clash with the delegates. The local inhabitants are not violent—only as silly as geese,** exceedingly conceited and priest-ridden. And we must note here that the Hague *police* behaved with *exemplary decency* towards the Congress; they did not have the Congress delegates spied on or provoked, questioned or maltreated in any other way; on their own initiative they unobtrusively had two security officers posted in front of the building where the Congress assembled to make sure that the street dawdlers did not disturb the peace and also that the huge throng of people at the public sittings gave no occasion for trouble. Be it mentioned in passing that the (by the way insignificant) interruptions which took place at the three public sittings were caused by ill-bred *bourgeois*.

Naturally there was no suggestion of the Congress being "wrecked"—once by the "population" and once by the Bakunist opposition—according to the inept fabrications of those asses on the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*. The Congress

* his very words.—*Ed.*

** The author of these lines was asked quite seriously *whether the king would also be present at the Congress.*—*Author's note.*

had to close at 1 p.m. on the Sunday 1) because the hall had only been rented up to that day, 2) because the delegates had neither the time nor the money to remain any longer in The Hague, and 3) because the agenda was *exhausted* and hence there was nothing to prevent the Congress closing. Never, incidentally, had a congress of the International lasted so long as this one; it was therefore only right that after being in session for a whole week it closed *in optima forma*.* The reason why the gentlemen of the press were so abusive of the Congress and in particular spread the lie about it being "wrecked" must be sought only in the fact that the Congress, holding only three (short) public sittings, *did not give* the penny-a-line reporters the opportunity to *earn enough*; it should have continued at least another week so that the press scribblers could have got their travelling expenses out of it. *Hinc irae*. (Hence the wrath!)

Published in
Der Volksstaat No. 77,
September 25. 1872

Translated from the German

[F R E D E R I C K E N G E L S]

ON THE HAGUE CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL²³

ARTICLE II **

The Congress comprised 64 delegates, sixteen of whom represented France, ten Germany, seven Belgium, five England, five North America, four Holland, four Spain, three the Romance Federation of Switzerland, two the Jura Federation of Switzerland, one Ireland, one Portugal, one Poland, one Austria, one Hungary, one Australia, and two Denmark. A number of them held mandates from two

* in due form.—*Ed.*

** Article II was not written by the author of Article I. When, owing to the arrest of our correspondent, we were unable to receive some of his papers—which was also the reason for our reports appearing so late—we asked two other participants in the Congress for reports. When the two reports arrived *Hepner's* papers relating to the Congress were also found and so we are in a position to present our readers with a choice of three different reports.—*Volksstaat* Editorial Board,

or three countries, so that the distribution given above is not quite accurate. According to their country of origin twenty of them were French, sixteen Germans, eight Belgians, six English, three Dutch, three Spanish, two Swiss, two Hungarian, one Polish, one Irish, one Danish, one Corsican. At no previous congress had so many nations been represented.

The verification of the mandates took nearly three days. The reason for this was that the affiliation of various Sections to the International was disputed. Thus No. 2 (French) Section of New York, which after taking part in the last congress of the American Federation subsequently opposed its decisions, was therefore expelled from the Federation by the American Federal Council. As it had not been recognised since then as an independent section by the General Council and its exclusion from the Congress had not been opposed, its delegate could not be admitted or its mandate acknowledged. (Administrative Rules II, paras 5,6; IV, para 4).*

The opposite was the case with the credentials of the New Madrid Federation. This comprised a number of workers who had been expelled from the old Madrid Federation under all sorts of pretexts and in flagrant violation of the local Rules. The real reason was that they had accused the secret society "The Alliance of Socialist Democracy" organised within the Spanish International of betraying the International. They consequently organised themselves into the New Madrid Federation and applied to the Spanish Federal Council for recognition. The Federal Council, adhering in the majority if not entirely to the Alliance, refused. The General Council, to whom they then applied, having recognised them as an independent Federation, they sent their delegate, whose credentials were disputed by the delegates of the Spanish Federation. In this case the General Council disregarded the prescriptions of the Administrative Rules (II, 5),²⁴ according to which it ought to have consulted the Spanish Federal Council before admitting the New Madrid Federation; it did not do this because, on the one hand, there was danger in delay, and secondly because the Spanish

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 300, 43-46, 130-32. *Der Volksstaat* mistakenly gives III instead of IV.—Ed.

Federal Council had placed itself in rebellion against the International by openly siding with the Alliance.

The Congress approved the General Council's way of acting by a large majority, nobody voting against, and thus the New Madrid Federation was recognised.

A similar question arose in respect of the credentials of the Geneva "Section of Revolutionary Propaganda", which the General Council, on the request of the Geneva Romance Federal Committee, had not recognised. The credentials, and with them the whole section, remained suspended until the end of the Congress, and as the case could not be settled for lack of time, the section is still suspended.

The General Council's right to be represented by six delegates as at previous congresses was recognised after weak objections.

The four delegates of the Spanish Federation, who had not sent any subscriptions for the past accounting year, were not admitted until the subscriptions had been paid.

Finally, the delegate of the American Section No. 12, the one which caused all the scandal in New York (as related earlier in *Der Volksstaat*),²⁵ was unanimously rejected after pleading a long time for Section No. 12, and accordingly Section No. 12 ultimately finds itself outside the International.

We see that under the form of verifying the mandates nearly all the practical questions which had occupied the International for a year were examined and settled. By a majority of from 38 to 45 against a minority of from 12 to 20, who mostly abstained altogether from voting, every single action of the General Council was approved by the Congress and it was given one vote of confidence after another.

An Italian delegate had also arrived, Signor Cafiero, chairman of the Rimini conference at which on August 4* twenty-one sections (twenty of which have not fulfilled a single one of the conditions laid down by the Rules for their admission and hence do not belong to the International) adopted a decision to break off all solidarity with the General Council and to hold a congress of like-minded sec-

* *Der Volksstaat* mistakenly gives August 7.—Ed,

tions on September 2, not at The Hague, but at Neuchâtel in Switzerland.

They apparently changed their minds and Signor Cafiero came to The Hague, but he was reasonable enough to keep his mandate in his pocket and to attend the Congress as an onlooker, relying on his membership card.

At the very first vote—the election of the commission to verify the mandates—the assembly split into a majority and a minority which, with few exceptions, remained a solid body till the end. France, Germany, America, Poland, Denmark, Ireland, Austria, Hungary, Portugal, the Romance Federation of Switzerland, and Australia formed the majority. Belgium, the Spanish and the Jura Federation, Holland, one French and one American delegate formed the minority, which on most questions abstained entirely or in part from voting. The English delegates voted dividedly and unevenly. The core of the majority was formed by the Germans and the French, who held together as though the great military, government and state actions of the year 1870 had never occurred. The unanimity of the German and French workers was sealed on the second anniversary of the capitulation at Sedan—a lesson for Bismarck no less than for Thiers!

When the matter of the mandates had been settled came the first urgent question—the position of the General Council. The first debate at the public sitting on the Wednesday evening already proved that there could be no talk of its *abolition*. The high-sounding phrases about free federation, autonomy of sections and so on died away ineffectively before the compact majority who were obviously determined not to let the International develop into a plaything. The delegates of those countries where the International has to wage a real struggle against the state power, that is to say those who take the International most seriously, the Germans, French, Austrians, Hungarians, Poles, Portuguese and Irish, were of the view that the General Council should have definite powers and should not be reduced to a mere “post-box”, a “correspondence and statistics office” as the minority demanded.

Accordingly, to para 2, Section II of the Administrative Rules, which reads:

“The General Council is bound to execute the congress resolutions”,

was added the following, adopted by 40 votes for to 5 against and 4 abstentions:

“and enforce strict observance of all the rules and regulations of the Association”.

And para 6 of the same section:

“The General Council shall also have the right to suspend any section from the International till the following congress” will henceforth read:

“The General Council shall have power to suspend a section, a federal council, or a federal committee and a whole federation.

“Nevertheless, where federal councils exist, it shall be the duty of the General Council to consult the same.

“Where a federal council is dissolved, the General Council shall arrange the election of a new federal council within thirty days at the latest.

“Where a whole federation is suspended, the General Council shall apprise all federations of the same, and should a majority of them require it, shall within thirty days convoke an extraordinary conference consisting of one delegate from each nationality for a final decision on the case.” (36 for, 11 against, 9 abstentions.)

Thus the position of the General Council, which according to the previous Rules and Congress resolutions could have been doubtful, was made sufficiently clear. The General Council is the Association's executive committee, and as such has definite powers in respect of the Sections and Federations. These powers have not been really extended by the above-quoted decisions, they have only been formulated better and provided with such guarantees as will never allow the General Council to lose awareness of its responsibility. After this resolution there can be less talk of dictatorship of the General Council than ever before.

The introduction of these two paragraphs into the Administrative Rules satisfied the most urgent requirement. Owing to the short time available a detailed revision of the General Rules was dispensed with. Nevertheless, in this respect there still remained an important point to be discussed. Serious differences had arisen over the programme

as regards the political activity of the working class. In the Jura Federation of Switzerland, in Spain and in Italy the Bakuninist sect had preached absolute abstention from all political activity, in particular from all elections, as a principle of the International. This misunderstanding had been removed by resolution IX of the London Conference in September 1871; on the other hand, the Bakuninists had decried this resolution too, as exceeding the powers of the conference. The Congress clarified the matter once more by adopting the London* Conference resolution by a two-thirds majority in the following formulation:

"In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the working class cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from and opposed to all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

"This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the triumph of the social revolution and of its ultimate end, the abolition of all classes.

"The combination of forces which the working class has already effected by its economical struggle ought, at the same time, to serve as a lever for its struggles against the political power of its exploiters.

"The landlords and capitalists always use their political privileges to defend and perpetuate their economic monopoly and to subjugate labour; the conquest of political power therefore becomes the great duty of the proletariat."

This resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 13 (including abstentions). Moreover, four French and six German delegates who had had to leave earlier had handed in their votes in writing *for* the new paragraphs of the General Rules, so that the real majority amounted to 38.

This decision has made it impossible for the abstentionists to spread the delusion that abstention from all elections and all political activity is a principle of the International. If this sect, the same one which from the very beginning has caused all the discords in the International, now finds it compatible with its principles to remain in the Interna-

* *Der Volksstaat* mistakenly gives English.—*Ed.*

tional, that is its business; certainly nobody will try to keep it in.

The next point was the election of the new General Council. The majority of the previous General Council—Marx, Engels, Serrailier, Dupont, Wróblewski, MacDonnell and others—moved that the General Council should be transferred to New York and the eight members of the American Federal Council appointed to it and that the American Federation should add another seven. The reason for this proposal was that most active members of the previous General Council had been obliged recently to devote all their time to the International, but were no longer in a position to do so. Marx and Engels had already informed their friends months earlier that it was possible for them to pursue their scientific work only on the condition that they retired from the General Council.

Others had similar motives. As a result, the General Council, if it were to remain in London, would be deprived of those very members who had so far been doing all the actual work, both the correspondence and the literary work. And then there were two elements in London both striving to gain the upper hand in the General Council, and in such conditions they would probably have done so.

One of these elements consisted of the French Blanquists (who, it is true, had never been recognised by Blanqui), a small coterie who replaced discernment of the real course of the movement with revolutionary talk, and propaganda activity with petty spurious conspiracy leading only to useless arrests. To hand over the leadership of the International in France to these people would mean senselessly throwing our people there into prison and disorganising again the thirty *départements* in which the International is flourishing. There were enough opportunities at the Congress itself for people to become convinced that the Internationals in France would put up with anything rather than the domination of these gentlemen.

The second dangerous element in London comprised those English working-class leaders in whose face Marx at the Congress had flung the words: it is a disgrace to be among these English working-class leaders, for almost all of them have sold themselves to Sir Charles Dilke, Samuel Morley,

or even Gladstone. These men, who have so far been kept down or outside by the compact Franco-German majority in the General Council, would now play quite a different role, and the activity of the International in England would not only come under the control of the bourgeois radicals, but probably even under the control of the government.

A transfer was therefore necessary, and once this was recognised, New York was the only place which combined the two necessary conditions; security for the Association's archives and an international composition of the General Council itself. It took some pains to carry this transfer through; this time the Belgians separated from the minority and voted for London, and the Germans in particular insisted on London. Nevertheless, after several votings the transfer to New York was decided and the following twelve members of the General Council were appointed, with the right to increase the number to fifteen: Kavanagh and Saint Clair (Irishmen), Laurel (a Swede), Fornaccieri (an Italian), David, Levièle, Dereure (Frenchmen), Bolte, Bertrand, Carl, Speyer (Germans), and Ward (an American).

It was further decided to hold the next Congress in Switzerland and to leave it to the General Council to determine the place.*

After the election of the new General Council, Lafargue, in the name of the two Federations he represented, the Portuguese and the New Madrid Federation, tabled the following motion, which was adopted unanimously:

"The new General Council is entrusted with the special mission to establish international trades societies.

"For this purpose it shall draw up within a month after the end of the Congress a circular which it shall have printed and send to all the working-men's societies, whether affiliated to the International or not, whose addresses it possesses.

"In this circular it shall invite the working-men's societies to establish an international trade society for their respective trades.

* The text given in issue No. 78 of the newspaper ends here. It is followed by the text of issue No. 81 under the editorial heading: "On the Hague Congress of the International (End of Article II).—*Ed.*

"Each working-men's society will also be invited to define the conditions for joining the International Society of its trade.

"The General Council is directed to collect all the conditions proposed by the societies which have accepted the idea and to work them up into general draft Rules which will be submitted for provisional acceptance to all the working-men's societies wishing to join the International Trades Society.

"The next Congress will finally confirm this agreement in due form."

In this way from the very beginning the new General Council was set an important task in practical organisation the solution of which might well alone suffice to give the allegedly dead International a hitherto unknown upswing.

Finally came the question of the *Alliance*. After working for a long time the commission which had to prepare this point for the Congress at last had its report ready on Saturday at 9 p. m. The report declared that the Rules and the aims of the Alliance were in contradiction with those of the International and demanded the expulsion of its founder, Bakunin, of the two leaders of the Jura Federation, Guillaume and Schwitzguébel, as the chief agents of the Alliance, and moreover of B. Malon and two others besides. It was proved to the majority of the commission that the Alliance was a secret society founded for conspiracy not against the government, but against the International. At the Basle Congress the Bakuninists had still hoped they would be able to seize the leadership in the International. That was why they themselves at the time proposed the famous Basle resolution by which the General Council's powers were extended. Disappointed and again deprived of the fulfilment of their hopes by the London Conference, up to the time of which they had won considerable ground in Spain and Italy, they changed their tactics. The Jura Federation, which was entirely under the control of the Alliance, issued its Sonvillier circular²⁶ in which the Basle resolutions once proposed by their own delegates were suddenly attacked as the source of all evil, as inspired by the evil spirit, the spirit of "authoritarianism", and in which com-

plete autonomy, a free alliance of independent factions was put forward as the only aim for the International. Naturally. When a secret society formed for the purpose of exercising leadership over a bigger open society cannot directly achieve supreme leadership, the best means for it to achieve its purpose is to disorganise the open society. When there is no central authority and no national central agencies or only such as are deprived of all powers, conspiring intriguers can best ensure themselves the leadership of the whole indirectly, by their concerted action. The "allies" of the Jura, Spain and Italy acted with great unanimity according to this plan and the disorganisation was to be carried so far at the Hague Congress that not only the General Council, but *all* central agencies, all the Congress resolutions and even the General Rules, with the exception of the Preamble, were to be abolished. The Italians had already included this in their Rules, and the Jura delegates had received definite instructions to propose this to the Congress and to withdraw in the event of its not being adopted. But they were grossly mistaken. Original documents were laid before the commission proving the link between all these intrigues in Spain, Italy and Switzerland, making it clear that the secret link lay precisely in the *Alliance* itself, whose slogan was provided by Bakunin and to which Guillaume and Schwitzguébel belonged. In Spain, where the Alliance had long been an open secret, it had been dissolved, as the delegates from that country belonging to it assured, and on these repeated assurances they were not subjected to disciplinary measures.

The debate on this question was heated. The members of the Alliance did all they could to draw out the matter, for at midnight the lease of the hall expired and the Congress had to be closed. The behaviour of the "allies" could not but dispel all doubt as to the existence and the ultimate aim of their conspiracy. Finally the majority succeeded in having the two main accused who were present—Guillaume and Schwitzguébel—take the floor; immediately after their defence the voting took place. Bakunin and Guillaume were expelled from the International, Schwitzguébel escaped this fate owing to his personal popularity by a small majority; then it was decided to amnesty the others.

These expulsions constitute an open declaration of war by the International to the Alliance and the whole of Mr. Bakunin's sect. Like every other shade of proletarian socialism Bakunin's sect was tolerated in the International on the general condition of maintaining peace and observing the Rules and the Congress resolutions. Instead of doing so, this sect led by dogmatic members of the bourgeoisie having more ambition than ability tried to impose its own narrow-minded programme on the whole of the International, violated the Rules and the Congress resolutions and finally declared them to be authoritarian trash which no true revolutionary need be bound by. The almost incomprehensible patience with which the General Council put up with the intrigues and calumny of the small band of mischief-makers was rewarded only with the reproach of dictatorial behaviour. Now at last the Congress has spoken out, and clearly enough at that. Just as clear will be the language of the documents concerning the Alliance and Bakunin's doings in general which the Commission will publish in accordance with the Congress decision. Then people will see what villainies the International was to be misused for.

Immediately after the voting a statement of the minority was read out, signed jointly by the Jura, Belgian, Dutch and four Spanish delegates, and also by one French and one American delegate, declaring that after the rejection of all their proposals they were still willing to remain in touch with the General Council as regards statistics and correspondence and the payment of subscriptions, but would suffer no interference by the General Council in the internal life of the Federations. In the event of such interference by the General Council all the undersigned Federations would declare their solidarity with the Federation concerned, such interference being justifiable only in blatant violation of the Rules adopted by the Geneva Congress.

The signatories of this statement thus declare themselves to be bound only by the Geneva Rules of 1866, but not by the subsequent alterations and Congress decisions. But they are forgetting that the Geneva Rules themselves acknowledge the binding force of all Congress decisions and thus the whole of their reservation falls to pieces. For the rest, this document signifies absolutely nothing and was received

by the Congress with the indifference it deserves. The signatories exceeded their powers inasmuch as they wish

1. to oblige their respective Federations to set up a separate alliance within the International and

2. to oblige these Federations to acknowledge only the Geneva Rules as being valid and to invalidate all other, subsequent Congress decisions.

The whole document, apparently forced on the duped minority only by the Alliance blusterers, is therefore worthless. And if a Section or a Federation were to try to contest the validity of the International's Congress decisions collected in our Rules and Administrative Regulations, the new General Council will not hesitate to do its duty as the old one did in respect of American Section No. 12. That is still a long way off for the separate alliance.²⁷

We note further that in the course of the same afternoon (Saturday) the General Council's accounts for the past financial year were audited, found correct and approved.

After yet another address from the Hague Section to the Congress had been read out the Congress was closed at half-past midnight with shouts of: "Long live the International Working Men's Association!"

Published in
Der Volksstaat Nos. 78 and 81,
September 28 and October 9,
1872

Translated from the German

[FRITZ MILKE]²⁸

ON THE HAGUE CONGRESS *

No congress of the International Working Men's Association was looked forward to with such suspense by the members of the Association as was this year's Fifth Congress at The Hague. And this was quite natural. For a long time there had been tension between the General Council and the Federal Councils of the Belgian, part of the Spanish, South French (?) and Romance-Swiss Sections. The efforts of the

* The title is preceded by: "Berlin".—*Ed.*

General Council to create a centralised organisation and to use the forces of the International Working Men's Association mainly to fight to conquer political power were resolutely countered by the opposition. The latter proceeded from the view that it was absurd for the working class to strive for political power. Not the conquest of state power, but the undermining of every kind of state power and the dissolution of the state itself, they claimed, was what the working class should accomplish. They therefore demanded no more and no less than that the working class should look calmly on while the state and the bourgeoisie fleeced it, and should wait until the economic development of the bourgeoisie reached its peak and of itself brought about the downfall of that same bourgeoisie. That every gendarme and policeman *à la* Rüder and the fearful persecution and oppression of the working class in every civilised country, not excluding Spain and Belgium, place the conquest of political power, so to speak, right under the noses of the workers, that is a thing which Messrs the "anarchists" (as they call themselves) could not and cannot realise. The ruling class is seeking more and more to strengthen and to centralise the power it has in its hands, yet the working class is expected to avoid centralising its forces and quietly to let the ruling class go on exploiting the masses with the help of state power. Understand that if you can.

In accordance with its views on the attitude of the working class to state power and politics, the opposition also wanted all centralised leadership to be abolished and to see the General Council given at most the status of a correspondence and statistics bureau. If the wishes of Messrs the anarchists had materialised, then, it is clear, the International would have ceased to be what it ought to be and is also in fact today: a power which stands opposed to the international power and exploitation of capital and to the international brotherhood of reaction—witness the suppression of the Commune and the meeting of the three emperors in Berlin—and which represents the solidarity of world working-class interests and organises and carries out in a planned manner the struggle against the forces of the old society.

All those to whom it is clear that in the struggle of the proletarians in all countries against the party of capital in

all countries it is not a question only of what should be, but also of what is, will and must agree that a victory of Messrs the anarchists *would have been nothing short of a victory for the enemies of the working class.*

From this standpoint the position of the *Neuer** can also be seen in the correct light: as an *enemy* of international working-class organisation it had nothing more pressing to do than to side with the Bakuninists, *vulgo* the anarchists, although *for its own* purposes it opposes federalism in Germany and defends "centralisation" when this ends in dictatorship which it itself must naturally exercise. "The end justifies the means."

Besides this outstanding interest which the present Congress of the International Working Men's Association presents for the working class as a whole, there was another, albeit subordinate interest, namely what attitude the Dutch government would adopt to the holding of the Congress. For weeks in advance all the bourgeois papers, led by the officious press (such as the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*), kept up an international concert of howling against the International and calling in all keys on the Dutch government not to allow the holding of the Congress. Why, Monsieur Jules Simon, Monsieur Thiers' Minister for Education, an ex-Republican and an ex-International, even deemed it appropriate to undertake a special journey to The Hague in order to induce the Dutch government by his personal intervention to prohibit the Congress or, that being impossible, to have it closely watched.

The Dutch government, contrary to the habit of its continental colleagues to carry out with dog-like servility every wish of a greater Power, was decent enough not to accede to this demand. It allowed the Congress to take place.

The result of the Congress is satisfying. The elements which had hitherto fomented discord and sought to turn the International on to a wrong road have either been expelled or have withdrawn of their own accord. The organisation has been improved and strengthened, the powers of the General Council have been clearly defined.

* *Neuer Social-Demokrat.*—Ed.

The differences which came to light during the Congress led hostile press organs of all shades: *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Neuer Social-Demokrat*, *Kölnische Zeitung*, *Volks-Zeitung* and the whole pack of small and tiny papers, to exult over the "disintegration" of the International. Go on jubilating, you will soon realise that you have been jubilating too soon. The International Working Men's Association is a power which carries the spark of life *indestructible* in it, for it is the necessary product of the economic relations and this necessity will lead it to victory, to power and splendour on the day when the old society falls to pieces.

Published in
Der Volksstaat No. 78,
September 28, 1872

Translated from the German

[A D O L F H E P N E R]

ON THE HAGUE CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL
ARTICLE III*

If we want to obtain an idea of how the press distorts the reports of the Congress, the best thing for us to do is first of all to see what the exemplary Biedermann, who after all has only once told an untruth in his life, writes in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*. The newspaper of this Reichstag and Landtag deputy and professor is in a way the gutter into which all the nonsense and rubbish of the old Germany's entire national-liberal press is discharged. We can therefore make our cleaning-up task easier if, in criticising the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* article, we forward the walloping to the "Ass" c/o the "Sack". The "Biedermanniad" begins with the assertion that "only after three whole days was the public admitted to the so pompously announced Congress". Lie number one! The announcement of the Congress by the socialist papers consisted of *only a few lines*, as plain and simple as one can possibly imagine an announcement; in

* The title is followed by the editorial remark: "By the author of Article I."—*Ed.*

the *Volksstaat* in particular it was expressed so briefly that Herr Rüder, who certainly reads the *Volksstaat* with scrupulous attention, overlooked it three times, noticed it only the fourth time and prohibited a repeat publication. The Congress was "pompously" announced only by the *hostile* papers, not the socialist ones. If indeed Herr Biedermann is astonished that for "three whole days" the Congress held closed and private sittings, we shall tranquillise him by telling him that an association whose delegates have not met for two years certainly needs three days to settle its internal affairs, even if this is described as "washing one's dirty linen". Any association, whatever its trend, occasionally finds itself in the impossibility to hold public sittings; so what is strange about the International observing a custom which is necessary and established in the whole world? Herr Biedermann himself has already attended countless "secret" sittings of his fellow-thinkers, indeed, he even had the courage, in his capacity of Landtag deputy, to *make a report to a narrow circle* of the Chemnitz bourgeoisie.

"It could have appeared (*and it would not have been surprising*) that in those first secret sittings all sorts of things had been discussed which there was cause to conceal from the eye of the law and its guardians."

(There is no hiding the informer streak in this man. *Volksstaat Ed.*); "but *in reality* the cause for this secrecy was *apparently* a different one." ("In reality", "apparently"—what professorial German!) "For one thing, the attendance was so small" (a reporter of the *Indépendance belge* counted only about 50 persons present in the hall) (no, there were 65 delegates present; certainly not too small a number when one considers the enormous expenses entailed by attendance at an international congress. If instead of 65 persons 130 had been present, the same press pack would certainly have grumbled about the "waste of the workers' pennies". *Volksstaat Ed.*)

"that one was ashamed (!) to appear thus in public, and waited from day to day—in the hope of a more numerous attendance. For another thing within the Congress itself there were all sorts of quarrels, intrigues and angry scenes which it was sought to veil as much as possible with secrecy."

Of course there were "intrigues" to be exposed, namely those of the Bakuninists, who, as already repeatedly mentioned, had organised a *secret* society within the International for the purpose of disintegrating it; yet there was no wish to "veil" these "intrigues" "with secrecy" but precisely to *reveal* them in order to *expel* the conspirators. Since *according to the Rules* all the Association's internal affairs, including questions concerning administration and the Rules, must be dealt with in private sittings, the matter of the Alliance—as the secret society founded by Bakunin calls itself—could naturally not be discussed in public. And as on the other hand the activities of the Bakuninists were dealt with in part in connection with verifying the mandates of the four Spanish and one American (Bakuninist) delegate, it is clear that the verification of the mandates took up an unusually long time. In our opinion the only reason why Messrs the newspaper reporters sneered so much at the long time the mandate verification took is that they were refused admittance when "Citizen West", the delegate of Mrs. Woodhull, the New York bourgeois swindler, millionairess and spiritualist—the Congress expelled him from the International together with those who gave him his mandate—elaborated on the theme of "*free love*" so current in practice among our bourgeoisie. To avenge themselves the correspondents then wrote that twelve American sections (instead of American Section No. 12, the one represented by West) had been expelled from the International by the Congress.

But let us return to our Biedermann. He affirms: "One delegate from America was counted" (the *Kasseler Tageblatt* even reported: "America has not even sent a *single* delegate"), whereas *Sorge* and *Dereure* from New York were present as representatives of the American Congress of the International and individual sections had moreover sent a special delegate. He went on to mention—a fact which the *Volksstaat* had reported several weeks previously—that the Italians in Rimini had convened a counter-congress to meet in Neuchâtel but *passed over in silence* the fact that the Rimini people happen to be *Bakuninists*, which naturally explains their "dissociation from the London General Council". "A delegate from *Leipzig* was present, representing the

Austrians," says the *Indépendance belge* correspondent, but he refrains from naming him. The informer again, but this time it is love's labour lost as far as he is concerned, since the "delegate from Leipzig representing Austria" whom he mentions is domiciled at present (and probably for ever) in London. It is to be hoped that only those who consider Biedermann to be an ignoble character will assume that it was for our co-editor *Hepner's* sake that he reprinted the item mentioned from the Brussels paper.

"As for the causes of the split," Biedermann continues, "they seem to be rooted partly in the too dictatorial power assumed by the General Council and rejected by many sections, and partly in the striving of the same General Council to use the members of the International to carry out, besides social agitation, also political activity in their respective countries, with which many, presumably, did not agree. *Certainly* it was precisely this question of the Association's political activity which resulted in the *wrecking* of the Congress."

The General Council's "dictatorial power" consisted in its suspending the spiritualist swindlers' "free love" society founded by Mrs. Woodhull in New York and some conspiratorial sections which incidentally acknowledged the Bakuninist Rules, which are *in contradiction* to the General Rules of the International. The Congress recognised that in the interest of the cause the General Council had not only the right, but the *duty* to take these steps, and it included in the Administrative Regulations a clause according to which the General Council has the right also *in the future* to suspend individual sections, of course previously consulting the Federal Council of the country in question. There will hardly be any more talk of a split in the International, for the Bakuninists will in future have either *to abide by* the decisions of the Congress or *to leave*. It has been *decided* by the Congress that the working class will take part in politics, and if the Bakuninists do not like this, they no longer have the right to belong to the International. That is quite clear.

It is characteristic that the whole anti-social-democratic press sides for Bakunin against the International although the latter, by declaring once and for all that it will have nothing to do with "secret societies", has established for itself the *best certificate of good character* in the eyes of cul-

tured historians. We pass over what Biedermann repeats after the Bakuninists about the General Council's "lust for domination"—this is why the Bakuninists call themselves "*anti-authoritarians*"—for we shall have further occasion to return to it in reporting separate speeches made at the public sitting. We only quote the following passage:

"The following example is related of how Marx successfully dealt with other opponents (apart from Bakunin): His son-in-law, a certain Lafargue, who acted as his adjutant (!) at the Congress, brought from Barcelona a mandate as a delegate—they said (who said? *Volksstaat Ed.*) from some nine or ten separate members, not sections of the Association. On the other hand there arrived from Spain four other delegates representing 17,000 (!!) Spanish citizens. But they were against the General Council and against Mr. Karl Marx. On account of this there was unwillingness to admit them at first, the validity of their mandate was contested, etc.; finally, as they were raising an infernal racket (!!) this was abandoned, but it was carried that the voting would be not by sections (so that each delegate would have a number of votes corresponding to the number of members from whom he had a mandate), but by individual vote!"

Untrue from beginning to end. Far from being Marx's "adjutant" Lafargue, on the contrary, when it was a question of expelling Schwitzguébel (Guillaume's associate), *abstained from voting*, although the motion for expulsion had been tabled by *Marx*. And as for the mode of voting, it is exactly laid down by the *General Rules* of the Association. It is true that the Spaniards moved to have the mode of voting changed; but even if this motion—that voting be not by individual delegates but according to the number of members represented—had been carried, this new mode of voting could only have been introduced, according to the Rules, at *next year's* Congress, not at the Hague Congress, and hence the sullenness of the Spaniards, who had an imperative mandate to abstain from voting until the mode of voting they wished for was introduced, was of no practical avail.

To characterise our press let us further mention that an idiot from the *Kasseler Tageblatt* represented the Hague Congress as a "*counterdemonstration to the meeting of the emperors*", and "almost regretted" that "Bebel and Liebknecht, who similarly, despite their years of verbal activity, have still not achieved anything" (probably they should now and

then organise a *little revolution* for the sake of the *Kasseler Tageblatt*?), "have been canonised as martyrs for their flirting with Marx and the international *whore* (!?)".

Published in
Der Volksstaat No. 84, October
19, 1872

Translated from the German

[A D O L F H E P N E R]

THE HAGUE CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

ARTICLE IV

(CONCLUDING ARTICLE. AGAINST THE BAKUNINISTS) *

As we said in issue No. 87, we hesitated at first to enter into a broader polemic with the Bakuninists, considering that these people (like the Schweitzerians) are extremely difficult to convince, and further because their influence does not extend to Germany; but later we decided to do so in the interest of the *Belgian* party comrades whose *only* press organ (*L'Internationale*) went over to the Bakuninists after the Congress and reprinted from the (Bakuninist) *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* the lying report on the Congress together with all that went with it. We therefore briefly record the mistakes, errors, falsifications, calumnies and so on of the *Bulletin* (No. 17/18) to characterise this species of "Internationals":

1) The few Hague members with all the will in the world could not have carried out the necessary preparations for the Congress; but

"the *General Council* having chosen The Hague, the latter had to comply whether they liked it or not".

In reality, the *General Council*—after it had decided in favour of Holland—left it entirely to the Dutch Sections themselves to decide where the Congress would be held and it was on their *proposal* that The Hague was accepted as the venue of the Congress.

* The title is followed by the editorial note: "By the author of Articles I and III."—*Ed.*

2) "The second unpleasant thing was the presence of the General Council almost in full strength (!); its members alone made up one-third of the Congress, and with the addition of a certain number of more or less (!) serious delegates they constituted a ready-made (?) majority which was bound to make all discussion illusive. There were twenty-two members of the General Council out of 64 delegates present at the first sitting on the Monday."

The answer to this is:

a) There were 67 delegates present, of whom in the course of the discussion one (West) was expelled and one (Zhu-kovsky) was suspended. There were twenty members of the General Council, or twenty-one (if Thomas Roche is included by mistake in the list instead of John Roach), therefore a little under one-third of the Congress members. But the General Council (according to a list of signatures of May 10 this year which we have before us) numbered forty-five members; consequently even twenty-two is not "almost the whole".

b) These twenty or twenty-one General Council members hardly *ever* voted unanimously but were generally divided into voters for and against and abstaining (not voting).

c) The twenty-one General Council members are not to blame for making up almost one-third of the Congress; why were there no more than sixty-seven delegates *present*?

d) It was a vote of *confidence* in them that so many General Council members were *given* mandates by the Sections.

e) Even if all forty-five of the General Council members had received mandates and attended the Congress, there could have been no objection to that.

f) The "certain number of more or less serious delegates" is a base and unfounded suspicion.

3) "Of these twenty-two, two were delegated *purely and simply* by the General Council, without a mandate from any section (a). A certain number of others had complimentary mandates issued by sections to which these gentlemen were and still are completely unknown (b). These mandates, which arrived blank in London, had then been filled in by the General Council itself (c). Vaillant had such a mandate for the Chaux-de-Fonds Section (d); similarly Arnaud for the Carouge Section, Barry from a Chicago Section (e) and Cournet for the Copenhagen Central Committee (f)."

Re a) The General Council had been recognised earlier and again confirmed at The Hague as being entitled to be represented at the Congress by six delegates.

Re b) The *Bulletin* still has to prove the fact of the "complimentary mandates", which it only assumes. But in any case a "complimentary mandate" is a vote of confidence and differs neither internally nor externally from any other mandate.

Re c) The General Council states that it did *not* fill in *any* mandate forms; this must be believed at least until the accusers provide *proof* of their assertions. Moreover, did not Messrs the Bakuninists first *introduce* blank mandates at the Basle Congress, offering them to various people who did not want to accept them?

Re d) Untrue: the Chaux-de-Fonds mandate was sent, completely *filled in* with Vaillant's name, to the corresponding secretary for Switzerland, Jung; besides, Vaillant had another two mandates.

Re e) We have no knowledge of Barry's membership of the General Council.

Re f) Cournet's mandate was delivered to him in The Hague by the Danish Federal Council *of its own accord* through Pihl (the Copenhagen delegate) and was so spontaneous an expression of the Danes' own feelings that *Pio*, then in prison, even expressed the wish in No. 49 of *Socialisten* (August 27) that Denmark should be represented only by the corresponding secretary of the General Council for Denmark (Cournet), and *not* by any delegates from Denmark. Cournet also had *another* mandate besides.

4) "What shall we say about the mandates from the French sections, whose bearers were half a dozen members of the General Council? It was agreed that in view of France's exceptional situation, these mandates could only be seen by the members of the mandate commission, and that the Congress would be ignorant of the very name of the sections by which these mandates had been issued. Thus we had to accept with our eyes closed (?) any delegate who said he had been 'sent by a French section'; we were forbidden (?) any investigation concerning them and we had to rely blindly (?) on the actions of a commission composed exclusively (?) of our declared enemies (?). Faced with such a state of affairs we must be permitted to say that the French mandates do not inspire (?) us with the same degree of confidence (?) as those whose validity could be established for all to see, such as the Belgian or Spanish. The French mandates may have been perfectly in order, but they may not all have been so."

So many statements, so many lies. The best thing for us to do here is to deal with the biggest lies first since by

exposing them we shall bring many other things to light simultaneously. It is not true, for instance, that the mandate commission was composed "exclusively of declared enemies" of the Jura people. It goes without saying that the majority had enough sense of justice to elect to the mandate commission a member of the minority, *Gerhard* from Amsterdam. Gerhard therefore had the fullest right and opportunity to represent the interests of the minority, to check the French mandates most carefully and eventually, if he had doubts about a mandate, to express his objections, not only in the mandate commission but also at the Congress sitting, where all the mandates were dealt with separately, and to inform his friends of the state of affairs. If the Jura gentlemen had suspicions about any delegate they could have asked their friend Gerhard; he also had the right to see the French correspondence of the corresponding secretary for France, *Serraillier* (cited by the commission) for the purpose of more carefully examining the French mandates. These were in general more strictly verified than all the other mandates, precisely because here the responsibility of the Congress members for preventing the infiltration of any unwanted element who could have betrayed the other members was much greater than in other cases. When the Jura gentlemen speak of "closed eyes" there is nothing we can object if they were really quite or half asleep, but that was not the fault of the majority. So the French mandates were checked "for all to see" like the others; if the Jura people did not protest, that is their business. Incidentally neither the Spanish, the Belgian, nor the Jura mandates were seen by anybody but the commission; so the Jura gentlemen had no right to demand that the French mandates be shown specially to them.

Finally let us mention that of the six General Council members who possessed French mandates, two had another one or two (see the attendance list), and that during the two and a half days which the Congress had to devote *exclusively* to verifying the mandates—*owing to* the Bakuninists' contentiousness—there were always half a dozen Bakuninists wanting to be given the floor and to make long speeches on the occasion of every trifle—the Jura gentlemen were given the opportunity to speak much more than was necessary,

the more so indeed as the temporary chairman, Van den Abeele, was a member of the minority, so that there can be no talk of biased restriction of freedom of speech on his part.*

After refuting the first four points let us now deal (out of its turn) with

5) the reproach which alleges that the General Council convened the Congress in Holland and not in Switzerland to make it easier for the London General Council members to attend the Congress.

To this we can reply:

a) That the Congress has been held *twice* already in Switzerland but not once until this time in Holland; so that least of all was there a cogent reason for holding the Congress in Switzerland;

b) that the eleven Belgian and Dutch delegates without exception belonged to the minority—a proof that the Congress was *not* transferred to The Hague in order to catch the minority unawares. Otherwise it would have been far better to hold the Congress in a country that sympathised with the *majority*. The General Council could not have proceeded with greater loyalty than by holding the Congress in the very centre of the minority.

Let us now continue with the refutation of the *Bulletin*.

6) "Several delegates, as a measure of precaution, had not even given their true name (a). In this way we found ourselves in presence of citizens whose mandates we could not check (b) and whose personal identity we could not even establish (c)....

"The General Council... *found fault*—we were going to say 'after the fashion of the Germans', but we would be reproached with fomenting national hatred—with the *Spanish* delegates and with several other members of the minority" (d).

Re a) There were five of these at the most.

Re b) See what was said in point 4.

Re c) Untrue. The use of a false name during the proceedings depended on the approval of the mandate commission, which included also (see point 4) a minority member. This member, Gerhard, did *not* raise *any* objection during the dis-

* The text given in issue No. 89 of the newspaper ends here. It is followed by the text from issue No. 91 under the editorial heading: "IV. (Against the Bakuninists. Continued)".—*Ed.*

cussion of the mandates in the Congress to the practice of the commission.

Besides, the author of the *Bulletin* article himself says (p. 8, col. 1) that one of the delegates who used a pseudonym (Lucain) gave him his name and address.

Re d) This "fault-finding" consisted among other things in the Spanish delegates having to pay the outstanding subscriptions of their mandatories (which they had in their pockets and apparently wanted to save for their mandatories in view of a possible secession) before they were admitted; on this point, see in general Article II.

Naturally the *Bulletin* says nothing of what "fault-finding" the *minority* resorted to against the mandates of Barry, Lafargue, Sorge, Dereure and Vaillant during the discussion.

7) A General Council member, *Sexton*, is said to have voted with the minority.

Untrue. It is not impossible that the author wants thus to make it appear as if England in general was on the side of the minority.

8) The *German* mandates are also said to have been invalid because in Germany the existence of sections of the International was prohibited and only individual members could exist. These were allowed, just like trade union delegates, to take part in discussions, but not in the voting.

Here the author sticks narrow-mindedly to the word "section"; he overlooks the fact that "membership" means nothing else; he also seems not to know that membership of the International is not prohibited in any town or village throughout Germany except in Leipzig.

9) *Eccarius*, *Mottershead* and *Roach* are said to have belonged to the minority.

Untrue: the last-named never did, and the two first-named very seldom; they were only occasionally among the abstainers.

10) "The Italian Federation was not represented."

But why did Mr. *Cafiero* not dare to present his mandate? Because after the *Rimini* decision to call a counter-congress at *Neuchâtel* his mandate would have been cancelled and be-

cause then the Jura people and the Spaniards would have *withdrawn*, as directed by their imperative mandate.

11) Eccarius is said to have been accused by the General Council of participation in the Alliance and of having sold himself to Gladstone.²⁹

A pure invention.

12) The intention of the minority to elect Brismée to the chairmanship is said to have been frustrated by a manoeuvre of Marx's.

Totally invented.

13) The author, after repeatedly describing the whole Congress and in particular the verification of the mandates as a "comedy" and a "mystification", admits (p. 2, col. 2) that the verification lasted "three days".

14) The Spaniards are said to have demanded voting by "Federations", and the majority to have rejected this (p. 3, col. 2).

Wrong. On the contrary, they demanded voting according to the number of persons represented. *No* vote was taken on this and Morago was still complaining about this on the Saturday evening in his long speech. The Jura people cannot therefore declare that "as a *consequence of this vote* they wished to abstain". Neither did they ever

"declare that they still wished to remain as simple spectators", but continued to take a lively part in the debate.

15) The author himself admits (p. 2, col. 2) that the majority—in compliance with the wish of the minority—elected the minority member Spingard to the commission to investigate the Alliance.

16) Vichard, a member of the commission to investigate the Alliance, is alleged to have used a false name.

Untrue. "Vichard" is *not* a pseudonym, but the *correct* name of the member in question.

17) It is said that the Blanquists alone voted for leaving the General Council in London, and that Marx and his comrades, who believed they would in the future get stronger support in New York than in London, voted for that reason for the transfer to New York.

Untrue insofar as most of the *Germans* also voted for London and the motives of Marx and his comrades—see Article II—were quite different from those given here.

18) The Blanquists are said to have left The Hague quickly because Marx had thus "put one over on them".

A stupid lie taken from the bourgeois papers and already dealt with in Articles I and III.

19) On the last evening but one,* when the political stand of the International was being discussed, Guillaume is said to have been the only minority delegate who was allowed to speak. Only four people were able to speak at all that evening. The fact that Guillaume was allowed to speak on account of his having been the first to put down his name to speak *against* the proposed resolution—although some others had their names down *before* him—this fact, this proof of *loyalty* is made use of by the author (Guillaume) to cast yet another suspicion on the majority:

Guillaume (whose expulsion, it is said, was already then intended) was allowed to speak against the resolution as a representative of the minority (out of his turn) in order to impress on the public that the ideas of the minority had only *one* representative, and one, at that, who could no longer be a member.

20) It is alleged that the Rules of the Alliance, which had just been expelled, were *approved* by the General Council in 1869.

The author acts as though he only knew the *public* Alliance; he passes over the secret one in silence. This misunderstanding was *intended* from the very beginning (and these people speak of "mystification" after *they* have founded, one beside the other, a public and a secret society under the *same* name!). The correspondence of the General Council with the public Alliance is to be found in the circular of March this year, "Splits, etc.", pp. 7-9.³⁰ The General Council *never* "approved" its programme but only noted that with the exception of one sentence it was not in direct contradiction to the principles of the International. But there are two quite different Alliances; when Guillaume was confronted with secretary Perron's letter to the General Council, in which he stated in the name of the Alliance that he accepted the conditions laid down by the General Council, Guillaume said in presence of Engels and the commission: "Mais c'est *l'autre* Alliance, l'Alliance publique!" (But that's the *other* Alliance, the public Alliance!) Engels at once had this included in the minutes.**

* September 6, 1872.—Ed.

** Cf. *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 337.—Ed.

21) The *Bulletin* finds it strange that after Bakunin and Guillaume had been expelled on the proposal of the commission on the Alliance, it was decided *not* to expel Malon, Bousquet and Marchand *in spite* of the commission's expulsion proposal and although Bousquet, according to the commission's motion, appeared seriously incriminated, more seriously, perhaps, than Bakunin.

And yet the matter is quite simple. What Bakunin and Guillaume had done against the International *was known* to all the Congress members. But the other accused are less well-known persons on whose conduct the Congress would first have had to be given more detailed *information* before it could come to a decision. But it was already too late for this information (at midnight on the Saturday)—the Congress *had* to close on the Sunday morning. So what else could the Congress do but *abandon* the idea of taking a decision on the commission's further expulsion proposals? For the rest, all the documents produced by the Commission on the Alliance will be published in the near future and thus everybody will be given the means to check whether Bakunin has been treated unjustly.

22) It is said that the new General Council has been given not the right, but the *duty* to co-opt three members.

Wrong. Only the right and only the restriction to three persons were decided (p. 7, col. 2).

23) It is nonsense to say that

the three Frenchmen of the commission to investigate the Alliance needed a Belgian (Splingard) to teach them French style (p. 8, col. 1).

It only proves that Splingard intervened in the editing of the report made by the majority of the commission although (in his capacity as arbiter) he did not sign the report. So if the report is defective we know where the reason is to be sought.

24) The originals of the proofs of Bakunin's money swindles were presented to the commission; they could not be made public so as not to compromise people in Russia. What Cuno said about a "vote of confidence" for the Commission referred to this (p. 9, col. 1, bottom).

25) What Guillaume claims to have said about a "comedy" etc. when speaking to defend himself (p. 9, col. 2) was never said and would not have been tolerated. Just as false is the

claim that Schwitzguébel made such a haughty speech (he spoke very repentantly), when the vote had been taken on him, and declared his solidarity with Guillaume. On the contrary, *Guillaume* stated *before* the vote was taken on both of them that they were *both jointly responsible* and that the vote should be taken on both of them together. After his expulsion Guillaume immediately left and therefore could not have said *after* the vote on Schwitzguébel that he, Guillaume, "still considered himself to be a member of the International" (p. 10, col. 1).*

Strictly speaking we could end now. We do not want to revive here purely personal attacks which we have so far left unheeded. However we must all the same dwell somewhat at the very last moment on one passage in which personal spite conceals a matter which is not unimportant from the point of view of principle. In connection with the discussion on the *political stand* of the workers' party it says:

25) **Hepner of the *Volksstaat*—one of the Jews of Marx's synagogue—declared that the Internationals who in Switzerland (?) did not go to vote in political elections (?) were allies (?) of the informer Schweitzer in Prussia (?), and that abstention from voting (?) led directly to the police station.... Hepner said many other things (?), never touching on questions of principles but telling all kinds of small stories (?), some false (1) and some susceptible of *venomous* and *calumnious* (?) interpretation."

So far (taking into account Hepner's close relation to the *Volksstaat* and some of these articles on the Congress) we have refrained from reproducing the utterances at the Hague Congress of the person named which are referred to in the above passage, the more so because we have not to hand the speeches of other speakers at the Congress. However, we consider that the distortions of the *Bulletin* justify us in informing the German party comrades what the abused—the only man from Germany who spoke at all at a public sitting—actually did say. He said approximately the following (at the Friday evening sitting):

"I would not have thought it necessary for me to speak on this question; I had assumed that no differences at all

* The text given in issue No. 91 of the newspaper ends here. It is followed by the text from issue No. 95 with the editorial heading: "IV. (Against the Bakuninists. Conclusion)".—*Ed.*

** *Sic* in the original.—*Ed.*

could exist among the delegates of the International relative to the political stand of the workers' party. But yesterday evening taught me the sad opposite. Citizen Guillaume's speech acquainted me with two so-called 'ideas' which the minority wished to defend: the idea of 'anti-authoritarianism' and that of 'political abstention'. These two so-called 'ideas' force me to reply; it is true that in dealing with the first point I shall have to return to the discussion on the General Council which has actually already been dealt with.

"In his speech yesterday on the abolition of the General Council or respectively the decreasing of its powers, Citizen Herman gave as the principal motive of his demand in the spirit of the 'anti-authoritarians' that the General Council has allegedly '*imposed its political doctrine*' on the Association; this excessive influence of the General Council, he said, must be paralysed.

"I ask you: *what* 'political doctrine' has the General Council 'imposed' on the Association? Why is nothing known about it in *Germany*? I was already a member three years ago but no complaint ever reached my ears that the General Council wanted to 'impose' something on the German Social-Democrats.

"The General Council has indeed officially published political *manifestos*, but as far as I know no one has ever raised his voice against these manifestos. As far as Germany in particular is concerned, I can assure you that these manifestos have been received with real enthusiasm by our party members, especially the one on the 'Civil War in France'; which in any case is the best work to date on that subject. The 'Civil War in France', besides being printed in the *Volksstaat*, which already at that time had a circulation of 4,000 (now it has over 6,100 subscribers), was also disseminated in our country as a separate impression of 4,000 copies—an impressive sign that among the German Social-Democrats no occasion is found for complaining about the 'political doctrine' of the General Council.

"But let us for the time being completely disregard the present, London, General Council and consider the question of the abolition of the General Council, the abolition of authoritarianism as such.

"In my opinion it would indeed be a very nice thing if all systems of authority could be abolished, but for that *one* condition is necessary, namely that men should be angels. As long as this is *not* the case we shall hardly be able to dispense entirely with a system of authority, for the ignorant must be taught, that is a *duty*.

"Let us pose a further question: What do the *consequences* of abolishing the General Council lead to? They lead to *all* authority, *all* party authorities, and consequently the *Federal* and *Local Councils*, having to be abolished. For when one once makes a *principle* of 'abolition' of the authority system, there is no *end* to 'abolition'. Thus you (turning to the Bakuninists), if your disastrous 'idea' were to win ground and prevail—which it is to be hoped will not be the case—you would, if you were to succeed in breaking the bond which holds the Association together, dissolve the International into mere separate *atoms*, condemn it to *impotence* and change it from an International *militans* into an international society of philistines in dressing-gowns and slippers.

"This raving theory of abolishing authority seems to me still more nonsensical than *the spiritualism* whose representative* was expelled from the Congress the day before yesterday. The spiritualists at least make themselves believe in some 'communication with spirits',—you (the Bakuninists), by abolishing the authorities, would make all regular relations between individual bodies *impossible*.

"Moreover, I cannot understand how the 'anti-authoritarians', faced with the frightful lessons left to us by the Paris *Commune*, can expect the present Congress to abolish the leadership of the International or at least to paralyse it. Let the members of the Commune who are present tell me whether I am right or not when I declare, and indeed not on the instructions, but in the *spirit*, of the German Social-Democrats, that the Commune exercised far too *little* authority; that it would have been better for it if it had asserted a little *more*.

"But in the end the 'anti-authoritarians' so brilliantly refuted themselves yesterday evening through their mouth-piece Guillaume that it is incomprehensible to me how for

* W. West.—*Ed.*

their part they can still speak of a 'principle', of an 'idea', of a 'theory'."

(*The public, apparently bored, becomes restless.*)

"I should like to draw the whole of your attention to the following: after Guillaume had complained at great length of the General Council's alleged harmfulness and alleged overstepping of its powers, without, however, producing anything convincing, he tried to demonstrate the alleged *uselessness* of the General Council. And how did he do that? I quote his own words: 'A-t-il jamais organisé une grève?' (Has it ever organised a strike?) 'Non' (No!). 'No more has it taken the initiative in *political* struggles. Consequently the General Council is not necessary to us either in the social or political respect.'

"Note the self-destroying contradiction of this kind of logic! The General Council is accused of exercising *too much* authority: and this "too much" is brought to a point in the still graver accusation that it has been *too little* authoritarian! Could one from our side deal anti-authoritarianism a heavier blow than the one it dealt *itself* with *this* 'logic'.

"All the same, let us also take a look at the content of the latter accusation!

"'The General Council has not yet organised a single strike.'

"Very well! It has something *better* to do! It has above all to direct *scientific* propaganda for the social revolution! To organise strikes is *not* its business. It only has to do its best, *once* a strike has broken out, *to support* it, and it *has done* that, as *Sorge* told us in detail yesterday. I for my part would most gratefully decline if the General Council were to take it upon itself to 'organise' strikes. *Nobody but our bourgeois opponents has yet expected it to do that.*

"Need we say any more about the General Council being accused of lacking initiative in the political struggle? This accusation too sounds as if it comes from the lips of an opponent! For it was precisely our *opponents* who made the ridiculous assertion that the Paris Commune was 'arranged' from *London*.

"But revolutions cannot be 'made' artificially, they must be the consequence of social relations. Since the Paris walls were unable to withstand Krupp's cannon it must be

clear even to the blindest that barricadology is an outdated standpoint; only that revolution can be victorious which *besides* barricades, i.e. violence, also has *minds* on its side.*

"So I have arrived at *the* point from which I should actually have started had I wished to speak strictly according to the agenda; only it appeared to me to be absolutely necessary—before going on to our special subject—to demonstrate by the so-called theory of anti-authoritarianism our opponents' entire lack of system, the more so as yesterday evening through the early closing of the discussion on the General Council I was no longer able to speak and was given to understand that I could well weave in what I had to say on the above-mentioned subject during the debate on the political stand of the Association, since the two subjects have certain points in common.

"So the opposition demands that the Congress should drop the resolution relating to the Association's political stand and declare in favour of political *abstention*.

"Citizen Vaillant has already explained in this connection that the slogan of 'abstention' was once launched in *France by the police*. I agree with that and enlarge upon it in a certain sense: that slogan occasionally *comes from* the police office and sometimes also *leads to* it. Unfortunately we had a very sad proof of that two years ago in Germany.

"When the Franco-German war broke out and the Social-Democratic Workers' Party took its stand *against* it, the General Association of German Workers' fought bitterly against us. It sided with the German national-liberal chauvinists. Why? As a consequence of the political *ignorance* in which those people were held by their leader *von Schweitzer*, who likewise preached 'political abstention'. Admittedly after *Sedan* they recognised their error and repented for it. And what about Herr von Schweitzer? He has now been ignominiously expelled from the Association by his own people as a police agent.

"So you see that 'political abstention' makes it possible for *government agents to draw the workers' movement over*

* In the *Bulletin* Guillaume has altered entirely the corresponding passages in his speech referred to in Hepner's reply given above.—*Author's note*,

into the wake of the ruling state system. So great is the disaster which that theory can cause."

So much for Hepner's speech, which neither insinuated that the Swiss Internationals were allies of Schweitzer if they did not wish to vote every time, or anything else. It was not a question of "abstention from voting" but of "political abstention", that beyond all doubt, according to our political doctrine, abstention from voting may sometimes be compulsory (e.g. in the case of *elections with property qualifications*).

This concludes our articles on this subject. We hope that the Belgian and Spanish party papers will rectify their earlier statements accordingly.

Published in
Der Volksstaat Nos. 89, 91, 95,
November 6, 13, 27, 1872

Translated from the German

ARTICLES
IN THE *NEUE FREIE PRESSE*
NEWSPAPER

[K A R L M A R X]

THE CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ³¹

The Hague, August 25

In a few days the Congress of the International Working Men's Association will begin its sittings. The authorities, in agreement with the liberal press, have created no difficulties for the organisers of the assembly, in spite of the government having received requests from many quarters to prevent the holding of the Congress in The Hague. The view prevalent in the government was that the right of free discussion should not be encroached upon since this was the only means by which success could be achieved in fighting what was wrong and unjustified in the field of ideas and in avoiding dangerous crises.

If I am already today making the Congress the object of a report, the reason is that it is necessary for understanding the discussions at the Congress that your readers should be informed in advance about the present state of affairs in the International. The proceedings this year may possibly be limited exclusively to internal matters, and since in this respect separate fractions will be confronting one another, I must begin by characterising their positions and the objects of the struggle. I must therefore in the first place speak my mind on the subjects to be discussed.

According to the announcement made by the London General Council, the future organisation of the International is to be discussed.* In this connection it is the intention of the General Council to propose the insertion in the General

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 23.—Ed.

Rules of a decision which was adopted by the Conference of delegates of the International held last year in London and according to which the members of the Association in the different countries should organise into political parties. It is on this point that a heated struggle will break out between the supporters of the Conference decision and the so-called abstentionists who refuse to have anything at all to do with politics. This will hardly be comprehensible to the uninformed.

More than twenty years ago, refugees from all the European states issued a manifesto which had been drawn up by Messrs Marx and Engels³² and in which the social relations were set forth in the light of the latest teaching about society, and in respect of political action the tactics were outlined that wherever bourgeois society was still struggling against representatives of the system of social estates or of feudalism the workers should always support the bourgeoisie if it fought energetically for progress.

The General Association of German Workers³³ founded in 1863 tried to apply these tactics in practice. Owing to the workers' immaturity and the lack of any understanding of the new socio-political movement on the part of the other classes of society, the Association was unable to achieve any significant power; on the contrary, after the death of its founder* it sank to the level of a sect directed by police agents whose high-flown phrases were used to inspire the propertied classes with fear. This sect will send no representatives to The Hague.

The Social-Democratic Party founded in Eisenach³⁴ also adopted a mainly political programme. It is still in the first stage of development and is therefore suffering from certain infantile disorders but is said to be continually growing stronger. This fraction will be represented at the Congress by delegates from Berlin, Dresden, Hamburg, Leipzig, Munich and Stuttgart.

As for the Austrian socialists, they also seem, to judge by their attitude up to now, to refuse to hear of political abstention, to the great dismay of the feudal-clericals. However, as a result of a circular published by former Mini-

* Ferdinand Lassalle.—*Ed.*

ster Giskra, the Austrian workers are not allowed to carry on propaganda for the International or to form any sections; but I am told that individual members of this Association living in Austria have directed a foreign delegate to state at the Congress that the Austrian socialists consider abstention from politics to be ridiculous.

The English members of the International Working Men's Association resumed political action a few weeks ago by founding a political party for England.³⁵

In general, the trend represented by the German socialists has made such progress that at the Congress not only the English, the Dutch and the Danish, but also the majority of the Swiss, French, Spanish and Portuguese will support the insertion of the above-mentioned London Conference decision in the General Rules of the International. The only ones to vote against this change in the General Rules will be the federalist Belgians and the supporters of the Russian Bakunin in French Switzerland, southern France, Spain and Italy.

I am now faced with the task first of all of informing you about the origins of the contradictions which have arisen in the International. As far as the Belgians and some of the French are concerned, they have always supported Proudhon and the federal principle represented by him. They cling to these principles with heat and persistence, and the German socialists respect them as honest opponents in the field of theory.

The situation is different where Bakunin's supporters are concerned. Bakunin himself did not participate in founding the International Working Men's Association. After his return from Siberia he preached pan-Slavism and racial war in Herzen's *Kolokol* journal. In 1868 he appeared at the Berne Congress of the League of Peace and Freedom to arouse enthusiasm in the assembly for the "equalisation of individuals" and the "abolition of the state". After the rejection of his proposals he founded a few workers' societies with the help of Russian refugees in French Switzerland, southern France, Italy and Spain, and gave them the name of "Alliance internationale de la démocratie socialiste". According to the General Rules of the International Working Men's Association its individual sections have indeed the right

to organise and administer themselves independently, each according to the laws of the land and the state relations, but no section's rules may be in contradiction to the general programme. This general programme says briefly: "The struggle for the emancipation of the working class embraces all countries in which modern society exists and has as its aim the abolition of all class rule. No social estate should rule over another." At the Brussels and Basle Congresses the majority supported the theory that a radical improvement in the condition of the working class could be achieved only if the public means of communication and the land became state property.

The abolition of private property, the elimination of the family, the equalisation of individuals and the abolition of the state have never been points in the programme of the International Working Men's Association founded in London. The General Council was therefore obliged, although it is only an executive authority, to demand that the leadership of the Alliance should alter its programme. This demand was countered by the Alliance with the requirement that its principles, which the General Council had declared to be absurd, should become the standard for the International Working Men's Association. Thereupon the General Council broke off correspondence with the Alliance and the latter then began to organise the war against the London executive authority. This war has continued without interruption until most recently, and as Mr. Bakunin's supporters are clever at sending out to the world large pompous manifestos and inflammatory addresses, it is understandable that the International Working Men's Association is so often confused with the "Alliance internationale de la démocratie socialiste" and the views of the latter are ascribed to the former.* I will only mention that both Jules Favre in his circular against the International and deputy Sacaze in his report on the Dufaure law cited the windy Alliance documents to prove the danger presented by the International.

In the early months of 1870 Bakunin acquired an associate in the person of Felix Pyat. The latter utilised a French

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 530-31.—
Ed.

workers' corporation in London* to publish under the sign of the "International" those bloodthirsty manifestos which, among other things, called for the murder of the Emperor Napoleon. For that reason the General Council declared in the press that Pyat had never been a member of the International and that the latter could not be held responsible for his actions. Thereupon the French workers' corporation mentioned had bills posted in London maintaining that the International was an anti-revolutionary society.

Towards the end of the year 1870 the fortunes of the Alliance had considerably paled. Bakunin had been deprived of the direction of the Geneva *Égalité* newspaper, which had been given to the General Council's supporters. The ranks of the abstentionists or anarchists became re-animated only when Paris Commune refugees arrived in Switzerland and in England. All dubious elements went over to the anarchists, while the spiritually more significant refugees rallied round the General Council.

Here is perhaps the place to say a few words about the attitude of the International to the uprising of the Commune. The Investigation³⁶ has already shown that it was not the International Working Men's Association as such which provided the impulse for the March revolution in Paris. This was borne out if only by the composition of the Commune, in which Jacobins and men like Pyat and his associates dominated. And furthermore the socialist element in the Commune consisted almost exclusively of federalist Proudhonists, for which reason also the German socialist newspapers expressed the opinion, shortly after the movement broke out, that it would have an unfortunate outcome. But when the defeat actually did come, and the defeated were the objects of all sorts of attacks, the General Council, and with it the press organs of the International, considered themselves obliged to take the Paris working-class population under their protection and to defend its actions.

With that I think I have said enough about the relations of the International on the Continent. I will only say concerning the International in America that there apostles of free love and ladies of the *demi-monde* had penetrated

* a French section in London.—Ed.

into the sections but have been expelled. Then those who were expelled formed a separate section but the General Council refused to admit it.

After what has been said the defeat of the anarchists at the Congress can be expected with certainty. In respect of Bakunin himself the matter is all the worse as matters have come to hand which compromise him gravely. There are people who call Bakunin a Russian Sabina.³⁷ Indeed it emerged at the Nechayev trial³⁸ that Bakunin sent to people in Russia whom he did not even know letters whose envelopes bore the stamp "Comité révolutionnaire secret". There is another matter against him which shows at the same time what the ideas of the abstentionists lead to. Messrs Albert Richard and Gaspard Blanc, two of Bakunin's adjutants, leaders of the "Alliance internationale" in southern France and initiators of the Lyons putsch in 1870, have gone over to the Bonaparte camp. Several months ago they put out a proclamation ending with "Long live the Emperor!" It also contained the pertinent remark:

"C'est la progression normale de nos idées qui nous a rendus impérialistes." (It is the normal development of our ideas which has made us supporters of the emperor.)³⁹

Finally I must note that Mr. Bakunin's supporters even strive to inflame national hate among the workers. The latest issue of the abstentionists' mouthpiece, the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*—which among other things carries a call ending with: "Long live anarchy! Long live collectivism!"—complains that the Congress is being held on the threshold of four Germanic countries. The London General Council is accused of pan-Germanic tendencies and one of its French members by the name of Vaillant is reproached with a German education because he studied in Vienna and Tübingen.

To this must be added that in the Romance countries it has been taken amiss that the German socialists have said of themselves that they are fifty years ahead of the French in theory and that Germany is called upon to determine the laws by which social reforms will be carried out. In this connection I recall a passage from fragments of the philosopher Fichte, whom Professor Johannes Huber in Munich called the first German socialist:

"From Germany will emerge the true Kingdom of Right, founded on the equality of all that of which the human personality is the bearer."⁴⁰

Published unsigned in the
Neue Freie Presse
No. 2878, August 29, 1872

Translated from the German

[H E I N R I C H O B E R W I N D E R]

THE CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

The Hague, September 3

The extensive comments in the conservative press here, which would have liked to see the holding of the Congress prevented by the authorities, and of the liberal papers, which insisted that the banning of the meeting was not permissible under Dutch law, have resulted in the population of The Hague, in itself very inquisitive, following with particular interest the proceedings of the Congress, which opened officially today.

Since Sunday, the concert hall in Lombard Straat has been surrounded by a dense crowd of people. Every stranger has been presumed to be an "International" and has been gaped at like some fabulous animal. Yesterday an inoffensive Englishman had to put up with a whole throng of school-boys, fishwives and seamen accompanying him from the station to his hotel. The Tuinenburg and Pico hotels on the Spui are besieged in the same way as the concert hall. It is in these two hotels, which are quite close to each other, that the most prominent representatives of the International are staying.

Already on Saturday delegates had arrived from the more distant countries. On Sunday, discussions of individual groups began. The Germans chose for the place of their discussions the lighthouse near Scheveningen so as to be able simultaneously to enjoy the view of the sea. The first general discussion took place on Sunday evening. Yesterday at noon, the mandates were collected by the executive committee of the Hague Section, represented by Gerhard and Van den Abeele. Present among others were: for *Germany* and *Swit-*

zerland, Marx, Engels, Dr. Kugelmann (Hanover), Ludwig (Heidelberg), Dr. Becker (Brunswick and Chemnitz), Cuno (Munich and Stuttgart), Heinrich Scheu from Vienna (for Königsberg and Esslingen), Johann Philipp Becker (Geneva), Milke and Friedländer (Berlin), Hepner (Leipzig), and so on. For *England*: Dr. Sexton, Hales, Mottershead, Roach. For *Denmark*: Haentjens.* For *Belgium*: the lawyer Brismée and six comrades. For *Spain*: Morago, Pellicer, Soriani** and the rich Creole, Dr. Lafargue, son-in-law of Karl Marx. For *Italy* representatives were announced but had not yet arrived. For *France*: Ranvier, Cournet, Vaillant, Johannard, Leo Frankel, etc. The names of the representatives of *Paris* and *Toulouse* were not revealed. For *America*: Sorge (German Section), Dereure (French Section), West (a secessionist). For *Australia*: Harcourt. *From Austria no mandates had arrived. Bakunin is not present, but his friends Zhukovsky, Schwitzguébel and Guillaume are here. The last-named organised recruiting offices in Switzerland for the French army during the Franco-German war.****

Yesterday's sittings, the last of which lasted until midnight, were devoted solely to the collection and checking of the mandates. Out of consideration for the delegates from France the sittings were not public and representatives of the press were not admitted. During the elections to the commission to check the mandates, the abstentionists suffered a first decisive defeat: they did not succeed in having a single one of their candidates elected. The commission made its report at the evening sitting. It objected to some six mandates. In the first place it demanded the rejection of the representative of the Geneva *Section d'action révolutionnaire*, because this section consisted only of individuals expelled from the French Central Section in Geneva. Further the commission proposed that the mandates issued by the Spanish sections of Bakunin's Alliance should be declared null and void. It also proposed not admitting the representative of the notorious *Miss Woodhull* from New York and

* This is a misprint: Denmark was represented by Pihl.—*Ed.*

** This is a misprint. It probably should be Alerini.—*Ed.*

*** See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 526-27.—*Ed.*

of an American section of the International not recognised by the General Council.

The commission's proposals will presumably be adopted and this will result in all the abstentionists and federalists leaving the Congress. Bakunin's supporters have an imperative mandate according to which, in the event of the majority deciding against them on the Programme issue, they must withdraw. Since this faction has fewer than 15 representatives among the 75 delegates, it will have to content itself with creating some disturbances and drawing out the discussions.

The Hague, September 3

The public sittings of the Congress have still not begun. Yesterday only a provisional bureau was formed, since the discussion of the contested mandates is only to end this morning. The Alliance supporters, who wish at all costs to be present at the discussion on the revision of the Rules, are defending themselves with all their might against expulsion.

The Spanish abstentionists, supported by the Belgians and some French Communards, tried to win over the feelings of the assembly by impassioned speeches. It was of no avail. From the seats occupied by the Germans, among whom precisely the younger ones are following the discussion with philosophical calm, the only thing that has been heard from time to time have been monotonous cries of "La clôture!"* and "Votel" They are leaving it to the members of the General Council to pursue the dispute over the mandates. The dominant language of the assembly is French, but most of the speakers also speak English and German. The Dutchman who is in the chair is interpreting for his fellow countrymen, who understand *only* Dutch.

The group of abstentionists presents a most interesting sight. The powerfully built Brussels lawyers are seated among the fiery-eyed Spaniards who, with their shirt-sleeves rolled up, look as if about to mount the barricades at any moment. The main speakers for this group are Morago, Brismée, the

* Close the debatel—Ed.

Genevese Guillaume, and the ardent Commune refugee Johannard. "General" Cluseret would also sit among them if his efforts to obtain a mandate from Geneva had succeeded. Among the contested mandates, those of the *Section d'action révolutionnaire* in Geneva, represented by Zhukovsky, and of Messrs Alerini (Marseilles), Sauva and West (America) have been declared null and void by a big majority.

When the moment of the vote on the Spanish mandates drew near, the bearers of these mandates publicly stated that they had withdrawn from the Alliance and went to the treasurer of the General Council to pay the subscriptions for the 30,000 workers whom they represent. But this was for them of course merely a means of gaining time, an aim which they achieved.

Nevertheless, *Karl Marx* immediately stated that in the following days he would submit a motion for the expulsion of the supporters of the Alliance who formed a secret society and discredited the International. With this statement yesterday's evening sitting was closed.

The square in front of the Congress hall still looks the same. Yesterday evening the crowd struck up the *Marseillaise* when an Amsterdam delegate called on them to show that they harboured no hostile feelings for the assembly. Only two policemen stand at the doors of the concert hall, and, owing to the Dutch people's great respect for their laws, manage with a few good-humoured words to keep the passage free. It is not the custom in Holland to send police commissaries to meetings to interrupt the speakers and excite the audience. Here the police merely have the task of protecting citizens in the free exercise of the right of assembly.

At the moment of writing the throng outside the assembly hall is quite extraordinary, since the beginning of the public proceedings is expected at any minute. And in fact they will begin at four o'clock and will probably continue until Sunday.

The Hague, September 5

The representatives of the faction at the Congress which opposes the scientific trend of the socialists and lets itself be guided exclusively by vulgar instinct spoke so much and

so long again yesterday that the opening of the public sittings had to be put off again until this morning. But yesterday evening the Germans and the French, Dutch, English, Danes and Spaniards (only the minority of the Spaniards oppose the German trend) supporting them lost all patience and, disregarding the abstentionists' motions, most of which concerned the mode of voting and procedure, went on with the business of the Congress and moved that the bureau should be formed immediately. At 9 p.m. a vote was taken. There were 78 delegates present, representing 102 mandates. The Paris porcelain painter Ranvier, at present resident in London, was elected the first chairman, and the bookseller Sorge from New York and the tailor Gerhard from Amsterdam were elected vice-chairmen.

As secretaries were appointed: Hepner (German), Le Moussu (French), the Irishman MacDonnell (English), Marselau (Spanish), and Van der Hout (Dutch).

When the bureau had been formed, the German delegates *Heim*, Johann Ph. *Becker*, *Scheu* and their comrades moved that immediately after first formalities had been dealt with and the General Report had been read out, the revision of the Rules should be discussed so that the political stand of the International and the powers of the General Council could be defined.

This was done to frustrate the manoeuvres of the abstentionists, who, after the fashion of the Left in the Hungarian Diet, wanted to prevent decisions being taken on political organisation by interpellations and discussion of procedure. The motion was carried after a heated debate, whereupon the delegates *Guillaume* (Geneva), *Brismée* (Brussels) and *Morago* (Spain) announced that they demanded the abolition of the General Council and would vote for abstention from politics, and that in the event of their being defeated by a majority they intended to act independently. A motion for the expulsion of the Alliance was referred to a commission consisting of Cuno, Walter, Vichard, Spingard and Lucaïn. The same commission was also to check the activity of the General Council. Therewith the business of the preliminary discussion was exhausted.

Concerning the expulsion of American Section No. 12 it must be added that the delegate in question, West by name,

an American street preacher, defended free love to the general animation and expounded the grounds why the said section, which had not been admitted to the International, had decided to appoint a woman (Miss Woodhull) as candidate for the American Presidency.

Today at 10 a.m. the first public sitting began. The enclosures for the public were packed out. More than 40 representatives of the press attended, most of them English or French. Sitting immediately behind the delegates were Mrs. Marx (she is known to be a sister of the former Prussian Minister Westphalen), her daughter, Madame Lafargue, a charming brunette, and the young wife of one of the Paris delegates whose names have not been revealed.

After the roll-call, the chairman, *Ranvier*, spoke to greet the assembly. He briefly reviewed the events of the past two years. Apart from a few scathing remarks against Jules Favre and Trochu, his speech was very moderate. *Ranvier* is a pleasant man and an idealist in the fullest sense of the word. He is truly respected by the Paris workers, as I myself have had occasion to see. *Ranvier*, *Cournet*, *Vaillant*, *Dereure*, *Wróblewski*, the lawyer *Longuet* (a future son-in-law of Karl Marx) and several others are in sharp opposition to the majority of the men who formed the Paris Commune.

After *Ranvier* had spoken *Dr. Sexton* from London read out in English the General Report drawn up by Karl Marx. *Longuet* read it in French, *Marx* in German, and *Dave* in Dutch.

The General Report contains nothing new, but only an enumeration of the persecutions carried out in recent years against members of the International and their results. I shall return to this subject tomorrow.

The Hague, September 6

The General Report of the General Council, which was read out yesterday, begins by characterising the International's position in relation to the Franco-German war as follows:

"The Paris members of the International had told the French people publicly and emphatically that voting the

plebiscite was voting despotism at home and war abroad. Under the pretext of having participated in a plot for the assassination of Louis Bonaparte, they were arrested on the eve of the plebiscite, the 23rd* of April, 1870. Simultaneous arrests of Internationalists took place at Lyons, Rouen, Marseilles, Brest and other towns. In its declaration of May 3rd, 1870, the General Council stated:

“This last plot will worthily range with its two predecessors of grotesque memory. The noisy and violent measures of the French government are intended to serve one single purpose—the manipulation of the plebiscite.’

“In point of fact, after the downfall of the empire, its governmental successors published documentary evidence to the effect that this last plot had been fabricated by the Bonapartist police itself, and that on the eve of the plebiscite, Ollivier, in a private circular, directly told his subordinates:

“The leaders of the International must be arrested or else the voting of the plebiscite could not be satisfactorily proceeded with.’

“The plebiscitary farce once over, the members of the Paris Federal Council were indeed condemned by Louis Bonaparte’s own judges, but for the simple crime of belonging to the International and not for any participation in the sham plot. Thus the Bonapartist government considered it necessary to initiate the most ruinous war that was ever brought down upon France, by a preliminary campaign against the French sections of the International Working Men’s Association....

“A few weeks after the plebiscite, when the Bonapartist press commenced to fan the warlike passions amongst the French people, the Paris Internationalists, nothing daunted by the government persecutions, issued their appeal of the 12th of July, ‘to the workmen of all nations’, denounced the intended war as a ‘criminal absurdity’, declaring:

“We, the members of the International Association, know of no frontiers’.

“Their appeal met with an enthusiastic echo from Germany, so that the General Council was entitled to state in its Manifesto of the 23rd of July, 1870:

* The newspaper has the 29th by mistake.—Ed.

“The very fact that while official France and Germany are rushing into a war, the workmen of France and Germany send each other messages of peace—this fact, unparalleled in the history of the past—opens the vista of a brighter future. It proves that in contrast to the old world with its social 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.’

“Up to the proclamation of the Republic,* the members of the Paris Federal Council remained in prison, while the other members of the Association were daily denounced to the mob as traitors acting in the pay of Prussia.”

The report then goes on to the persecutions which the Social-Democrats had to suffer in Germany, Austria and Hungary, Spain, Belgium and Denmark. Then it says:

“But all the measures of repression which the combined government intellect of Europe was capable of devising, vanish into nothing before the war of calumny undertaken by the lying power of the civilised world. Apocryphal histories and mysteries of the International, shameless forgeries of public documents and private letters, sensational telegrams and so on, followed each other in rapid succession; all the sluices of slander were opened at once to set free a deluge of infamy in which to drown the execrated foe. This war of calumny finds no parallel in history for the truly international area over which it has spread. When the great conflagration took place in Chicago, the telegraph round the world announced it as the infernal deed of the International; and it is truly wonderful that to its demoniacal agency has not been attributed the hurricane ravaging the West Indies.”

The report ends with a review of the progress made by the Association since the Basle Congress and the London Conference of 1871. Since that time it has become firmly established in England, Holland, Denmark and Portugal, has become strongly organised in the United States of America, and branches exist in Buenos Aires, Australia and New Zealand.

* September 4, 1870.—*Ed.*

After the reading of the report, the sitting was adjourned until 4 p.m. When it was resumed, the discussion on the revision of the General Rules began.

Herman (Belgium) wanted the General Council to be abolished; there was no need for an executive authority; the individual Federations could maintain correspondence, politics was a secondary matter, the chief thing was the fight against capital.

Lafargue (for Madrid, the industrial regions of Catalonia and all the Portuguese sections) opposed the preceding speaker, expounding the importance of an executive body. He had an imperative mandate to vote for extending the powers of the General Council and for participation in the political struggle.

Guillaume (Geneva) defended the federal principle with the eloquence of a Girondin and declared for abolition of the General Council. The latter had done nothing, neither staged an uprising nor organised a strike. These had all been carried out on the initiative of the individual Federations. On the contrary, the General Council had obstructively interfered in many places.

Morago (Valencia) favoured reducing the powers of the General Council. If this was not done his section would declare itself autonomous.

Thereupon the public sitting was closed, as the commission sittings were to begin. The next public sitting will begin at 7 p. m. today.

In the morning of September 6 an administrative sitting was held.

As the commission which was to decide on the expulsion of the Alliance could not yet report on its work, the discussion on the General Rules was continued on a motion by *Sorge* and his comrades.

Lafargue, Johann Philipp Becker, Heim and others moved that Para 2 of the General Rules, which says that the General Council is obliged to carry out the decisions of the Congresses, should be formulated so that the General Council would be obliged not only to carry out the decisions of the Congresses, but also to see to it that the basic principles as laid down in the Programme should not be violated by any Section.

Morago spoke against this, *Lafargue* in favour, after which the discussion was closed and the vote was taken.

The motion was adopted by a majority with five votes against. Eleven delegates abstained from voting. The Spanish secessionists are such consistent abstentionists that they abstain at every vote.

Van der Hout severely censured this way of acting.

Becker and his comrades further moved that the General Council shall have power to dissolve Sections and Federations till the following Congress and to suspend Federal Councils if they violate the Programme.

Where a Section is dissolved it shall be the duty of the General Council first to consult the Federal Council; when a Federal Council is suspended new elections shall be arranged within thirty days. When a Section is dissolved all Federations must be immediately appraised. Should a majority of the Sections require it, the General Council shall convene a Conference to which each country shall send one delegate.

Marx and *Engels* declared in favour of this. The former pointed out that an end must be put to the activity of agents provocateurs, fools and the like, if the International was not to be destroyed. In the South of France a policeman wanted to form a section. Similar things happened in Austria.

The motion of *Becker* and his comrades was adopted. The proportion of votes was the same as before.

Thereupon the sitting was interrupted.

September 7

After the adoption of the motion on the powers of the General Council the administrative sitting dealt with the choice of the seat of the General Council. When the majority had spoken in favour of the transfer of the General Council from London it was proposed to make New York its seat, to appoint the members of the Federal Council there—*Kavanagh*, *Saint Clair*, *Cetti*, *Levièle*, *Laurel*, *Speyer*, *Carl*, *Bertrand*, *Bolte* and *Dereure*—to the General Council and to leave it to them to bring the number of members of the General Council up to fifteen. It is true that objections were raised to New York because of its great distance from Europe,

but the majority decided in favour of that city. Some of the Germans voted for the removal of the General Council from London if only because they were of the opinion that the Blanquists (supporters of the famous conspirator Blanqui) resident in London would gain the upper hand in the General Council, which could result in the calm and rational development of the social movement being endangered.

At yesterday's administrative sitting a small incident also took place. *Cuno*, the young Stuttgart delegate, a Social-Democrat repeatedly subjected to persecution, among other things to expulsion from Milan, had heard at the first public sitting that Rudolph Schramm, former Prussian Consul in Milan, was in one of the galleries. In an outburst of petulance Cuno challenged Schramm to call on him. Schramm was, in fact, in The Hague and had made a written application for an admission card, but he was not at the sitting in question. The local *Dagblad* published Cuno's statement with certain exaggerations, and accordingly Mr. Schramm appeared yesterday in the assembly hall in a state of great excitement and asked the meeting why he had been condemned to death. A waiter at the hotel where he was staying had brought him the news of his sentence at 5 a.m. With great difficulty Schramm was calmed down and persuaded to leave the hall with Cuno. In the afternoon there came a note from Mr. Schramm in which he announced that he had reached agreement with Cuno. He bore no responsibility for Cuno's expulsion from Milan, it was his successor, Mack, who was to blame for it.

The well-known journalist *Lissagaray* also created a small diversion by complaining from up in the gallery about the disorderliness of the audience.

Yesterday at 6 p.m. the second public sitting began. The public throng was so extraordinary that maintenance of order was out of the question. Before the opening of the discussion a *Dutch delegate** addressed the public sharply criticising the calumny of the Congress published in the *Dagblad*. The reply was a boisterous repetition of the cry "Long live the International!" We shall see later that this enthusiasm did not last long.

* Van der Hout.—*Ed.*

On the agenda was the discussion on the inclusion of the London Conference resolutions on the International's position in regard to politics in the General Rules. As we have already reported, this resolution culminates in the proposition that it is necessary for the workers to conquer political power.

Vaillant, *Longuet*, *Hepner* and others spoke in favour of this. *Guillaume* spoke against. The last-named advocated a "negative", "destructive" and revolutionary policy.

After a three-hour debate restless movement backward and forward among the public made it necessary to interrupt the sitting. There was a call for an end to the debate and an immediate vote.

The talkative *Johannard*, furious at not being allowed to speak, was shouting and raving.

The crowd thought that these vigorous complaints were addressed to them and was confirmed in this opinion when a *Dutchman* demanded in far from polite terms that some of the public should leave the hall. A tumult broke loose. There were shouts and whistles from the journalists' gallery, some of the spectators sang the Dutch national anthem, others the *Marseillaise*. *The Chairman* then adjourned the sitting and in a few minutes the crowds of people had dispersed in all directions.

The public sittings were suspended by a decision taken today, since in any case the Congress was to close this evening. The discussion on the International's position in respect of politics will be continued in administrative sittings.

Published in the morning and evening editions of the *Neue Freie Presse*, Nos. 2885, 2886, 2888, 2890, September 5, 6, 8, 10, 1872

Translated from the German

[K A R L M A R X]

THE CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

The Hague, September 8

During the discussion of the position of the International in respect of politics, which I already mentioned yesterday, the points of view of individual groups were clearly brought

out. The majority of the Paris Communards now residing in London belong to the Blanquists, who go along with the Germans on many questions but by no means completely agree with them. The Blanquists themselves, owing to the bitter experience of recent years, have, it is true, become more sober, but they are still afflicted with a certain national haughtiness and thirst for action which they seek to satisfy in a reckless and even downright wrong manner. They motivated their vote for the inclusion of the resolutions of the London Conference in the General Rules with expressions which gave delegates who had come from Paris an occasion to make the following statement:

"For all the respect which we entertain for Blanqui, we are forced herewith to state that the Paris workers today no longer share the views of the Blanquists. We want to win political power in the first place by raising the working class to a spiritual level which will make it possible to attain our aim—the abolition of all class rule. We want to impress the world not by means of conspiracies but by tireless public work for the cause of our emancipation."⁴¹

The Germans spoke in the same spirit.

Addressing the anarchist Guillaume, *Hepner* exclaimed: "The time of your barricade logic has passed. Political abstention leads to the police office."

Another German delegate expressed his thoughts as follows: "We Germans have been called authoritarian socialists. Well, I admit that in a certain respect we are. We consider it necessary that the authority of character and spirit should also be respected in the society which we are striving for. But even more significant and indispensable is respect for such authority in the struggle which we are waging. The existence of the International as an association created for a definite purpose is not justified unless it provides itself with an organ which will see to it that individual groups do not discredit the International as a whole and endanger its interests." (*Turning to the abstentionists:*) "You want to fight centralist caesarism by falling into another extreme, into federalism, which belongs to a past period of history. You want to overthrow the strongly organised apparatus of reaction, and for that purpose you decree anarchy in your own ranks!" (*Stormy applause*). "The federalists, having no

understanding of the course of history, served reaction during the first French revolution; they have just suffered complete bankruptcy in Germany, their defeat in *Austria* is inevitable. Your federalism in the Jura mountains, in Belgium, Holland and some Spanish provinces has brought *agents provocateurs* into our ranks and made individual groups allies of reaction.... You refer to Proudhon, who, in 1863, recommended political abstention in respect of the Empire. What did that abstentionism lead to? To the formation of a government of talentless men and traitors. I do not by any means condemn the Paris Communards: the revolution of March 18 arose out of need, and moreover it was provoked. France owes to it the preservation of the Republic. But one of its principal weaknesses was its federalist character. In crushing the Commune Thiers was able to plead the maintenance of state unity as the French statesmen did at the massacre of the Huguenots.... If you do not wish to take part in our political work, which enlightens in all respects and sets minds in motion, if you want to stand aloof as a sect, world history, ignoring you, will pass on to its immediate affairs."

As was to be expected, the resolution on the position of the International in respect of political activity was carried with general support against the votes of Bakunin's adherents.

In the course of yesterday's closed sitting it was also decided to instruct the General Council to set up international trade unions, to hold the next Congress in Switzerland and to levy annual subscriptions of the previous size.

The finance commission reported on the financial accounts, which were acknowledged to be correct; outlays and receipts were read out before all the delegates and it turned out that certain members of the General Council belonging to the propertied classes had made considerable material sacrifices.

At 7 o'clock the *third public sitting* began, as on the request of the representatives of the press the decision taken the day before yesterday to suspend public meetings had been abandoned.

The people again thronged into the visitors' enclosure, the adjacent streets also were filled with people, but this time the order was exemplary.

The speeches of the Dutch delegates *Van den Abeele*, *Van der Hout*, *Herman*, and of the Brussels delegate *Brismée* concerned the tendencies of the International and were heartily applauded. Some shrill whistles in the gallery ceased immediately, as the public themselves reproved the trouble-makers.

After the decisions of the administrative sittings and the letters and telegrams received had been read out, the public sitting was again closed.

The last administrative sitting concluded the affair of the international Alliance. The Congress decided to expel the Alliance, especially Messrs Bakunin and Guillaume.

At 1 a.m. the Congress was declared closed. Today there will be a popular meeting in Amsterdam, the centre of the Dutch working-class movement.

Published in the evening edition
of the *Neue Freie Presse*
No. 2890, September 10, 1872

Translated from the German

ACCOUNT OF THE HAGUE CONGRESS IN THE VIENNA NEWSPAPER *VOLKSWILLE*⁴²

CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION AT THE HAGUE

On September 1 the first general discussion took place in the Concert Hall in Lombard Straat. On the following day the mandates were discussed. Among those present were:

For Germany and Switzerland: Marx, Engels, Dr. Kugelmann (Hanover), Johann Philipp Becker (Geneva), Ludwig (Heidelberg), Becker (Brunswick and Chemnitz), Cuno (Munich and Stuttgart), Heinrich Scheu from Vienna (Königsberg and Eszlingen), Milke and Friedländer (Berlin), Hepner (Leipzig) and others; for England: Dr. Sexton, Hales, Mottershead, Roach; for Denmark: Haentjens*; for Belgium: lawyer Brismée and six comrades; for Spain: Morago, Farga Pellicer, Alerini** and Dr. Lafargue; those announced to represent Italy had not yet arrived; for France: Ranvier, Cournet, Vaillant, Johannard, Leo Frankel and others. The names of those representing Paris and Toulouse were not made known. For America: Sorge (a former Baden volunteer), Dereure (French Section) and West. For Australia: Harcourt. Bakunin is not present, but his friends Guillaume, Schwitzguébel (Jura Section) and Zhukovsky are.

The sittings, the last of which lasted until midnight, were devoted exclusively to the examination and verification of the mandates. Bakunin's supporters suffered a first decisive defeat at the voting for the commission to verify the

* The newspaper has a mistake here: Denmark was represented by Pihl.—*Ed.*

** The newspaper has Soriano by mistake.—*Ed.*

mandates. They did not succeed in having a single candidate elected.

At the evening sitting the commission made its report. It contested some six mandates. The commission demanded first of all the rejection of the representatives of the Geneva *Section d'action révolutionnaire* because it consisted only of individuals expelled from the French Central Section in Geneva. Further the commission demanded the invalidation of the mandates issued by the Spanish section of Bakunin's Alliance. Bakunin's supporters have an imperative mandate according to which, in the event of their views on the question of the programme not being adopted, they must withdraw.

On September 3 and 4 there were no public sittings. The mandates were verified. Of the contested mandates the following were declared non-valid by a great majority: that of the *Section d'action révolutionnaire* in Geneva represented by Zhukovsky and those of Messrs Alerini (Marseilles), Sauva and West (America). The last-named preaches free love.

As the moment arrived when the vote was to be taken on the Spanish mandates, the bearers of those mandates publicly announced their withdrawal from the Alliance and went to the treasurer of the General Council to pay the subscriptions for the 30,000 workers they represented. *Karl Marx* immediately announced that he would table a motion for the expulsion of the Alliance supporters who had formed a secret society and compromised the International. He was in a position to produce documents which will sufficiently prove the necessity for this step.

The main language at the Congress is French, but most of the speakers speak also English and German. The Dutchman who is in the chair interprets for his compatriots who only understand Dutch.

Today the abstentionists tried by the most varied proposals to postpone the opening of the public sittings. And they succeeded. But in the evening the Germans and the French, Dutch, English, Danish and Spanish delegates who support them (only some of the Spanish delegates are in opposition to the General Council) found the continual postponements excessive and moved that the bureau should be immediately appointed.

This motion was adopted.

There were 78 delegates present, representing 102 mandates. Ranvier from Paris, at the time resident in London, was elected to be the first chairman, and Sorge from New York and Gerhard from Amsterdam as his deputies. Acting as secretaries are Hepner (German), Le Moussu (French), MacDonnell (English), Marselau (Spanish) and Van der Hout (Dutch). When the bureau had been formed a motion was proposed by the German delegates Scheu, Johann Philipp Becker, Heim and their comrades to pass on to the revision of the General Rules immediately after the first formalities had been carried out and the General Report had been read, so that the political position of the International and the powers of the General Council could be defined.

After a heated debate the majority voted for this motion, whereupon the delegates *Guillaume* (Geneva), *Brismée* (Brussels) and *Morago* (Spain) announced that they demanded the abolition of the General Council and that in the event of their being defeated they intended to carry on independently.

The proposal to expel the Alliance was referred to a commission. The same commission was to check the activity of the General Council. With this the subjects to be dealt with in the preliminary debates were exhausted.

On September 5 the first public sitting took place. The seats for the public were overcrowded. More than forty representatives of the press turned up. After the roll-call *the chairman** took the floor. He pointed out that owing to the Paris events a Congress had not met for two years, but that the conference which had been held in London had substantially promoted the interests of the International. The number of members had increased, particularly among the rural population. The speaker attacked Jules Favre and General Trochu and ended with a call to continue working for the emancipation of the working class.

After Ranvier Dr. *Sexton* from London was given the floor to read out in English the General Report drawn up by Karl Marx. *Longuet* read it in French, *Marx* in German, and *Dave* in Dutch.

* Ranvier.—*Ed.*

The General Report of the General Council begins by characterising as follows the position of the International in respect of the Franco-German war:

"The Paris members of the International had told the French people publicly and emphatically that voting the plebiscite was voting despotism at home and war abroad. Under the pretext of having participated in a plot for the assassination of Louis Bonaparte, they were arrested on the eve of the plebiscite, the 23rd* of April, 1870. Simultaneous arrests of Internationalists took place at Lyons, Rouen, Marseilles, Brest, and other towns. In its declaration of May 3rd, 1870 the General Council stated:

"This last plot will worthily range with its predecessors of grotesque memory. The noisy and violent measures of the French government are exclusively intended to serve one single purpose—the manipulation of the plebiscite.'

"In point of fact, after the downfall of the December empire its governmental successors published documentary evidence to the effect that this last plot had been fabricated by the Bonapartist police itself, and that on the eve of the plebiscite, Ollivier, in a private circular, directly told his subordinates:

"The leaders of the International must be arrested, or else the voting of the plebiscite could not be satisfactorily proceeded with.'

"The plebiscitary farce once over, the members of the Paris Federal Council were indeed condemned by Louis Bonaparte's own judges, but simply for belonging to the International, and not for any participation in the sham plot. Thus the Bonapartist government considered it necessary to initiate the most ruinous war that was ever brought down upon France, by a preliminary campaign against the French sections of the International Working Men's Association....

"A few weeks after the plebiscite, when the Bonapartist press commenced to fan the warlike passions amongst the French people, the Paris Internationalists, nothing daunted by the government persecutions, issued their appeal of the 12th of July 'to the workmen of all nations', denounced the intended war as a 'criminal absurdity', and declared that

* The newspaper has mistakenly the 29th.—Ed.

"We, the members of the International Association, know of no frontiers."

"Their appeal met with an enthusiastic echo from Germany, so that the General Council was entitled to state in its address of July 23, 1870:

"The very fact that while official France and official Germany are rushing into a war, the workers of France and Germany send each other messages of peace—this great fact, unparalleled in the history of the past—opens up 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."

"Up to the proclamation of the Republic, the members of the Paris Federal Council remained in prison, while the other members of the Association were daily denounced to the mob as traitors acting in the pay of Prussia."

The report then goes on to the persecutions which the Social-Democrats had to suffer in Germany, Austria and Hungary, Spain, Belgium and Denmark. Then it says:

"But all the measures of repression which the combined government intellect of Europe was capable of devising vanish into nothing before the war of calumny undertaken by the lying power of the civilised world. Apocryphal histories and mysteries of the International, shameless forgeries of public documents and private letters, sensational telegrams, followed each other in rapid succession; all the sluices of slander were opened at once to set free a deluge of infamy in which to drown the execrated foe. This war of calumny finds no parallel in history for the truly international area over which it has spread. When the great conflagration took place at Chicago, the telegraph round the world announced it as the infernal deed of the 'International'; and it is really wonderful that to its demoniacal agency has not been attributed the hurricane ravaging the West Indies."

The report ends with a review of the progress made by the Association since the Basle Congress and the London Conference of 1871. Since that time it has become firmly established in England, Holland, Denmark and Portugal,

has become strongly organised in the United States of America, and branches exist in Buenos Aires, Australia and New Zealand.

After the reading of the report, the sitting was adjourned until 4 p.m. When it was resumed, the discussion on the revision of the General Rules began.

Herman (Belgium) wanted the General Council to be abolished; there was no need for an executive authority, the individual Federations could maintain correspondence, politics was a secondary matter, the chief thing was the fight against capital.

Lafargue (for Madrid, the industrial regions of Catalonia and all the Portuguese sections) opposed the preceding speaker, expounding the importance of an executive body. He had an imperative mandate to vote for extending the powers of the General Council and for participation in the political struggle.

Guillaume (Geneva) defended the federal principle with the eloquence of a Girondin and declared for abolition of the General Council. The latter had done nothing, neither staged an uprising nor organised a strike. These had all been carried out on the initiative of the individual Federations. On the contrary the General Council had obstructively interfered in many places.

Morago (Valencia) favoured reducing the powers of the General Council. If this was not done his section would declare itself autonomous.

Thereupon the public sitting was closed because the commission sittings were to begin.

In the morning of September 6 an administrative sitting was held.

As the commission which was to decide on the expulsion of the Alliance could not yet report on its work, the discussion on the General Rules was continued on a motion by *Sorge* and his comrades.

Lafargue, *Johann Philipp Becker*, *Heim* and others moved that para 2 of the General Rules, which says that the General Council is obliged to carry out the decisions of the Congresses, should be formulated so that the General Council would be obliged not only to carry out the decisions of the Congresses, but also to see to it that the basic principles

as laid down in the Programme should not be violated by any Section.

Morago spoke against this, *Lafargue* in favour, after which the discussion was closed and the vote was taken.

The motion was adopted by a majority with five votes against. Eleven delegates abstained from voting. The Spanish secessionists are such consistent abstentionists that they abstain at every vote. *Van der Hout* severely censured this way of acting.

Becker and his comrades further moved that the General Council shall have power to dissolve Sections and Federations till the following Congress and to suspend Federal Councils if they violate the Programme.

Where a Section is dissolved it shall be the duty of the General Council first to consult the Federal Council; when a Federal Council is suspended new elections shall be arranged within thirty days. When a Section is dissolved all Federations must be immediately apprised. Should a majority of the Sections require it, the General Council shall convene a Conference to which each country shall send one delegate.

Marx and *Engels* declared in favour of this. The former pointed out that an end must be put to the activity of *agents provocateurs*, fools and the like, if the International was not to be destroyed. In the South of France a policeman wanted to form a section. Similar things happened in Austria.

The motion of *Becker* and his comrades was adopted. The proportion of votes was the same as before.

Thereupon the sitting was interrupted.

After the adoption of the motion on the powers of the General Council the administrative sitting dealt with the choice of the seat of the General Council. When the majority had spoken in favour of the transfer of the General Council from London it was proposed to make New York its seat, to appoint the members of the Federal Council there—*Cavanagh*, *Saint Clair*, *Cetti*, *Levièle*, *Laurel*, *Speyer*, *Karl*, *Bertrand*, *Bolte* and *Dereure*—to the General Council and to leave it to them to bring the number of members of the General Council up to fifteen. It is true that objections were raised to New York because of its great distance from Europe, but the majority decided in favour of that city.

The second public sitting was held on September 6 in the afternoon.

On the agenda was the discussion on the inclusion of the London Conference resolutions on the International's position in regard to politics in the General Rules. As we have already reported, this resolution culminates in the proposition that it is necessary for the workers to conquer political power.

Vaillant, *Longuet*, *Hepner* and others spoke in favour of this. *Guillaume* spoke against. The last-named advocated a negative, destructive policy.

Because of the growing disturbance in the hall the public sitting was declared closed after three hours' discussion, and the debate on the political position of the International was continued in a closed sitting.

At this sitting the delegates of the Paris workers made a very significant statement, the conclusion of which was: "We want to win political power in the first place by raising the working class to a spiritual level which will make it possible to attain our aim—the abolition of all class rule. We want to impress the world not by means of conspiracies but by tireless public work for the cause of our emancipation."

The Germans also expressed the same sentiments as the delegates of the Paris workers. Their speech can be summed up in the following words:

"We Germans have been called authoritarian socialists. Well, I agree that in a certain respect we are. We consider it necessary that the authority of character and mind should be respected also in the society for which we are striving. But still more significant and imperative is respect for such authority in the struggle we are pursuing. The International has no right to exist as an Association for a definite purpose unless it provides itself with a body which sees to it that no individual groups compromise the whole association or endanger its interests. The abstentionists want to fight centralistic caesarism by going to another extreme, to federalism, which belongs to a past period in history. They want to overthrow the firmly organised apparatus of reaction and for this purpose they decree anarchy in their own ranks! The federalists, having no understanding of the

course of history, served reaction in the First French revolution; they have similarly suffered complete bankruptcy in Germany; their defeat in Austria is inevitable. The federalism of the abstentionists in the Jura, in Belgium, Holland and some Spanish provinces has introduced *agents provocateurs* into our ranks and made some groups allies of reaction. Reference is made to Proudhon, who recommended political abstention in respect of the Empire in 1863. What did that abstention lead to? To a government of incompetence and treachery. If they (the abstentionists) do not want to take part in our political work which enlightens on all sides and sets minds in motion, if they seclude themselves like sects, world history will carry on its agenda without them."

Hepner called out to the federalist Guillaume: "The time of your barricade logic has gone. Political abstention leads to the police station."

The motion concerning the political position of the International was finally adopted by all except Bakunin's supporters, who voted against.

It was further decided at the closed sitting to direct the General Council to set up international trade unions, to convene the next congress in Switzerland and to raise annual subscriptions at the same rate as previously.

The Finance Commission reported on the accounts of the Treasury, which were found correct. The expenditures and receipts were read out to all the delegates.

At 7 o'clock the third public sitting began.

Crowds of people again streamed into the hall and the adjacent streets were also full of people, but this time the order was exemplary. Speeches were made by *Van den Abeele*, *Van der Hout*, *Herman* and *Brismée* on the tendencies in the International.

Then the decisions of the administrative sittings and letters and telegrams were read out, and thereupon the public sitting was closed.

The last administrative sitting settled the question of the international Alliance. The investigation commission reported on the intrigues of Mr. Bakunin and his associates, who had founded a secret society within the International. It produced documents which were very compromising for

Bakunin and his supporters in the Jura Section, and accordingly proposed the expulsion of the Alliance and in particular the expulsion of Messrs Bakunin and Guillaume.

After Mr. *Guillaume* and his friends had been allowed to speak in their defence and had made full use of this, the Congress decided in favour of the Commission's proposal. The federalists further declared that they would not comply with the decisions of the Congress, upon which *Sorge* from New York closed the Congress at 1 a.m.

On September 8 there was a popular meeting in Amsterdam. Several Congress delegates spoke about the organisation of the International.

Published in the *Volkswille*
Nos. 37 and 38, September 14
and 21, 1872

Translated from the German

[H E I N R I C H S C H E U]

ON THE CONGRESS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION ⁴³

We followed with intense attention the struggles of ideas whose outcome was decided at the Congress in The Hague and we noted with satisfaction that these struggles promoted the process of purification which is going on at present within the parties which have inscribed on their banner the social emancipation of the working class.

Tens of years had to go by before the social movement rose from so-called vulgar communism to scientific socialism, and many a year will pass before the latter meets with the necessary recognition in all the countries of Europe, at least among the workers.

The Congress in The Hague carried us some steps forward.

The trend of scientific socialism, to which our young party in Austria also adheres, having freed itself from the traditions of the older socialism, won at The Hague a victory which must not be underestimated. The reactionary press would naturally have preferred, as we could see from its reports, to see the anarchists and reckless dreamers triumph so that they would have had an opportunity to incite the police against the International. That was also the reason why in its accounts, apart from the insolent fictions to which it treated its readers, it favoured those whose extravagances had for years provided it with material to cast suspicion on the strivings of the workers. On the other hand, it sought to ascribe the intentions and plans of the minority to the majority.

Thus the Vienna *Deutsche Zeitung* this time even played the role of informer for extraordinarily petty motives which we do not want to adduce here. This newspaper, in particular, on the occasion of the Congress resolution on the political position of the International, published a leading article under the heading "The Question of the Worker Caste" in which it tried to prove that this resolution meant nothing else than that the workers as a caste intended to rule over the other social classes. That is the kind of nonsense a newspaper prints on the same page which deals with the programme of the International, *the abolition of all class rule!*

But the conduct of the press needs to be mentioned no further. We have long since been aware what we can expect of it. So let us return to our discussion of the Congress itself.

For seven days, from early morning till late at night, the delegates of Europe's socialist parties deliberated and worked. The proceedings were not interrupted by any banquet or entertainment of any kind. They ended as they had begun, without any pomp, seriously.

One will not be surprised that there was no complete unanimity in the assembly if one bears in mind that the workers' parties in individual countries are only beginning to develop and organise themselves and that, as is necessarily the case with young parties, all of them without exception have to endure difficult inner struggles.

To this we must add the different political and social relationships in the various countries. As in years gone by the disunited conditions in Germany gave birth to some progressive parties and ultimately to a federalistic democracy, as the same conditions also hindered a uniform development of the workers' movement in Germany, so also small states such as Holland and Belgium, which still until the present day have avoided the fate of annexion, are apt to produce separatistic views even among the workers. From these countries, and also from little Switzerland, or rather from the still smaller Jura region, where there is only one industry of any significance, that of watchmaking, and finally from a few provincial towns in still backward Spain, came those conspirators, brawlers and doctrinaires who opposed the majority.

It is not our intention to go into details here and that is why we shall disregard the individuals who came into the foreground when the internal dissensions were divulged.

By declaring itself against sectarianism, against anarchy, and for centralising all forces to win political power, the Congress has shown all workers' parties the direction they must follow in individual countries.

The external struggle requires internal strength. To achieve and preserve this, all reckless experiments must be prevented, all play with secret societies must cease, all useless expenditure must be avoided, all harmful elements must be kept out of the party.

For years ahead our work must consist mainly in shaking up all indifferent workers who hinder the progress of our movement, lifting them up out of the bog in which they still live and making them morally decent and educated persons capable of taking part in the cultural work of our time.

With this purpose in view it is for us in Austria at the same time a matter of honour and imperative necessity to come in possession of a daily newspaper as soon as possible.

This project is feasible at a time when the Austrian workers are aware of their mission, when they grasp the importance of having a press organ which daily defends their interests and brings enlightenment to all strata of the population. Not by strikes, which in our day so frequently bear no fruit and when they are successful only too often alienate the workers from their unions, shall we be able to protect ourselves against the encroachments of our enemies. At a time when the present rulers of Europe intend to suppress the largely disunited workers' movement, we must at last realise how important is the existence in the centre of the European workers' movement, in Vienna, of a press organ whose task is to show the world that the achievement of our aims answers the interests of all. We must not forget that precisely since our project took shape the enemies of our party have been more active than ever and have endeavoured under all sorts of disguises to sow dissension and to mislead the workers. That is why anybody who took part

in the proceedings of the Hague Congress, anybody who wishes to promote the international workers' movement in the general interest, anybody who wishes to help in establishing a state of freedom, morality and solidarity, let him work for the speedy appearance of our daily paper.

Published in the
Volkswille No. 38,
September 21, 1872

Translated from the German

**REPORT OF THE FRENCH DELEGATE
RAIMOND WILMART
ON THE HAGUE CONGRESS ⁴⁴**

In the verification of credentials several discussions took place which are worthy of recording.

Such was the case with Citizen *West*, delegated by Section 12 of the United States, who made a long speech in defence of the conduct of his Section.

Citizen *Sauva* (U.S.) opposed the admission of Section 12, but admitted that it had actively defended the Commune.

Citizen *Sorge* (U.S.) also opposed its admission, stating that it was composed of middle-class people and was always more ready to agitate for anything but the International.

Citizen *Brismée* (Belgium) moved a resolution to the effect that the International Working Men's Association could not admit a middle-class section, and the resolution was carried.

Other debates took place on various credentials, but all other delegates were admitted.

A committee of five members was then appointed to investigate the deeds of the Alliance.

In the first public sitting the attributes of the General Council were discussed.

Citizen *Herman* (Belgium) said that his Section wished to diminish the powers of the General Council and to reduce it to a centre of correspondence and statistics.

Citizen *P. Lafargue* (Portugal) defended the maintenance of existing powers.

Citizen *Guillaume* (Switzerland) advocated an increase of power in the General Council of the Congress of 1869,* but now his Section wished those powers to be diminished. He was in favour of suppressing it altogether, but was prepared to accept a compromise granting that the General Council would only be regarded as a means of exchanging correspondence.

Citizen *Karl Marx* (General Council) replied that the General Council had to be the keeper of the ground principles of the Association or to be nothing at all. He asserted that it was impossible to conceive a federation of societies for the promotion of a principle and the pursuit of one aim, without a body to see that all those societies do what they are expected to do from the tenor of the statutes.

It was resolved that the General Council would have to watch in all countries that the rules and fundamental principles be strictly observed, and that it has a right to suspend a Section until the next Congress, after taking advice from the Federal Council in such countries where one exists. It has a right to dissolve a Federal Council, but must advise the respective Sections that they may immediately proceed to the election of a new one. It has a right to suspend a whole federation, in which case it must advise all the federations and summon a conference within thirty days if the majority of federations require it, in which case countries having no federation shall enjoy the same rights.

The resolution of the Conference of 1871 was then discussed and was supported by Citizens *Vaillant* and *Hepner*, and opposed by Citizens *Guillaume* and *Longuet*.**

A vote was then taken, resulting in the addition of the rule, "That to conquer political power is the first duty of the proletariat."***

The contributions to the General Council remain as before.

It was generally agreed that the removal of the General Council from London was advisable. Several places were proposed, amongst which were Brussels, Geneva, Madrid,

* The newspaper has 1860 by mistake.—*Ed.*

** Here there is a mistake in the report. Longuet did not oppose, but supported the resolution on political activity.—*Ed.*

*** See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 282.—*Ed.*

Saragossa, and Chicago. On the motion of Citizen *Engels*, New York was chosen by a large majority.

The next business was the election of twelve members for the new Council, to which was given the power of adding three members. The twelve elected were Kavanagh, St. Clair, Cetti, Laurel, Levièle, Bertrand, Bolte, Carl, Fornaccieri, Speyer, and Dereure.*

It was then resolved to hold the next Congress in Switzerland, the General Council to select the town.

The report of the committee appointed to investigate the deeds of the Alliance was then read, and it was decided to expel Bakunin and Guillaume from the Association, on the grounds that they had organised a secret society inside the International Working Men's Association, with a view to directing the whole body in favour of their personal and sect interest.

Editorial Note.—If friends will restrain their impatience they may yet endorse the care that is being taken to provide an impartial and serviceable report of the recent Congress. It is intended to give such a report as early as possible. The daily papers, of course, were not particular as to the soundness of the merchandise they bought and sold, but when a Society has to be consulted and reports have to be compared, criticised, and accepted *before publication*, some delay is unavoidable. It is quite certain that very important decisions will be arrived at and announced shortly, meantime *let every Section secure a representative*. It is not within the province of the editor of this journal to publish sensational or speculative reports. Better wait for truth than gape for fiction.

Published in *The International Herald* No. 25, September 21, 1872

Printed according to the newspaper

* The list of members elected to the General Council is given in the newspaper text with numerous misprints, and the name of Ward, who resigned in October 1872, is omitted.—*Ed.*

[EDOUARD VAILLANT]

INTERNATIONAL AND REVOLUTION ⁴⁵

WRITTEN ON THE OCCASION OF THE HAGUE CONGRESS
BY COMMUNARD EMIGRÉS, FORMERLY
MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL'S GENERAL COUNCIL

In the absence of an official account and in view of the contradictory reports in the press on what happened at The Hague, we believe it our duty to state what our attitude was to the events which occurred at the Congress of the International.

We may have to explain later in greater detail what motives induced us to enter the General Council and led us to go to the Congress at The Hague and what events brought us to realise that the International Association was not and could not become the powerful revolutionary lever which we had desired. But being determined to remain above all questions of personality, we shall here touch only on considerations of general interest. For the time being it will be sufficient for us to establish what appears to us to be the position of the revolutionary party in respect of the International.

Forgetting the regrettable compromises of which several branches of the Association, including some French groups, had been guilty in advocating neutrality under the Empire and obtaining indulgence from a power tainted with crime which was pleased to see doctrinaires and schemers rendering the workers indifferent to the political struggle and seeking legal grounds for their metaphysical drivel and their intrigues, we found ourselves, following the fall of the Commune, faced with declarations of the General Council which seemed to open up before the International a new and fruitful future on the road to the Revolution.

From the very outset of the 1870 war, the General Council had attacked the policy of plunder and conquest for which Prussia was arming, and pointed out the danger of seeing established on the ruins of the Bonapartist empire a no less infamous but younger empire supported by a bourgeoisie less frayed and better armed against the Revolution and constituting the greatest obstacle to it: the Prussian empire.

At the time when the Social Revolution was succumbing in Paris, when, after two months' heroic struggle, the Paris Commune had fallen under the onslaught of a ferocious bourgeoisie which tried with repressions as bloody as they were stupid to make the champions of the proletarian cause pay for the terror caused by the threat to its privileges, the General Council published its manifesto on the Civil War in which, declaring in the name of the International its solidarity with all the actions of the Commune, it expounded from a highly elevated point of view the meaning and the grandeur of the Revolution of March 18.

A short time later, the London Conference, on the initiative of some of us who had recently entered the General Council, adopted the resolution stating the necessity for the proletariat to form a separate political party opposed to all the parties formed by the propertied classes and uniting against all these bourgeois parties for the political struggle the forces of the proletariat already organised for the economic struggle.

This resolution moreover asserted the truth, which has become more obvious since March 18, that the conquest of political power by the proletariat was the true means for its emancipation.

The International seemed to step openly on to the path of revolution; the General Council appeared determined to lead it on that path; so some Communards entered the Council, resolved to join those who had preceded them there and to strengthen the revolutionary element in it in order to give the International the role and the function they desired for it.

For us the International was neither a union of trades societies nor a federation of resistance societies. It was to be the international vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat. We recognised the usefulness of these vast workers'

associations which organise revolt on economic ground and many a time broke by their cohesion, by strikes, the chains of oppression fettering them. We recognised too well the unbreakable unity of proletarian revolutionary action under its dual aspect, economic and political, to fall into the error for which we reproached our adversaries and to deny one side of the movement under the pretext of better asserting the other.

We knew that it was by the economic struggle that the proletariat began to organise, that it began to feel itself a class, a power, and that by it lastly it created the medium which permits it, when constituted into the party of the proletarians, to accept battle on all grounds, a battle without mercy or respite, which will end only when, by the conquest of political power and by its dictatorship, the proletariat has smashed the old society and created the elements of the new one.*

* In formulating this truth, which since March 18 has become an axiom, that the conquest of political power by force was necessary for the proletariat in order to carry out the Social Revolution, we did not expect our thought to be misunderstood. We do not know to what extent we should attribute to good faith what we are still prepared to call a misunderstanding on the part of our adversaries. It seems to us that there can be no doubt for socialists that after the disappearance of those privileges, those classes whose existence has produced what is understood by State, Government, and whose modifications manifest themselves in corresponding changes in those institutions, which are products of those class distinctions, of those privileges and the guarantee of their preservation, those institutions will disappear of themselves, their social functions no longer existing. The functions of government will resolve themselves into administrative functions in the egalitarian medium of the new society; the State will no longer exist any more than the classes will.

But in order to carry out this emancipation of the workers, this abolition of the classes which is the aim of the Social Revolution, it is necessary for the bourgeoisie to be dispossessed of its political privilege, by which it maintains all the others. The proletariat must, in a period of revolutionary dictatorship, use for its emancipation this power which so far has been directed against it. It must turn against its adversaries the very weapons which have so far held it in oppression. And only then, when it has made a clean sweep of those institutions, those privileges which make up present-day society, this dictatorship of the proletariat will cease as having no purpose, the abolition of all classes of itself making government by one class disappear. The groups as well as individuals will be autonomous, then there will be realised that Federation, the result of and not the means for victory, *anarchy*

We knew that this organisation of the workers in view of the economic struggle was far from complete, and above all that it did not include the most numerous and most indigent strata of the proletarian world; that consequently in this respect there was much more to be done than had already been done, and in our opinion it was one of the duties of the International to complete this organisation, to spread it to where it had not penetrated.

Being formed of the most energetic element, it was to be the initiator of all economic and political movements, it was to organise the proletarian party in each country, to lead it everywhere and always to the fight against the bourgeoisie until the day when, through the solidarity of efforts of all countries, it had led to final victory.

The International was to be above all the permanent organisation of the proletariat for insurrection or it would only be a make-believe, a fatal diversion from the movement.

It seemed to us all the more necessary that the International should take this path since, as a result of the manifesto on the Civil War, as a result of the part some Internationals had taken individually in the Commune, and above all as a result of persecution by the government, the public conscience had ascribed this role to the International, which had become almost a power, and its name a password.

Unfortunately the majority of the General Council did not understand as we did the necessity for transforming the International Association in order to bring it up to the level of the movement. Those who inspired it felt, incidentally, that too much revolution would kill *their* International, would disarrange their plans and disturb their tranquillity.

Too much skill is harmful, and what has been done to save the International and protect it against the undertakings of the revolutionary element compromises and ruins it. The great idea of uniting in a common effort the individual efforts of each country existed prior to the foundation of the

which is produced by victory and which, during struggle is disorganisation or weakness if it is not treachery or stupidity.—*Author's note.*

Association and survives it, and since the Commune it has been growing more powerful every day.

But this impetuous striving of the proletariat for its emancipation cannot be regulated, codified. This creative movement cannot be embodied in an association, however broad its framework and its spirit may be.

We are not denying that by establishing the International its founders contributed greatly to spreading this idea of solidarity among the proletarians of all countries. But the development of the idea has made the institution which was intended to develop it useless. We witnessed its powerlessness and its weakness at The Hague. The movement has outstripped it, and the International, far from promoting the movement, is thwarting it and holding it back.

Whereas the true international revolutionary point of view is that of the most advanced countries, there seem to be efforts to create a legal or semi-legal situation, avoiding the too dangerous ground of Revolution.

Our efforts to lead the International along the path of revolution¹ having remained fruitless owing to the opposition of all the factions in the Council, the question for us at The Hague was to undertake a last attempt. We asked for the Conference statement on the political activity of the working class to be included in the General Rules in such a way as to oblige the International to take action.* We also asked for the powers of the General Council to be extended and the subscription to be increased in order to increase its power of initiative.

At the same time we submitted a declaration, promising revenge for the defeated, vengeance for the murdered, and victory for the proletariat who show consideration for and trust in their delegates.

And finally we asked that the organisation of the revolutionary forces should be placed on the order of the day.

The Congress fell short of all expectations.

Quarrels among schools and personalities, intrigues etc., took up more than half of the sittings. One felt oneself in

* Here a footnote refers to the resolution of the London Conference which was published as Appendix No. 2 to the pamphlet. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 282.—Ed.

the presence of a shadow to which only public credulity imparted existence. The International was thought to be powerful because it was held to represent Revolution. It proved to be timid, divided and parliamentary. Only with difficulty was the Conference resolution inserted in the General Rules. As for the statements and resolutions which we had asked for on the organisation of the revolutionary forces of the proletariat, they were buried by being referred to a commission.*

The extension of the General Council's powers having been voted, the cause was not yet lost, for facts are always worth more than words. A Council purged of unwholesome and weak elements, armed with full powers, relying on a beginning of organisation of the Association could at once take up the struggle with renewed energy. This was the important point, on condition that this extension of powers was not annulled first by the removal of the Council to America and then by the subscription being maintained at ten centimes per member per year. What, in effect, makes the International not very active is the lack of impulse from the centre. When a party groups to fight, its action can be said to be all the more powerful as its condensed expression, its executive or directing committee, is more active, better armed, stronger. The very aspect of the Association would have changed if, instead of remaining a correspondence, information and statistics bureau, its General Council had been given the mission to organise, agitate, enliven the movement by all possible means and with all possible energy, if, instead of regulating its activity according to the average of national ideas, it had taken as its guide-line the most advanced expression of revolutionary ideas.

It is certain that once the General Council had become a committee of action, without ceasing to render the same services from the point of view of the economic struggle, it would have carried with it the good elements in the Associa-

* Here a footnote refers to the address of Edouard Vaillant, Antoine Arnaud and others to the Congress asking for the inclusion in the agenda of the forthcoming Congress of the question of working-class political activity, which was published as Appendix No. 1 to the pamphlet. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 183-85, 187.—*Ed.*

tion in this revolutionary impetus, and the International would have become the vanguard of the Revolution.

For that it was necessary that, without sacrificing one aspect of the movement to the other, the Council should be given over to socialist revolutionary elements determined to carry the struggle to the extreme in the economic and the political fields. In a word, the Council should have been at the centre of action, in London.

Such was the project, and such it had to be, intending to make the International a really revolutionary organisation; but that was not the opinion of those who feared too great a preponderance of the French Commune element in a Council with its seat in London. And so the Congress moved it to America.*

For fear of becoming communalistic the International preferred suicide. Its friends, who did not know the secret behind the comedy, wept over it. They wondered what extravagant idea had led, when the scene of the struggle was Europe, when the main body of the army was fighting in France, Austria, England, Spain, and Germany, to the head, the leadership, being sent to America, to the centre of the divisions, to the atmosphere of charlatanism, and to the least socialist people in the world.

Challenged to do its duty, the International refused. It escaped from Revolution. It fled across the Atlantic. But Revolution can do without its co-operation. In deserting the scene of battle the International Association has vanished, has destroyed its power in the eyes of those who saw in it one of the vital forces of Revolution.

The movement will not be diminished by this. The situation will be the same, but clearer. It is a good thing, by the way, for spectres to vanish, for phantasmagoria to disappear, giving place to the reality of Revolution arming everywhere, organising in every country against the common oppression. So may the destiny of the Association be accomplished! The international idea under whose auspices it was founded will not perish; it is more tenacious than ever.

* Here a footnote refers to the proposal of Karl Marx, Frederick Engels and others on the seat and the composition of the General Council, which was published as Appendix No. 4 to the pamphlet. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 189.—Ed.

As for the Association itself, it was becoming a hindrance every day. As we have already said, it needed the transformation we asked for, it should have become revolutionary to produce the movement instead of being dragged along by it. Its previous structure—even with the extension of its Council's powers, weakened by its exile to New York—the manner in which its action has been determined by a Congress of delegates and by an elected Council, makes it a parliamentary institution rather than one of action. By the force of things the central impetus of the Congress and the Council is determined by a certain average of all the national elements comprised by the Association, which is always inferior to the revolutionary idea of the most advanced countries, the idea which should be the law if the aim of the Association were the movement. And so, in some cases inferior, in some superior to the national groups in the various countries, the General Council, because it does not adopt a position of action, bears a character which, granted, is more international than that of a national committee, but is less precise, more irresolute, better constituted as the guardian of a pact than as a committee of action, as a conservative senate than as a revolutionary committee.

The principal function of the International has been to serve as a link between the workers' associations; its General Council has been the real body which served as their intermediary and brought some unity into their efforts. The International has spread and developed the organisation of the proletariat from the point of view of the economic struggle, it has shown the proletariat the need for international cohesion; it has, in a word, compensated for the incompleteness of the workers' organisation and on many an occasion has made victory easier. Its function of initiator would therefore be useless for the economic struggle as soon as the proletariat, more conscious of its interests and its strength, organised itself in national and international federal trade societies. Only when the proletariat has constituted itself by this direct organisation will it be possible to undertake the economic struggle and pursue it with success, and the services of the International will become useless.

This moment has arrived. This need for direct organisation is asserting itself every day more strongly, and the

Association will bring its work to a worthy end by facilitating this constitution of the proletariat. The Hague Congress seemed to understand this when it called on the workers to form international trade societies and instructed the General Council to direct all its activity towards creating and developing this institution. This proposal, to which we eagerly subscribed, was adopted unanimously by the Congress.* Its natural and necessary consequence must be the fusion of all the societies in a world socialist federation of the whole of the proletariat.

In this way the army of the workers will be constituted and it is that army that will carry on the permanent economic struggle against the privileges of the propertied classes; it is from the depths of this mass that the more active elements, exasperated by poverty, oppression and injustice, will emerge to reinforce the revolutionary vanguard and fight that decisive battle against the privileged classes which will allow the proletariat, by conquering political power, to obliterate those privileges, to abolish those classes and to create the elements of the future society.

Just as the International had the role of initiator in regard to the economic struggle, we wanted it to have the same role in regard to the political struggle. We thought it could also organise that revolutionary international party of the workers which is asserting itself and fighting relentlessly in every country and which is numerous and would be strong if it had organisation. That is what the Congress did not want to understand and what men who are revolutionaries in words more than in acts could not admit.

The Congress preferred to remove the centre of the Association and to transfer to New York a leadership which by reason of its location is rendered ineffective.

But one cannot insist too much that the revolutionary movement is far from being tied to the International; often even, as in France, it has been opposed to the International, and it does not need to wait for the International to modify its decisions in order to assume its form and trend. Hither-

* Here a footnote refers to the resolution relating to the internationalisation of Trades Societies published as Appendix No. 3 to the pamphlet. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 285.—Ed.

to, despite manifestos and declarations, the various branches of the International have prudently abstained from armed struggle; only individually have its members mixed with the fighters.

We have already said that the International, founded to make up for the workers' lack of organisation, to create and develop that organisation, could not make up its mind to assume this militant role that we endeavoured to give it. It remains and ends with the services it has rendered, with its successor and heir, the international union of trade societies. There ends its first and last period. It has been unwilling to begin a second, still more fruitful period with the revolutionary party and it is fleeing to America, expressing admittedly the desire to organise the working classes in a separate political party but evading the duty of contributing to this.

As for us, we saw with regret the International renounce completing its work, obliterating the errors and faults of several of its branches and doing for political action what it had done for economic action. But as the direct organisation of the proletariat in trades societies is going to become a reality, so also the formation of the active proletarian elements into a political party becomes more feasible every day and in every country; and wherever this party is created, the international idea presides over its creation. It is sufficient for this party to be organised in one country for it to have immediately relations of fraternal solidarity with the workers' party in the other countries.

We need not say that in withdrawing from the International it is not our wish to withdraw from action; on the contrary, and we think we have given the reasons for this, it is to enter into it with greater energy than ever, having no ambition but to do our duty to the end. But we are under no illusion, we know that the most energetic efforts of exiles have less effect than the most feeble action of those who have been able to remain on the field of battle.

We only insist on these people knowing that they can rely on us as we rely on them to reconstitute the revolutionary party, to organise revenge and to prepare the new and final struggle. It is to our friends in France, to the Communards who escaped the shootings and the pontoons, to the

revolutionary proletariat that this work of revenge and victory belongs.

We have therefore only one aim: the reorganisation in France as in every other country of the workers' party in the most militant manner around the banner of the social revolution for which Paris fought and fell, for the revolutionary Commune.

In France, the place *par excellence* of armed revolution, it is of urgent importance not to tie the future of the organisation of the revolutionary socialist party to that of the International. There the future of the revolution lies in the hands of the proletariat in the towns, which alone is revolutionary. The workers in the country, tied down to small property or gravitating around it, are still, owing to ignorance of their own interests, under the power of reaction and are its support.

The revolutionary minority of the proletariat in the towns must therefore rely only on themselves; it is up to them to make up by their organisation and energy for their numerical inferiority. Only at this price can they carry out the revolution and neutralise the inert and adverse mass until they can carry it with them. They will have this mass on their side when they have shown by the abolition of privileges that the interests of the workers are the same everywhere. Then the peasant will not be the least ardent adversary of the property which he worships and defends today.

The duty of the revolutionary party is to arm, to strengthen and to organise itself. Let all the French Communards group together and, not forgetting that it is on the morrow of defeat that a vanquished party which has the future on its side must rise, let them begin again that struggle to the death against the bourgeoisie which must end with the destruction of that caste, the emancipation of the workers, the abolition of classes, the social revolution.

Only by this organisation can victory be secured, maintained, and turned into final triumph.

Let the most energetic and dedicated citizens everywhere take the initiative of this organisation; grouped by trades for economic struggle, the workers will also be grouped by their revolutionary energy in the political struggle. Let them

not forget that the value of a group depends less on the number than on the energy of those who constitute it. All the revolutionary working elements must seek each other out, league up, federate together. Often a single man of initiative is sufficient to organise the revolutionary elements in a town or in a *département*. In times of revolution the people always follow those whose intelligence and energy show them the way.

Above all let any contact with the bourgeoisie be avoided; at no cost must there be an alliance with the bourgeois parties; there can be no closeness, even for an instant, between the brothers of those who were shot and those who shot them.

The radical bourgeoisie of Versailles, like any other bourgeoisie, is also responsible for the massacres. It is our most dangerous enemy, the one who stands between the present and the future Commune. It too must be crushed. We must not forget that any dealings with radicalism would be an abdication for the revolutionary party; isolation is its strength.

So let the proletariat rally and group around the revolutionary Commune, the name of battle and soon of victory for the social revolution.

London, September 15, 1872

*Ant. Arnaud.—F. Cournet.—
Margueritte.—Constant Martin.
—G. Ranvier.—Ed. Vaillant.*

P. S. These lines, written on our return to London, were to have been published at once; but reasons of a material character delayed their being printed.

Since then some newspapers have dealt again with the Congress and have interpreted our attitude at The Hague according to their own liking.

We would say nothing of these fanciful assessments had we not been astonished to see some socialist newspapers take up the slanders of reactionary newspapers and use them against us.

However far removed we feel from certain socialist groups whose ideas seem to us to be dangerous for the revolution, we are of the opinion that there is nevertheless an abyss between them and the so-called radical bourgeois parties, Jacobins, etc.

How is it then that some socialists have shown enough stupidity or bad faith to misinterpret our words, falsify our ideas, trying to liken us to those pernicious doctrinaires of the so-called radical bourgeoisie, the Jacobins, the most detestable of our adversaries? Were they forgetting that it is only at Versailles that there are Jacobins, that it is in the radical bourgeois party that Jacobinism flourishes, that only there, among the last buttresses of the old society, the last refuge of the bourgeoisie, can it find representatives?

It is not among the Jacobins, those reactionaries of the first revolution, that the ancestors of the Commune are to be found. If one wants to find them it is in the Paris Commune, it is among the Héberts, the Chaumettes, the Marats, the Babeufs and not among the Robespierres, the Jacobins and their like who ruined the Republic and put a stop to the revolution, that they must be looked for.

In giving this explanation we are almost ashamed for those to whom we address it, for it is insulting to their intelligence to admit their good faith. They can try as much as they like to bury us in the past with those dead bourgeois of the first revolution. We shall nonetheless live to prove to them that the revolution is with us, not with them.

Published as the pamphlet:
Internationale et Révolution,—
à propos du Congrès de la Haye
par des Réfugiés de la Commune,
Ex-membres du Conseil Général
de l'Internationale,
London, 1872

Translated from the French

ACCOUNT OF THE SWISS DELEGATE
JOH. PH. BECKER
OF THE FIFTH CONGRESS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION AT THE HAGUE ⁴⁶

Considering the small size of the *Tagwacht*, it will all the less occur to me to give a detailed account of this congress as the bigger papers of our party have already given the most essential details about it. It therefore seems in general more appropriate to afford our party comrades a more exact acquaintance with the differences which appeared some time ago within our Association and came to light at The Hague, so that they will be able to understand more correctly and better assess the attitude and the results of the Congress. And our opponents too, insofar as they condescend to read a small workers' paper and to do so with a certain degree of impartial thinking, must be given to know that they were mistaken in jubilating over the imminent dissolution, disintegration and impending death of the great Workers' Association and must realise that the single and pure socialist principle brilliantly triumphed at The Hague and that the International Working Men's Association purged and strengthened itself and became more capable than ever of fulfilling its cultural and historical task.

To be sure, the International cannot harbour the illusion that it is composed only of heroes of virtue and wisdom, for there is complete consciousness among its leadership that the temporary character of man and society, of classes and races must be considered as the product of circumstances, that a workers' association cannot remain free of the prejudices and habits, usages and abuses prevailing in the present

generation, that in it both noble and base passions are bound to be represented, and that fact and fancy, thoroughness and superficiality, sound judgment and flightiness, caution and presumption etc., cannot exist together without friction and conflict; that one has to organise and construct with such elements and materials as conditions provide, and that these elements and materials by no means possess the properties which one could assume them to possess were they the product of more rational and therefore more just conditions; on the contrary, one must first carefully prepare the wool gathered with effort and sacrifice, cut out of it the right cloth to provide the appropriate garment for the social body, which becomes more distinct and definite in shape during the process of this work. One must never abandon oneself to the illusion that even when culture has reached its most progressive stage the time will come when there will cease to be differences of character, of temperament determining expression of will and conduct, of needs and urges, and that everything will be in ideal harmony. On the contrary one can make bold to presume from experience that side by side there will always be reasonable minds and also extravagant and tired ones, weak and strong hearts, noble and vulgar souls, that mediocrity will always have the greatest scope for action, and that the species of humanity which often enough becomes a public scourge, thinking it alone has found the philosopher's stone and continually toiling with a self-important air to invent *perpetuum mobile*, an elixir of life or some other impossible thing, is indestructible and immortal.

And why should not that meddling and impertinent species, mounting its favourite hobby-horse, have found the way to have itself represented, and give itself airs and obtain influence in the International Working Men's Association? Why, anyhow, should the International alone be exempt from all the defects and shortcomings of the present generation and as immaculate as befits only the Virgin Mary?

Nevertheless, the ruling class in society, which possesses the privileges of upbringing, education and science as well as the monopoly of putting them to use, mockingly demands of the working class, which it treats as a Cinderella and strives to hold in bondage to it through the stultifying church

organisation, that it should possess all the virtues, even superhuman ones, in accordance with the notions of times gone by, that its associations should include only people of a pious and docile manner of thought, and that in their conduct they should, out of good manners, avoid all presumptuous clashes with their masters. Yet it is the ruling class which contains the whole army of refined (crafty) exploiters, the most perfect samples of artful crooks, the biggest idlers, squanderers, gluttons and debauchees of all kinds—in a word the actual bearers of all the vices of modern times, and is the calamity of history.

Therefore, without any shyness or false shame, we can reveal the failings of the working proletariat, for which the bourgeoisie is itself chiefly responsible, and pass in review the various elements of the International Working Men's Association exactly as they appear at the congresses in order the better to understand what will be said later. If this Association stands at all on the positions of positive knowledge, the knowledge of its essence is of the highest significance.

So let us try, before we deal with the Hague Congress in detail, to carry out this review as succinctly as possible.

The greater part of the International, constituting its immutable core, has no other school, no other object for the basis of its studies and of the theory following from them, than the political and socio-economic life before it, studies all facts in their causes and effects, strives to express their manifestations correctly and bring them to the general knowledge in order finally to arrive at the right understanding of the appropriate action, whether in destroying or building, and thus to accomplish collective work in theory and in practice. *This means scientific socialism, successive (gradual) and permanent (continuous) revolution which tries to keep in step with developing political and socio-economic reality and is therefore genuine revolution, so to speak developing of itself; however, although it ordinarily proceeds with measured steps it makes an extraordinary leap forward whenever a favourable concurrence of circumstances allows the tremendous obstacles in its way to be eliminated and historic development to be brought back to its normal course.*

But at the very foundation of the Association other elements which were already present then and therefore had a right to exist joined up with this core of the International. They considered socialism as a doctrine invented by minds of genius and having a mostly negative scientific basis in the criticism of existing reality; they indulge mainly in dogmatism, enthuse* over conditions which are painted in rosy colours in their studies, have ready-made plans for this in their pockets and build up in imagination splendid social forms for the happiness of the world which they intend to realise one fine day by inviting humanity, after it has been adequately educated by assiduous propaganda, to be kind enough to walk in.

Our congresses, especially the first ones, were strongly afflicted by such elements who were full of aversion for anything real and full of veneration for the abstract, who could hardly differentiate between real values and nominal ones, and could imagine nothing substantial without metaphysical trappings and frills. To these congresses came grey-haired representatives of all salvation schools with caskets full of plans for the happiness of humanity, proudly convinced that they were going to change the whole of the old world. How useful it was for many a one at the approach of this swarm of saviours of the world to be used to mosquitoes and Rhine midges. How thoroughly all these leonine heads were drilled in their dogmas, how loudly they roared, saying more in five minutes than normal human reason can grasp in five years and yet prattling for hours every day. Even today I am horrified when I think how at the Geneva Congress a Frenchman of the kind that embrace millions of brothers and who saw the possibility of solving the social question only in the introduction of a universal language,⁴⁷ beamed as he took out of his suitcase a quarter of a ream of paper on which was written the plan he had invented and in all seriousness threatened to read it out to the Congress. And immediately a German brother too (from Munich) who saw in the organisation of emigration the only means of saving

* Here the original has *schwören* instead of *schwärmen*, a mistake which was rectified in the following issue, No. 42, of the newspaper.—*Ed.*

"lazy" Europe and carried under his arm a heavy package of motives, stubbornly expressed his intention to treat the tormented assembly to the outpourings of his heart.

What civilities had to be squandered on these good people in order to avoid with decency the danger of being overwhelmed by their means of conferring happiness!

But besides these wandering stars of happiness, there shone in the firmament of the Congress others fixed in the sweet belief that the whole world would soon revolve around them alone. There were Fourierists, Cabetists, Considerantists, Proudhonists, Schulze-Delitzschians, and so on, as well as communists, phalansterists, free-traders, mutualists and self-helpists, whose minds must have been wonderfully adapted to chewing the cud of their "brilliant" masters' and sect-founders' works. But there were also Blanquists, who besides their doctrinarian socialism also dabbled in Jacobinism and Carbonarism and lubricated their vehicle with chauvinism still more than the afore-mentioned doctrinaire-coachmen, though they indisputably formed the most revolutionary of the socialist sects, hoping to organise revolution by conspiracy, to overthrow all traditional political and economic power, to build up their ideal conditions on its ruins and, proceeding from France, to save the whole world.

But fortunately the representation of the sects diminished from congress to congress and one after the other the noble citizens Fribourg, Tolain, Muret, Langlois and so on (not to mention the rascals Besnier, Richard, Blanc and Durand) were pushed aside and driven away; naturally most of them, as magnitudes rejected by us, are trying to obtain recognition in the enemy camp, from where, foaming for revenge, they calumniate us. I shall have something to say later about the respectable Blanquists, who still played a role, modest though it was, at the Hague Congress.

For the present I only wish to draw the reader's attention to the circumstance that in the same proportion as their representation diminished from congress to congress, the sectarians must have lost influence also everywhere in the workers' societies. But precisely because the afore-mentioned species of human beings, called types in common parlance, no longer found a great support in the old doctrinarian

socialism, they hastened without much scruple to found a new sect which, however, was able to win some adherents only in countries where modern industry is still weak (as is the case for example in Italy and Spain) and hence the workers', i.e. the social-democratic movement is still at a quite elementary stage of development and therefore more liable to be affected by political and socialist charlatanry. Therewith I have now reached the point when I must do Mr. Bakunin, the supreme head of the new sect, and certainly to his most intimate satisfaction, the honour of saying a word about his intrigues and machinations. And this is made very easy for me since our notorious reveller was long ago fittingly ridden to earth by Borkheim in the *Volksstaat* and one of his fellow countrymen has just finished him off in the *Tagwacht*⁴⁸ so that it only remains for me to proceed with a fitting burial of his mortal remains. A repulsive job for me, to deal with the dead! But what can I do about it?

For as the deceased still haunts many minds with his grotesque and bewildering apparitions I must pursue him even after he is dead and, doubtless most flatteringly for him, exorcise the devil. And so we shall see how everything was possible for this strange man and how it even everywhere became possible for him to make his impossibility possible. Mr. Bakunin, with his fair eloquence, his generally pleasant features, but also often, especially when he sees his authority shaken, a look so perkily sulky and frowning that any Bengal tiger could envy him, is more of a demagogue than a democrat and yet often more democratic than science and practice reasonably and decently demand. At the same time he belongs to that type of his species who are full of their own importance and therefore quite naturally engages only on paths on which he hopes to find suitable pabulum for his boastfulness. He is equally adroit when on the ascent or the decline, but in fact is more wasteful of his honour than he is ambitious; it is indifferent to him whether he enjoys good or evil fame, as a fleecer or a Mirabeau, a Rinaldo Rinaldini or a Washington. Whatever is said about him, whether in praise or reproach, he swallows it like a dainty morsel in any quantity with insatiable appetite and without ever suffering from indigestion.

So I may rest assured that he (Bakunin) will be pleased with the grub that I am serving him and will thank me silently for it from the bottom of his heart. But perhaps my party comrades will be angry with me if I dwell too long on this *homo omnium horarum* (man who fits all circumstances) and threaten them with a further discourse on him. Yet I cannot restrain myself from pleasing him with succulent morsels and seeing him yawn with satisfaction and hearing him snore thunderously like a well-fed lion, even were I thus to risk losing the favour of all my party brothers. For it is most instructive to observe beings which were born to contemplate themselves and listen to themselves devouring their favourite food, since in so doing they display their characteristic features most clearly and are the least able to conceal their true nature.

Considering that when one gets to know the head of a sect well one can more quickly assess all that surrounds him, I may certainly hope that my party friends will willingly forgive me if I insist on further describing this strange man to them.

Well then.

Mr. Bakunin has been through the schools of all the socialist systems and only left them when their standpoints had been overcome; however, being able to absorb much, he assimilated all of them in order with practical sense and noble taste to make use today of this and tomorrow of that according to the circumstances. (It is sufficient to read his prattle about socialism, communism and mutualism in his "Discours au congrès de la paix et de la liberté à Berne, 1868", Geneva, 1869).⁴⁹ On the other hand one must acknowledge that at every revolutionary outburst he arrived in time to help it *fail* quickly and brilliantly through his wise intervention. Since all contradictions and antitheses find ample room in his capacious head, he produces on weak minds the impression of a universal intellect, and since he thus daily enters into conflict with himself he must be readily forgiven when he provokes conflicts everywhere he goes.

He is not a happy man, for if he feels that he is somehow excelled by others, he cannot sleep peacefully, and if he finds that he is not excelled, he cannot wait for the coming day in order to seize the first opportunity that offers to excel

himself; indeed, in his holy zeal he is capable of challenging himself—with pistols? No, with roaring and buzzing instruments, to see whether the Russian peasant communism he brought with him is outroared, outbuzzed and triumphantly deafened by the civilisation-tinged mutualism he picked up in the Romance countries, or *vice versa*. And how often has today's Bakunin seriously imperilled the life of yesterday's and hewn chunks off himself in particular in his writings "A Few Words to the Young Russian Brothers", 1869, "Letter about the Revolutionary Movement in Russia", April 16, 1870, and "The Knout-Germanic Empire", September 1870.⁵⁰

But on one point he certainly remains for ever unexcelled and can hardly excel himself any more, for if there are virtuosi capable of playing a piece in two keys on the French horn, no mortal has yet ever succeeded like him in preaching fraternisation of peoples and racial hatred in one and the same breath. One may rightly reproach him for lack of principles and of character, but one cannot deny him unqualified recognition for his consistent self-denial. Bakunin is "the Bakunin", and were he not *the* Bakunin, he would willingly be a Karl Marx or something of the sort. In order to satisfy his enormous need to raise himself higher than all other people, he begins the building of his temple of world salvation by the roof, dispensing with the tiny detail of laying the foundation, and even climbs up to the top of the tower when the timber necessary to erect it is still growing in the forest and the stones and iron still slumber in the earth.

In order that he may appear as the accomplished democrat, he likewise carries to the extreme his confusion of the concepts of governing and administering, of government and state, of the state which stands in opposition to society and whose ultimate argument is guns*, and of the state which is society itself, and which has at its disposal only moral means, words spoken and written. This is all because he holds the senseless opinion that since the state based on government by force is evil, so must the people's state and the socialist

* Due to a misprint the newspaper reads *Kommune* instead of *Kanone*. This is rectified in the following issues, No. 44.—*Ed.*

state and any state at all be evil, that even the oppressed class in its struggle to eliminate the state based on force, to eliminate strict organisation, needs no subordination of any kind, no organisation at all, and that even its freely elected authorities must have no prerogatives or moral directing influence.

That is why, every time I heard Mr. Bakunin hold forth on his theory of negation of the state, it reminded me of the Bavarian who, when he found out that soup prepared with the appropriate amount of fat was very tasty, wisely exclaimed: "Oh, if I were King and Prince of Bavaria I would cook myself some soup out of pure fat." But the comparison does not quite fit Bakunin's culinary art: if soup made of pure fat is uneatable, the fat would come in useful for other soup, whereas the soup without fat or salt that Bakunin intends to mete out to the starving people can only be served as dishwater to deceive the stomach.

Yet no! It's not all so bad as it appears and Bakunin is by no means so stupid as he pretends to be; he recognises that not even in his *perpetuum mobile* can a something be set and maintained in motion by a nothing but that a guiding mind and a motive force must be there. And so he showed mercy to humanity orphaned by the strangling of the state its mother and founded a secret alliance. In this alliance the conspirators, like fragments of an invisible providence, were organised in hierarchic subordination (as they should be in a proper plot), all state prerogatives were usurped, all sovereignty juggled away and Mr. Bakunin, holding all the leading strings in his hand, was proclaimed God the Father. And in this capacity he will announce in a voice of thunder to redeemed humanity the complete destruction of all former state and authority systems. Such is this insidious-socialistically glimmering band, worthy to be envied by the religiously sparkling Loyolas.

Our party comrades may now have a fair knowledge of the reason why the puppets, at the beckoning of their blusterer-in-chief act in this way or that at the congresses of the International, why and wherefore they, not only with the consent of their supreme chief, but even on the orders of that supreme chief, protest against all government powers, the authority of the people and of the state and with logical

consistence fanatically preach strict abstention in all political and state matters. It goes without saying that in passing judgment one must distinguish here between the seducers and the seduced, between the deceivers and the deceived. The youth, and especially the immaturity in places, of the great cultural and historic movement, the conditions in which individuals grow up and live, demand that many should be forgiven.

We now come to the Hague Congress and shall see what role Bakunin's sect played at it.

Before beginning to describe the proceedings at the Hague Congress and the corresponding conduct of the representatives of the aforementioned sect, I wish to inform the readers of the *Tagwacht* of most important decisions which have so far been held back from them and which, at least within the Association, raise a barrier for ever to all the doctrinarian talk of happiness, megalomaniac intrigues and petty dogmatizing.

In the decision as already reported in the *Tagwacht* (No. 38, Sept. 21) the last paragraph is incomplete, and therefore we reproduce it here in full:

"In the case of the suspension of an entire federation, the General Council shall immediately inform thereof the whole of the federation. If the majority of them demand it, the General Council shall convoke an extraordinary conference, composed of one delegate for each nationality, which shall meet within one month and finally decide upon the question."

The whole of this decision, which contains a revision of the General Rules, was adopted by 36 votes to 11 and 9 abstentions.

The following decision, bearing on the political action of the Association, which is only a more precise formulation of that adopted at the London Conference (1871), says:

"In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the working class cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

"This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the

triumph of the social revolution, and of its ultimate end, the abolition of classes.

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

"The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies, and for the enslavement of labour. The conquest of political power has therefore become the great duty of the working class."

The resolution was adopted by 38 votes to 13 (including the abstentions). Four Frenchmen and six Germans who had already left, had handed in their vote in writing.

After the election of the new General Council and its place of residence, the result of which was also already reported in the aforementioned issue of the *Tagwacht*, the following motion by Lafargue, representing the Lisbon Section and the New Madrid Federation, was adopted unanimously not counting 14 abstentions:

"The new General Council is entrusted with the special mission to establish International trades unions.

"For this purpose it will, within the month following this Congress, draw up a circular which shall be translated and published in all languages, and forwarded to all trades societies whose addresses are known, whether they are affiliated to the International or not.

"In this circular every Union shall be called upon to enter into an International union of its respective trade.

"Every Union shall be invited to fix itself the conditions under which it proposes to enter the International Union of its trade.

"The General Council shall, from the conditions fixed by the Unions, adopting the idea of International union, draw up a general plan, and submit it to the provisional acceptance of the Societies.

"The next Congress will finally settle the basic treaty for the International trades unions."

To this must be added that a decision was adopted that

next year congress would be held in Switzerland, it being left to the General Council to decide where.

As has already been pointed out, there was hardly any trace at the Congress of the tendency of the old doctrinarian socialism; there were only supporters of a new school which, to give some idea of its doctrine, has been given the name of Bakuninist, to the immense satisfaction of its founder and High Priest. But the orthodoxy of the apolitical and religion-free but zealously believing sect was represented only by six members of the school: 2 French-Swiss (Guillaume and Schwitzguébel, delegates of the so-called Jura Federation) and 4 Spaniards (Alerini, Farga Pellicer, Morago and Marselau); the seven Belgians and four Dutchmen proved to be only close sympathisers and not firm believers in the school, with whose representatives not all of them voted on all questions, so that pure Bakuninism usually secured only 11 and in rare cases 17 votes. They were sometimes joined by one of the North American delegates, Sauva; his mandate for a simultaneously expelled section led by a "lady" which mainly advocates "free love" and engages in agitation in a bourgeois spirit, was not recognised,⁵¹ but he also represented Sections Nos. 29 and 42 in Hoboken and Patterson. Likewise three English representatives, probably motivated by some special interest, found pleasure in displaying amphibian inclinations by adopting the standpoint of the social-democrats and trying to swim at the same time in the wake of the bourgeoisie.

Some owe their chameleon propensities more or less to the struggle for existence, others to pure vanity, and all to lack of character.

Blanquism also cast a shadow over the hall where the Congress was held, the shadow of a political trend which has historically outlived itself and is now dying out. (I cannot forgo the opportunity to express my complete admiration and profound respect for Citizen *Blanqui*, its spirited and knowledgeable founder, an untiring and inflexible fighter and martyr, and a splendid example of the spirit of sacrifice). But as far as I know, among the representatives of this trend there were only two, Vaillant and Arnaud, who were really sincere and dedicated to the common cause of the people.

Unfortunately both of them together with their supporters are still prisoners of the regrettable illusion that world-historical aims can be achieved by means which after fifty years' use have proved almost completely unsuccessful, and this even now when conditions have become drastically unfavourable and demand far more clearly and urgently other ways and means of transformation. Indeed, they still do not feel or understand that the historical movement of our time has outgrown the school of secret societies and clubs (a warning also to Mr. Bakunin if he is not entirely beyond redemption); that it is based on the social science which develops simultaneously with it, and hence on political and economic reality; that it can be guided only by the aggregate spirit of the social class which is fighting for equality of rights, which accordingly rejects all secretiveness and needs complete publicity to bring things as they are and as they should be to the general consciousness, to achieve the strength and might which transform the world.

He who does not take concrete action, and who instead of giving expression in thought to historically effective facts and drawing the logical conclusions from them, is a prisoner of superstition and thinks that these facts can be directed according to the wisdom of his fantasy, always ends up on the road of tyranny and with the best will in the world can only harm the cause, never be of use to it.

Nevertheless it must be acknowledged that the few representatives of Blanquism, who were delegated not by societies of this trend, but by working men's sections of our Association entirely unaffected by it, by no means sided with the separatist faction, but on the contrary always voted in the spirit of the general interests of the Association and the working class. They let themselves be noticeably depressed only by the transfer of the General Council from London to New York, because as a result of this they were losing a good opportunity of winning the influence they desired in the General Council to carry out their special plans, particularly in France. In view of this alone, even had there been no other reasons, the temporary transfer of the seat of the Association should have been recognised as an expedient measure.

Indeed, the weakness of the Blanquist school consists precisely in the belief or the superstition that salvation can be ensured by secret endeavours, whereby their French motherland is attributed a messianic role, the principle of equality and equal rights of other civilised peoples not being given fitting consideration in the obtaining conditions.

How can any kind of national presumption (with which not all the supporters of the school are equally infected, but the school's doctrine certainly is infected) and the infatuation for secret societies and club revolts, which always leads to a despotic hierarchy, be conciliated with the desire for the emancipation of the working class in all countries? The ineradicable shoots of the future form of society lie only in the trade unions, which flourish most fully only when they enjoy maximum publicity and which recognise no territorial frontiers. And it is only in the course of struggle, in the free and open intercourse of life that these shoots can and must take firm root and put forth unshakable stems.

And how soon will history be cured of the Blanquist seeking for happiness, which will hardly outlive its admittedly honest founder! Did not the other French delegates officially protest in the name of France's working-class circles aware of the tasks of our time against the introduction of this disease, a protest which will be published in full in the official report of the Congress*?

Concerning the attitude of the Belgian and Dutch delegates to the Congress, it is not a question of close support of Bakuninism, but only that our comrades of the Association in both the Low Countries happen to agree with the Bakuninists in their views on the organisation and tactics of the Association, though not on all points. It is easy to understand and to excuse these good people, who have grown up with a certain one-sidedness and a small-state mentality which hinders any broadness of views, especially since they feel much more free than in the big neighbouring states and fear that they may lose the freedom and inde-

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 233-36. — Ed.

pendence of their small hearth as a result of these states, political and military centralisation carried to the extreme. There the slogans of autonomy, federalism, denial of authority, and decentralisation have a pleasant ring, and any kind of centralisation arouses a feverish fear going as far as to strike the very word out of the dictionary.

In Switzerland, too, we are very well aware how matters stand with village, town, region, canton, province and state patriotism; how it narrows people's outlook, encourages sluggish thinking, narrowly confines all consciousness of humanity as a whole, denies all solidarity, scorns all fraternity, and befouls any noble flight of the spirit with sarcasm and ill-will.

The workers' movement is irreconcilably opposed to such dwarfing philistine patriotism as also to all dreams of domination for one's country and cult of nationality.

By the way there are the best signs that our comrades in Belgium will soon abandon their temporary error and return to the correct path of the general working-class movement and common revolutionary action. And it could not be otherwise in a country where highly developed modern industry daily drives the great majority of the people through the hard school of socio-economic life, teaches them the language of facts and irrefutably proves to them that only by close brotherhood and rigorous organisation can the working class in all the modern world accomplish its work of emancipation; that the revolution can be carried through without high-sounding phrases, without the phantasmagory of dazzling quack magic about salvation and happiness. And in less industrialised Holland, where the working-class movement is only at its beginning and is laboriously following that of its neighbours, to begin with in matters of organisation and tactics, it will certainly soon become more self-aware and will part with all kinds of separatism and follow the general stream.

The account of how the Spanish and Swiss-Jura delegations to the Congress behaved brings me to the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, the child of Mr. Bakunin. This Alliance, about which the lackey bourgeois press in its spiteful cunning made more noise than even the artful dodgers of the Alliance managed to make with their drums

and trumpets, is in reality not a secret society but only the cover for one, the deceptive label on a conspiratorial philtre bottle.

The bulk of the membership of the branches of the Alliance (in truth neither a mass nor a numerous one), to whom denial of authority and abstention from politics are preached with crafty zeal, are only the unconscious tool of the *authority* of a secret band of intriguers and an invisible providence which has a monopoly on all knowledge and hovers like the "Holy Ghost" over the heads of enraptured believers—a providence which in the sections, section councils and federal councils conjures up incendiarism, revolutionary flame and craziness.

Although the Alliance, professing atheism and denying all authority, logically strives to abolish all divinity, divine and human powers, it is not callous enough to orphan the whole of mankind but feels its heart moved by pity to take the reins of world government in its hands for the time being.

And why should not the human race, which has already been yearning in vain for salvation thousands of years, accept for a change and by way of trial a religion without any god or any authority, particularly as in it there is no Father, Son and Holy Ghost in an unknown world-beyond, no Allah great and Mahomet his prophet, but the triune god exists on earth in one gentleman, Bakunin, who is Allah and the prophet at the same time? But like the old divine providence, this new one also has its weak points, an infatuation with "chosen ones" and therefore its *semi-* and *wholly initiated* ministerial counsellors and executives, and, as in the old one, the *uninitiated* are and remain the dupes in the game, the "whipping boys" and the "scape-goats".

It is true that by the force of circumstances the Alliance has been "dissolved" almost everywhere, but that changes nothing in the content of the secret band, and the conspiratorial philtre has become the life-giving potion of salvation, drunk like kümmel and gin without the old label. There are already several new signs to be registered, but that is beside the matter, since such changes do not affect the substance.

Clearly, such an usurped authority, which being capable of evading control and distorting and falsifying the expression of will of the collective, can easily estrange the Association from its purpose, and with the best will in the world be abused, absolutely cannot be tolerated within the International Working Men's Association—not even if the leading elements in the Alliance were moved by the most honourable intentions.

However one must not think that this society is as important in its open and secret activity as the quack talent of some of its leaders tries to make out in order to mislead not only the rest of the working class and bourgeois world but also their own semi- and uninitiated confederates. We shall therefore see what the situation is as regards the "Jura Federation" in the valley of Saint Imier, which is considered the centre of the Alliance, around which alone deluded world history is soon to revolve.

* * *

N. B. I have just received a booklet (16 pages) entitled: *Internationale et Révolution à propos du congrès de la Haye par des réfugiés de la Commune, ex-membres du Conseil général de l'Internationale* (London, 1872). It contains a statement on the attitude of the Blanquists at the Congress, reproaching them and the International in general for the position adopted, which allegedly does not answer the interests of the revolution. It is dated Sept. 15 and signed by Ant. Arnaud, G. Ranvier, Ed. Vaillant, Margueritte, Const. Martin, and F. Cournet.* It is written with dignity and sincerity, but the whole of its contents fully justifies the assessment of the separatists given by me above, clearly proves that they constantly tend to regard and to use the workers' association in general as their own domain, and failing this, to pout at it.

While admitting the well-meaning tone and the honourable intention of the statement, one can allow oneself to say that it does more honour to the signa-

* See pp. 177—89 of this volume.—*Ed.*

tories' feelings than to their understanding of the general state of affairs and the tasks of the International. Occasionally it even produces the impression that the worthy authors wrote it against themselves.

* * *

In a relatively small region of the Berne and Neuchâtel Jura mountains, where the main occupation is the watch industry, there lies in the valley of St. Imier the village of Sonvillier, which has so far always been and still is the central seat of the Jura Federation. In this village, which is the birthplace and residence of one of the spokesmen, Schwitzguébel, an engraver, the sect has its strongest section, consisting mainly of engravers. (I base myself here on data received from several local members.) Smaller sections, also composed mostly of engravers, are to be found in the villages of Renan, St. Imier, Billeret, Corgemont, Cortebert, Courtelary, Sonceboz, and Porrentruy totalling with the first-named a membership of 135. Besides these there are a section of engravers 60 strong and a central section (with members of different trades) counting 7 members in the small town of Locle. In Chaux-de-Fonds, the principal town of the Jura watch industry, the Federation has only a central section of 9 members and in Neuchâtel another of 5 members (including Guillaume and Malon). Similar miniature sections which existed in Biel, Bötzingen, Grenchen, Lausanne and Vivis ceased to exist long ago.

A larger section in Münster (Moutier grand val) has been in opposition since the referendum of May 12 this year⁵² because it would not hear of abstention in politics, and has joined the Romance Federation. The ill-famed Socialist and Revolutionary Propaganda Section in Geneva, comprising 13 members, mostly French refugees and non-workers who quarrel every day and provide a show for 1,300 people, and which until all doors were finally closed to it, only caused discord and produced confusion in the working-class movement, is nevertheless, and perhaps precisely for that reason, still the pride of the Jura Federation. To these we need add only the Slav Student Section founded by Bakunin in the spring of this year in Zurich.

In all, this federation, which makes so much noise in cafés, at congresses, and in the press, numbers 260 members at the most, and not only has it no prospects of growth, but is so consumptive that the bit of body which it has, not to speak of its soul, will completely disappear before very long, and then it will, in keeping with its calling, haunt the world as a mere ghost.

Meanwhile it is an indisputable fact that at the time of the split in the Romance Federation (as the united French-speaking sections in Switzerland are called) and of the birth by forceps delivery of the Jura Federation, the working-class movement in the industrial regions of the Jura was in the best condition and precisely since then has been more and more stagnating.

The constant mutually spiteful polemic soon almost completely did away for a long time with the local workers' desire for common efforts. The leadership of the Romance Federation could not reasonably be presumed to be infallible; but it managed at least to preserve for itself a central section and several trade sections in Chaux-de-Fonds.

Moreover, the watch-industry workers, being much better paid than all others, and therefore socially nearer to the bourgeoisie, are far less receptive to socialist revolutionary propaganda, so that these workers, even with the clearest exposition of the principles, most skilful leadership and most expert organisation, could never exert any serious influence on the course of the general social-democratic movement of our time. And then they live in isolated valleys without any real central point and extremely scattered. The working proletariat of any modern industrial town of about only 60,000 inhabitants could do more for the cause of emancipation than all the watchmakers of the Jura together. Taking into consideration their small number and the fact that they are entirely lost in the extremely inflated Jura Federation, the latter appears as a mysterious goddess cleverly fondled but all the more fooled and misused by Bakunin and his fellows.

Indeed the Jura Federation was intended to give half a dozen loud-mouthed heroes of the stump and the pen the appearance of being the general staff of a great army conquering our continent, revolutionising society, in a word,

making world history. But not the general staff without an army, while wanting political abstention, also wants, as it shows in fact, to leave the bourgeoisie and the rule of capital in peace and to make war only on the International Working Men's Association, the organisation of the proletariat, by means of distortion, lies and calumny, and this in the highly modest opinion that they alone know everything best and are able to work for the good of mankind.

But like us in Switzerland our party comrades in Germany, France, Austria and England have long been disgusted by these absurdities and castles in the air and so will our friends in Belgium, Holland, Italy and Spain soon. It is true that the public Alliance has been dissolved, but the secret one is still alive and kicking. But will there still long be workers who will let themselves be so impudently made fools of and so shamelessly used as tools?

Considering that the whole of Switzerland has only two and a half million inhabitants, of whom hardly one-third are French-speaking, and that in this third the working proletariat, insofar as it has an organisation, is divided not only between two federations, the bigger, Romance one, and the smaller, Jura one, but also that a considerable number of other workers' societies exist, some independent, some affiliated to other associations, it is quite clear that none of the federations named, even if the whole working population of its region were united in it under excellent organisation and leadership, could play a decisive role in the general social-democratic workers' movement.

Yet the delegates of the Jura Federation, inured to Bakunin's arrogance and plagued with knowing everything better than anybody, had the insolence to pretend to so elevated a mission at the Hague Congress. Good. We do not want to reproach these strange customers too severely, for since they are the product of circumstances they are not to blame for being as they are. On the other hand, the good citizens will bear me no grudge since the efficacy of the social-democrats rests only on positive *knowledge* and they must first of all *know* the state of all the parts of their body, mind and heart if I mercilessly lay bare the sore spots and they then appear as rotten flesh etc., whose removal is necessary for the cure and strengthening of the whole organism.

For this reason it is a party duty to reveal one's own defects and shortcomings and I fulfil this duty as well as I can not, because it is agreeable to me, but because although it is profoundly repulsive to me, and it is my urgent duty.

We must admit to ourselves that even if the whole of the Swiss working population were ranged under one and the same banner, if the existence of three official languages in our country were less of an obstacle to a common understanding and combined action and uniformity of laws had put an end to the pernicious cantonal spirit, if the indigenous workers were not at all infected with a nationalistic spirit which still to a great extent causes them to drag along in the wake of the bourgeoisie, and were more class conscious, they still could not play a decisive role in the general historical movement embracing the modern world. For this movement is concerned with territorial and state borders only as subordinate, existing but changeable conditions.

It is true that the Swiss working proletariat could be well ahead of and an example to their brothers in all other countries by making strict use of the Swiss democratic institutions for practical attempts, corresponding to the present circumstances, to achieve greater socio-economic equality in the life of the state.

But that is just what the Jura Federation will not allow, as it fanatically preaches abstention from politics, negation of the state and, in order to appear really progressive and enthusiastically revolutionary, anarchy as the most reasonable means of development. Yes, anarchy, the negation of law and order.

If, as I wrote thirty years ago,⁵³ it is reasonably justifiable to imagine that a time will come when human society will develop without any laws, simply according to the rhythm of the mood and tone set by enlightened public opinion, I always held the view that in practical matters, despite lofty ideals, one must strive first of all after what can be achieved in the given circumstances, counting the birds in the hand and not those in the bush. But, anarchy, with which the infamous Alliance and Jura Federation preen themselves to acquire a really ultra-revolu-

tionary appearance, can be nothing but ruin, confusion and decay—classical *Babylonism*—which world history, if it wishes to be favourable to Mr. Bakunin's unques- tioned vanity, will one day call *Bakuninism* in memory of him.

"But one must act in a revolutionary manner," the simple- hearted anarchists tell me. Yes, of course, but the social- democrats do not need to worry about the violent revolu- tion, which can be neither called forth nor done away with by declamations or proclamations, neither drummed in nor drummed out, for reaction, represented by the ruling class, forced by merciless history, has undertaken to ensure its outbreak.

So let the false revolutionary prophets be told once and for all that, as already stated, *the socialism which is actuating the peoples of our times is not doctrinarian socialism. It is a socialism which has arisen out of the whole of life, out of the political, social and philosophical relations, and therefore a cultural and historical fact; it is not the invention of some world-wise man, it is the invention, the logic, of history itself.*

Only he who acknowledges this fact, who helps to give expres- sion to it and to bring it to the consciousness and understanding of all, is an effectively working socialist, because he is really serving history.

Socialism therefore belongs to science based on experience and reality, it has nothing to do with fantastic visions or metaphysical deductions; its aim is the application of all positive science to life.

Before continuing the criticism of the socialist sects and their apostles, I permit myself in the interest of the cause to reveal in passing a weak point of the social-democra- tic party and the working proletariat in general and to show how the oppressed class still to a large extent unthinkingly imitates the methods of the class which oppresses it and from whose tutelage over its education it has not yet freed itself. If Messrs the bourgeois in their dealings among them- selves always try delicately to avoid attacks on individuals and even on their public activities, the working people are usually naive enough to believe that such "decent" conduct is always based on moral grounds, whereas these worthy

gentlemen as a rule only keep their mouths shut "because one hand washes the other" and so as to be able to fish in troubled waters. For these proud exploiters of the people have achieved in the press, in the parliaments and other advisory bodies not only mutual guarantee of silence but even lavish praise for strokes of genius and daring achievements. So every expression of praise is greeted with resounding applause, and every accusation with the cry of "No personalities!"

It seems to me, however, that in this respect too the oppressed class should behave in exactly the opposite way to the ruling class, that we should always call things by their names and not be so foolish and cowardly as to beat the sack instead of the donkey. But of course one must always have in view the cause and really harmful actions and never give rein to personal animosity or vain quarrelsomeness. In order to protect the movement against harmful illusions, it is equally necessary, as already pointed out, not to cover up its shortcomings and failings with fig leaves out of false shame, but to reveal them to all in order to achieve a correct understanding, for publicity is the most vital element of social-democracy.

The chief thing now is to guard the Association against the disease of sectarianism, which occurs with particular force in transitional periods of history, hence also in our movement today. This task is all the more difficult as the sects (sometimes, it is true, serving as means to the self-seeking aims of crafty and hypocritical leaders who misuse the imperfect knowledge of the masses) are happy in the belief that they alone possess the remedies for all social evils and therefore, in their blind zeal, scoff at all reasonable advice.

That fanaticism is always impudent, presumptuous and obtrusive has been sufficiently proved by the representatives of the sects at all the congresses. But whenever there was any reluctance to accept their recipes as infallible and to make use of their elixirs of life, they immediately adopted a haughty, sulking and sullen attitude and refused further co-operation. Yet since they are impertinent and loquacious, as fanatics usually are, they were fortunate, owing to their zeal to save mankind, to cause the Hague Congress to take

three whole days to settle the question of accepting or rejecting the mandates. And then these gallant jousters had brought imperative mandates, i.e. mandates qualified by definite stipulations which under certain conditions bound them to abstain, not from making speeches, but from voting. By these mandates both those who issued them and their bearers proved that they had not grasped the spirit of the International Working Men's Association and indeed were directly opposed to the purpose of the Congress.

For the purpose of a congress is to arrive by discussing the various views on aims and means at collective formulation binding for the time, to achieve a common opinion, serving as a guideline for the workers in all countries for unity of action, by which alone it can attain the full strength necessary to fulfil its cultural and historic mission.

Indeed the ABC of all common strivings tells us that any proposal, any opinion must contain the possibility to rise as a result of a thorough discussion to a higher point of view, better corresponding to the great Association. If on the contrary the delegations table immutable proposals and opinions, if they lay them before the assembly like hardened crystals which cannot be melted in the heat of discussion and united in a conception corresponding to the common purpose, the congresses are bound not only to degenerate into ridiculous farces, but to become shameful betrayals of history.

Where do these imperative mandates come from? Who are those who authoritatively issue them and those who obediently carry them out.

They originate partly from the authority of the sections and partly from that of the federations; they are written out by members of section and central committees, that is, by depositories of local or federal authority, and they are borne and defended with authority by the most uncompromising opponents of all authority, the most zealous preachers of anarchy! That is logic and consistency for you! It turns out that authority is a boon for *local* societies and their *national* federations, but a curse for the *international* association.

And while these people thus try to throttle general brotherhood, they have the insolence to shout with the mien of saviours of the world, "Long live the International!" Does this mean foolishness and madness, or wickedness and badness? One really can't tell how to qualify such individuals, how to classify them. Certainly they are not of those "who always wish to do evil and always do good", perhaps rather of those who, though they do not always wish to do good, always do evil.

Indeed one must be really mad or have an uneasy conscience if one fears an authority which, being without bayonets or cannon, without gendarmes or soldiers, has only moral means at its command and can rely only on the agreement and the voluntary readiness of the Association's members. And how foolish an idea it is to wish to overcome the most rigorously organised states based on force with anarchy and the denial of authority!

Naturally one must be very lenient with the workers who have such a leadership; at the beginning of a movement which penetrates so deeply into all life's relationships, errors are all the more difficult to avoid as there are always also false prophets, whom [such times bring with them, and people who work from morning till night to earn their living come but slowly on to the right path; but in the end they themselves severely take to task those who have been duping them.

These sectarian apostles' main mistake is that they imagine they can make world history all on their own and force a revolution on it as they wish, whereas they themselves are entirely disregarded by world history and mercilessly pushed and cast aside; further that, instead of presenting the results of their "études sociales" to all for the benefit of humanity, they only indulge, out of green-eyed envy in their exercises in reviling, casting suspicions on and calumniating their party comrades who, through their ability and their achievements, tower like giants over these dwarfs.

The Hague Congress did a good thing in separating itself for ever from all trends incompatible with the task of the International Working Men's Association, though this may have led to misunderstanding even in some working-class circles for a fairly long time. (Concerning the expulsion of

Bakunin and Guillaume the Congress, in fact, only confirmed what the Central Section in Geneva did for Bakunin and the Congress of the Romance Federation for both as far back as 1870.⁵⁴)

Insofar as the working-class association as a whole is based on correct consciousness of its historical mission, it understands also that it must be only a public and mutual schooling for the whole of the proletariat, the organised and ever more appropriately self-organising vanguard of a new culture movement, that it must fittingly prepare and use the material which modern history gives it for progress and building anew, and that if it is now by far not everything, it will certainly be everything in the future.

The working-class tendency all over the world is and remains by its very nature—though by far not everywhere consciously—international. It may be impeded here and there in its organisation or even suppressed by force, but it will nevertheless always appear again and with constantly increasing strength as the International Working Men's Association. Yes, the Congress, equal to its mission, acted quite correctly when, even at the risk of exposing the Association to major convulsions for a time, it stood fast on the foundation which can be modified only by the development of science.

The bourgeois press, which sees in the social-democratic movement only what it wishes and hopes for, bore a most shameful testimony to its own ignorance of the actual state of affairs when, on the occasion of the Hague Congress, it burst forth in noisy jubilation over the "disintegration" of the International Working Men's Association.

Well, it serves the ruling class right when its well paid hired writers (to its future horrible disappointment, it is true) lyingly say every day that the movement is an artificial one conjured up by ambitious, self-seeking and unprincipled fanatics. No wonder the class which among other privileges possesses that of education cannot understand that the so-called leaders of the social-democrats are really only products, and imperfect ones at that, of the movement itself and that as soon as they prove unusable they are pitilessly cast aside by history and replaced, accord-

ing to the requirements of the more developed relationships, by more highly developed forces.

No, history does not depend on its children, the children depend on their mother—history.

If the mouth-pieces of the International Working Men's Association one and all were fools and rogues, and were they to play the most foolish and most nasty tricks one after another, even conspire to destroy the Association, they would only become victims of their own impotence, and the brotherly Association would live on, indestructible and irresistible as history itself.

Poor bourgeoisie! There is no more consolation for your Excellency here, here lies and calumny are of no avail, and executions and exile can no longer save you! Your rule is perishing in itself and through itself; your politics, your economics, your religion and your practical wisdom already lie before the tribunal of the world as proofs of your fraud. Your god is money, your morals are money, your yearning and your heaven is money; you pray and you curse, you love and you hate, you flatter and betray, you oppress and exploit, do or refrain from doing anything, all for money. In the fever of your cupidity your idealism is fouled, your brain scorched, your heart frozen and your nature turned brutish. Because you endeavour to assert your world-historical mission longer than justice allows, you become a monster which fortunately devours itself. The outcome of the principle by which you act, the logic of your economic institutions and order drive you up to the most dizzy heights to perform a *salto mortale* and plunge into the abyss amid cries of joy from the rest of the world. Pitiless fate! Just retribution!

Yes, proud ruling class, you must fall, and with you all "blood and iron" politics, guns as the last argument, the whole system of state violence which you foster and fondle with such care and tenderness for the perpetuation of your magnificence.

Equality of rights to enjoy life—justice for all with equal rights and equal duties—this is the new gospel which sets in motion the exploited masses of all civilised nations and is being accomplished through the radical transformation of the modern mode of production—replacement of wages for

labour by the yield of labour—on the principle of co-operative production.

Thus it should be, thus it will be!

Since wherever there is a ruling class there must also be an oppressed class, consequently only injustice can stand at the helm there. But where *injustice* rules, there only *unjust* means can be applied to uphold it, and the injustice becomes all the greater, overstepping all measure and ever mounting, the longer it lasts and the more frequent and powerful the attacks to which it is subjected.

As against this there arises in the oppressed class an inverse relationship; for as this class strives for *justice*, and not only for itself, but for all, so it can only achieve its aim by *just* means. Therefore it builds up the morals and discipline of its members and has historical initiative, whereas the ruling class demoralises and depraves its members and is ignored by the further course of history.

The more universally the ruling injustice is recognised as such, the more senseless it becomes, and the means by which it is upheld become all the more senseless, the more unjust they are—for which reason also social-democracy often makes better progress through the insane activity of the bourgeoisie than through its own wisdom and ability.

But this all comes to the same for the bourgeoisie, for as the social-democratic movement cannot ruin itself by any mistake or blunder, so the privileged class cannot save itself by the greatest wisdom or the craftiest artifice.

Justice is synonymous with reason and makes life beautiful, and beauty of life means morality and happiness.

The struggle which has begun along the whole line can end only with the achievement of equal rights for all—when class rule is buried and there are no longer any bourgeois or any proletarians.

And when the sowing is good today, the harvest tomorrow will be excellent.

Long live the International through active brotherhood, genuine mutuality and universal links between the workers of all countries!

N.B. I intended at the end to give more factual material on the proceedings of the Congress. However, in the meantime extracts from the official minutes of the Congress,* have been published, intrigues of the Alliance, and the *Volksstaat* as well as other party newspapers have given fairly detailed information. The reader will therefore have to be satisfied with what has been written above.

Published in
Die Tagwacht, Nos. 41-44, 47,
49, October 12, 19 and 26;
November 2 and 23; December 7,
1872, and Nos. 8-12; February
22, March 1, 8, 15 and 22,
1873

Translated from the German

* Report of the General Council to the Congress. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 211-19.—Ed.

REPORT
OF THE JURA FEDERATION DELEGATE
JAMES GUILLAUME ⁵⁵

THE CONGRESS OF THE HAGUE

This Congress began on Sunday, September 1, in the evening with a preliminary meeting at which the delegates, arriving one by one and with great difficulty at the Concordia Hall in Lange Lombard Straat through a generally hostile crowd, were able to note two very unpleasant things: first that the preparations for the Congress had by no means been completed for want of a local organisation which could have seriously undertaken this; for the few Internationals of The Hague, for all their good will, were faced with the material impossibility to prepare everything necessary for the normal holding of the Congress. But the General Council having chosen The Hague, the latter had to comply whether they liked it or not. The second unpleasant thing was the presence of the General Council almost in full strength; its members alone made up one-third of the Congress, and with the addition of a certain number of more or less serious delegates they constituted a ready-made majority which was bound to make all discussion illusive.

In fact one could note officially at the administrative sitting on Monday, when the checking of the mandates began, the presence of *twenty-two* members of the General Council out of a total of 64 delegates. Of these *twenty-two*, two were delegated purely and simply by the General Council, without a mandate from any section. A certain number of others had complimentary mandates

issued by sections to which these gentlemen were and still are completely unknown. These mandates, which arrived blank in London, had then been filled in by the General Council itself. We saw this with our own eyes in the case of Citizen Vaillant, who had a mandate from the Section of Chaux-de-Fonds (the Ulysse Dubois-Elzingre-Coullery Section). This mandate did not contain any instructions, but said simply: "The section delegates to the Congress Citizen... (a blank space for the name) with powers to represent it," and then another hand had inserted the name of Vaillant. Other members of the General Council, such as Ant. Arnaud, who had a mandate from the Carouge Section; Barry, who had a mandate from the Chicago Section (North America); and Cournet, who had a mandate from the Central Committee of Copenhagen, were in the same situation as Vaillant.

What shall we say about the mandates from the French sections, whose bearers were half a dozen members of the General Council? It was agreed that in view of France's exceptional situation, these mandates could only be seen by the members of the mandate commission and that the Congress would be ignorant of the very name of the sections by which these mandates had been issued. Thus we had to accept with our eyes closed any delegate who said he had been sent by a French section; we were forbidden any investigation concerning them and we had to rely blindly on the actions of a commission composed exclusively of our declared enemies. Faced with such a state of affairs we must be permitted to say that the French mandates do not inspire us with the same degree of confidence as those whose validity could be established before everybody, such as the Belgian or Spanish. The French mandates may have been perfectly in order, but they may not all have been so. And when we see citizens Frankel, Johannard, Longuet, Ranvier, Serrailier, members of the General Council, having seats at the Congress merely on the strength of such mandates it seems to us rather strange that they claim to represent the International better than the Spaniards, Belgians, Dutchmen or Jurassians, who were delegated by the most numerous, the most active and the most regularly constituted sections.

There were also, besides the General Council, a certain number of delegates bearing French mandates, and several of them, as a measure of precaution, had not even given their true name. In this way we found ourselves in presence of citizens whose mandates we could not check and whose personal identity we could not even establish. As these citizens voted with the General Council, the latter made no remark and found that everything was perfectly in order. But if by chance the opposition had ventured to bring a certain number of delegates in similar conditions, we doubt whether the General Council would have shown itself so easy-going with them. By the way, it gave the measure of its impartiality when, having passed over the French mandates without any remark, it found fault—we were going to say after the fashion of the *Germans*, but we would be reproached with fomenting national hatred—with the Spanish delegates and with several other members of the minority.

The four categories of citizens of whom we have just spoken: delegates of the General Council only, members of the General Council bearing complimentary mandates, members of the General Council delegated by French sections and delegates of French sections outside the General Council, made a total of at least seventeen delegates: Dupont, Sexton, Vaillant, Arnaud, Barry, Cournet, Frankel, Johannard, Longuet, Ranvier, Serraillier, Dumont, Lucain, Swarm, Walter, Vichard, Wilmot, all of whom, except Sexton, voted with the majority.

The observation concerning the French mandates applies also, though in a lesser degree, to the German mandates. We know that the International is forbidden by law in Germany: only individual adherents to the Association may exist in Germany, but no sections. Is this a reason to prevent the delegates of the German Workers' Associations from sitting on the Congress? By no means; but one should apply to them the rule voted at the Basle Congress which says that in the case of countries where a law prevents the normal existence of the International the delegates of the Workers' Associations of those countries may be permitted to sit on the Congress, *but without the right to vote on administrative questions.*

The opposition, intending to carry the spirit of conciliation to the extreme limit, believed it should not invoke this Basle decision against the vote of the German delegates; but it is nonetheless certain that strictly according to the rule it could have taken advantage of it.

Let us now sum up the elements which constituted the majority. First of all the sixteen delegates of whom we have spoken, whose mandates either could be contested or were of but doubtful value; then the delegates who had only German mandates, totalling seven: Bernhard Becker, Cuno, Dietzgen, Kugelmann, Milke, Schumacher, Scheu; then Marx and Engels, members of the General Council and provided with various American and German mandates; Le Moussu, member of the General Council, representing a French section in London; Lessner, member of the General Council, representing a German section in London; Wróblewski, member of the General Council, representing a Polish section in London; Hepner, editor of the *Leipzig Volksstaat*, bearing an American mandate; Lafargue, Marx's son-in-law, representing that famous *New Madrid Federation*, which numbers nine members and is not recognised by the Spanish Regional Federation, and having besides a mandate from Lisbon; finally, two delegates from Geneva, one delegate from Zurich, two delegates from America, one delegate from Denmark, one delegate from Australia, one delegate from Bohemia and one delegate from Hungary.

In a word, as comrade Brismée of Brussels very aptly pointed out, the majority was formed essentially from two countries in which *the International cannot exist normally*, France and Germany. And it was more or less authentic representatives of these two countries, representatives whose acts the working men of their countries will have no possibility of seriously controlling, it was those delegates who wanted to lay down the law for the International at The Hague and who claimed to have crushed with their artificial majority federations represented by twenty-two delegates of the minority, the list of whom is as follows:

Belgian Federation: Brismée, Coenen, Eberhardt, Fluse, Herman, Spingard, Van den Abeele.

Dutch Federation: Dave, Gerhard, Gilkens, Van der Hout.

Jura Federation: Guillaume, Schwitzguébel.

English Federation: Eccarius, John Hales, Mottershead, Roach.

Spanish Federation: Alerini, Farga Pellicer, Marselau, Morago.

Part of the American Federation: Sauva.

The Italian Federation was not represented, but it had made known in advance its adherence to the principles of the opposition.

The foregoing observations will suffice to make it clear what kind of work would be carried out by a Congress thus composed; this work could only be—and the word came involuntarily to the minds of all the opposition delegates—*mystification*.

* * *

We cannot claim to give the minutes of the Congress sittings; we must confine ourselves, after pointing out its composition, to mentioning the principal incidents.

Three days, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, were taken up entirely with checking the mandates.

The mandate commission contested several mandates of opposition delegates, among others those of the Spaniards, those of two Americans and that of a delegate of the Propaganda and Socialist Action Section of Geneva.

The objection raised to the Spaniards was that their federation had not paid its subscriptions to London.

The majority believed it was sure of what it said; unfortunately for it, the Spaniards had brought their subscriptions with them, intending to pay them at the Congress itself, which they did. Once the subscriptions were paid, it seemed there could no longer be any objection to the Spanish delegates, since the commission had not expressed any others. But Mr. Marx is a resourceful man: he immediately found another pretext. The Spaniards were implicated in the matter of the Alliance, their admission had to be suspended until after the discussion on that matter. These jesuitic tactics were frustrated by the Spa-

niards' energetic attitude: Marselau, from Seville, in a speech expressing crushing scorn for the filthy machinations of the majority, laid bare all the petty intrigues used against Spain and called on the Congress to state frankly whether or not it wished to expel the Spanish Federation from the International. The majority did not dare to reply, and the Spaniards were admitted.

The American delegates whose mandates were contested were Sauva, from Sections No. 2, No. 29 and No. 42, and West, from Section No. 12. The differences dividing the American sections deserve a special study and we have not enough room for that today. We shall therefore confine ourselves to saying that the mandate from Section No. 2 was annulled and that Sauva was admitted only as a delegate from Sections No. 29 and No. 42; the mandate from Section No. 12 was also annulled and West was not allowed to sit on the Congress. Let us note here the curious incident that Eccarius, a member of the General Council and a former correspondent for America, disagreeing with his colleagues over Section No. 12, was openly accused by them of *being affiliated to the Alliance and of having sold himself to Gladstone ministry*.⁵⁶ By the way that is what Mr. Marx said about the whole of the English Federation, whose Federal Council dared to enter into open rebellion against him.

The Propaganda and Socialist Action Section of Geneva, which is part of the Jura Federation, feeling that it was not sufficiently represented by the two delegates elected to the Congress from Chaux-de-Fonds, had insisted on sending to the Congress its own special delegate in the person of Citizen Zhukovsky. It happened that it was not represented at all, the majority having decided to postpone indefinitely the examination of the credentials of Zhukovsky, who thus had to wait during the whole length of the Congress for a decision which was never taken, the Congress not having time to deal with him.

Once the question of the mandates had been settled, the Congress dealt with the constitution of the bureau. The provisional chairman, Van den Abeele, was replaced by Citizen Ranvier; Sorge (the New York Karl Marx) and Dupont were elected vice-chairmen. This election was marked

by a small manoeuvre on Marx's part in respect of Brismée, whom the opposition proposed as candidate for the chairmanship,—but we have not enough time to relate all these trifles in detail. The secretaries were Le Moussu for French, Roach for English, Marselau for Spanish; the names of the secretaries for German and Dutch have slipped our memory.

As soon as the Congress opened, the Spaniards introduced a motion aiming at changing the mode of voting. The usage adopted up to now, which gives one vote to each delegate, allows the delegates of a single region, if the geographical conditions permit a large number of them to attend, to form by themselves alone the majority at a Congress. The Spaniards, seconded by the Belgians and the Jurassians, consequently asked that the voting should be not by individuals, but by federations. This so legitimate request was rejected by the majority, who saw themselves lost if the vote was not by individuals. Faced with this decision of the Congress, the Spaniards and the Jurassians declared that they would not take part in any vote, and that they considered the Congress as a mere farce; simultaneously they announced their decision to remain present at the doings of the majority till the end—as simple spectators. Several of the Belgians and the Dutch equally ceased voting in the first days.

The agenda of the Congress was fixed as follows: 1. Discussion of the powers of the General Council; 2. Discussion of the insertion in the General Rules of Resolution IX of the London Conference concerning the political action of the proletariat; 3. Various administrative measures such as the election of the General Council, the choice of the venue of the next congress, the auditing of the General Council's accounts, the reports of the various commissions etc.

On a motion by the General Council, a commission of five was appointed to investigate the society of the *Alliance* and submit a report to the Congress. The five members were: Cuno, a German; Walter, a Frenchman; Lucain, a Frenchman; Vichard, a Frenchman; and Roch Splingard, a Belgian. Splingard was elected to the commission on the formal request of the minority, who insisted on getting a clear understanding of the documents with which the General Council claimed to back its accusations. The three

Frenchmen, Walter, Lucain and Vichard were disguised under false names and all three of them surrounded by impenetrable mystery. And it was to three citizens whose identity could not even be established by the Congress that the mission of opening an investigation of such seriousness was entrusted! As for Cuno, the chairman of the commission, he gave the full measure of his judgment by provoking during an open sitting on the Thursday, a German official,* to whom he was obliged to apologise in public on the Friday.

Most of the delegates whom this commission, which was appointed on the Wednesday, deemed appropriate to call before it, stated that they did not recognise the investigation and absolutely refused to answer questions which, in their opinion, nobody had the right to put to them. Others consented to give some explanations. But let us not anticipate the work of this notorious commission; we shall speak about it later.

* * *

Having carried out all the preliminary procedures, terminated by the mandate comedy, appointed the bureau and fixed the agenda, the Congress decided to hold a public sitting on the Thursday afternoon. A numerous and generally sympathetic crowd packed the small hall where the sittings were held. The attitude of the Hague population to the International had noticeably changed since the Sunday; it had been noted that the socialists did not set fire to any house or eat up any small child; so the bourgeois did not insult them any more in the streets and the working men were beginning to pluck up courage and show their sympathy openly.

At this first public sitting, after a speech by the chairman *Ranvier*, who praised the London Conference, the General Council presented a report on the political events in Europe during the three years since the Basle Congress. This report has been published by various newspapers and will probably appear as a pamphlet, so we think we can refrain

* Rudolf Schramm.—*Ed.*

from giving a summary of it, which would necessarily be incomplete.

After the report had been read out in French, English and German, the Jura Federation delegates, seconded by various other opposition delegates, tabled the following resolution:

"The Congress of the International Working Men's Association, assembled in The Hague, expresses in the name of the world proletariat its admiration for the heroic champions of the emancipation of labour who fell victims of their devotion and sends fraternal and sympathetic greetings to all those who are at present persecuted by bourgeois reaction in France, Germany, Denmark and the entire world."

This resolution was not voted on, it was carried by acclamation.

The discussion then began on the first point of the agenda: the powers of the General Council.

Herman, delegated by the sections of Liège (Belgium), himself a member of the General Council, in which he fulfils the function of secretary for Belgium, opened the discussion. *Herman* belongs to the opposition. The sections which he represents, like all the Belgian sections in general, are of the opinion that the General Council should not be a political centre imposing any doctrine and claiming to direct the Association. It should be formed differently from the way it has been up to now, every country being able to nominate representatives, without the right to appoint any foreign member. The aim pursued by the International is to organise the working-class forces in the struggle against capital with the ultimate objective of abolishing wage-labour and the proletariat. Each country should be free to seek the means of action which suit it best in this struggle. As for *Herman*, his delegation was explicit: it demanded that the Congress should establish such conditions that the General Council will no longer be in a position to impose any direction on the Association.

Lafargue, Marx's son-in-law, replied to *Herman*. He spoke of his Lisbon and Madrid mandates and of the instructions which they contained (instructions written under the dictation of Mr. *Lafargue* himself). The General Council's

powers had to be maintained; it was through it that the International existed; if it was suppressed, the International would perish. He would say of the General Council what Voltaire said of God: if it did not exist it would have to be invented.]

Guillaume, a Jura delegate, expounded the opinion of his federation in a speech the principal points of which we reproduce so that the members of the Jura Federation can judge whether their delegate expressed their opinion faithfully.

Actually, he said, there were two great trends of ideas in the Association. Some considered it as the permanent creation of a central power, of a group of men in possession of a certain social doctrine the application of which was to emancipate labour; they were spreading their doctrine everywhere, preventing all propaganda opposed to it. It was thought that it was owing to this group, which maintained a sort of orthodoxy, and because of it, that the International existed. Others on the contrary believed that the International did not result from the action of any group of men, but from the economic conditions prevailing in each country. The similar situation of the workers in the various countries produced identity of sentiments, aspirations and interests which spontaneously gave birth to the International. The latter was not a conception of one brain, but the necessary result of economic facts.

The members of the Jura Federation had contributed at Basle to placing in the hands of the General Council the powers they were complaining of at present. This they readily admitted. It was because they had been taught by experience and had had to suffer from the General Council's abuse of power that they gradually came to examine whether the extent of those powers was not a danger. They acted as practical people, not as theorists.

The desire expressed about a year earlier by their federation to curtail the powers of the General Council had won the adherence of various federations. In Belgium it had even been suggested to suppress the Council. They did not go so far. But when that proposal came to their knowledge they sought to find out whether, in the actual situation of the International, the existence of the General Council

was necessary. They had held discussions and had consulted the other federations: what was the result of that inquiry? The majority of the federations were in favour of preserving not a central authority, but a correspondence and statistics centre. It seemed to them that the federations could enter into relations with each other without that intermediary; nevertheless they adhered to the opinion of the majority on condition that the General Council would be no more than a correspondence and statistics centre.

Those who wished to preserve the General Council with the powers it actually possessed objected that a strong power was needed to uphold our Association. The International pursued a struggle of two kinds: the economic struggle which was expressed by strikes, and the political struggle, which according to countries, was expressed by nominating workers as candidates, or by revolution. Those two struggles were inseparable: they had to be pursued simultaneously, there was no disagreement on that score. But on what grounds would the General Council be necessary to direct them in the one or the other of these struggles? Had it ever organised a strike? No. It had taken no action in those conflicts. When they arose it was only solidarity that determined them to act. It should be remembered, to speak of Switzerland alone, what protests the Geneva Federation addressed to the newspapers which claimed, at the time of the 1868-69 strikes, that that federation had received an order from London and Paris.⁵⁷ As for them, they did not want the International to receive orders from London or from anywhere else.

Neither was the General Council necessary for the political struggle. It had never led the workers to revolution. Those grandiose manifestations were carried out spontaneously, without any need for guidance.

Since that time they had contested the necessity of the General Council. However, they admitted it if its role was reduced to the simple functions of a correspondence and statistics bureau.

Sorge, from New York, replied that America had also experience, which led it to opposite conclusions to those of the Jura Federation. The Jura Federation was decla-

ring itself an enemy of authority: he would have liked it at least not to have power to print the infamous things it had published....

Here there was an interruption and an uproar. The opposition demanded that the chairman should call Sorge to order. Sorge withdrew his last words and continued:

It was said that the General Council in London had never organised strikes; that was not true. Its intervention had been most effective in the strike of the Paris bronze-workers, in that of the New York sewing-machine makers, and in that of the Newcastle mechanics...⁵⁸

At those words, *Mottershead*, an English delegate, interrupted again, saying: That is inaccurate; the Newcastle mechanics had no need of the General Council.

Sorge went on: The General Council should be the general staff of the Association. The supporters of autonomy say that our Association needs no head; we, on the contrary think it needs one, and one with a good brain. (There are glances at Marx and laughter.) We absolutely must have strong centralisation, and to conclude I demand, in opposition to those who want the General Council's powers to be diminished, that it should be given more.

After this speech the public sitting was adjourned. Then in an administrative sitting the majority declared the discussion closed and voted the following decisions on the functions of the General Council:

Article 2. The General Council is bound to execute the Congress Resolutions, and to take care that in every country the principles and the General Rules and Regulations of the International are strictly observed.

Article 6. The General Council has also the right to suspend Branches, Sections, Federal Councils or Committees and Federations of the International till the meeting of the next Congress. Nevertheless, in the case of sections belonging to a federation, the General Council will exercise this right only after having consulted the respective federation.

In the case of the dissolution of a Federal Council, the General Council shall, at the same time, call upon

the Sections of the respective Federation to elect a new Federal Council within thirty days at most.

In the case of the suspension of an entire federation, the General Council shall immediately inform thereof the whole of the federation. If the majority of them demand it, the General Council shall convoke an extraordinary conference, composed of one delegate for each nationality, which shall meet within one month and finally decide upon the question.

Nevertheless, it is well understood that the countries where the International is prohibited shall exercise the same rights as the regular federations.

* * *

On the Friday the second public sitting was held. At it there was discussion of a motion signed by a certain number of members of the majority to insert in the General Rules Resolution IX of the London Conference formulated as follows:

Article 7a.

In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the working class cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to ensure the triumph of the social revolution, and of its ultimate end, the abolition of classes.

The combination of forces which the working class has already effected by its economical struggles ought, at the same time, to serve a lever in the hands of this class in the struggles against the political power of these exploiters.

The lords of land and of capital always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies and for the enslavement of labour; the conquest of political power therefore becomes the great duty of the working class.

The discussion was not a serious one. The two speakers in favour of the motion, Vaillant and Hepner, did not adduce any argument.

The Blanquist *Vaillant* confined himself to praising force and dictatorship, declaring that those who did not think as he did were bourgeois or intriguers, and that once the motion was adopted and inserted as an article of faith in the *Bible of the International* (literally), every international would be obliged under pain of expulsion to conform to the political programme outlined in it.—We would be interested to know what the Romance Section of Chaux-de-Fonds thinks of the opinions of its delegate Vaillant.

Hepner of the *Volksstaat*—one of the Jews of Marx's synagogue—declared that the Internationals who in Switzerland did not go to vote in political elections were allies of the informer Schweitzer in Prussia, and that abstention from voting led directly to the police station. At the time of the Franco-German war the abstentionists in Germany became the most ardent Prussian patriots, and it was the same everywhere. As for the claim that the General Council wanted to impose a special doctrine, it was false: the General Council never imposed anything on the Germans, and the political doctrine expounded in the General Council's pamphlets was in perfect harmony with the feelings of the German workers without any need to do them violence. Hepner said many other things, never touching on question of principles but telling all kinds of small stories, some false and some susceptible of venomous and calumnious interpretation.

Guillaume was the only delegate of the minority who was allowed to speak. This was a breach of order, since there were fifteen names down before his, but as we understood later, the General Council's plan was to have Guillaume expound the theories of the opposition in a public sitting, and then, at the end of the Congress to punish with expulsion the one who had been the mouthpiece of the minority in order to let the public at large think that the minority had no other advocate than a man who was unworthy to be a member of the International.

Guillaume's reply was very incomplete because, as he had not come to any previous understanding with his collea-

gues of the minority he could not collect all the material scattered in the hands of various delegates who intended to speak against the motion. Besides, the minority felt repugnance at producing in a public sitting certain letters written by members of the General Council which showed the true meaning of the motion.⁵⁹ Guillaume therefore confined himself to a general exposition of the federalist and revolutionary theory, which he opposed to the communist theory expounded in the famous *Communist Manifesto* published by Marx and Engels in 1848. Resolution IX of the London Conference, which it was intended to insert in the General Rules was, according to the minority, only a first step in the direction of that communist programme. Recalling the term *abstentionists* applied to the Belgian, Dutch, Jura, Spanish and Italian Internationals, Guillaume said that this term, introduced into socialist vocabulary by Proudhon, was liable to be equivocally interpreted, and that what the minority at the Congress aimed at was not political indifferentism, but a special kind of politics negating bourgeois politics and which we should call the politics of labour. The distinction between the positive politics of the majority and the negative politics of the minority was, by the way, clearly brought out in the definition of the aims pursued by the one and by the other: the majority wanted *the conquest of political power*, the minority wanted *the destruction of political power*.

The reply to this speech given by *Longuet*, a former Proudhonist who became a Marxist for family reasons, was absolutely void of content. We sought in vain the principal points in order to summarise them briefly; there was nothing in this long-winded harangue: words, a lot of words but not an idea beneath them. The only thing that could be taken for an argument in all those phrases was a joke which consisted in saying that the speaker for the minority had read neither Proudhon nor Marx—a joke which reminded us of Mr. Lafargue speaking of the *blessed ignorance* of the Jura Federation,⁶⁰ and which had the same success.

The public sitting was then closed; afterwards, in a closed sitting following the same procedure as the first time, the majority having declared the discussion closed, the motion was adopted.

* * *

It was at a closed sitting that the seat of the new General Council was decided on and that the General Council was elected. The Blanquists (Ranvier, Cournot, Arnaud, Vailant) wanted the General Council to remain in London, hoping thus to have it under their influence. Marx, on the contrary, after using the Blanquists against the minority, wanted at all cost to remove them from the General Council, and it was he and his friends that initiated the proposal to transfer the Council to America. In New York, he thought, the General Council, which he would place under the control of his friend Sorge, would always submit to his influence, and at the same time he would appear not to interfere in anything and to have given a great example of self-denial. But there was one thing which Marx, despite his subtlety, was not aware of, namely that in fooling the Blanquists and in the belief that he had accomplished a master stroke which would perpetuate his domination over the General Council, he was at the same time playing into the hand of the minority. The latter reasoned as follows: "Once the General Council is located across the Atlantic, it will actually be the same for us as if it did not exist and we are going to be provided with a splendid opportunity to prove in a practical manner that the General Council can be dispensed with."

And indeed it was a few votes of the minority, Belgians and Dutch (the Spaniards and Jurassians having ceased to take part in the voting), which ensured a majority for the choice of New York; and while Marx was congratulating himself on the victory which he had won over the Blanquists, the minority was equally congratulating itself on the enormous mistake which it had helped Marx's friends commit.

In effect, after this vote of the Congress, the minority, finding the ground cleared by Marx, was able to come to the understanding it had always sought to establish between its members since the very first day of the Congress. Private meetings of the minority had taken place on several occasions at the premises of the Hague Section; all the members of the opposition, including the English, had been present at them; they had exchanged ideas and noted their agreement

on the principle of autonomy and now only had to express that agreement in a statement to be presented to the Congress. At first this statement seemed to be a very laborious matter because of certain divergences in detail between the delegates of the various federations; but after the vote transferring the seat of the General Council to New York, it went smoothly. On the Saturday morning a final formulation was arrived at and presented to the opposition delegates for signing. They all signed except the English, who had already had to leave The Hague but had approved the principles at the previous minority meetings.

In respect of the choice of members of the General Council, the Congress was forced to vote with its eyes closed, none of the Europeans knowing the candidates proposed. Let us note but one fact: Sorge's candidature was not even put forward, as it would certainly have been defeated because as an individual he aroused antipathy even in some of the majority; but in order to allow Sorge to join the Council later it was decided that the new Council not only *could* but *should* co-opt three members, whose names we shall learn later.

The Blanquists, furious at having been duped by Marx, had left the Congress; Ranvier, giving up the chairmanship, in which he was replaced by Sorge, declared that the International was ruined; and the minority, more and more solidly united and determined, and more and more convinced that it was truly representative of the International said on the contrary: The International is saved, it is going to be its own master again; the authority of the General Council, voted for in principle by the majority, has in fact been abolished by the choice of New York.

It remains to be said that at the same sitting it was decided that the next general Congress would be held in Switzerland.

* * *

Let us pass rapidly over various secondary incidents and over the third and last public sitting—which took place on the Saturday and at which there was no discussion, but only propaganda speeches for the benefit of the Dutch pub-

lic—and go on to the last of the important questions dealt with by the Congress.

The commission to investigate the Alliance, appointed on the Wednesday, spent several evenings examining documents which were communicated to it by Engels and hearing various witnesses. This commission, composed in the way we have already described, at first strangely claimed the functions of examining magistrate: the interrogation of the witnesses was to be secret, then there were to be confrontations and efforts to catch the witnesses out. Some of those who were thus called refused to answer; others, the accusers, on the contrary, spent hours on end relating their grievances to the commission. We cannot say what happened at these sittings of the commission; we do not know the statements which were made, we have not seen the documents which were produced there, but it will suffice for the edification of our readers to make known to them the opinions of two members of the commission.

Roch Spingard, after having been present at all these mysterious discussions, having heard the revelations made by Messrs Marx and Engels, told all who wanted to listen to him that the inquiry could not lead anywhere, that the accusers had produced no serious document, that the whole business was a mystification and that he had been made to waste his time by being appointed to such a commission. Incidentally, the written report which he submitted as minority member of the commission will be given below.

Another member of the commission, the Frenchman *Walter*, belonging to the majority on the Congress (a point to be noted) was so disgusted with all that he saw and heard in the commission that he wrote a letter informing it that he ceased to participate in its work and declined all responsibility for any conclusions it might reach. It is true that on the Saturday evening, Citizen Walter, having changed his opinion,—we shall see under what influence—attempted to retract his letter, but this sudden change only showed more clearly the pressure brought to bear from certain quarters on the poor commission of inquiry.

Another significant fact. On the Saturday, about 4 p.m. in the premises of the Dutch Section, citizens Cuno, Lucain and Vichard, who alone made up the commission since

Walter had withdrawn and Spingard was in the minority, told Guillaume that, in spite of all the trouble they had taken, they had been unable to obtain any serious result and that the work of the commission of inquiry, when it came to submit its report to the Congress that evening, would be reminiscent of a mountain giving birth to a mouse. Lucain and Guillaume then had a friendly conversation about the reorganisation of the sections in France, about the usefulness of forming a French Federal Council etc. Lucain showed the greatest confidence in Guillaume, asked him to enter into correspondence with him, gave him his address and his real name. Then they parted and the commission resumed its sitting *to hear Marx!* Marx brought no new documents, he had had everything submitted to Engels: what could he tell the commission? We do not know. At any rate, the statements of the three citizens who had just spoken to Guillaume were suddenly changed, and Walter himself, renouncing his independence, prepared to disavow his letter of the day before.

It was after this interview with Marx that the commission suddenly converted in its sentiments, drew up its memorable conclusions. And here another characteristic fact took place. The three judges of the majority, incapable of formulating those few sentences in good French, were forced to resort to Spingard's assistance and he, while protesting against their conclusions, corrected the style as far as that was feasible.

And after all this, on the Saturday evening, at an administrative sitting, a few minutes before the closing of the Congress, Lucain, reporting for the commission read the following memorable report:

Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Alliance Society

As the Commission of Inquiry has not had time to present you with a complete report, it can only supply you with an evaluation based on the documents communicated to it and on the statements which it has received.

After having heard citizens Engels, Karl Marx,

Wróblewski, Dupont, Serrailier and Swarm for the Association,

And citizens Guillaume, Schwitzguébel, Zhukovsky, Morago, Marselau and Farga Pellicer, accused of belonging to the Alliance secret society,

The commission announces:

1. That the secret Alliance founded on the basis of rules completely opposed to those of the International Working Men's Association has existed, but it has not been sufficiently proved to the commission that it still exists.

2. That it has been proved, by draft rules and by letters signed "Bakunin", that this citizen has attempted, perhaps successfully, to found in Europe a society called the Alliance with rules completely at variance, from the social and political point of view, with those of the International Working Men's Association.

3. That Citizen Bakunin has resorted to dishonest dealings with the aim of appropriating the whole or part of another person's property, which constitutes an act of fraud.

Furthermore, in order to avoid fulfilling his obligations, he or his agents have resorted to intimidation.

On these grounds:

the citizen-members of the commission demand that the Congress:

1. Should expel Citizen Bakunin from the International Working Men's Association;

2. should likewise expel citizens Guillaume and Schwitzguébel, being convinced that they still belong to a society called the Alliance;

3. since, during the course of the inquiry, it has been proved to us that citizens Malon, Bousquet—the latter being secretary to the Police Commissioner for Béziers (France)—and Louis Marchand, who has been residing at Bordeaux, have all been guilty of acts aimed at the disorganisation of the International Working Men's Association, the commission likewise demands their expulsion from the Association.

4. As regards citizens Morago, Farga Pellicer, Marselau, Alerini and Zhukovsky, the commission, bearing

in mind their formal statements that they no longer belong to the said *Alliance* society, requests that the Congress should consider them not implicated in the matter.

To ensure their responsibility, the members of the commission request that the documents which have been communicated to them, as also the statements made, should be published by them in the official organ of the Association.

The Hague, September 7, 1872

Chairman *Th. F. Cuno*
(delegate for Stuttgart and Düsseldorf)
Secretary *Lucain*
(delegate for France)

A few short remarks will show at once the stupidity and the infamy of this document:

In it the *Alliance* society is spoken of now as a secret society, now as a public one, so that complete confusion on this score reigns from beginning to end of the report.

It is said, on the one hand, *that the secret Alliance has existed, but that it has not been sufficiently proved that it still exists*, and further on *that Bakunin has attempted, perhaps successfully to found a society called Alliance*,—and on the other hand the commission says it is convinced that Guillaume and Schwitzguébel *still belong to a society called the Alliance*. Is it possible to fall into a more childish contradiction? For either the commission affirms, as it does above, that it has not been sufficiently proved to it that the Alliance still exists, and then it is absurd to say that it is convinced that Guillaume and Schwitzguébel still belong to it; or else it is in fact proved that Guillaume and Schwitzguébel still belong to it, and in that case the commission does not know what it is talking about when it claims that the very existence of this Society has not been sufficiently proved to it.

The commission affirms that this Alliance had Rules completely opposed to those of the International. But the truth, which the commission knows as well as we do, is that the Alliance has really existed; that Bakunin not only attempted, but succeeded in founding it; that it functioned in broad daylight, in public, to everybody's knowledge; that

this fact is known by all those who have anything to do with the socialist movement; and that the programme of this Alliance and the rules of the section which bore that name in Geneva were approved in 1869 by the General Council in London, so that they could not be opposed to those of the International.

Further the commission formulates an accusation of fraud against Bakunin. But not the slightest proof has been supplied to the Congress to back up such a grave accusation, and the accused was neither informed nor heard! This is therefore a case of defamation, pure and simple. But it is useless to insist on this for the time being: Bakunin's honour cannot be affected by such indignities.

Cuno, the chairman of the commission, explained to the Congress that the commission had, in reality, not received any material proof of the facts imputed to the citizens concerned, but that it had acquired a *moral certainty* in their respect; and that, having no arguments to present to the Congress in support of its opinion, the commission confined itself to requesting a *vote of confidence!*

Then the statement by Roch Spingard was read out; it is as follows:

"I protest against the report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Alliance and I reserve the right to give my reasons before the Congress. Only one thing in my opinion has been established in the debate, and that is Mr. Bakunin's attempt to organise a secret society within the Association.

"As for the expulsions proposed by the majority of the Commission of Inquiry, I declare that I cannot give my opinion as a member of the said commission, having received no mandate for the purpose, and state my readiness to fight this decision before the Congress.

Signed: *Roch Spingard*"

Spingard explained his protest in a few vigorous words which did justice to the commission's report and *Cuno's* strange speech.

Guillaume, being invited to defend himself, refused to do so saying that this would apparently be taking seriously the farce organised by the majority. He limited himself to noting that it was at the whole of the federalist party that

the majority wished to strike a blow by the measures taken against a few of its members; but, he added, your revenge is too late, we had anticipated that, our pact of solidarity is drawn up and signed, and we shall read it to you.

And thereupon, *Dave*, a delegate of The Hague, read out the following statement:

Statement of the Minority

We the undersigned, members of the minority at the Hague Congress, supporters of the autonomy and federation of groups of working men, faced with a vote on decisions which seem to us to be contrary to the principles recognised by the countries we represented at the preceding congress, but desiring to avoid any kind of split within the International Working Men's Association, take the following decision, which we shall submit for approval to the sections which delegated us:

1. We shall continue our administrative relations with the General Council in the matter of payment of subscriptions, correspondence and labour statistics.

2. The federations which we represent will establish direct and permanent relations between themselves and all regularly constituted branches of the Association.

3. In the event of the General Council wishing to interfere in the internal affairs of a federation, the federations represented by the undersigned undertake jointly to maintain their autonomy as long as the federations do not engage on a path directly opposed to the General Rules of the International approved at the Geneva Congress.

4. We call on all the federations and sections to prepare between now and the next general congress for the triumph within the International of the principles of federative autonomy as the basis of the organisation of labour.

5. We resolutely reject any connection whatever with the so-called London World Federalist Council and with any similar organisation alien to the International.

Signed:

Alerini, delegate of the Spanish Federation.

Farga Pellicer, id.

Morago, id.

Marselau, id.

Brismée, Belgian delegate.

Coenen, id.

Fluse, id.

Van den Abeele, id.

Eberhardt, id.

Schwitzguébel, Jura delegate.

Guillaume, id.

Dave, delegate of Holland.

Gerhard, id.

Sauva, delegate of America.

The members of the majority listened in silence to this unexpected reading. Not a remark was made. As everybody was in a hurry to get it over, *the chairman* had a vote taken by roll-call on the expulsions proposed by the commission.

About one-third of the delegates had left the Congress, only some forty remained.

Bakunin's expulsion was voted by 27 *for*, 7 *against* and 7 abstentions (the abstainers were the 4 Spaniards, the 2 Jura delegates, and another member of the minority).

Guillaume's expulsion was voted by 25 *for*, 9 *against* and 8 abstentions (the abstainers being the same plus the Irishman MacDonnell).

In respect of Schwitzguébel we do not know the number *for*. There were 17 *against* and 9 abstentions. The number *against* and abstaining was more than the number *for*, the expulsion was not adopted.*

Schwitzguébel immediately protested; he pointed out that his expulsion had been proposed for exactly the same motives as that of Guillaume and that it was absurd to expel one and not the other. The majority did not reply, and Guillaume for his part stated that he continued to consider himself a member of the International.

* We borrow these figures from the Brussels *Liberté* and therefore cannot guarantee their absolute accuracy.—*Author's note.*

A member of the majority* proposed to let drop the demand for the expulsion of Malon, Bousquet and Marchand. "The example we have just made," he added, "will be sufficient."

The majority agreed, and the proceedings continued.

Thus Citizen Bousquet, accused by the report of the commission of being an informer, remained a member of the International by the will of the majority, who did not deem it necessary to expel him!

The same commission which had been charged with the inquiry into the Alliance had received authority to hear the accusations which the delegates of the various federations in their turn made against the General Council for abuse of its powers, violation of the General Rules, calumny etc. But the commission stated that it had no time to deal with this second part of its task, so that the examination of the General Council's actions, which was more important than the ludicrous inquiry into the Alliance, could not take place.

After these fine decisions, the chairman *Sorge* declared the Congress closed.

* * *

On the next day, Sunday, September 8, the delegates left The Hague for Amsterdam, where they had been invited by the section of that city. The division between the majority and the minority was especially felt on this occasion. A meeting attended by 150 people was held in a hall outside the city; only representatives of the majority spoke at it. *Marx*, *Becker*, *Sorge* and some others made speeches which got a cool reception. The minority were absent. On the other hand, the minority held an informal meeting in the afternoon in the blacksmiths' premises, and the frank cordiality which reigned there provided a compensation for the disheartening sight which the majority had presented to the eyes of the opposition for a week. Nearly all the federations of the International were represented at this quite intimate gathering: Americans, Englishmen, Irishmen, Dutchmen,

* Frederick Engels.—*Ed.*

Belgians, Russians, Frenchmen, Italians, Spaniards and Jurassians. In the evening, the minority went to a public meeting organised by the striking printers; several hundred persons, including many women, were present. The delegates of the International were invited to speak, and by way of protest against the *ukases* of the majority it was *Guillaume*, expelled the day before by those gentlemen, whom they entrusted to speak in the name of the International. His speech, translated into Dutch by *Dave*, was listened to with enthusiasm by the printers. *Dave* and *Brismée* then spoke. Mr. Engels, who had mistakenly come to this meeting, seeing the sentiments of the Dutch workers, departed in haste.

Finally, the day ended with a meeting of the Amsterdam Section. There the statement of the minority was read out and approved with unanimity. A deep-going discussion of the principles of the International was able to convince the delegates that the Amsterdam Section, like all the other sections in Holland, intended to march like us along the path of autonomy and federalism.

On the Monday evening most of the minority delegates attended a meeting in Brussels of the Brussels Federation. It is not up to us to announce the decisions which were taken there; it will suffice to say that the spirit which animated that meeting, presided over by Comrade *Victor Arnould*, editor of *Liberté*, provided the delegates of the other federations who attended with a sure guarantee that the Belgian sections would never allow anybody to violate their full and entire autonomy.

The Jura delegates left Brussels on the Tuesday accompanied by the Spanish delegates, who had been instructed to travel via Switzerland in order to come to an agreement with the Jura Federation and if possible with the Italian Federation, whose delegates were expected in the Jura in the second week of September.⁶¹

ACCOUNT OF THE WORK AND RESOLUTIONS
OF THE HAGUE CONGRESS
BY THE BELGIAN DELEGATE PIERRE FLUSE ⁶²

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The Hague Congress was the outcome of exceptional circumstances. On one side, the prodigious events which had taken place since our last international congress, first of all in Germany and France simultaneously, at the time of the Franco-Prussian war, then in France at the time of the Paris Commune, seemed bound to influence considerably the course of the Congress and the ideas which were to be expounded at it. On the other hand, the difficulties which had arisen since more than a year within the Association itself, difficulties caused largely by the General Council in London, threatened to divide the Congress into two camps between which it would be difficult to establish understanding. What we foresaw did in fact happen: the Congress, from its opening to the closure of the debates, which were very stormy, was a veritable arena of struggles and disputes which will stand out clearly before you when we speak to you about the administrative sittings.

For better understanding of the account we have to give in our capacity as *rapporteur* of the Federation of Vesdre valley, we have divided the work into two distinct parts; in the first, less important part, we shall deal with the public sittings, in the second with the administrative ones. We shall end this work with a special chapter in which, in the form of a general conclusion, we shall point out our fears for the future and also our hopes, which are stronger than our fears. We shall be guided only by the principles of justice and impartiality which must be the basis and rule of

conduct' of every genuine socialist revolutionary fighting for the enfranchisement and the emancipation of the working people and the whole of humanity.

NOMINAL LIST OF THE DELEGATES TO THE FIFTH GENERAL CONGRESS HELD AT THE HAGUE (HOLLAND) SEPTEMBER 2-7, 1872 ⁶³

- Arnaud (Antoine), chemist, delegate of the Section of Carouge (Geneva), Switzerland
 Alerini, delegate of the Spanish Federation
 Becker (Philipp), brushmaker, delegate of the Romance Federal Council, of two Basle sections, the Zug Section, the Lucerne Section, the German Section of Geneva (Switzerland)
 Barry (America), delegate of the Chicago Section (North America)
 Becker (Bernhard), delegate of the Section of Brunswick (Prussia)
 Brismée (Désiré), printer, delegate of the Brussels Section (Belgium)
 Cournet (Frédéric), delegate of the London General Council and of the Central Committee of Copenhagen (Denmark)
 Cuno, delegate of the Düsseldorf Section (Prussian Rhineland) and the Stuttgart Section (Württemberg)
 Coenen,* delegate of the Antwerp Section (Belgium)
 Cyrille, business clerk, delegate of the French Section of Brussels (Belgium)
 Faillet,* French Sections of Paris and Rouen
 Dietzgen,* tanner, delegate of the Section of Dresden (Saxony)
 Dupont' (Eugène), musical instrument maker, delegate of the General Council of London
 Dave (Victor), delegate of the Section of The Hague (Holland)
 Duval, joiner, delegate of the Romance Federal Council, Geneva (Switzerland)
 Dereure, Simon, delegate of the New York Congress (North America)
 Eberhardt, delegate of the Sections of hide-dressers, boot-closers, tailors, joiners, painters, hide-dyers and marble workers of Brussels (Belgium)

- Eccarius, tailor, delegate of the London Section of boot-closers
- Engels (Frederick), man of letters, delegate of the Section of Breslau (Prussia) and Section No. 6 of New York (North America)
- Farga Pellicer, printer, delegate of the Spanish Federation
- Fluse, weaver, delegate of the Federation of La Vedre (Belgium)
- Farkas (Carl), mechanician, delegate of two sections of Pest (Hungary)
- Friedländer (Hugo), delegate of the Section of Zurich (Switzerland)
- Frankel (Leo), delegate of the French Section
- Guillaume (James), delegate of the Congress of Neuchâtel (Switzerland)
- Gerhard, tailor, delegate of the Amsterdam Federal Council (Holland)
- Gilkens, lithographer, delegate of the Section of lithographers, Amsterdam (Holland)
- Harcourt (Edwell), goldminer, delegate of the Section of Victoria (Australia)
- Herman, delegate of the Liège Federation of mechanics, of the trade union of united joiners, marble workers and sculptors (Belgium)
- Hepner (Adolf), journalist, delegate of Section No. 8 of New York (North America)
- Hales (John), delegate of the Hackney Road Branch, London
- Heim, delegate of the Section of Bohemia (Austria)
- Johannard, artificial flower maker, delegate of the French Section
- Karl Marx, man of letters, delegate of the General Council, of Section No. 1 of New York, a Section in Leipzig, a Section in Mainz (Prussia)
- Kugelmann, doctor, delegate of the Section of Celle (Hanover)
- Potel, delegate of the French Section
- Lessner, tailor, delegate of the German Section of London
- Lafargue (Paul), delegate of the New Madrid Federation (Spain) and the Portuguese Federation
- Longuet (Charles), teacher, delegate of the French Section

- Le Moussu, draughtsman, delegate of the French Section of London
- Milke, printer, delegate of the Berlin Section (Prussia)
- Morago, delegate of the Spanish Federation
- Marselau, delegate of the Spanish Federation
- Mottershead, delegate of the Bethnal Green Branch in London
- MacDonnell, delegate of the Irish Section in London and of the Dublin Section
- Pihl F. S., delegate of the Copenhagen Section (Denmark)
- Ranvier, porcelain painter, delegate of the Ferré Section in Paris (France)
- Roach (Thomas), delegate of the London General Council
- Rittinghausen, man of letters, delegate of the Munich Section
- Swarm, draughtsman, delegate of the French Section
- Sauva (Arsène), delegate of Sections No. 29 and No. 42, Hoboken and Paterson, New York (North America)
- Sexton (George), delegate of the London General Council
- Schumacher (Gustav), tanner, delegate of the Solingen Section (Prussian Rhineland)
- Splingard (Roch), delegate of a group in Charleroi (Belgium)
- Sorge, teacher, delegate of the Congress of New York (North America)
- Schwitzguébel, engraver, delegate of the Congress of Neuchâtel (Switzerland)
- Serraillier, bootcloser, delegate of the General Council and of the French Section
- Scheu (Heinrich), delegate of the Section of Eszlingen (Württemberg)
- Walter, delegate of the French Section
- Wróblewski, teacher, delegate of the Polish Section in London and of the General Council
- Van der Hout, delegate of the Amsterdam Section (Holland)
- Van den Abeele, delegate of the Ghent Section (Belgium)
- Vaillant, civil engineer, delegate of the Section of Chaux-de-Fonds (Switzerland), the French Section and the San Francisco Section (North America)
- Vichard, delegate of the French Section
- Wilmot*

* The photocopy is damaged here.—*Ed.*

Chapter I

PUBLIC SITTINGS

The first public sitting was held on September 5 at 10 a.m.

Before proceeding with the roll-call, the chairman, *Ranvier*, said a few words to the numerous public crowding the spacious enclosure allotted to them. You know, he said in substance, which causes prevented us from assembling earlier. The Versailles massacres made great gaps in our ranks; the constantly renewed persecutions deprived us for a long time of a home and of any safety. We were only able to call a secret conference in London in 1871. But that conference did no harm; on the contrary, the International has grown stronger everywhere, and we have above all won over to our cause a lot of agricultural workers who together with us will hasten the time of social emancipation. We have come to place ourselves trustingly under the safeguard of the Dutch government. We had faith in its traditional hospitality and believed that it would give refuge to the exiles of the Commune as well as other governments protect the Bonapartist conspirators. So thanks and sympathy to the noble people of Holland! You know what our objective is. We want the triumph of the working classes, and we are not so far from it as some people claim. The proof is that despite all Favre's circulars and all Dufaure's laws, the International is continuing its organisation, becoming stronger and more powerful from day to day. (Applause.)

Roll-call. Three were absent.

A communication was made to the Congress, coming from a number of delegates, former members of the Paris Commune.

To the General Congress of the International Working Men's Association Sitting in The Hague.

Citizens,

For the first time since the fall of the Commune, the delegates of the proletariat massacred in Paris, persecuted everywhere and everywhere oppressed, have assembled at an international congress. Therefore all eyes are turned at this moment towards The Hague—our enemies expecting

an admission of weakness or fearing a challenge which would provide proof of the impotence of their furious reaction. For its part, the people expects from those in whom it sees its representatives: a word of hope, the promise of energetic efforts in view of imminent revenge, of early and final victory.

Therefore, in the assurance that, conscious of its duty, the Congress will not fail in it, we, Communards, delegates to the Congress, come in the name of the machine-gunned, proscribed people, in the name of the suffering people, to ask of you that word of hope which you will not refuse it, because it will be the contract which will prove to it that you are worthy of its confidence.

In face of the repression, which is as savage as it is senseless, on the part of the victorious bourgeoisie against the defeated proletariat,

In face of the necessity to organise the proletarian forces disorganised by defeat in view of more energetic action,

In face of the weakness shown vis-à-vis the authorities* by certain groups of the International Association which cover up their desertion of the people's cause with the pernicious doctrine of abstention in political matters by betraying this cause by alliance or compromise with bourgeois parties whatever may be their name,

Considering that the social revolution can no more be enclosed in formulas than it can be resolved by petty measures and that it must be approached as a whole and in its totality if it is to be achieved,

That the destruction of every capitalist property regime,

That the abolition of the classes, the social revolution, can be achieved only by mustering all the energy of the revolutionary forces,

That abstention from political action is the negation of the first duty of the working class: the conquest of political power for the purpose of sweeping away the old society and creating the elements of the new by the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat,

* The text submitted to the Congress has "bourgeois powers" (*The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 183).—Ed.

That any alliance with a bourgeois party whichever shade it belongs to, under any pretext whatever, is desertion of the proletariat's cause on the part of any individual or group guilty of it,

That if the formation of societies of resistance, their federation, beginning the organisation of the working class, provides it with the weapons to fight capitalist oppression,

That if the strike is one means of revolutionary action, the barricade is another, and the most powerful of all,

The Congress declares:

1. The militant organisation of the proletariat's revolutionary forces and of their political struggle is placed on the agenda of the next congress.

The General Council is instructed to submit a project for this organisation.

2. Any individual or group claiming to belong to the International who is proved to have, by weakness, cowardice or doctrinarian stupidity, deserted the cause of the revolutionary proletariat will no longer be allowed to remain in the International Association.

The General Council will have the power to exclude such individuals or groups from the International pending a final decision by the Congress.

Signed: *Ant. Arnaud, Cournot,
Dereure, Ranvier, Ed. Vaillant**

Then the report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association was read in four languages: French, German, English and Dutch. This report, which I have asked Citizen Karl Marx for several times and which he has promised me every time I have asked him, has in the end not been given to me. But we received it through the newspaper *Liberté*, which published it *in extenso*.

The report was put to the vote and adopted by the Congress.

Several delegates then tabled the following motion: "The Congress assembled at The Hague sends messages of sympathy to the victims of government persecution in Ger-

* The address to the Congress was signed also by Le Moussu. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 184.—Ed.

many and Austria, France and America, to all the exiles, heroic victims for the workers' cause."

This motion, as you will well understand, was immediately adopted by acclamations of all the delegates.

(The Schramm-Cuno incident.)

The second public sitting took place at seven in the evening of the same day.

After an incident caused by the reading of a letter from the French Ferré Section (calumniating Malon), it was decided that the documents sent to the Congress would no longer be read when upon receipt, but would be gone through by a commission of five members who would summarise them and make a report on them to the Congress. Citizens Brismée, Dupont, Frankel, Dereure and Lafargue were appointed members of this commission.

The agenda then called for discussion of the powers of the General Council.

Comrade *Herman* expounded the question briefly and clearly as understood by us in Belgium.

Here there already began to appear that majority system which constantly tried to prevent the members of the minority from speaking.

Citizen *Lafargue* attempted to prove that *Herman* was not expounding the question but only wanted to air his imperative mandate.

However, after remarks made by comrade *Dave*, who was joined by Citizen *Longuet* of the majority on this occasion only, it was noted that *Herman* had only formulated the question. It was even implicitly decided that the administrative resolutions of the Basle Congress about the number of speakers and the time they were allowed to speak would be disregarded.

Citizen *Dupont* asked that no limit should be fixed in so serious a question, and this motion was considered adopted. But the members of the majority soon showed us that they took a different view of this.

Citizen *Lafargue* spoke after *Herman*. The General Council must exist, he said, to link the different national branches and federations. Our duty was to group into trade corporations, and the Council was necessary as a link between the different scattered branches. The bourgeois of the Interna-

tional were against the Council because they wanted to bring us back to their economic and philosophical movement, but we wanted no more of that.

To this strange theory Comrade *Guillaume*, Swiss delegate of the Jura Federation, opposed the true principles. The International, he said in brief, was divided between two trends of ideas. Some grouped the working classes under one and the same doctrine, the product of the more or less organised brains of a few men who believed in the orthodoxy of their ideas. Others believed that the International arose spontaneously from the needs and aspirations of the workers, they grouped as a result of the identity of the economic realities. If this identity existed, the General Council would not be able to evade it; if it did not exist, the most authoritative council in the world would not be able to produce it. At the Basle Congress we had voted for the powers of the General Council; we had cruel experience; the Council considerably abused them; we therefore asked that they should be withdrawn from it. The General Council was of no use to lead us in the economic struggle: what strike had it organised? It was of no use either to guide us on the revolutionary path: was it the Council which created solidarity? No! It was the initiative of the groups. Not needing to be led, where did we see the necessity for the Council? We only needed a correspondence bureau to maintain international relations, but we did not want this bureau or this Council ever to intervene in our internal affairs.

Citizen *Sorge* speaking during the debate, said that on the contrary, we needed a council with a strong head and plenty of brains. An army, he said, must have chiefs and strong centralisation. If the Council had not done more, it was because its powers were far too limited. They should be extended.

Comrade *Morago*, of Spain, thought that the authority of the Council was good at the most for those who wanted to obey, but we, he said, who wanted to be free and autonomous, we did not want it at any cost because we felt the danger of it.

The sitting was adjourned after this speech, but all the members of the minority were convinced that the discussion of this question remained open.

Comrades Brismée, Dave and Fluse of the minority had their names down to speak, as well as Longuet of the majority.

But at the *public sitting in the evening of September 6* our extreme astonishment was justified when a motion was tabled, signed by citizens Arnaud, Vaillant and Cournet, of the majority, asking for the discussion to be closed. Our protests were of no avail, these citizens, supported by the majority, who always voted as one man, got the upper hand, and it was impossible for us to speak.

After an incident caused by a member of the Dutch press (*Van der Hout* of the *Dagblad**), the Congress proceeded to discuss Vaillant's motion concerning the political action of the working class; in other words it was proposed to ratify Resolution IX of the London Conference. The mode of voting ought to have been discussed first, the Spanish delegates feeling uncertain since the beginning of the Congress about the validity of their delegation. But as these citizens belonged to the minority they were refused justice and the proceedings continued.

Citizen *Vaillant* said he was convinced that emancipation must be conquered by force; unity of action was necessary; the abstentionists and the radicals were our enemies; they had been seen sitting at Versailles or in the police. Politics was the means by which we would achieve the abolition of classes, and he thanked the Conference for the good resolution it had adopted.

Citizen *Hepner*, a German delegate, was of the opinion that the Lassalleans and the German abstentionists (those who marched with us) had done great harm to the cause, and that we should engage in politics far more than we did.

Two more speakers dealt with this question, the others who had their names down being again prevented from speaking by a hasty demand for the closing of the debate, again made by the authors of the motion under discussion. Those who spoke were citizens *Guillaume* and *Longuet*, who repeated, each from his own point of view, the arguments for or against the political action of the working classes.

* This is inaccurate: Van der Hout wrote an exposal of the *Dagblad*. See p. 63 of this volume.—*Ed.*

Citizen *Johannard*, though belonging to the majority, made a very witty and just remark when the closing of the discussion was demanded. I note, he said, that there are delegates here who can get a vote on anything they like, and Citizen *Arnaud* is one of them. The same delegates are always talking about political questions, and never of social questions, probably because they know nothing about them.

The remark was cutting, but I think it was true for many.

On *September 7 in the evening* the last public sitting was held, attended by a vast crowd of public. Speeches were made in Dutch only.

Comrade *Dave* opened fire with a historical account of our powerful Association, recalling that its creation was quite spontaneous, quite natural, and not artificial or fictitious as the members of the majority affirmed. He proved that in order to be genuinely scientific its organisation should proceed from the bottom upwards, and not from the top downwards. He then enumerated and commented on the diverse achievements of the International and the future in store for it. He ended with an ardent call to the Dutch people, urging the Batavian nation to remember its glorious historical traditions of freedom, independence and republican pride and to join the Association, the saviour of the proletariat, *en masse*.

Then Comrade *Van der Hout* described the situation of the Association in Holland, saying that much propaganda had been carried on in that country but that there was still an immense amount to be done and that in this respect the holding of the Congress at The Hague would be very beneficial for the future of the Association in the Netherlands.

Comrade *Brismée* ended this last public sitting with a short exposition of the idea of the Association. He developed the idea that union alone can produce strength and that without union the workers' solidarity is a vain word.

The chairman, Citizen *Sorge*, said a few words of thanks to the public, which were translated by Comrade *Dave*, and then declared the public sittings of the Fifth World Congress closed.

The rapporteur, delegate *P. Fluse*

GENERAL CONCLUSION FROM THE HAGUE CONGRESS

We went to the Hague Congress firmly determined to defend revolutionary and anarchist ideas, for the triumph of which we have not ceased to fight since the origin of our vast and powerful organisation. We met there, marching united with us, all the Belgians from the other Federations, and with them all the Spaniards, the Dutch, the Swiss, a large part of America and a considerable portion of England. The whole of Italy, which reasons of the highest importance had prevented from sending a delegate to the Congress, defends the same principles and fights all restoration of authority. In fact the struggle was on the one hand between the supporters of authority and centralisation, represented above all by the General Council, by the Germans and by the French, and the supporters of pure anarchy on the other. Two major questions were submitted to us for discussion, and both of them were solved in a manner contrary to our hopes. There was first of all the question of extending the powers of the General Council, of increasing the powers which it had possessed until now, and then of sanctioning by the vote of a world Congress the resolution adopted at the London Conference on the political action of the working classes. The General Council has become a veritable power, whereas we would have wished it to lose even the power which it already had; the resolution of the London Conference was accepted, whereas we had fostered the hope that the majority of the Congress, recognising at last that it was entering on a path which was ruinous and dangerous for the Association, would renounce these erroneous ideas and its counter-revolutionary tendencies.

Before going any further, however, let us add that this double failure, though it saddened us, did not in the least discourage us. The International Working Men's Association is too powerful, the revolution of the nineteenth century is too well entirely embodied in it for it to fear such struggles; and we shall point out with Proudhon that Christianity also had its heresies at the very beginning, and later its great schism; the Reformation had its confessions and its sects; the French Revolution had, to mention only the most famous names, its Constitutionals, its Jacobins, and its

Girondins. So may the International too have its anarchists and its authoritarians; the Revolution will recognise its own!

Two trends of ideas divide the International today. Some think that the Working Men's Association must be organised as a *hierarchy*, that is to say, that it needs a head linking together and directing from above the scattered members of this vast body. Force being the guiding principle and the only support of modern states, they think that we also must use the force that is in us, which is the result of our organisation, and constitute ourselves into a powerful political party capable of conquering political power in order to replace the bourgeois state by the people's state, the *Volksstaat* of the German socialists. This is, as we were reminded at the Hague Congress, a return to the programme of the German communists of 1848. This conception, in our opinion, has no serious philosophical value, because the organisation of the International, the fruit of this entirely mystical conception, is neither free, nor natural, nor, consequently, true. It is not free because it receives its impulse from above, because it creates an authority *outside itself*, and sacrifices the conscience of the people; it is not natural because, coming from above, it does not take into account the liberty, the autonomy of each of its members, but substitutes for the individual's or the group's own, *essential* authority of the acquired and artificial authority of a few men who, by the nature of the functions they have been given, find themselves at the top of the organisation, at the head of the hierarchy; lastly, it is not true because, by borrowing its mode of functioning from one of the forms of the Absolute, authority, it can only end up by establishing within itself a party, that of the top, holding all the rest of the organisation under its domination, by imposing its own sovereign will on that organisation as the rule of its conduct. This system, which emerged fully armed from the eternally ravaged flanks of the Absolute, must be applied in an equally absolutist manner, if indeed it can ever triumph. The people's state, the last and perhaps the ideal form of revolutionary reaction, emerges naturally, fatally from this artificial and extra-natural organisation. Whatever it does, this people's state, in order to maintain itself,

will have to call on the reactionary forces which are natural allies of authority: the army, diplomacy, war, centralisation of all powers preventing the liberty and initiative of individuals and groups from emerging and manifesting themselves. Liberty, in fact, is illusory in this system, since it exists only by the constant diminution of force, by the progressive destruction of power, and because all the wheels of the system function, on the contrary, in such a way as to render the power of the people's government as crushing as the power of the bourgeois government is today. Once engaged on this arbitrary and despotic road, one must fatally climb one by one all the rungs of authority; there is no place on this fatal road where one can stop. Do you want a new and striking example of this? The Basle Congress gave the General Council the right to *suspend* a section of the International. This formidable right, which in a moment of blind confidence and social inexperience, if we may say so, we granted to the Council, placed it above the whole of the Federation to which the excommunicated section belonged. We bitterly regretted our error, but we could entertain the hope that this resolution would never be applied. The Hague Congress disillusioned us. We learned there that the Council's authority was not great enough, and the majority of the Congress lost no time in filling this gap. From now on the General Council will have the right to suspend a whole federation, that is to say, it has become the supreme arbiter of the revolutionary destiny of a whole nation. Were we wrong in saying that once engaged on this road, it is impossible not to encroach more and more on the autonomy of the groups until in the end they are all absorbed and destroyed completely!

Contrary to the supporters of authoritarianism and centralisation, we think with Bakunin (Bakunin, *Almanach du Peuple pour 1870*⁶⁴) that the International Working Men's Association would have no meaning at all if it did not tend invincibly towards the abolition of the state. It only organises the popular masses in view of this destruction. And how does it organise them?

Not from the top to the bottom, by imposing on the social diversity produced by the diversity of labour among the masses, or imposing on the natural life of the masses,

an artificial unity and order as states do; but from the bottom to the top, on the contrary, by taking as the point of departure the social existence of the masses, their real aspirations, and inducing and helping them to group themselves, to harmonise and balance themselves in conformity with this natural diversity of occupations and situations.

This means in other words that we use for the workers' organisation the only rational and positive method, that we group the different trades, first locally, then by federations and nations, and then internationally, leaving to each natural group its own autonomy. Every individual, every group thus develops spontaneously, moves freely, within the limits of law and of justice, and its action can be modified only by the influence exerted on it by all the individuals, all the other organised groups. And when the International has been thus organised everywhere, the political authoritarian workers' party will be of no use for abolishing the state, for, as Proudhon judiciously observed, a government of reaction, by wanting to save society from revolution, affects the interests of the whole of society. Once the grouping of the proletariat is achieved, it will be the end of the state, and as we do not wish to replace it by another, even a people's state, we have no use for the formation of a working-class army, the purpose of which would be to *conquer* political power. The proletariat's mission is, on the contrary, to dissolve the state in the industrial organisation.

Since the Absolute is completely eliminated from this conception of the International, all the successive creations of the Absolute disappear with it.

In the system of Revolution, God is dethroned, society is the work of man, who is his own beginning and his own end, and the distribution or rather the sharing out of earthly goods is effected according to his will, regulated by reason and justice. There is no class which directs and dominates another class, every member of society works for himself and for all and fulfils his social function alone and entirely himself. All the useful forces are necessary for the development of society, and nobody has the right to deprive it of the co-operation of any one of them. God, no longer being the supreme regulator of human destinies, becomes useless, and poverty ceases to be without remedy: labour and intelligence must naturally overcome it. The Church, deriving the reason for its existence and its force from the Absolute, disappears with it. It is no longer the state, the army, the Church, God,

who preside over the government of the world; it is labour, represented by the people, which rules everything, having raised everything to itself. Religion having been destroyed, the people rises from its intellectual and moral degradation; politics having been eliminated, it rises from its economic decay, with which disappears at once the feudalism of finance, of industry, of property, of capital. Social science appears and destroys all which is incompatible with it: politics and government. "The economic balance being established there is no need of the army to maintain it, war, being by its nature a great parasite, able only to disrupt, not strengthen the established balance. Peace is the necessary result and the sublime crowning of all the forces directed towards labour.

"Labour being essentially a peacemaker, the people emancipated by revolutionary politics strives to give guarantees to its labour and thereby to the labour of all; instead of creating, as is inevitably the case today, new monopolies for the profit of a few, on the contrary it extends these guarantees, and unites town with town, country with country; it gives all workers solidarity with one another and creates the life of relationships in economic order. Can politics and war still find a place, be it ever so small, in society thus transformed? No, and when this constitution of labour has finally replaced the constitution of the old world, the accession of the working class will have been realised so imperiously and fatally that the most severe justice will recognise its legitimacy and bow down before it" (Victor Dave, "L'autorité ou la Révolution". *Liberté*, November 13, 1870).⁶⁵

We are reproached with being *abstentionists* in politics. At the Hague Congress this term was proved to be quite inappropriate. In respect of states and governments our politics is in fact *negative*, and in this sense we understand to a certain point that we are called abstentionists. But we have our own politics, the true politics of the people and of labour, and that politics is *positive*. It is *federalism* which we oppose to authoritarianism. Every political form being intimately linked to an economic organisation and depending on that organisation, the federalist politics must be different from the authoritarian politics, because the economic organisation corresponding to these two political forms is essentially different. Authoritarianism is, in effect, the political expression of the communist principle which leads to the constitutions of a people's proprietor state; federalism, on the contrary, is the political expression of the collectivist principle which leads to the free federation of free associations of producers. The difference between the two paths followed by the International is therefore clearly seen, and it is not difficult to foresee which of

the two will lead to the democratic and social Revolution. When we oppose with all our might the triumph of the authoritarian, unitarian and absolutist principle, we are fighting like Proudhon to realise the interests of each one together with the interests of all, the identity of collective sovereignty and individual sovereignty. Since we must therefore fight adversaries who have appeared in our midst, let us do so with our heart penetrated with mutual loyalty to both parties and with the consciousness of a great duty to be fulfilled. And then let ancient and implacable Nemesis, who is never moved by anything, lead us through all obstacles and not stop us until the people's conscience and the Revolution are satisfied!

Delegate to the Hague Congress *Pierre Fluse*

Chapter II

THE ADMINISTRATIVE SITTINGS

The administrative sittings began on September 2, 1872.

The delegates on their arrival at the Congress handed in their delegation mandates to the bureau.

This was provisionally composed of comrades Gerhard of the Federal* Council of Holland, Van den Abeele of the Ghent Section, Coenen of the Antwerp Section. This bureau remained in office until the next day, when Van den Abeele, Chairman; Gerhard, Vice-Chairman; Le Moussu, French secretary; Hepner, German secretary; Van der Hout, Dutch secretary; and MacDonnell, English secretary, were appointed, still provisionally. On September 3, special translators were appointed: Frankel for German, Dave for Dutch, Wilmot for French, and Eccarius for English.

A commission was then appointed to verify the mandates. Those appointed to it were citizens Marx, Ranvier, Frankel, Dereure, MacDonnell, Roach and Gerhard.

This last-named commission presented its report at the evening sitting on September 2. It had named its own chairman, Gerhard, and rapporteur, Ranvier. Comrade *Herman*

* The original has "General" here.—*Ed.*

having demanded a vote on each delegate, was opposed by citizens *Marx* and *Engels*, and it was decided that the contested mandates would be laid aside for discussion and that the others would be admitted *en bloc*. Some mandates were contested. The names of their bearers were: Alerini, Barry, Dereure, Farga Pellicer, J. Guillaume, Lafargue, Morago, Marselau, Sauva, Sorge, Schwitzguébel, Vaillant.

Moreover Comrade *Guillaume* opposed the admission of General Council members as delegates of this Council. But the members of the majority drowned the speaker's voice and the mandates of the Council members were recognised amidst an explosion of applause, naturally provoked by the majority.

The rapporteur asked for a vote of confidence in the commission, which had worked with the most scrupulous impartiality.

Adopted.

Citizen *Engels* asked that speakers whose mandates had been contested should speak first and for no more than five minutes.

Citizen *Sauva* thought he saw in this tactics by which he did not want to be duped and asked for ten minutes.

Then the minority in the person of comrades *Fluse*, *Guillaume*, *Dave* and *Sauva* tabled a motion in the following terms:

"The time for each speaker will be limited, but not the number of speakers."

Naturally the General Council could not let such a generous motion be passed; it made a counter-proposal to the effect that only one speaker could speak on each question.

This was immediately adopted.

Vaillant's Mandate

Comrade *Schwitzguébel* contested the existence of a French section at La Chaux-de-Fonds, therefore Citizen Vaillant could not have a mandate from there. He was delegated by La Chaux-de-Fonds as a section adhering to the Romance Federation. But La Chaux-de-Fonds was a mixture of backward elements.

Citizen *Vaillant* did not know what was going on there and had accepted the reactionary mandate to defend the Romance Federation against the Jura Federation.

Citizen *Vaillant's* powers were recognised valid.

Dereure's Mandate

Comrade *Sauva* said that the New York Congress had acted wrongly in sending delegates to the Hague Congress. Article 6 of the Rules, which requires that there should be 500 members for a second delegate cannot be applied to them. It is a two-stage election. And more than that, the Congress had instructed *Dereure* and *Sorge* to choose from the General Council five or six men to represent America at the Congress, that was a three-stage election.

Dereure's powers were recognised valid.

Sorge's Mandate

Comrade *Sauva* opposed his admission for the same reasons as for *Dereure*, since they were nominated at the same time.

Sorge's mandate was declared valid and his powers recognised.

Sauva's Mandate

Citizen *Sorge* claimed that the sections which had sent *Sauva* were not regular ones. Section No. 29, for example, did not belong to any federation. Section No. 42 refused to give 55 centimes per member for delegation expenses.

Sauva replied that Section No. 29 did not consider the two American Federal Councils as good enough and that was why it had withdrawn. Section No. 42 had other reasons than the question of the 55 centimes for not considering or approving the sending of delegates from New York. It had the motive that the election had been falsified.

Realising that this delegate could cause inconvenience to the authoritarians, *Karl Marx* spoke violently against this mandate, which was nevertheless finally accepted by 30 votes to 18.

Lafargue's Mandate

Comrade *Alerini* established that Lafargue was representing at the Congress the *New Madrid Federation*, which had been recognised by the General Council but not by the Spanish region. Lafargue and his friends had been expelled from the Madrid Federation.

Lafargue submitted a very revolutionary article which had motivated his expulsion; he had been expelled by 15 members from a section which had 130 members. I was expelled with my friends José Mesa y Leompart, Francisco Mora, Victor Pagés and Inocente Calleja, he said.

Alerini asked whether or not that New Madrid Federation had been legally constituted. Well then, the General Council had exceeded its rights in recognising it without consulting us. As for their expulsion, it was decided in two votes, and as there are sittings every week, they only had to appear. We Spanish delegates protest against Lafargue's admission.

Engels, of the General Council, claimed that there was violent ill feeling against Lafargue because he had denounced the existence in Spain of the *Alliance*, a secret society, and that the people who were opposing him that day belonged to that *clique*, as well as Guillaume and others.

Guillaume: I demand that Engels be called to order.

Engels: You are from the *Alliance*.

Guillaume: That is false.

Engels: I shall prove it. (*Enthusiastic applause from all the friends of the General Council.*)

Amidst noise and tumult Lafargue's mandate was recognised by 40 votes, all the others abstaining.

Before closing the sitting Citizen *K. Marx* moved the expulsion of all members of the *Alliance* from the International.

At the administrative sitting of September 3 in the afternoon the validation of the mandates continued. Some of the mandates were contested only because of questions of form and were immediately validated when these were set right; we shall not deal with these, but only with those which were contested because of questions of principle.

Zhukovsky's Mandate (Geneva Alliance)

This mandate was contested because its bearer was a member of the Alliance, whose rules were allegedly opposed to those of the International.

Zhukovsky explained the rules of the Alliance and affirmed that he had nothing to do with the old Alliance, nor his friends either.

The powers of Comrade *Zhukovsky*, again one of the minority, were suspended until Karl Marx had given his proofs of guilt in the affair of the Alliance. Let us state in passing that the powers of this delegate, who could have been so embarrassing, remained *suspended* until the closing of the Congress. That was a suspension which had its effect!

Mandate of Morago and Others

The commission did not accept these mandates because the Spanish Federation from which they originated was not in order with the General Council.

Engels added that, moreover, he had learned many things since the day before. Its delegates belonged to the Alliance and their federal council too.

Morago replied that the Madrid delegates had not paid their money because they only had Spanish currency, which they wanted to change. And as for the Alliance, he answered that the Alliance had done *everything* in Spain whereas the General Council had done *nothing*. In the Alliance they had met only generous men who worked for all. He had suffered prison and exile for the Revolution. Their situation did not resemble that of the English and the Belgians, they had all suffered, much more than those who then wished to excommunicate them. The Alliance had been very necessary in Spain, but at the present day it no longer existed, it had been dissolved at the Congress of Saragossa. The divisions which had existed in Spain had been brought there by a single man, Paul Lafargue, who had come from England to subordinate them to his father-in-law's party. He would not get them!

Citizen *Ranvier*, the rapporteur for the mandate commission, asked that the same should be done in regard to the Spaniards as to *Zhukovsky*.

Morago continued with greater vigour saying that the commission members had nothing to do with their persons; listening to them one would have thought that the English and the French knew better than the Spaniards themselves what was going on in Spain; those who had nominated them knew down to the last detail who they were and he had the right to say that that should be enough. They were there representing an imposing force of Spanish workers; 30,000 men supported at that very moment, in the heart of their country, the words coming from his lips. Would they dare to send them away? He besought them to speak and conclude with sincerity.

The majority, visibly overwhelmed by the language, a worthy echo of the sons of ancient Castille, did not dare to say any more. The matter was put to the vote and the Spanish delegates, *Morago*, *Alerini*, *Marselau*, and *Farga Pellicer* were admitted unanimously with one abstention—their own!

Sauva's Mandate, Section No. 2 of America

The Section was in order with the General Council but had withdrawn* from the American Federal Council, which had become transformed into a political council and wanted to nominate Mrs. Woodhull for the Presidency of the USA.

Citizen *Dereure* asked whether a section which did not comply with the resolutions of a congress could still be part of the International.

Despite Comrade *Herman*, who tried to re-establish the true principles, Section No. 2 was rejected by 49 votes to 9 with 11 abstentions.

West's Mandate, Section No. 12 of America

Marx opposed the mandate because this section did not recognise the General Council and would not pay. It included as many members of the bourgeoisie as workers. The General Council had deemed useful to suspend it.

* This is inaccurate. See pp. 41-42 of this volume.—*Ed.*

West agreed that the General Council had suspended them, but arbitrarily, without even calling on them to fulfil their obligations. The section was expelled because it claimed that love should be free, though every one of them practised it every day. They had the right to profess whatever theories they wished. There were said to be spiritualists among the section; were there not free-masons among the members of the Council? The Council had acted wrongly in not even informing them of their suspension and they did not recognise that act of tyranny.

Sorge violently opposed Section No. 12 and said that Mrs. Woodhull was only trying to attain power with the support of the workers.

Sauva, though not wishing to defend Section No. 12, said how much good Mrs. Woodhull had done, to the refugees of the Commune among others, and ended by thanking the Congress for the sympathy with which it had heard the defence of the American Citizen West.

Delegate West was not admitted to the Congress by 49 votes with 9 abstentions.

At the evening sitting on September 4, after the roll-call, the appointment of the final bureau took place. Those nominated were: Chairman, Ranvier; Vice-Chairmen, Gerhard and *Sorge*; secretaries: Le Moussu, MacDonnell, Marselau, Van der Hout, and Hepner.

There was a unanimous vote of thanks to the provisional Chairman, Van den Abeele and the permanent Chairman thanked the Congress in the name of the Ferré Section which he represented.

The Germans tabled a motion that as they had to attend the Congress at Magence with the Austrians and the Hungarians, the Congress should immediately begin with the discussion of the General Council's powers, its seat and that of the next Congress, and the revision of the General Rules.

The Belgians requested on the contrary that they should begin by settling the mode of voting on administrative questions.

The Germans' motion was adopted by 49 votes, the others abstaining.

After that a commission was appointed to investigate the question of the *Alliance*, but first Guillaume said that so

far they had always voted for commissions but none of the candidates presented by them had succeeded in being appointed. He asked that in the Congress the accused should be allowed to choose a member to represent them on that commission.

Adopted.

Those appointed were: Lucain, Spingard, Cuno, Walter and Vichard.

Motion: We ask for a commission of five members to check certain official acts of the General Council as well as the underground activity which some of its members have been carrying on.*

The members of the preceding commission were appointed also to this one, but it did not function.

At the administrative sitting of September 6, 1872 a beginning was at last made with the discussion of important questions of the Congress. It was a matter of sanctioning by a vote the following resolutions:

Article 2. The General Council is bound to execute the Congress resolutions, and to take care that in every country the principles and the General Rules and Regulations of the International are strictly observed.

Article 6. The General Council has also the right to suspend branches, sections, federal councils or committees and federations of the International, till the meeting of the next Congress. Nevertheless, in the case of sections belonging to a federation, it will exercise this right only after having consulted the respective Federal Council.

In the case of the dissolution of a Federal Council, the General Council shall, at the same time, call upon the Sections of the respective Federation to elect a new Federal Council within thirty days at most.

In the case of the suspension of an entire federation, the General Council shall immediately inform thereof the whole of the federations. If the majority of the federations demand it the General Council shall convoke an extraordinary conference composed of one delegate for each nationality, which shall meet within one month and finally decide upon the

* The motion was tabled by Alerini and Guillaume. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 145.—Ed.

question. Nevertheless it is well understood that the countries where the International is prohibited shall exercise the same rights as the regular federations.

Comrade *Brismée* found that this motion gave still more authority to the Council and we had come there to oppose all authority. My friend Fluse, he said, had a mandate from the Belgian congress to demand the suppression of the Council. Afterwards his federation accepted the Rules voted at the Belgian congresses, but you must see from this how much we love authority.

Citizen *Longuet* said that Fluse had been more logical at the Congress when he asked for the suppression of the Council, for if the Council should only be a correspondence bureau as *Brismée* demanded, it would be just as good for the federations to correspond among themselves. If not, since the people cannot be omnipresent any more than God is, it must have agents to carry on its business.

Serraillier said that the International in France was now much stronger than under the Empire when it was guided by political abstentionists.

Guillaume replied that *Serraillier* should therefore respect Varlin, who had done more than he had.

Longuet said that Varlin was not a political socialist as they were.

Morago in turn opposed authority of any kind with strength and vigour.

After a short rejoinder by *Lafargue*, who, borrowing a saying of Voltaire about God, said that if the Council did not exist it would have to be invented, the discussion was cut short and the vote was taken.

The article* was adopted by 40 votes to 5 and 11 abstentions.

The Congress then went on to discuss the other articles of the section.

Sauva was authorised by the Americans whom he represented to declare to the Congress that his country would not recognise the General Council if it continued to demand rights instead of simply carrying out its duties. As for the suspension of a section, only the Congress could decide that.

* Article 2 of Section II of the Administrative Regulations.—*Ed.*

Herman said that the federation established in Belgium did not allow abuse of power by the Council and that it was impossible for the Belgian Council to be in conflict with all the sections. Neither could we admit that the Council should suspend a whole nation which had been in the International for five or six years and had always respected its Rules and principles.

Marx affirmed that by the very fact that the Council's powers were taken away, it was being abolished. It is not for ourselves, he said, that we are asking for powers; I have stated that before accepting the Belgian rules I would demand the dissolution of the Council altogether. As for the suspension of sections, if only you knew in the countries where the International was banned, how many attempts there had been to form police sections! Elements of secret police societies manage to penetrate even into federal councils. The day will come when you will feel the necessity for a central seat for concentrating forces.

Article 6 was accepted in its entirety by 36 votes to 6 with 15 abstentions.

Citizen *Vaillant* asked for an immediate decision on the resolutions of the London Conference concerning the *political action of the working classes*, and tabled a motion signed by several members of the majority who were former members of the Commune. The motion was to insert in the General Rules Resolution IX of the London Conference formulated as follows:

In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the proletariat cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

This constitution of the proletariat into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the triumph of the social revolution and of its ultimate end, the abolition of classes.

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

The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies and for the enslavement of labour.

The conquest of political power has therefore become the great duty of the proletariat.

This motion was adopted by the majority of the Congress and consequently inserted in the General Rules.

Engels motioned the following: We request that the General Council should be transferred to New York for 1872-73, that it should * have the right to co-opt such members as it shall judge suitable, but that the number of members should not exceed 15.

Engels set forth the moral situation of the Council in Europe and said that most of its members would not accept the renewal of their powers. Brussels had been thought of, but Brussels was impossible because there was not enough security there for keeping the archives and minutes. Moreover nothing would prevent the General Council from appointing a delegation in Europe.

Citizen *Vaillant* pointed out that the Council could function suitably only in Europe, that is, at the centre of the Association, and he suggested that it should be left in London.

After *Sauva* had said a few words in favour of the Council's transfer, the discussion was closed.

The seat of the Council would be in New York, voted by 31 votes to 1 for Brussels, 14 for London and 1 for Barcelona.

At the administrative sitting of Saturday, September 7, note was taken of the hurried departure of the Blanquists—Cournet, Ranvier, Arnaud, Vaillant and others after their failure to keep the Council in London.

Alerini moved that the members of the new General Council should be elected by the regional federations.

Serrailier opposed this and *Alerini's* motion was rejected by 29 votes to 9 and 8 abstentions.

Marx proposed that the Congress should nominate nine members and that these should co-opt six others.

Sauva asked that the Congress should nominate all the fifteen even without knowing them; it would in any case do better than leaving it to the Council to nominate them,

* Fluse's record here omits the words: "be composed of the following members of the North American Federal Council: Kavanagh, Saint Clair, Levièle Laurel, F. J. Bertrand, J. Bolte, C. Carl".—*Ed.*

because it would choose only the most authoritarian in the whole of America.

After a few remarks by Citizen *Sorge*, who adopted the pose of a semi-god of authority, Marx's motion was adopted by 19 votes to 4 and 19 abstentions.

The members of the new Council, not counting those to be co-opted were:

Kavanagh, Irish	29	votes
Saint Clair, Irish	29	"
Laurel, Swede	29	"
David, French	26	"
Bertrand, French	29	"
Bolte, German	29	"
Carl, German	29	"
Levièle, French	28	"
Fornaccieri, Italian	25	"
Ward, American	22	"
Dereure, French	26	"

After this vote, Citizen *Lafargue*, delegate of Spain and Portugal, tabled the following motion in the name of the Federation of Portugal and the New Madrid Federation. The motion was adopted.

The new Council is charged with the special mission of organising international trade unions.

For this purpose it must in the month following the Congress draw up a circular which it will have translated and printed in all languages and sent to all the working men's societies affiliated to the International or not, whose addresses are known to it.

In this circular it will invite every working men's society to form an international union of its trade.

Every society will be invited to fix itself the conditions of membership of the international union of its trade.

The General Council is instructed to collect the conditions fixed by the societies which accept the idea of an international union and to draw up a general project which will be submitted for provisional acceptance by all the societies desiring to be members of the international trade union.

The next Congress will confirm the final agreement of the international unions.

Signed: *Paul Lafargue*

Seconded by: *Sorge*—America, *Dereure*—America, *Milke*—Germany, *Hepner*—Germany, *Duval*—Romance Switzerland, *Lucain*—France.

INVESTIGATION OF THE SOCIALIST ALLIANCE
(SECRET SOCIETY)

The commission appointed to carry out an inquiry into the *Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, which constitutes, according to the General Council, a secret society within the International, spreading, also according to the Council, opinions and principles contrary to those of the International Working Men's Association, submitted its report at the *closed sitting of Saturday evening**; its conclusions result according to the *rapporteur*** from painstaking investigations which we shall soon be able to check, since a vote of the Congress has allowed the publication of the documents on which it was able to base its opinion.

Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Alliance Society.

As the Commission of Inquiry has not had time to present you with a complete report, it can only supply you with an evaluation based on the documents communicated to it and on the statements which it has received.

After having heard citizens Engels, Karl Marx, Wróblewski, Dupont, Serrailier and Swarm for the General Council

And citizens James Guillaume, Adhémar Schwitzguébel, Zhukovsky, Morago, Marselau and Farga Peller, accused of belonging to the Alliance society,

The undersigned declare: 1. That the secret Alliance founded on the basis of rules completely opposed to those of the International Working Men's Association has existed, but it has not been sufficiently proved to the commission that it still exists.

2. That it has been proved, by draft rules and by letters signed "Bakunin", that this Citizen has attempted, perhaps successfully, to found in Europe a society cal-

* September 7, 1872.—Ed.

** Lucain.—Ed.

led the Alliance with rules completely at variance, from the social and political points of view, with those of the International Working Men's Association.

3. That Citizen Bakunin has resorted to dishonest dealings with the aim of appropriating the whole or part of another person's property, which constitutes an act of fraud.

Furthermore, in order to avoid fulfilling his obligations, he or his agents have resorted to intimidation.

On these grounds:

The citizen-members of the commission request that the Congress:

1. Should expel Citizen Bakunin from the International Working Men's Association.

2. Should likewise expel citizens Guillaume and Schwitzguébel, being convinced that they still belong to a society called the Alliance.

3. Since, during the course of the inquiry, it has been proved to us that citizens Malon, Bousquet—the latter being secretary of the Police Commissioner at Béziers (France)—and Louis Marchand, who has been residing at Bordeaux, have all been guilty of acts aimed at the disorganisation of the International Working Men's Association, the commission likewise demands their expulsion from the Association.

4. As regards citizens Morago, Farga Pellicer, Marselau, Alerini and Zhukovsky, the commission, bearing in mind their formal statements that they no longer belong to the said Alliance society, requests that the Congress should consider them not implicated in the matter.

To ensure their responsibility, the members of the commission request that the documents which have been communicated to them, as also the statements made, should be published by them in the official organ of the Association.

Chairman of the Commission *Th. F. Cuno*
(delegate for Stuttgart)
Secretary *Lucain* (delegate of a French
Section)

Permission to speak was given to Citizen *Alerini*, who said,

I see that there the commission is simply conducting a tendentious process. I belonged to the Alliance and I am proud of it, because the Alliance alone formed the International in Spain and was the cause of its great development. Do the Rules say that one must not be a member of a secret society? No! Then what are you accusing these men of? Of having conspired! Everybody conspires. More than that, if I had known that a secret society would be useful to the International, I admit frankly that I would have been a member of it.

Johannard. I wish to point out two things: does the commission think it has done its work seriously? Walter withdraws saying there has not been sufficient proof. What then is that? I should consider it the basest cowardice if I did not say something in favour of Malon. We have not the same ideas from the political and social point of view. Is that a crime? No! Malon has done much for the International and I do not see why his expulsion is demanded. As for Bakunin and Guillaume, I do not know them well enough to dare to ask for their expulsion, but let the commission know that it is assuming a terrible responsibility; to drive anybody out of the International is a thing of the greatest gravity. Give me proofs and I shall express my opinion, even were he my greatest friend.

Splingard (member of the commission). I ask a preliminary question: I ask the member who proposed expulsion to establish proofs. When one procures documents from a secret society it must be a traitor who delivers them. Karl Marx has only supplied the commission with moral proof, and as for moral proof, irrespective of the loyalty and sincerity of those who supply them I cannot admit them. You have at your disposal only a draft of the rules, is that a proof? You cannot even provide a single copy of minutes of that terrible society. I believe you are chasing a ghost.

Karl Marx. Splingard spoke like the defence of the accused. I procured papers which Citizen Engels communicated to the commission, and those proofs are not moral proof, but written proof. That is all I have to answer.

(*Lucain*, rapporteur). Does Citizen Spingard think he has more conscience than we have? Before pronouncing judgment, we weighed up the materials communicated to us and we gave our sentence and we declare ourselves responsible for that judgment. And the Congress should authorise us to publish those documents so that everybody can judge this matter.

Guillaume. I have a simple remark to make: you have waited until today to expel two members from the International; are you imitating the Jacobins of 1793 who led members of the Commune to the scaffold in the same cart as robbers?

Fluse. It seems to me that the Alliance is only an aberration of certain minds. We are told that the rules are contrary to the International. Are not the rules of the Grand Orient contrary to the International, and there are plenty of members of the Grand Orient among us; better still, if I asked for their expulsion, your astonishment would know no bounds; we have the same reason to be astonished at the resolutions of the commission. Here I can only note one fact: wherever the Alliance existed the International developed vastly; and wherever the General Council had a hand there was division in those countries. For example, Spain and Switzerland, where the General Council's private circular was nothing but a bad joke. To sum up: since the Alliance has done more and better for the good of the International than the General Council has, I should prefer to vote for the dissolution of the Council than for the expulsion of those who belonged to the Alliance.

There were demands for the debate to be closed. Put to the vote and adopted.

A vote by roll-call was taken.

Bakunin:	27	yes	7	no	7	abstentions
Guillaume:	25	"	9	"	8	"

Citizen *Engels* asked to speak and proposed the expulsion of only these two members, which would serve as a lesson for the others.

Adopted.

PROGRAMME OF THE *ALLIANCE*

1. The *Alliance* declares itself to be atheist; it strives for the abolition of cults, the substitution of science for faith and of human justice for divine justice.

2. It seeks, above all, final and complete abolition of classes, the political, economic and social equalisation of individuals of both sexes, and to achieve this aim it demands in the first place the abolition of the right of inheritance, so that in future the enjoyment of the benefits should be equal to the production of each, and so that, in conformity with the decision taken by the last Congress of workers at Brussels the land and instruments of labour, like all other capital, by becoming the collective property of society as a whole, may not be used except by the workers, that is to say, by agricultural and industrial associations.

3. It requires all children of both sexes, from the day of their birth, to have equality of the means of development, that is to say, maintenance, education and training at all levels in science, industry and the arts, being convinced that this equality, at first purely economic and social, will eventually lead to greater natural equality of individuals by eliminating all the artificial inequalities which are historical products of a social organisation as false as it is iniquitous.

4. As the enemy of all despotism, recognising no political form other than the republican, and rejecting outright all reactionary alliance, the *Alliance* also rejects all political action which does not have for its immediate and direct goal the triumph of the cause of the workers against capital.

5. It recognises that all the political and authoritarian states now existing, as they are reduced more and more to the simple administrative functions of the public services in their respective countries, must disappear in the universal union of free Associations, agricultural and industrial alike.

6. Since the social question cannot find a definitive and practicable solution except on the basis of international solidarity of the workers of all countries, the

Alliance rejects any policy founded on so-called patriotism and the rivalry of nations.

7. It wants the universal Association of all the local Associations through liberty.

Dave reads out the statement of the minority. Disarray among the majority.

STATEMENT OF THE MINORITY

We the undersigned, members of the minority at the Hague Congress, supporters of autonomy and federation of groups of working men, faced with a vote on decisions which seem to us to be contrary to the principles recognised by the countries we represented at the preceding congress, but desiring to avoid any kind of split within the International Working Men's Association, take the following decision, which we shall submit for approval to the sections which delegated us:

1. We shall continue our administrative relations with the General Council in the matter of payment of subscriptions, correspondence and labour statistics.

2. The federations which we represent will establish direct and permanent relations between themselves and all regularly constituted branches of the Association.

3. In the event of the General Council wishing to interfere in the internal affairs of a federation, the federations represented by the undersigned undertake jointly to maintain their autonomy as long as the federations do not engage on a path directly opposed to the General Rules of the International approved at the Geneva Congress.

4. We call on all the federations and sections to prepare between now and the next general congress for the triumph within the International of the principles of federative autonomy as the basis of the organisation of labour.

5. We resolutely reject any connection whatever with the so-called London World Federalist Council and with any similar organisation alien to the International.

Signed:

Alerini,	delegate	of	the	Spanish	Federation
Farga Pellicer	"	"	"	"	"
Morago	"	"	"	"	"
Marselau	"	"	"	"	"
Brismée	"	"	"	Belgian	"
Fluse	"	"	"	"	"
Coenen	"	"	"	"	"
Herman	"	"	"	"	"
Splingard	"	"	"	"	"
Van den Abeele	"	"	"	"	"
Eberhardt	"	"	"	"	"
Schwitzguébel	"	"	"	Jura	"
Guillaume James	"	"	"	"	"
Dave	"	"	Holland		
Gerhard	"	"	"	"	
Sauva	"	"	America		

It is decided that the next Congress will take place in Switzerland. The Congress breaks up. Meeting in Amsterdam.

First published
in Russian

Translated from the French

IMPERATIVE MANDATES
AT THE HAGUE CONGRESS ⁶⁶

The betrayals of their electors in recent times by many deputies to parliament have caused the return to fashion of the old imperative mandates of the Middle Ages which had been abolished by the Revolution of 1789. We shall not undertake here a discussion in principle of such mandates. We shall only note that if all electors gave their delegates imperative mandates concerning all points on the agenda, meetings and discussions of the delegates would be superfluous. It would be sufficient to send the mandates to a central counting office which would count up the votes and announce the results. This would be much cheaper.

What is important for us is to show the most unusual situation in which imperative mandates place their holders at the Hague Congress—a situation which can serve as a good lesson to the enthusiastic supporters of such mandates.

The delegates of the Spanish Federation, elected, as we know, under pressure from the Federal Council, received an imperative mandate to demand

“that the votes be counted according to the number of those represented by the delegates holding an imperative mandate; that the votes of those represented by delegates not provided with an imperative mandate will not count until the sections or federations which they represent have discussed and voted on the questions debated at the Congress.... In the event of the Congress persisting in the traditional system of voting, our delegates will take part in the discussion, but will abstain from voting.”*

* The *Jura Bulletin*, which is known to be the official organ of the Alliance leadership, published in its latest issue a short account of the sittings of the Hague Congress, the authenticity of which can be judged

This mandate therefore demands that the Congress, before dealing with anything else, should adopt the following decisions:

1. To change the articles of the Administrative Regulations dealing with the mode of voting.

2. To decree that delegates not holding an imperative mandate should not have the right to vote.

3. To declare that these changes would apply immediately to the present Congress.

It was immediately pointed out to the delegates of the Spanish Federation that even if the Congress adopted their requests Nos. 1 and 2, request No. 3 would be inadmissible. The Hague Congress had been called on the basis of certain of the Association's organisational rules. It certainly had the right to change them, but if it did change them, it would by the very fact have destroyed the basis of its own existence and would have placed itself in the absolute necessity to dissolve itself immediately, after convoking a new congress, whose delegates would be elected on the basis of the new organisational rules. To apply these new rules to the present Congress would be to make them retroactive and to violate every principle of justice. Consequently, whether the Congress adopted proposals Nos. 1 and 2 or not, it could by no means adopt proposal No. 3; and if the Spanish delegates had received and accepted a mandate which was in flagrant contradiction with itself, which placed them in the impossibility to vote during the whole duration of the Congress, whose fault was it?

The case was so clear that neither the minority, nor even the delegates of our region, found words to contest it. Consequently they remained present at the Congress without voting, and this in the end so exasperated the Dutch that one of them asked:

"Why didn't you stay at home if you hold a mandate which forbids you to vote and deprives the minority of four votes every time a vote is taken?"

by the following, which we translate word for word: "The Spaniards, seconded by the Belgians and the Jurassians, demanded that the voting should be not by individuals, but by *federations*." Did this demand appear in the mandate of the Spanish Federation?—*Author's note*.—See p. 225—*Ed*.

But for a really Alliance mandate and an Alliance way of using it, the *Jura* Federation had not its peer.

Here is the mandate of its delegates:

"The delegates of the *Jura* Federation are given an imperative mandate to present to the Congress of The Hague the following principles as the basis of the organisation of the International.

"Any group of workers which adheres to the programme of the International as it has been defined by the preamble to the General Rules voted at the Geneva Congress, and which undertakes to observe economic solidarity in respect of all the workers and groups of workers in the struggle against monopoly capital is a section of the International enjoying full rights."

Here, indeed, the General Rules and Regulations are abolished. If the preamble is allowed to remain, that is only because, no conclusions being drawn from it, it simply has no meaning.

"The federal principle being the basis of the organisation of the International, the sections federate freely among themselves and the federations federate freely among themselves with full autonomy, setting up according to their needs all the organs of correspondence, statistics bureaus etc., which they judge to be suitable.

"The *Jura* Federation sees as a consequence of the above-mentioned principles the abolition of the General Council and the suppression of all authority in the International."

Thus the General Council, the federal councils, the local councils, and various rules and regulations which possess "authority" are to be abolished. Each one will act as he thinks fit, "with full autonomy".

"The *Jura* delegates must act in complete solidarity with the Spanish, Italian and French delegates and all those who protest frankly and broadly against the authoritarian principle. Consequently, refusal to admit a delegate of these federations must lead to the *immediate withdrawal* of the *Jura* delegates. Similarly, if the Congress does not accept the organisational bases of the International set forth above, the delegates will have to *withdraw* in agreement with the delegates of the anti-authoritarian federations."

Let us now see what use the *Jura* delegates made of this imperative mandate. In the first place, there were no French anti-authoritarian delegates at the Congress except one, a madman,* who did, in fact, "withdraw" very noisily many times, but returned every time because he could never get

* Victor Cyrille.—*Ed.*

a single other anti-authoritarian delegate to follow him. The mandate of Sauva of Section No. 2 of New York (anti-authoritarian) was annulled, but the *Jurassians* remained at the Congress. That of the Section of *Propaganda and Socialist Revolutionary Action* of Geneva—a section which belonged directly to the Jura Federation—remained suspended until the end of the Congress, and the *Jurassians* behaved as though nothing had happened. The mandate of Section No. 12 of New York which they themselves had encouraged to resist the General Council, was annulled, and the *Jurassians* remained impassive. As for the mandate of the Italian delegate* who was present, they did not even dare to present it.

But were the bases of organisation—or rather disorganisation—proposed by the *Jurassians*, adopted by the Congress? Not at all; exactly the opposite: the Congress decided to strengthen the organisation, that is, according to them, the authority. Did they withdraw after this? Nothing of the sort. They merely declared that they would refrain from voting in future.

So that was the true way to use the imperative mandate. The delegate complies with it if it suits him; if not, he pleads unforeseen circumstances and, in the end, does as he likes. After all, is it not a duty for the anti-authoritarians to disregard the *authority* of imperative mandates just the same as all other authority? The radically alliancist spirit so well revealed in the imperative mandate of the *Jurassians* was supplemented by the really anarchist manner in which they ignored that mandate. Does it not follow from this that these delegates are more initiated members of the Alliance than their Spanish colleagues?

The *Jura* mandate gives occasion for still other reflections. This mandate reveals the situation as a whole in the Alliance, where, despite all the talk about *anarchy*, *autonomy*, *free federation* etc., there is in reality nothing but *authority* and *obedience*. A few weeks before Schwitzguébel and Guillaume made out their own mandates, abolishing the General Rules except for the preamble, their friends, delegates, not belonging to the International, at the Rimini Conference,

* Carlo Cafiero.—Ed.

drew up the rules of a self-styled Italian Federation, consisting of the preamble to the General Rules of the Association and the regulations of the federation. Thus the organisation set up at Rimini *rejected* the General Rules. It is obvious that the gentlemen of the Alliance always in their actions obey secret and uniform orders. It was these secret orders also, no doubt, that the Barcelona *Federación* obeyed, when it unexpectedly started preaching the disorganisation of the International. The fact was that the strong organisation of our Association in Spain was becoming a threat to the secret leaders of the Alliance. This organisation gives the working class too much strength and by the very fact raises difficulties to the secret rule of the gentlemen of the Alliance, who know perfectly well that fish are best caught in troubled waters.

Destroy organisation, and the waters will be as troubled as you can wish. Eliminate first of all the trade unions, declare war on strikes, reduce working-class solidarity to empty words and you will have complete freedom for your high-sounding but empty doctrinaire talk. That is, if the workers of our region allow you to destroy the result of their four years of work, their organisation, which is, beyond doubt, the best in the whole of the International.

▶ To return to the imperative mandates, we still have one question to solve: Why do the Alliancists, declared enemies of the principle of authority in any form, so obstinately insist on the authority of imperative mandates? Because for such a secret society as the one existing within the public organisation of the International, there is nothing more convenient than the imperative mandate. The mandates of the Alliance members will all be identical, while the mandates of the sections not influenced by the Alliance or opposing it will be at variance with one another, so that very often the absolute majority, and always the relative majority, will belong to the secret society; whereas at a congress where there are no imperative mandates, the common sense of the independent delegates will swiftly unite them in a common party against the party of the secret society. The imperative mandate is an extremely effective means of domination, and that is why the Alliance, despite all its *anarchism*, supports its authority.

Before ending we must say that for the Spanish Federal Council, consisting of Alliancists, the most convenient form of action was the creation of a *collective* imperative mandate, a fact which was bound to lead to this mandate being the mandate of the Federal Council, or, what is the same, an Alliance mandate. All the Spanish federations which accepted the proposal of the Council contrary to the Regulations, sent extraordinary subscriptions to Valencia to pay the travelling expenses of the delegates, and together with these subscriptions the results of the voting, and together with the results of the voting—the imperative mandate of their federation, in order to “unite all the mandates and create a *collective imperative mandate*”. We readily admit that given a *loyal attitude* and *good will*, the Federal Council could have been entrusted with counting the votes of all the local federations, but to join in one the different opinions of all the local federations, the regional federations required supreme intelligence or a miraculous crucible in which it probably fused the various imperative mandates. And what came out of this new sort of crucible? What was bound to come out—the opinion of the Regional Council. We defy all the Alliancists to point out to us a chemico-electoral procedure which could produce another result.

The Spanish Federal Council, so anti-authoritarian, so anarchistic etc., thus *centralised* subscriptions in its hands so as to send delegates to The Hague; it *conducted* the elections of those delegates itself, and so skilfully that only Alliancists were elected, and, to crown it all, it composed the *collective imperative mandate*, which, it said, expressed the will of the members of the International in Spain.

More respect cannot be paid to autonomy.

REPORTS OF THE SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE
DELEGATE PAUL LAFARGUE
TO THE NEWSPAPER *LA EMANCIPACIÓN* 67

NEWS FROM THE HAGUE

THE TRIUMPH OF JUSTICE

The local council of the New Madrid Federation has given us the following news of the General Congress at The Hague for publication:

The International Congress of The Hague has accepted the mandate of our representative.

The International Congress of The Hague has recognised the New Madrid Federation.

In vain did the delegates of the Alliance, who went to the Congress deceiving the good faith of the Spanish workers, oppose the admission of our representative; in vain did they repeat that we had been declared traitors, and even have the insolence to maintain that in our expulsion the Regulations had been observed. The working-class delegates, who obey only the inspiration of justice, examined the previous history of the question and saw that we had been treated unjustly, that our enemies had infringed the Rules of the Association, that the General Council had been right in recognising us, and pronounced a verdict which must be final for the whole of the International.

Unanimously, without a single vote against, the Congress declared that it recognised the validity of the New Madrid Federation's powers.

Even Citizen Guillaume, a delegate of the Jura, voted in our favour, saying that the mandate of our delegate "was in order".*

* The extant copies of the Minutes do not contain this speech by Guillaume.—*Ed.*

This question being settled, a motion was tabled asking for the expulsion of all the members of the Alliance. A commission was appointed to examine the documents concerning this society. Among these is the imperative mandate which our Portuguese brothers sent to their representative at the Hague Congress. We reproduce it below, for we consider it to be extremely important at the present time.

IMPERATIVE MANDATE OF THE PORTUGUESE FEDERATION
TO ITS DELEGATE AT THE HAGUE CONGRESS

The undersigned, delegates of the various sections of the International Working Men's Association assembled at a meeting of the local Lisbon Council,

Being informed by the newspapers of the polemics which have been publicly raised by the members of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy in different countries;

Considering that the conduct of the Alliance has produced lamentable consequences for the prestige of the International Working Men's Association;

That its purpose is to dominate and disorganise our Association and to direct the working class towards a particular aim;

That if there is a reason for accusing the General Council this accusation should have been submitted to the consideration of the sections, resolved within their framework and sanctioned by the Congress;

Considering also that the conduct of the Italian sections is contrary to the letter and the spirit of the General Rules of the International;

That the said sections have committed an act of despotism by arrogating the authority to convene a General Congress, thus violating the basic principle of the Statute;

For all these reasons we propose:

1. In respect of the Alliance:

That it be declared a society dangerous and highly prejudicial to the economic emancipation of the working class and that the Congress must act with energy against it.

2. In respect of the Italian sections:

That their resolution relative to the convening of a General Congress be considered as a violation of the basic principle of the Statute which unites all the members of the International.

Lisbon, August 23, 1872

Daniel Alves, Chairman of the sitting.—*José Almeida y Santos*.—*José da Silva*.—*José Pereira*.—*Raimundo Luba*.—*Santos Leite*.—*Celestino Aspro*, secretary.—*Nobre França*, secretary

The delegates who attended the Congress of The Hague on September 3, 1872 were the following:

For France, 9; for England, 10; for Switzerland, 6; for Spain, 5; for Holland, 4; for Denmark, 2; for Hungary, 1; for Saxony, 1; for Württemberg, 2; for Australia, 1; for Portugal, 1; for Belgium, 9; for Austria, 2; for America, 3; for Prussia, 2; for Prussian Rhineland, 3; for Hanover, 1; for Ireland, 1.

Total: 62 delegates.

The Hague, September 6, 1872

Dear Comrades,

After three public sittings at which very eloquent speeches were made—though they could have been somewhat more concrete—and brilliant theories were expounded on decentralisation and federalism, which do not seem to me very appropriate for the problem the International is called upon to solve, the Congress, at the end of today's sitting, adopted a series of important resolutions whose usefulness will be appreciated by all who really desire the prosperity and strength of our great Association. The Congress decided that*:

“1. The General Council is bound to execute the Congresses' Resolutions and to take care that in every coun-

* The Spanish text shows slight discrepancies with the official text of the Congress resolutions.—*Ed.*

try the principles and the General Rules and Regulations of the International are observed (40* delegates voted for this decision, 5 against, and 11 abstained).

"2. The General Council has the right to suspend sections, federal councils or committees and even regional federations.

"However, in the case of sections belonging to a regional federation it will previously consult the respective federal council.

"In the case of the dissolution of a federal council, the General Council shall first ensure the election of a new federal council within thirty days.

"In the case of the suspension of a whole regional federation, the General Council shall consult all the federations, and if the majority of these demand it, shall convoke an extraordinary conference composed of one delegate for each nationality and finally decide on the conflict.

"It is well understood that the countries where the International is prohibited shall exercise the same rights as the countries where it exists legally (36 delegates voted for these proposals, 11 against, and 9 abstained).

"3. The General Council will be transferred to New York (United States of America)."

This proposal was introduced by Marx, Engels, Wróblewski, Serrailier, and other members of the previous General Council.

The Congress took three days to examine and discuss the mandates; in this connection all the internal questions of the Association were discussed. As these were administrative sittings, I have not the right to give an account of this discussion; suffice it to know that it was very impassioned; that the American Sections Nos. 2 and 12, which have caused so many scandals recently in the United States, were definitively expelled, and that the NEW MADRID FEDERATION was recognised by the Congress; all this by a majority of three to one. The majority always included from 42 to 45 (Germans, Frenchmen, Danes, Romance Swiss, Hungarians, some Englishmen and Americans),

* The newspaper has a misprint: 10.—*Ed.*

and the minority 16 or 17 (Belgians, Jura Swiss, one American, some Englishmen, and the abstainers—4 Spaniards and 3 Dutchmen). The French and Germans constantly voted united. It is truly unprecedented in history to see this cordial unity of the workers of two nations which little more than a year ago were fighting a most cruel war against each other.

The Spanish delegates, members of the Alliance, abstained from all the votes; those of the Jura, also members of the Alliance, finally adopted the same course. Apparently this was a tactical move.

Cafiero, the delegate of the Italian opposition sections and chairman of the Rimini Conference, is present, but he did not risk showing his mandate and is attending the sittings of the Congress as a mere spectator. Did the Italian sections by chance believe that, though they had never been *members of a federation*, had never belonged to the International, had never paid their subscriptions to the Council, did they believe that they were going to be admitted to solve questions that perturb the Association today? If this precedent had been allowed, the International would soon have been at the mercy of the bourgeois parties and the police in all countries.

The question of the Alliance was dealt with by a commission appointed for the purpose. Documents of the greatest importance have been submitted and will be published. I shall give you further details,

The Hague, September 9

Dear friends,

Attached is the official list of the delegates who composed the Fifth General Congress of our Association. In my last report I told you that the Congress spent three days examining the mandates. The fact must not be overlooked that on this occasion the entire activity of the General Council was appraised. Thus, by admitting the representative of the New Madrid Federation, the Congress approved the conduct of the General Council, and by annulling the mandate of the American delegate West, who came as a representative of Section No. 12, which had been suspended by the General Council, it recognised the right of the Council to suspend that section.

I sent you yesterday the two resolutions confirming the powers held so far by the General Council, and even extending them in respect of certain important points. The common sense and justice of the working class did not allow it to be deceived by bourgeois theories of the Alliance men.

As I already informed you yesterday, New York has been chosen as the place of residence of the General Council. Here are the details of the voting: for London, 14 votes; for Brussels, 1; abstentions, 13; for New York, 30.

The vote was then taken on the composition of the New Council, resulting in the election of the following 12 members, with the right to co-opt a further three:

Kavanagh, Irish,	29	votes
St. Clair, ditto,	29	
Laurel, Swede,	29	
Fornaccieri, Italian,	29	
David, French,	26	
Levièle, ditto	29	
Bolte, German,	19	
Carl, ditto,	28	
Ward, American,	22	
Bertrand, English	29	
Speyer, ditto	23	
Dereure, French	26	

Although the decision to transfer the General Council to New York appeared strange to some, the truth is that it is the only place, besides London, which offers the necessary guarantee for the safety of the archives and for the international character of the Council's composition. The Belgians themselves declared that Brussels offered no security, and they voted first for London, and then for New York. Geneva was not proposed. The Spaniards proposed Spain, but understandably this idea was not favourably received. Hence there remained no other place proposed but New York.

It was decided at the same time that the next General Congress would be held in Switzerland, leaving it to the General Council to fix the place.

On Saturday 7th, the question of the International's attitude to politics was raised and Resolution IX of the

London Conference was submitted for discussion. It was adopted by a majority of 28 to 13 (including the abstentions) and now forms *Article 8 of the General Rules*. The formulation has been somewhat changed, the preamble having been included in the text. Here it is word for word:

Para 8. In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the working class cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party distinct from and opposed to all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to ensure the triumph of the social revolution and of its ultimate end—the abolition of classes.

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

The lords of the land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies and for the enslavement of labour; the conquest of political power has therefore become the great duty of the working class.

Then the following motion was introduced:

“On behalf of the Portuguese Federation and the New Madrid Federation:

“I propose that the new General Council be charged with the special mission of organising international trade unions.

“For this purpose, in the month following this Congress it will draw up a circular which shall be printed and sent to all the working men’s societies, affiliated to the International or not, whose addresses are known to it.

“In this circular the Council will call on the workers’ societies to form an international union of their respective trades.

“Every society will also be invited to fix itself the conditions for joining the international union of its trade.

"The General Council is instructed to collect all the conditions put forward by the societies which accept this idea, and to draw up a general draft which will be submitted for provisional acceptance to all the workers' societies wishing to join the international trade unions.

"The next Congress will formally approve the regulations.

Paul Lafargue,
delegate of the New Madrid
Federation and of Portugal."

This proposal, seconded by Sorge, Dereure, Bernhard Becker, Milke, Hepner, Heim, Carl Farkas, Lucain, Fluse, and Lessner, was unanimously adopted.

Finally we come to the question of the Alliance.

The Alliance men did all they could to make us waste time and to prevent this question being submitted to the Congress; but the commission had worked so well that at last, on Saturday at 9 p. m. it presented its report. In it the commission proposed to expel Bakunin, Schwitzguébel, Guillaume, Malon and another two from France, and to leave aside the question of the four Spaniards, since they had formally declared that the Alliance in Spain had been dissolved. The method of wasting time was again resorted to. *Morago* made a speech in Spanish and after half an hour he was interrupted by *the chairman*, who told him that he had not yet been accused. Only with the greatest difficulty could Guillaume and Schwitzguébel be calmed down at half past eleven, after which the question was put to the vote. Bakunin and Guillaume were expelled, Schwitzguébel was saved by a very small majority, since it was considered, as I too consider, that he was an honourable man and that he had been led astray in the same way as Marselau, the only one of the Spaniards who managed to command the respect of his adversaries. He was also the only one who made a statement about the Alliance before the voting, saying that in the whole of this affair he had been guided by the best intentions. Seeing this, Comrade *Engels* proposed that the others should be amnestied, and this proposition was adopted.

It was then thirty minutes past midnight, and the Congress was declared closed without any great lustre but having accomplished a most important task.

The commission will publish its report on the Alliance, together with the documents and statements.

To sum up, Bakunin and Guillaume were expelled from the International, and the rules of the Alliance were declared contrary to the Rules of the International.

Below is the list of delegates mentioned in a previous report....*

On the 8th a big meeting of the members of the International was held in Amsterdam and attended by the delegates of the Hague Congress. Among the latter *Sorge*, *Marx*, *Dupont*, *Wróblewski* and *Lafargue* made speeches.**

Published in
La Emancipación No. 65,
September 14, 1872

Translated from the Spanish

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 330-33.—*Ed.*

** A detailed account of this meeting is given in this volume, pp. 634-41.—*Ed.*

[F R E D E R I C K E N G E L S]

THE CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE ⁶⁸

(LETTER TO ENRICO BIGNAMI)

London, October 1, 1872

Dear Bignami,

From September 2 to 7, the 64 delegates of the International Working Men's Association held their sittings at The Hague. Of these delegates 16 represented France; 10, Germany; 7, Belgium; 5, England; 5, America; 4, Holland; 4, Spain; 3, the Romance Federation (Switzerland); 2, the Jura Federation (Switzerland); 1, Ireland; 1, Austria; 1, Hungary; 1, Poland; 1, Portugal; 1, Australia; and 2, Denmark. According to nationalities there were: 20 Frenchmen, 16 Germans, 8 Belgians, 6 Englishmen, 1 Pole, 1 Irishman, 1 Corsican, and 1 Dane.

The verification of the mandates took more than two days. In this form, all the internal questions which had occupied the International since the last Congress were examined, and in almost every case it was a question of the General Council's activity.

Of the three mandates held by Citizen Lafargue, representing Portugal and two Spanish local federations, one, that of the New Madrid Federation, was contested by the other Spanish delegates. The New Madrid Federation, formed by members of the International arbitrarily expelled from the old federation in violation of the General Rules, had not been recognised by the Spanish Federal Council; it had then applied directly to the General Council in London, which had recognised it.

The Congress unanimously confirmed that decision.

The six delegates whom the General Council had sent, basing itself on the action of previous congresses, and who, by the way, with one exception, were also provided with other mandates, were admitted. The mandate of the delegate sent by the Section of Propaganda and Revolutionary Action of Geneva, a section not recognised by the General Council, was suspended for the whole duration of the Congress, and the section was not recognised. The four delegates of the Spanish Federation were not admitted until they had paid the subscriptions they were owing to the General Council for the year 1871-1872. And finally, the delegate of Section No. 12 of New York, which had been suspended by the General Council, was not admitted to the Congress, despite a speech which lasted more than an hour. All these decisions, adopted by a majority of three quarters of the votes, were at the same time expressions of confidence in the General Council, whose "authoritarian" action (as some are pleased to call it) was entirely approved by the immense majority of the Congress.

After these discussions, which smoothed out many differences which had arisen within the International, and which were therefore by no means without profit, the question of the General Council was posed. Was it necessary to abolish it? In the event of its being preserved, was it to retain its powers, or was it to be reduced to a mere correspondence and statistics bureau, a *boîte aux lettres*,* so to speak? The answer of the Congress left no doubt on this score: Article 2, Section II of the Administrative Regulations was formulated as follows:

"The General Council is bound to execute the Congress resolutions."

To this the Congress at The Hague added:

"and to take care that in every country the principles and the General Rules and Regulations of the International are strictly observed" (40 votes for this addition, 5 against, and 11 abstentions).

Article 6 of the same section, which confers on the General Council the right to suspend a section, was formulated as follows:

* letter-box.—Ed.

"*Article 6.* The General Council has also the right to suspend branches, sections, federal councils or committees, and federations of the International till the meeting of the next Congress.

"Nevertheless, in the case of sections belonging to a federation, it must previously consult the respective federal council....

"In the case of the suspension of a whole federation, the General Council shall immediately inform there of all federations. If the majority of the federations demand it, the General Council shall convoke an extraordinary conference, composed of one delegate for each nationality, which shall meet within one month and finally decide on the disputed questions.

"Nevertheless, it is well understood that the countries where the International is prohibited shall exercise the same rights as the regular federations."

It is clear that this new article of the Regulations defining with great clarity the powers of the General Council, contains the necessary guarantees against their abuse.

The Congress declared its will that the General Council should be invested with authority, but responsible. This paragraph was adopted by a majority of 36 votes to 11 with 9 abstentions.

Then came the question of the new General Council. If the General Council, whose powers were on the point of expiring, wished to be re-elected as a whole or partially, it was sure of an almost unanimous vote, since the Belgians and the Dutch had separated from the minority on this question and voted for London. A proof that Marx, Engels, Serrailier, Wróblewski, Dupont, and the other members of the previous Council had by no means demanded wider and better defined powers of the General Council for themselves personally was their motion that the General Council should be transferred to New York, this being the only place, besides London, where the principal conditions were ensured, namely safety of the archives and the international character of the Council's composition. Of all the proposals moved by the previous Council, this was the only one which encountered any difficulty, since all the delegates, with the exception of the Jura Federation

representatives and the Spaniards, agreed to leave the direction of the International in the same hands as it had been before. Only after the most active and well-known members of the previous Council had stated that they declined to be re-elected, was the transfer to New York adopted by a majority vote. The Congress went on to the election of the New Council, which was composed of 2 Irishmen, 1 Swede, 1 Italian, 3 Frenchmen, 1 American, and 4 Germans, with the right to co-opt three other members.

It is known that Resolution IX of the London Conference (September 1871) on the political action of the working class was vigorously opposed as being allegedly contrary to the principles of the International by the Jurassians, some of the Spaniards and the majority of the Italians. Nevertheless, that resolution now constitutes Article 8 of the General Rules of the International, which is as follows:

"Article 7a. In its struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes, the working class cannot act as a class except by constituting itself into a political party distinct from and opposed to all old parties formed by the propertied classes.

"This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the triumph of the social revolution and of its ultimate end, the abolition of classes.

"The combination of forces which 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 the landlords and capitalists.

"The lords of the land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies, and for the enslavement of labour. The conquest of political power has therefore become the great duty of the working class."

This resolution was adopted by 28 votes to 13 (counting the abstentions), and as the majority exceeded two-thirds, this resolution has been included in the General Rules. To this majority we must also add the votes of 6 German and 4 French delegates who were obliged to leave The Hague

and had left their vote in writing for the resolution; thus abstention from politics was condemned by a majority of three-quarters of the votes to one quarter. There remained only one important question. The General Council had denounced to the Congress the existence within the International of a secret society directed not against the existing governments, but against our Association itself. The members of this secret society, headed by its founder, Mikhail Bakunin, were divided into three categories according to the degree of their initiation. It set itself the aim of seizing the central leadership of the International, or, failing that, to disorganise it in order thus the better to ensure their own influence. With this objective, slogans on the *autonomy* of sections and *resistance* to the "authoritarian" tendencies of the General Council were spread. The Congress appointed a commission to investigate the question of this society, and its report was read out at the closing sitting. The report contained proof of the existence of this secret society and of its hostile character. The report ended with a motion to expel from the International Bakunin, Guillaume, Schwitzguébel, Malon and two others.

The conclusions of this report concerning the Alliance were accepted by the Congress; as for the individuals, Bakunin and Guillaume were expelled, Schwitzguébel was saved by a small minority, and the others were amnestied.

These were the principal decisions of the Hague Congress; they are definite enough, and at the same time extremely moderate. The General Council, supported by a majority of three to one, did its utmost to ensure for the new Council a clear and well defined position, to establish with clarity the political programme of the International which had been placed in doubt by a sectarian minority and to eliminate a secret society which, instead of conspiring against the existing governments, conspired against the International itself. Then the General Council refused to have itself re-elected and had to go to great trouble for its resignation to be accepted.

The majority at the Congress was composed mainly of French, German, Hungarian, Danish, Polish, Portuguese, Irish, Australian and American delegates and the delegates of Romance Switzerland; the minority consisted of Bel-

gians, Dutchmen, Spaniards, the delegates of the Jura Federation, and one American. The English delegates were divided in various ways at the voting. Not once did the minority (including the abstainers) exceed 20 out of 64 delegates; generally it numbered between 12 and 16.

There was one Italian delegate* present, the chairman of the federation established at Rimini, but he did not submit his mandate; the Congress would certainly not have accepted it. He attended the sittings as a spectator.

On my return from The Hague, I found in the Mantua *Favilla* an article signed Atheist** which disputed the correctness of the assertion that out of the 21 sections whose delegates signed the Rimini resolution, only one (that of Naples) belonged to the *International*.

"In saying further that only the Naples section is in order, the General Council is lying. The Milan workers' circle, the Girgenti society, that of Ravenna, that of Rome, and the Turin section, which was the initiator, have long since paid the ten centesimi fixed by the General Rules."⁶⁹

In order to make sure who is lying, the General Council or Mr. Atheist, it is sufficient to note that neither the Milan nor that of Girgenti, nor that of Turin appear among the signatories of the Rimini resolution, and that the Rome section did not apply to the General Council until after that conference (and I believe it was not the same section which was represented at Rimini).

The Italian Internationals may rest assured that as long as an *International*, a *Congress*, a *General Council*, *General Rules* and *Regulations* exist, no section will be recognised by the Congress or by the Council so long as it refuses to recognise the conditions fixed by the General Rules and Regulations, which are the same for all.

Frederick Engels

Published in
La Plebe No. 106,
October 5, 1872

Translated from the Italian

* Carlo Cafiero.—*Ed.*

** Carlo Terzaghi.—*Ed.*

[F R E D E R I C K E N G E L S]

From the Article:
LONDON LETTERS

II
MORE ABOUT THE HAGUE CONGRESS

London October 5, 1872

I hope that the outcome of the Hague Congress will make our Italian "autonomous" friends think. They ought to know that wherever there is an organisation, some autonomy is sacrificed for the sake of unity of action. If they do not realise that the *International* is a society organised for struggle, and not for fine theories, I am very sorry, but one thing is certain: the great *International* will leave Italy to act on its own until it agrees to accept the conditions common to all.

In the secret Alliance of Socialist Democracy there are three grades: international brethren (a tiny number), national brethren, and mere allies. C.* is an *international* brother, just as Guillaume (chief of Bakunin's general staff) and one or two Spaniards.

Among the French delegates, five came from France under fictitious names, the others are refugees of the Commune. I attach the list, in which the names and localities of the French sections are not given so as not to betray them to the police. But we have reorganised in more than thirty of the French *départements* and the *International* there is stronger and more active than ever.

It was gratifying to see the French and the Germans always voting in agreement at The Hague: it was obvious that all the wars, the conquests, the national hatred did

* Carlo Cafiero.—*Ed.*

not exist for the *International*. It was this union of the French and the Germans that led to all the resolutions without exception being adopted.

The reason for the transfer of the General Council to New York was: 1. The firm determination of Marx, Serrailier, Dupont and Engels not to accept a new mandate. Marx and Engels have scientific works to complete and have not had time for this in the past two years; 2. The certainty that in the event of their resignation a General Council in London would be composed as far as the French were concerned of *Blanquists* who, with their simulation of conspiracy, would lead to the arrest of the majority of our members in France—if they were accepted by these at all; as far as the English were concerned, of corrupt men used to selling themselves to the liberal bourgeoisie and to Mr. Gladstone's *radical* agents; and as for all the other nationalities, they would not be represented at all, since Wróblewski, Mac-Donnell and Frankel did not want to remain on it without Marx and the others.

Whatever the bourgeois press may say, we were well received by the workers of The Hague. Once the reactionaries sent a handful of drunks to us to sing the Dutch national royal anthem after the ending of the sitting. We let them sing and, passing through them, replied with the *Marseillaise*. Even the minority at the Congress would have been sufficient to disperse them by force. At the last sitting, on the Saturday, a numerous public gave the speakers a lot of applause.

Published in
La Plebe No. 107,
October 8, 1872

Translated from the Italian

**REPORT BY F. A. SORGE
TO THE NORTH AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S
ASSOCIATION ⁷⁰**

ON THE WORK OF THE DELEGATION
TO THE FIFTH GENERAL CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE
SEPTEMBER 2 TO 7, 1872

After a brief sea journey, the undersigned arrived in London about midnight on Monday, August 19, and on the following morning called at once on Karl Marx. We were received very cordially and Marx, and other arriving party comrades—Frankel, Longuet, Engels, Le Moussu, Jones from Manchester, and others—informed us rather closely on the situation in the General Council and in individual European countries.

In the evening of the same day we went to the sitting of the General Council,* where we received a friendly welcome from most of its members, and by a special decision were allowed to attend the sittings of the General Council. Eccarius and Hales kept aloof from us. Almost the majority of the General Council consisted of Frenchmen, that is, refugees who were members or supporters of the Commune. This imparted to the General Council, and later also to the Congress, a French character, and therefore the latter suffered from much talkativeness and exaggerated liveliness which was occasionally difficult to restrain. A natural result of exile is always strife and dissent among the exiles, who blame one another to a greater or lesser degree for failure

* Probably a sitting of a Sub-committee of the General Council.
—Ed.

and level more or less justified reproaches at one another,— and the splitting of the refugees into small groups (cliques), which fight intensely among themselves instead of attacking the common enemy. Do not reproach me with partiality because I speak of Frenchmen. We must tell one another the truth, and I do not hesitate for a moment to declare that the German refugees of 1848-49 were no whit better, but possibly more demoralised and split than the French refugees of 1871.

I am only reporting facts. Naturally, the aforementioned strife did not fail to influence the General Council comprising so many Frenchmen, and it required all the skill and prestige of a few old German party comrades to prevent open discord within the General Council.

Fighting raged against the so-called Federalists, Proudhonists, Alliance men, and Bakuninists. These people preach revolution without organisation, association without laws, fight without leaders, society without cohesion, the body without a head, as well as without ideas. For the autonomy, that is, the sovereignty, which they value above all else, leads in its natural consequences to the complete dissolution of the Association, to the atomisation of society into its smallest elements, that is, to complete disorganisation. The sovereign *ego*, if sufficiently strong, becomes the autocratic *ego*; thus naked autocracy arises from veiled autonomy, and the mystery of pompously announced personal freedom is resolved in the most vulgar tyranny; and it has become obvious that the representatives of this autonomy and this individual independence are the greatest despots in their demands and in the means of achieving them.

There is little danger that the practical, sober worker will allow himself to be deceived by these phrases.

Hence we find in countries with strongly developed industry, in England, France, and Germany, few so-called Federalists or no adherents at all of this trend; on the other hand, this trend has not a few disciples in those countries where industry and the proletariat are less developed and where consequently the working class is still far from consciously realising its condition, as, for example, in Italy and Spain. What Bakunin himself says in a letter about his supporters in Italy is indicative:

"declassed or disinherited bourgeois sons, lawyers, young enthusiastic students, in general people with no future and means".*

There is no mention of workers here.

That the Belgians incline so strongly to that direction is due to the jealousy with which they guard their nationality and independence, a sentiment which is found in excess especially among small peoples and nations. For the rest, they do not go so far in their demands as do the Italians and the others.

I said above: the fight is raging!

The old loyal members and founders of the I.W.A. saw this organisation endangered by the intrigues of Bakunin and his helpmates, who, by means of a secret society called Alliance, sought to take over and dominate the International.

I have had in my hand and have read evidence of this in Bakunin's own handwriting. Hence, the General Council was quite right when in its last communication to the New York Federal Council it stated: "At this Congress the existence of the I.W.A. is at stake",** and accordingly made every effort to counter the opposition at the Congress.

The Italians had ineptly discarded their mask by calling a counter-congress at Neuchâtel. The Jurassians and Spaniards were clever enough to disapprove of this step and to send their delegates to The Hague.

This fight constituted one of the main questions to be decided by the Congress, and it kept the General Council extraordinarily busy.

In the midst of this fight it became clear that the General Council lacked sufficient powers. Provided with adequate powers, the General Council could not have allowed such sectarianism as that indicated above to arise and become a force which now had to be fought in earnest.

Besides, because of the great events of recent years and the long interval between the Congress at Basle and the Congress at The Hague, discipline in the party in general had become quite slack and the ties had to be renewed.

* Here Sorge is recalling Bakunin's letter of April 5, 1872 to Francisco Mora. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 637-39.—*Ed.*

** See p. 352 of this volume.—*Ed.*

Hence arose the second main question before the Congress, that of increasing or strengthening the powers of the General Council.

The third major point which the Congress had to consider was the approval of the work and resolutions of the London Conference. The most important of these was the resolution on the political action of the working class; this resolution, so intensely opposed by the Jurassians, Bakuninists, and their associates needed to be confirmed by the Congress in order to become a valid rule.

In addition, the no less important fourth question before the Congress concerned the disputes and the split in America, and I am glad to be able to inform my electors that the General Council almost without exception decisively took our side, and therefore the result was entirely in our favour.

Our party comrades need only consider and imagine what a tremendous task it was to organise a Congress after an interval of several years and what great efforts had to be made to resolve the main questions mentioned above, and they will be satisfied with what has been achieved and will not wonder that some minor wishes and particular motions could not be considered and taken into account.

The Congress—may our American party comrades believe this—has discharged its obligations in full measure! Let us now do our duty, and the next Congress will easily make up for what is missing! And let us not forget that the Hague Congress has given us in bold outline unmistakably the directive for our future conduct.

The incessant struggle of the last years and the long tenure of office has tired though not disheartened several of our tested party comrades in the old General Council; their theoretical work, which is of such infinite importance and usefulness for the movement, has been left aside under the pressure of petty administrative work; for this reason, and also in view of the already mentioned dissensions, several older members of the General Council, particularly Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, have announced that under no circumstances will they accept re-election to the General Council. It was precisely these oldest and most active members of the old General Council who, after mature consideration, made the well-grounded proposal to transfer the

General Council to New York; after the first shock of this totally unexpected proposal was over, the great majority of the Congress found itself in agreement with it.

The reasons adduced by Engels in the name of the sponsors of the motion—all members of the old General Council—were the following:

1. The General Council must be moved away from London;
2. Most older members will not accept re-election;
3. The General Council and its papers are nowhere secure on the Continent (the Belgians and Swiss confirm this);
4. Thus there remains only New York;
5. In case of emergency and special circumstances the General Council may grant special authority to persons and delegations;
6. New York is more international than any other place;
7. There we have capable party comrades and resources etc.

This motion came as unexpectedly to both of your delegates as it probably does to you.

I further note the following briefly: Sauva, on his appearance at the General Council in London with the mandate from Section No. 2, was rejected, but he was admitted with the underhandedly obtained mandate from Section No. 42.

When West appeared at the General Council in London he was rejected.

I shall now proceed to give you my condensed report on the Congress.

We arrived in The Hague in the afternoon of Sunday, September 1.

The Hague has almost no industrial or working-class population. The court and its retinue, officials and servants, make up its population. The inhabitants gaped at us as if we were monsters and fabulous creatures, and there was no lack of insults, although people became somewhat more decent to us towards the end of the week of the Congress.

No provision had been made for cheap accommodation or for any accommodation at all. At first we had difficulty in finding lodgings and we had to pay dearly for everything.

The meeting hall was very far from our quarters and had poor lighting and no ventilation.

Sixty-five delegates were present, namely: 18 Frenchmen, 15 Germans, 7 Belgians, 5 Englishmen, 5 Spaniards, 4 Dutchmen, 4 Swiss, 2 Austrians, 1 Dane, 1 Hungarian, 1 Australian, 1 Irishman, and 1 Pole. They represented 95 mandates, of which Belgium had sent 17, German 15, France 14, Switzerland 11, America 7, the General Council 6, Spain 5, England 5, Holland 4, Denmark 2, Ireland 2, Hungary 2, Portugal 1, Poland 1, Austria 1, and Australia 1.

A printed copy of the complete list is attached.*

In general the behaviour of the delegates was dignified, self-confident and commanding respect. The predominance of the French nationality among the delegates and also the fact that the proceedings were conducted preferably in the French language imparted to the Congress an air of French liveliness, talkativeness and lack of restraint.

On Sunday, September 1, at 7 p.m. the so-called preliminary meeting was held, at which nothing happened except for the Dutch welcome to the Congress, several people objecting that the Congress had been called not for September 1, but September 2.

It was decided, however, to hold a closed sitting at 9 a. m. on Monday, September 2, and to admit members only.

On the Monday at 9 a.m. the sitting was opened by the representative of the Dutch Federal Council, who later ceded the chairmanship to *Van den Abeele* of Ghent, Belgium.

It was decided not to admit newspaper reporters, and Dupont, Frankel and Eccarius were appointed translators.

Upon a motion from *Engels* it was decided to appoint a mandate commission of 7 members, whilst *Sauva* and the *Jurassians* demanded one member from each federation.

The *Spanish delegates* pointed out that they had definite instructions not to vote until voting proceeded by number of members represented.

Marx, Ranvier, Roach, MacDonnell, Dereure, Gerhard and Frankel were elected to the Mandate Commission.

The sitting was adjourned at 3 p.m.

The evening sitting did not begin until 8.30 p.m. because the Mandate Commission did not appear earlier. It rejected

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 330-33.—
Ed.

the mandate of W. West, Sections Nos. 12 and 19; that of Sauva, of Section No. 2; that of Alerini, of a Marseilles Section; that of Zhukovsky, of the Geneva Section of Revolutionary Propaganda, etc., and objected to the mandates of the Spanish delegates for non-payment of subscriptions; it also requested further information on the mandates of Fluse and Dave. All other mandates were recommended for acceptance, including Sauva's mandates from Sections Nos. 42 and 29, which had been sent on after him. After prolonged negotiations Fluse and Dave were declared to be in order; Dereure's and Sorge's mandates were contested by *Sauva*, Sauva's by *Sorge*, Vaillant's by *Schwitzguëbel*, Lafargue's by *Alerini*, Barry's by *Hales*. With the exception of these and those objected to by the Mandate Commission, the others were all at once declared valid.

Hardly had this been done when *Hales* contested Sorge's right to speak.

The sitting was closed at 9.30 p.m.

On Tuesday, September 3, at 9.30 a. m. the sitting was reopened, and four secretaries were appointed for the German, French, English and Dutch languages.

After a long debate, provoked especially by *Sauva*,* it was decided to hear two speakers for each side and then to vote.

Vaillant's mandate from La Chaux-de-Fonds, which *Schwitzguëbel* had contested, was unanimously recognised, likewise the mandates of Dereure and Sorge against the single vote of *Sauva*, who made several false assertions in contesting it. Sauva's mandate from Sections No. 29 and No. 42 were opposed by *Sorge*, who tried to prove that it was only a ruse to bring Sauva into the Congress, as was confirmed by Sauva's own statement; but for want of positive proof, which the Federal Council had failed to forward, Sauva was finally admitted as delegate of Sections No. 29 and No. 42 by 30 votes to 20; Dereure abstained from voting, and thus Sauva had smuggled himself into the Congress.

Lafargue's mandate, contested by *Alerini*, was recognised.

Marx tabled a motion to expel the Alliance and to appoint a commission of inquiry.

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 117.—Ed.

The sitting was closed at 2 p.m.

The sitting was resumed at 4 p.m.

It was decided henceforth to take a roll-call and report absentees to their electors.

Barry's mandate, contested by *Hales*, was obligingly opposed in the absence of the latter by *Sauva*, but without success, since the mandate was recognised with two votes against, those of *Sauva* and *Mottershead*.

Alerini's mandate from Marseilles was rejected, Zhukovsky's mandate from the Geneva Propaganda Section was suspended pending a decision on the Alliance.

The mandates of the Spanish delegates were the occasion of prolonged discussion, but were finally recognised after they had paid their subscriptions to the chairman.

The mandate of Section No. 2 (New York) for *Sauva* was rejected by the Mandate Commission and after a long discussion it was declared null and void by the Congress by 39 votes to 9 with 11 abstentions, hence with a full two-thirds majority.

The sitting was closed at 10 p.m.

On Wednesday, September 4, the sitting was opened at 9.15 a.m.

Upon a motion by *Wilmot* smoking was prohibited in the hall.

The mandate from Section No. 12 (New York) for *W. West* came up for discussion. Upon *Sauva's* motion the rules for business were altered for this case and speaking time was not limited (31 votes to 8).

Marx demanded on behalf of the Mandate Commission that *West's* mandate should be declared null and void since *West* was or had been a member of Section No. 12, of the Philadelphia Congress, and of the Prince Street Council. He described the aims of Section No. 12, its "appeal" etc., pointed out its relations to the Jurassians, and also dwelt on the decision of the General Council, the two-thirds wage-workers' issue etc.*

West replied with a speech of almost one and a half hours, interrupted by frequent laughter because of its pathos and nonsense, and finally the Congress lost patience.

* For a detailed account of *Marx's* speech see: *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 133-34.—*Ed.*

Sorge replied to West.

Sauva said he did not wish to speak for Section No. 12, but made a speech in praise of Mrs. Woodhull and Section No. 12.

Guillaume tried to make a diversion in favour of West and said that the Jurassians had never written officially to America; but he himself had written privately to Vespillier; he read out Vespillier's reply, replete with accusations against Sorge and Section No. 1.

Sorge demanded a copy.

Sauva testified to the truthfulness of Vespillier's assertions.

Brismée moved that the Congress should not recognise any section composed of bourgeois people.

This was adopted by a roll-call vote by 47 votes and 9 abstentions.

West's mandate was declared null and void by a roll-call vote by 49 votes to 0 and 9 abstentions (among them Eccarius, Guillaume, and Schwitzguébel).

Eccarius explained his abstention by pointing out that he always had had and still had business relations with the secessionists, that the reports to the General Council were lies and that Sorge was the sole originator of the whole split.

It was decided to hold another closed sitting at 7 p. m. and a public sitting the following day, Thursday.

The sitting was closed at 4 p. m.

At 7.30 p. m. the sitting was opened again.

Ranvier was elected chairman, Gerhard and Sorge were elected vice-chairmen, Hepner, Le Moussu, MacDonnell, Van der Hout and Marselau were elected secretaries.

After a long discussion a motion by *J. Ph. Becker* and comrades was adopted to the effect that the Congress should immediately go on to discuss the most important business: the powers of the General Council, its seat, the revision of the General Rules etc.

Priority was denied to the Spanish motion to change the mode of voting.

A closed sitting was fixed for 8 a.m. and a public sitting for 10 a.m. The sitting ended after midnight.

Three full days of the Congress had now passed, an

entire sitting had been spent on West's mandate, and Sauva had taken up at least half of the entire time.

On Thursday, September 5, at 8 a. m. a closed sitting was held.

Marx announced that the report of the General Council was intended for the public at large.

It was resolved to appoint a commission of five to inquire into the Alliance. The Jurassians and the Spaniards demanded that it should include at least *one* member from among them (Splingard). Their proposal was adopted and Cuno, Splingard, Walter, Lucain, and Vichard were elected to the commission.

The same commission was to investigate the accusations levelled by the Jurassians and the Spaniards against the General Council.

At 10 a. m. a public sitting was opened.

The roll-call showed only three absentees.

*The Chairman** addressed the public in defence of the I.W.A. and the Commune against the usual accusations.

Sexton then read the report of the General Council in English, Longuet in French, Marx in German, and Van den Abeele in Flemish. The report described especially the persecutions of the I.W.A. which emanated from Vienna and had spread across the entire Continent; it emphasised how the proletariat of all countries had declared itself for the Commune, and how the I.W.A. had spread, especially in Portugal, Holland, Denmark, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, and Buenos Aires.

The sympathy and brotherly greeting of the Congress were extended to the persecuted of all countries.

The sitting ended at 3 p. m.

At 4.15 p. m. the sitting was resumed.

Several German delegates announced their departure.

A commission was appointed to examine all incoming documents. It was composed of Dupont, Hepner, Frankel, Dereure, Lafargue, and Brismée.

Then followed a discussion on the General Council and its powers.

Lafargue and *Sorge* spoke for the General Council, for

* *Ranvier.—Ed.*

a broadening of its powers; *Guillaume* and *Morago* opposed this.

The sitting was closed at 11 p.m.

The fifth day was now approaching and nothing had been accomplished as yet; the German delegates were compelled to leave soon, and the funds of most of the delegates had run low. Thereupon the Germans pulled themselves together and next day they submitted the most important resolutions and carried them with the aid of the French. Things could no longer go on that way if we did not wish to go home having accomplished nothing; an end had to be made to the long talks and deliberate delays.

Friday, September 6, 9 a. m.

Roll-call—7 absent.

The commission of inquiry received permission to continue its work during the sittings of the Congress.

A motion by Becker, Sorge and comrades to debate the powers etc. of the General Council at once, to hear *one* speaker for and *one* against, and then to vote, was carried by 34 votes to 4.

The same delegates submitted the following articles concerning the General Council for insertion in the Regulations*:

Article 2. "The General Council has to execute the resolutions of the Congress and to see to it that the principles, statutes, and General Rules of the I.W.A. are closely adhered to in every country."

Article 6. "The General Council also has the right to suspend branches, sections, federal councils or committees, and federations of the I.W.A. until the next Congress.

"With sections which belong to a federation it shall not make use of this right before having sought the advice of the corresponding federal council.

"In cases of dissolution of a federal council or committee the General Council shall arrange at once for the election of a new federal council or committee by the sections of the respective federation within thirty days.

"In the case of suspension of an entire federation the General Council shall notify directly all other federations.

* The text of both articles shows slight differences from the official Congress resolutions.—*Ed.*

"Upon request of the majority of federations, the General Council shall call an extraordinary conference consisting of one delegate from each nationality; it shall meet within one month and bring the dispute to a final decision.

"It is expressly understood, however, that those countries where the I.W.A. is prohibited have the same rights as the regular federations."

Article 2 was adopted by a roll-call vote by 40 votes to 5 with 11 abstentions.

Article 6 was similarly adopted by a roll-call vote by 36 votes to 6 with 15 abstentions.

Marx, Engels, Le Moussu, Serrailier, Dupont, and others submitted the following motion:

"The seat of the Council for 1872-1873 is New York; the General Council consists of the members of the New York Federal Council and may co-opt others up to fifteen members."

The motion was divided and it was decided: 1. to move the seat of the General Council away from London; 2. to remove it to New York; the first part was adopted by 26 votes to 23; the second part with 31 votes for New York, 14 for London, 1 for Barcelona, 1 for Brussels and 10 abstentions.

The sitting was closed at 2.30 p.m.

At 6 p.m. a public sitting was held, and the insertion of the following Article into the General Rules was discussed:

"In the struggle against the collective power of the propertied classes the proletariat can act as a class only by constituting itself as a special political party in opposition to all older parties formed by the propertied classes.

"This constitution of the proletariat as a political party is indispensable in order to secure the triumph of the social revolution and its supreme goal, the abolition of classes.

"The unity of the forces of labour already attained in the economic struggles must also serve in the hands of this class as a lever in its struggle against the political power of its exploiters.

"As the propertied classes, landlords and capitalists always use their political privileges to defend and perpetuate their economic monopoly and to enslave labour, the conquest of political power becomes the great duty of the proletariat."

Vaillant, Hepner and Longuet spoke in favour, *Guillaume* against the resolution.

The vote was interrupted by noise among the public and the sitting was closed at 11 p.m.

On Saturday, September 7, at 9.30 a.m. the sitting was opened.

Sorge took the chair after the departure of *Ranvier*.

The Congress proceeded to elect the General Council.

Sauva stated that the American Federal Council had a German majority.

Sorge proved this to be untrue.

After a lengthy discussion the original motion of *Marx, Engels* and comrades was adopted by 19 votes to 4 with 19 abstentions.

Objections to this vote were raised and, upon *Marx's* proposal, the whole vote was submitted to reconsideration.

Dereure handed *Sorge* a list which had been accepted by *Sauva*.

Sorge rejected it.

After *Sorge's* explicit statement that he would not accept election by the Congress, the Congress elected the following persons to the General Council, with the right to co-opt others, up to fifteen members in all: *S. Kavanagh, E. P. St. Clair, Fornaccieri, Laurel, Levièle, David, Dereure, Carl, Bolte, Bertrand, Ward, and Speyer.*

It was decided that each federation should appoint *one* member to a commission to audit the financial statement of the General Council.

Then the vote concerning the political action of the working class, which had been interrupted the night before, was taken, and the result was 27 votes for, 4 against and 9 abstentions for inclusion of the article in the Rules of the I.W.A.

The members of the commission were permitted to hand in their vote in writing.

An increase of the subscription was rejected.

Upon *Serraillier's* motion the following was decided: "All credentials given by the previous General Council to persons, committees, sections etc., are hereby withdrawn, null and void. It is left to the General Council in New York to issue new credentials."

The Congress unanimously approved the following motion of *Lafargue, Sorge*, and comrades:

"The General Council will take into its hands the formation of international trade unions, work out a proposal to this effect within one month, and send it translated into the various languages to all the trade unions with which it can communicate in the various countries to obtain their approval; it shall collate and compare the incoming opinions, arrange a vote on the result, and submit the whole matter to the next General Congress for final approval and decision."

It was decided to travel to Amsterdam the next day, Sunday, at 9 a. m.

A closed sitting was fixed for 5 p. m., a public sitting for 7-9 p. m. and after 9 p. m. another closed sitting.

The sitting was closed at 3.30 p. m.

The sitting opened again at 5.30 p. m.

Engels reported that eight federations had already signed and approved the financial report. Upon request he read out the whole report showing that only a few federations had paid their subscriptions and that the Association still owed about £ 25 to members of the General Council and others.

The financial report of the General Council was unanimously accepted.

Marx, Dereure, Lafargue, Johannard, Longuet and others drew attention to the fact that the financial report had shown how some members of the General Council had not only sacrificed their time, but also their money to the cause, while certain quarters (*Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*) accused and publicly slandered them of living off the workers' pennies.

Guillaume defended himself quite lamely by pointing out that the columns of their paper were open for rejoinders. A hot dispute arose between *Duval* and *Guillaume*, *Duval* leveling grievous charges against *Guillaume* and his friends and former followers.

The Congress decided to hold the next general congress in Switzerland, and to leave it to the General Council to fix the place.

Furthermore, *Marx, Engels, Serrailier, Dupont*, and *Frankel* were appointed to a commission to review, translate and prepare for publication the Minutes of the Congress, as

well as to transmit the papers and documents to the new General Council.

Sorge deposited the text of various resolutions with the bureau.*

At 7 p. m. the public were admitted and the delegates *Dave*, *Van der Hout*, *Van den Abeele*, and *Brismée* made speeches.

Meanwhile two collections were made among the delegates: 1. to compensate those members of the Hague Section who had had to sacrifice time and labour during the week of the Congress, and 2. to cover the printing expenses of the list of delegates.

At about 10 p.m. the closed sitting was reopened.

Walter announced his release from the commission of inquiry into the Alliance and declared that there had not been enough time for an investigation and that *Guillaume* had refused to answer certain questions.

The Commission of Inquiry reported**:

That the secret Alliance, founded on the bases of rules completely opposed to those of the I.W.A., has existed, but there is insufficient proof of its continued existence;

That it has been proved by documents and letters in his own hand that *Bakunin* tried, possibly with success, to establish a society Alliance in Europe whose rules were entirely at variance from the social and political point of view with those of the I.W.A.;

That *Bakunin* fraudulently sought to appropriate other people's money and even resorted to intimidation.

Therefore the Commission proposes:

1. to expel *Bakunin* from the I.W.A.;
2. to expel likewise *Guillaume* and *Schwitzguébel*;
3. to expel *Malon*, *Bousquet*, and *Louis Marchand*;
4. to consider *Morago*, *Farga Pellicer*, *Marselau*, *Zhukovsky*, and *Alerini* as not implicated in the matter;
5. to publish the documentary proofs and hearings.

Splingard, a member of the Commission, protested against these proposals and merely admitted that *Bakunin* had attempted to found a secret society.

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 198.—Ed.

** This text of the Inquiry Commission's Report shows slight differences from the official text of the report. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 481-82.—Ed.

Dave stated that the so-called minority or opposition had held special meetings and had agreed upon the following statement*:

1. We shall continue to communicate with the General Council in the matter of payment of subscriptions, correspondence, and labour statistics;

2. The federations represented by us will exchange with one another and with others regular and direct reports and connections;

3. Should the General Council wish to interfere in the internal affairs of a federation, the federations represented by the undersigned assume the joint obligation to maintain their autonomy as long as these federations do not engage on a path directly opposed to the General Rules of the I.W.A. as adopted at the Geneva Congress;

4. We call on all federations and sections to prepare for the next general congress, for the triumph of the principles of federative autonomy as the organisational basis of work within the International;

5. We reject emphatically all relationship to the so-called World Federalist Council in London or to any other similar organisation alien to the International.

Signed: *Fluse, Morago, Alerini, Schwitzguébel, Guillaume, Van den Abeele, Coenen, Eberhardt, Gerhard, Brismée, Van der Hout, Dave, Marselau, Farga Pellicer, Sauva,** Splingard, Herman*

After a lengthy discussion the Congress put the recommendations of the Commission to a vote by roll-call.

Mikhail Bakunin was expelled by 29 votes to 7 with 8 abstentions; James Guillaume was expelled by 25 votes to 9 with 9 abstentions; the expulsion of Adhémar Schwitzguébel was rejected by 16 votes to 15 with 10 abstentions.

Upon the motion of *Frederick Engels* the Congress decided not to vote on Point 3 (expulsion of Malon and others)

* For the full text of the statement of the minority see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 199-200.—*Ed.*

** Emphasised in the MS.—*Ed.*

and to accept the other proposals of the Commission (Point 4 etc.).

Upon the proposal of *the Chairman** the new General Council was instructed to wind up unfinished business.

Sauva deposited various documents and motions, as did also *J. Ph. Becker*.

The Chairman declared that he had lost his voice but not his confidence in the cause and at 12.30 p.m. closed the Fifth General Congress of the International Working Men's Association with a cheer for Labour.

On Sunday, September 8, at 9 a.m. most of the delegates drove to Amsterdam, were welcomed cordially by the Amsterdam party comrades, and were led to a public meeting where *Marx*, *J. Ph. Becker*, *Duval*, *Wróblewski*, *Sorge*, *Lafargue*, *Dupont*, and *Van der Hout* made speeches, which were enthusiastically received, on the goals and aspirations of the I.W.A., the work of the Congress just closed, and the future of the Association.

Aboard the steamer *Atlantic*
September 20, 1872

Signed: *F. A. Sorge*, Delegate

Published as a facsimile of the manuscript and in an English translation in: *The First International. Minutes of the Hague Congress of 1872*, Madison, 1958

Translated from the German

* *Sorge*.—*Ed.*

II
FROM THE CORRESPONDENCE
OF KARL MARX,
FREDERICK ENGELS,
FIGURES IN THE INTERNATIONAL
AND OTHERS

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT IN LEIPZIG

London, January 2, 1872

Your letter is still with Marx, so I cannot answer it point by point.

In any case you must find a form which makes your representation at the next Congress possible, and if nobody can come you must have yourselves represented by the old men here. Since the Bakuninists and Proudhonists will do everything they can, the mandates will be severely examined, and for instance, a delegation consisting of you and Bebel *in person*, like the Conference mandate sent to me, would not go down well. The Spaniards are in just as bad a predicament as you are, but they do not allow themselves to be confused. Incidentally, the Brunswick sentence is no rule. Such a beastly thing as to invoke a Bundestag laws into the bargain is only possible in a degenerate small state. Bebel should protest against it in the Reichstag, the progressists must either go with him or discredit themselves before the whole of Germany. As soon as ever I find time I shall send the *Volksstaat* a (juridical) criticism of this concoction.

In Spain, according to Lafargue's report (he is or was in Madrid), everything is going well; the Bakuninists have overshot the mark there with their violent behaviour—the Spaniards are workers and want above all unity and organisation. You probably received the last circular of the

Sonvillier Congress, in which they attack the Basle administrative decisions as the source of all the harm. That fills the cup to the brim and we are going to act.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO CARLO TERZAGHI IN TURIN⁷¹

[*Second draft*]

[London,] January 14[-15], 1872
[256 High Holborn]

We would have voted you 150 francs despite our poverty had not the *Gazzettino Rosa* arrived with the news, etc. That changed everything. If you had simply decided to send a delegate to the future Congress, well and good. But this was a Congress which was being convened through a circular full of lies and false accusations against the General Council. If only you had awaited the answer of the General Council to that circular! The Council could not fail to see in your resolution proof that you had taken the part of the accusers without waiting to hear the defence of the Council—and the authorisation I had been given to send you the money in question was cancelled. Meanwhile you received *L'Égalité* with the reply of the Romance Committee,* which represents ten times as many Swiss workers as the Jurassians do. But the Jura Circular discloses the evil intent of the authors.

At first they picked a quarrel with us on the pretext of the Conference; now they attack us because we are carrying out the resolutions of the Basle Congress, resolutions which we are *obliged* to carry out. They do not want any authority exercised through the General Council *even if it were freely assented to by all*. I would very much like to know how without that authority (as they call it) it would have been possible to bring the Tolains, Durands and Nechayevs to

* Reply of the Committee of the Romance Federation to the Circular of Sixteen Participants in the Sonvillier Congress.—*Ed.*

account and how the intrusion of Mardocheans and traitors is going to be prevented by your fine phrase, autonomy of the sections, as is explained in the Circular.

No one, to be sure, disputes the autonomy of the sections, but federation is not possible without ceding certain powers to the federal committees and, in the last instance, to the General Council. But do you know who the authors and protagonists of these *authoritarian* resolutions were? The delegates of the General Council? By no means. Those authoritarian measures were proposed by the Belgian delegates, and the Schwitzguébels, the Guillaumes and the Bakunins were their *most ardent defenders*. *That's how things are.*

I believe the terms *authority* and centralisation are being greatly abused. I know nothing more authoritarian than a revolution, and when one's will is imposed on others with bombs and bullets, as in every revolution, it seems to me an act of authority is being committed. It was the lack of centralisation and authority that cost the Paris Commune its life. Do what you like with authority, etc., after the victory, but for the struggle we must unite all our forces in one *fascio* and concentrate them at one point of attack. And when I am told that authority and centralisation are two things that should be condemned under all circumstances it seems to me that those who say so either do not know what a revolution is or are revolutionaries in name only.

If you want to know what the authors of the circular have done in practice for the International, read their own official report to the Congress on the State of the Jura Confederation (Geneva, *Révolution Sociale* of November 23, 1871) and you will see to what a state of dissolution and impotence they have reduced a federation that was well stabilised but a year ago. And those are people who want to reform the International!

Fraternal greetings.

Yours,
F. Engels

Translated from the Italian and
German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT IN LEIPZIG

London, January 18, 1872

...The Belgian workers are not inclined to start a rebellion in the International. Hence the bitter-sweet wording of the decision. Luckily Mr. Hins has outwitted himself, for the working-class papers, who don't see behind the scenes, reproduce the resolution *word for word* and see it as an explanation *for us*. Thus the *Tagwacht*, the Madrid *Emancipación*, etc.

The resolutions of the Conference* have no binding force, as in itself the convening of a conference is an illegal measure justifiable only by necessity. Hence recognition is always desirable.

It will be a good thing therefore if you explain the Belgian decision⁷² in the above sense, as is the case in the *Tagwacht* and thereby say that the decision concerning a revision of the Rules, which is first to be discussed in *their* Congress (in June) and then submitted to the regular International Congress, which could not be convened before the regular September term, is a rejection of the Bakuninist call for an *immediate* Congress. Then you can also remark that if the Belgians are of the opinion that the General Council is merely a correspondence bureau, they must have forgotten the Basle Resolutions,** which are of a quite different nature and in any case remain in force until they are cancelled by a regular International Congress.

So far we intend to convene the Congress at the regular time. The place is yet to be fixed, but quite certainly not in Switzerland and not in Germany either.

Translated from the German

* *Resolutions of a Conference of Delegates of the International Working Men's Association.*—Ed.

** Resolution V granted the General Council the right to refuse to accept new sections; Resolution VI that of suspending sections pending the regular Congress.—Ed.

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO PAUL LAFARGUE IN MADRID ⁷³

London, January 19, 1872

My dear Toole,

Your letter of the 8th gave us much pleasure. As for Morago, you may be sure there is a bit of Bakunin behind it. These people are of an unbelievable assiduity in their private correspondence; and if he has been a member of the Alliance, they will have kept him well bombarded with letters and compliments. Still it is a victory for us that it was voted to put all these matters to a Spanish Congress; for—

1st. That is a *negative* answer, albeit indirect, to the demand for the *immediate* convening of an international Congress;

2nd. We find that as soon as the workers themselves, in a body, discuss these matters, their natural good sense and innate feeling of solidarity have always, and very speedily, dealt with these personal intrigues. For the workers, the International is a great conquest which they have no intention of relinquishing; for these scheming doctrinaires, it is no thing but an arena for petty personal and sectarian squabbles.

Frederick Engels, Paul and Laura Lafargue, *Correspondence*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1959, p. 37

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO THEODOR CUNO IN MILAN

London, January 24, 1872

...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 have 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 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.⁷⁴ Incidentally, the General Council will shortly issue a circular of its own on 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 has never taken before, should excommunicate Beghelli of the *Ficcanaso*, 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* with the Jura Circular, one issue of the Geneva *Égalité* (unfortunately I have no copies left of the issue containing the answer of the Geneva *Comité fédéral*, which represents twenty times as many workers as the Jura people) and one *Volksstaat* which will show you what the people in Germany think about the case. The Saxon Regional Meeting—120 delegates

* *Fictitious Splits in the International.*—Ed.

from 60 localities—declared *unanimously* for the General Council.⁷⁵—The Belgian Congress (December 25-26) demands a revision of the Rules, but at the *regular* Congress (in September).⁷⁶ 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 they start doing anything against the Rules or the Congress resolutions the General Council will do its duty.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF WILHELM LIEBKNECHT
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

[Leipzig,] February 1, 1872

The question of *where* the next Congress is to be held is being given serious consideration. It cannot be in Germany, writes Marx. A great pity—but then at least not too far from Germany, i.e., either on the *Belgian* or the *Swiss* border. And hardly the latter, because the preceding Congress was in Basle. So only Belgium remains. If the place is chosen not too far away, we shall see to it that Germany is adequately represented. If not, then we cannot.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF KARL MARX
TO FERDINAND JOZEWICZ IN BERLIN

[London,] February 24, 1872

The next Congress will take place in September 1872. The General Council has not yet decided as to the venue. The

Social-Democratic Party would do well to inform us immediately when it will hold its Congress.

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS
TO CESARE BERT IN TURIN *

London, March 21, 1872

[Draft]

Citizen Cesare Bert,

I received from Citizen Et. Péchard, who passed through Turin in the last days of February, your address with the information that you are now secretary of our *Emancipazione del Proletario* Section in place of C. Terzaghi, expelled for embezzlement, etc. It will henceforth be a pleasant duty for me to correspond with you.⁷⁷

I have just received a long letter from Terzaghi in which he says that he has handed in his resignation as member and secretary of the *Emancipazione del Proletario* because it is composed in part of government agents and Mazzinists and because that Society intended to give him a vote of no confidence because he preached *war against capital*.

Naturally we here are far more inclined to believe what you and the other members of your Council told Péchard than what Terzaghi writes, for he has always resorted to all kinds of subterfuges in his relations with us. But in order to be able to act with certainty and decision and to assume our responsibility at the forthcoming Congress, we ask you to send us an official letter from your Council formulating the accusations against Terzaghi and informing us of the resolutions taken by your Society in respect of him. It would be impossible to have two rival sections fighting each other in the same city. Fortunately the Administrative Regulations (Resolutions of the Basle Congress) give the General Council the right to admit or to reject any new section, and you yourselves will see how necessary for our

* The letter bears a note by Engels: London, March 21, 1872. To C. Bert, Turin.—*Ed.*

organisation is this right, which Terzaghi's Jura friends wanted you to believe was authoritarian and unjustifiable.

Please do me the pleasure of a prompt reply and accept a fraternal handshake from

Yours

Translated from the Italian

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT IN LEIPZIG

London, April 23, 1872

...But see that the sale of stamps goes well, and not only in Leipzig, *they will be very strict* at the next Congress.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT IN LEIPZIG

London, May 7, 1872

Nothing is to be written about the Congress. *Where* it will assemble can be decided only at the last moment. *That* it will assemble you know.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

London, May 9, 1872

Dear Becker,

There is much in favour of your proposal to hold the Congress in Geneva and it is very much liked here, but of course nothing can be decided now, the conditions can change every day. Meanwhile, in order to be able to take a final decision,

we must know how things stand there and whether it will be possible for you *to be sure* of a compact and reliable majority among the Swiss delegates. The Alliance people will do all they can to secure a majority for themselves with the old tricks as in Basle; the Jurassians will have fictitious sections represented; the Italians, with the exception of Turin, will send *nobody but* friends of Bakunin, even Milan, where these people have got the upper hand again since Cuno's deportation; but Spaniards will be divided, in what proportion one cannot say yet. Germany will be poorly represented as usual, England likewise; France only by a few refugees there and perhaps some from here; the Belgians are very unreliable, so that very strong efforts must still be made to ensure a *respectable* majority; for a tiny majority would be worse than none at all and the squabbling would immediately begin all over again. So write and tell us how things stand with you and also in German Switzerland, and quite outspokenly so that we will not miscalculate.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO THE FERRARA WORKERS' ASSOCIATION *

[London,] May 10, [1872]

I inform you that the General Council will soon be occupied with preparations for the Congress and that the Congress will take place in September.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT IN LEIPZIG

London, May 15 [—22], 1872

It goes without saying that nothing has yet been decided concerning the place of the Congress....

* The letter is in Engels' handwriting on the third, clean page of the Association's letter of April 27, 1872. On the fourth page is the note: Ferrara, April 27, 72. Ferrara Section. *Replied May 10*. On the second: Adopted at sitting of May 7.—Ed.

What is the attitude of the Committee in Hamburg* to the International? We must clear up the matter now, and quickly too, so that Germany can be decently represented at the Congress. I must ask you to give us at last a clear picture of how things stand with the International in your localities.

1. About how many stamps have been placed and in how many and *which* localities? The 208 counted by Fink are surely not all?

2. Does the Social-Democratic Workers' Party propose having itself represented at the Congress, and if so how is it thinking of putting itself *en règle* with the General Council beforehand so that its mandates cannot be contested at the Congress? For that it must: a) really explicitly and not just *figuratively* declare itself a German Federation of the International, and b) *as such* pay its subscription before the Congress. The matter is becoming serious, and we must know how we stand, otherwise you are obliging us to act on our own responsibility and to consider the Social-Democratic Workers' Party as a body alien to us and indifferent in its attitude towards the International. We cannot allow that, for motives which are unknown to us but in any case petty, the representation of the German workers at the Congress should be bungled or botched. We ask for early and clear information on this matter.

Translated from the German

JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON **

Geneva, May 20, 1872

My dear friend Engels,

I entirely agree that the Congress must be held in a place where we are sure of a large majority. But I believe, so far as I can judge of the circumstances, that this will nowhere

* The Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party was located in Hamburg from August 1871.—*Ed.*

** The address on the envelope is: Miss Burns, 122 Regent's Park London N. W. The original has a misprint: Bruns.—*Ed.*

be more the case than in Geneva, since we are sure in advance of the 30 sections here, and consequently of just as many delegates. In the rest of Romance Switzerland we can get together at least as many representatives as the so-called Jura Federation. It is true that the latter, if it has enough money, might conceivably invent sections, Italy could send exclusively opponents, Spain and France also partly, but at any rate only in very limited numbers. If we reckon 10 Jurassians, 10 Frenchmen, 6 Italians and 4 Spaniards as opponents, that will be all; if it comes to the worst the Belgians will hold the balance and the English should all be on our side. Then with Germany we can thus be sure of an imposing majority if, besides those directly delegated, we get as large a number of societies as possible to send me mandates for Germans living here and elsewhere in Switzerland, omitting the names, which I could fill in as required. Of course these societies or temporary associations of party comrades must pay the eventual representatives the corresponding compensation, because as a rule they will be workers depending on their wages. These tactics must already now be energetically pursued to ensure that Germany is adequately represented. But you must *at once* take the lead in this matter from London and get as many as possible of our most enterprising friends interested in it.

As far as German Switzerland is concerned, at the beginning of the year we had the best prospects for an appreciable representation closely corresponding to our views, but now they have vanished altogether owing to the senseless (in keeping with the doings, wishes and tastes of that old rascal Fazy) conduct of the local National-Political Workers' Association on the question of revising the Federal Constitution. The German Swiss and the native Genevese are at present in the sharpest opposition to each other. This would not mean so much if the reproach could be addressed only to the native Genevese, and if Utin, who can never miss an opportunity to make himself important (no matter how stupid and opposed to facts that opportunity is) by his uncalled-for conduct in *L'Égalité*, had not laid all the blame, or at least the appearance of it, on the International.⁷⁸ It will be years before the harm of this inexcusable blunder is completely wiped out. Unfortunately Borkheim is right

after all when he says that there is still not a single Russian who is of any use to our cause. The German Swiss have nearly all withdrawn from the Association. Incidentally, the dispute over the revision of the Constitution showed how little the native Genevese workers had stood the test of internationalism, and even in the Temple Unique they most vulgarly bandied such words as *tête carrée* and *bougre allemand*.* The fellows are not even intercantonal, much less international. But Mr. Utin poured oil on the fire of this regrettable feud, both openly and underhandedly, to the great satisfaction of Messrs Fazy, Vogt and other political charlatans and crafty bigots. Nevertheless at the time being there is no reason to doubt Utin's dedication to our cause, as is already shown by his irreconcilable hostility to Bakunin.

At any rate we shall have some delegates from German Switzerland and consequently perhaps the opportunity and the means of a speedy solution.

Write soon and tell me what you are thinking of doing so that I can do as much as possible in respect both of Germany and of German Switzerland.

What are our friends Vaillant and Frankel doing, from whom we have not had word for so long?

How is Jung? Please forward the enclosed note to Borkheim.

Greetings to Marx, Eccarius and all the other comrades.

Fraternally yours,

Johann Philipp Becker

For further information:

The regional reform movement led not only to a split between the Romance and the German Swiss workers, but even among the Romance Swiss workers. About half of the Romance Swiss voted for and the other half against; in la Chaux-de-Fonds and Locle nearly all voted for, and in the St. Imier valley, as far as Bakunin's influence reaches, abstinence is preached with a certain success.

I have already written to Cuno twice in Verona without getting any reply.

In the course of this summer I shall probably publish

* Square-head, German blackguard—French words often used offensively and chauvinistically.—*Ed.*

something inflammatory making fun of all the traditional stuff, which will surely amuse you all.⁷⁹

I would do more directly for the cause at present if I were not in the necessity to earn my bread after seven lean years.

Our Grosselin, who is good at letting you down and bad at thinking, by working hand in hand with the bourgeoisie of the canton on the question of revising the Federal Constitution, has found ways and means of taking over a watch-case-making business. We shall see after a while what this employer's attitude to the worker will be.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT IN BERLIN

London, May 27 [—28], 1872

The Belgians discussed a revision of the General Rules but came to no conclusion. Hins submitted a project according to which the General Council would be abolished.⁸⁰ That would suit me personally, Marx and I are not going to be on it again; as things are now we hardly have time to work, and that must stop.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF KARL MARX
TO CÉSAR DE PAEPE IN BRUSSELS

London, May 28, 1872

I am waiting impatiently for the next Congress. It will be the end of my slavery. After that I shall become a free man again; I shall not accept any more administrative functions, either for the General Council or for the British Federal Council.

Translated from the French

FROM A LETTER OF KARL MARX
TO NIKOLAI DANIELSON IN ST. PETERSBURG

London, May 28, 1872

I am so* overworked, and in fact so much interfered with in my theoretical work, that, after September, I shall *withdraw* from the *commercial concern*,** which, at this moment, weighs principally upon my own shoulders, and which, as you know, has its ramifications all over the world. *Mais*** est modus in rebus*,**** and I can no longer afford—for some time at least—to combine two sorts of business of so very different character....

One of the charlatans now resident in Switzerland—Mr. Bakunin—plays such tricks that I should be very grateful for any information on the man: 1. on his influence in Russia; 2. on the role played by his person in the notorious lawsuit.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF NIKOLAI DANIELSON
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

St. Petersburg, May 23 (June 4), 1872

Highly unpleasant is the news that you give me, that you intend to give up all non-theoretical work; the cause itself will suffer a sensible loss.

I shall endeavour to satisfy as soon as possible your desire for more detailed information on Bakunin. I thought our mutual friend***** had given you a certain amount of information about him during his stay in London. All that I can tell you now is that: 1) he (Bakunin) has never had any particu-

* From here until the end the paragraph is in English in the original except a few words in French and Latin.—*Ed.*

** Marx intended to withdraw from the General Council of the International after the Hague Congress.—*Ed.*

*** But.—*Ed.*

**** There is a medium on all things. (Horace, *Satires*, Part I.)—*Ed.*

***** Hermann Lopatin.—*Ed.*

lar influence. At the present there can be no question of any influence because of the stupid and detestable role he has played in this trial.⁸¹ 2) Unfortunately this role was not revealed during the court proceedings, although he was the principal person in the whole affair. All the famous proclamations (in which he announced murder, arson, etc., etc.) were composed by him, but he took the greatest pains to conceal this in order not to damage his reputation in the West; his adjutant Nechayev (for whom he had respect) kept it secret in his own interests. A certain Negreskul was to have revealed it all in court but he died of consumption before the trial. His (Bakunin's) role was stupid in this respect, because he let himself be fooled by Nechayev and considered his chatter as utterances of an oracle.

Yours very respectfully,
N. D.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT IN LEIPZIG

London, June 5[-6], 1872

Many thanks for the information on persons,⁸² but I have still not received an answer to my question as to what your party proposes to do to obtain that clarity in its relations with the General Council without which it is absolutely impossible for it to be represented at the Congress.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF WILHELM LIEBKNECHT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

Leipzig, [about June 8, 1872]

Dear Engels,

I received your letter and consequently am expecting news from Borkheim about Wuttke's book.

Today also I shall write to *Geib* to get in touch with you. An *official* relationship of our Committee* to the General Council is not possible; the only way which seems practicable to me is that *everywhere some of our members* (the more the better, though *all* cannot be expected to do so) buy membership cards of the International Working Men's Association and stamps with the Rules, and then for the Internationals of one locality to get together and elect a delegate or else issue a mandate.

If you have any other proposal, make it; I don't think it can be done any other way and I believe also that this *entirely* answers all our purposes.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO THEODOR CUNO IN LIÈGE

London, June 10, 1872

Dear Cuno,

A few words in a hurry. By the first post today I sent Herman 2 copies (one of them for you) of the General Council's Circular on Bakunin's intrigues** wrapped in a *Kölnische Zeitung*. There you will find all the necessary material from the beginning to the end.

We now have all the proofs in hand concerning the secret society *la Aleanza* in Spain, and those people will have a jolly time of it at the Congress. In Italy the case is also *certain* to be the same. If only Regis could take a trip there! But the poor devil is now selling newspapers in Geneva just to earn his living. Cafiero in Naples and somebody in Turin, I do not yet know who, have divulged letters of mine to the Jurassians⁸³—it does not matter to me, but the fact of the betrayal is unpleasant. The Italians need to be schooled a little by experience to learn that a backward peasant people such as they are only makes a laughing-stock of itself when it tries to prescribe to the workers of the great industrial nations how they should emancipate themselves.

* Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Party.—*Ed.*

** *Fictitious Splits in the International.*—*Ed.*

Incidentally, I am not receiving any more Italian newspapers and so cannot send you any. Cafiero, who used always to send me them, obviously has something on his conscience.

You have probably received the letter from Düsseldorf which I sent you.

We know that things look rather lousy in Belgium. The spinelessness of this neutral (*sit venia verbo**) nation underlies the fact that an intriguer and an ass can lay down the law. The International in Belgium is sinking day by day owing to the inertness of the intellectuals and trusted ones among the leaders. By the way, the intriguers who have the say there have rendered us the greatest service with the new project for the General Rules. The proposal to abolish the General Council⁸⁴ has done away with the last remains of their influence (which was by no means negligible, since it is one of the oldest federations). The Spaniards outspokenly call it a betrayal.⁸⁵

Translated from the German

HERMANN JUNG
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON**

[June 12, 1872]

Dear Marx,

While acknowledging the receipt of the money would I do well to inform Schwitzguébel of our decision concerning the Congress or would it be better to say nothing to him about it?

Fraternally,
H. Jung

My best regards to all.

First published in Russian

Written in English

* May the word be forgiven.—*Ed.*

** Written on a postcard addressed: Karl Marx, 1 Maitland Park Road, Haverstock Hill. It bears the stamp: H. F. Jung, Watch Maker, 4 Charles St., Clerkenwell E.C.—*Ed.*

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

London, June 14, 1872

Dear Old Fellow,

We here do not quite agree with your calculations concerning the Congress; for example, the Jurassians with their well-known manoeuvring and the Italians would certainly alone send 30 delegates, if not 50. But unfortunately at the present that is the minimum. What makes it impossible to hold the Congress in Switzerland this year is the unfortunate and quite unnecessary split between the German and French Swiss workers which has taken place in connection with the revision of the Constitution and has given the Jurassians the occasion for so much exultation and such a proud exposition of their abstentionist superiority.⁸⁶ We here cannot but lay equal blame on either side. The revised Swiss Constitution was at best only a highly moderate bourgeois step forward which on the one hand imposed some degree of motion on the barbarians of the old cantons, but on the other hand could also obstruct in their development the most advanced cantons, in particular exceptionally favourably placed Geneva—an industrial city and at the same time a self-dependent republic—by placing them under the control of the total Swiss peasant majority. So there was something to be said for and something against the revision, depending on the locality; my personal sympathy would have been *for* rather than against; but to be sure the whole thing was not worth being made an issue *inside* the International and giving the Jurassians the occasion to say: You see, we wild men are better all the same, *nous abstenons** while the others squabble over trifles, and to prove that all politics comes from the Evil One.

We know perfectly well how things go in what is after all a god-forsaken place like Geneva and in the whole of Switzerland, where everybody knows everybody else and so every political movement takes the form of gossipy and intrigue, and that is why we do not take the matter too seriously and think that proletarian feeling will shortly get the

* We abstain.—*Ed.*

upper hand and smooth everything out. But, as I was saying, because of this it will unfortunately be impossible to hold the Congress in Geneva, and we are now thinking of Holland.

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS
TO THE *EMANCIPAZIONE DEL PROLETARIO*
SOCIETY IN TURIN

[Reference to subject of letter]

[London, June 14, 1872]

In Milan, Ferrara, Naples, everywhere there are friends of Bakunin. As for the *Fascio Operaio di Bologna*, we have never had a word from it. The Jura party, abandoned everywhere, seems to want to make Italy its great fortress. This party has formed within the International a secret society for the purpose of dominating it; we have in our possession proofs as regards Spain, it must be the same thing in Italy. These men, who always have on their lips the words autonomy and free federation, treat the workers like a flock of sheep which is good only for being directed by the heads of this secret society and used to attain ends unknown to the masses. You have had a good example of this in Terzaghi (investigations are being made concerning the handing over of the letter). The Jura Committee, having revolted against the whole organisation of the International, and knowing that it would have had great difficulty in justifying itself at the Congress in the coming September, is now searching everywhere for letters and mandates originating from the General Council in order to fabricate a false accusation against us. I, and all of us, are of the opinion that all our letters concerning the Congress are thus being read, but I have not been able to obtain the certitude that the same letters which we wrote to this or that section have been placed at the disposal of these gentlemen.⁸⁷

Meanwhile we ask you to postpone any decision and then act as the interests of the International dictate to you; I hope that you will discover that it was not the General

Council, but certainly these Jura men, acting exclusively in the interest of the ambition of Bakunin, the head of the secret society, who sowed the discord.

(Request an immediate reply concerning the letter.)

Translated from the Italian

J. PATRIC MACDONNELL
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[London], 8 Southboro Terrace,
Carlton Grove, Peckham

Saturday [June 15, 1872]

My dear Engels,

Your reply to hand.** Monday will of course suit, if convenient for you. I received 6/6 this morning from Liverpool for the poor fellow.*** His last letter to me is a sad one. Try and send me two or three of the Swiss pamphlets.

Kind respects to Mrs. Engels.

Very truly yours,

J. P. McDonnell

Tomorrow evening I will urge the Irish sections here to prepare for the Congress.

First published in Russian

Written in English

ANSELMO LORENZO
TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL IN LONDON ****

Valencia, June 19, 1872

Comrades Members of the General Council,

This Council at a session held in the night of the 14th inst. adopted the following decision:

* The letter has been dated by the postmark. The envelope bears the address: Frederick Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, Primrose Hill, N.W.—*Ed.*

** Engels' letter has not been preserved.—*Ed.* †

*** De Morgan.—*Ed.*

**** The letter bears a round stamp with the words: Asociacion internacional de Trabajadores Consejo federal, España. Enclosed was the

"Taking into account Resolution IX of the Congress of Saragossa, the Council has decided to send to the General Council for inclusion in the agenda of the next International Congress the following subject:

"Revision of the General Rules.—Method of practically establishing working-class solidarity between all the Regional Federations."

This we forward profiting by a favourable opportunity and enclose the said Resolution IX.

We have received your communication dated May 28 together with your *Declaration*, which, after acquainting ourselves with it, we dispatched for publication in the newspapers.⁸⁸

Could you send us accounts of the meetings of the General Council, as well as of all that could be of interest to the Association, especially if it is in French, since that is a language with which we are more or less familiar.

Greetings and social liquidation.

By agreement with and on behalf of the Federal Council
The Secretary General *Anselmo Lorenzo*

First published in Russian

Translated from the Spanish

THE SPANISH FEDERAL COUNCIL
TO THE BELGIAN FEDERAL COUNCIL IN BRUSSELS *

Valencia, June 19, 1872

Comrades,

Soon one of the most important acts in the life of our Association will take place, and it is the duty of all good Internationals to prepare to draw from it the most profitable results for our cause. The time is approaching of an International Congress which in the present circumstances is of double importance due both to the attitude adopted by the bourgeoisie and the governments of all countries and to

text of Resolution IX of the Saragossa Congress of the Spanish Federation on adherence to the decision of the Congress of the Belgian Federation on revising the General Rules.—*Ed.*

* The letter bears a round stamp with the words: *Asociacion internacional de Trabajadores Consejo federal, España.—Ed.*

the degree of development and activity attained by the proletariat. On the resolutions that are taken at it will necessarily depend the future of the revolution, and therefore it is essential that they be based on a mature examination inspired by a lofty criterium of justice and free of all passion.

This Council, taking into account the said necessity and the declaration made by the Congress of this Regional Federation that it agrees entirely with the resolutions adopted by the Congress of the Belgian Federation held at Brussels in December 1871, has adopted the following decision which it has sent to the General Council:

"Taking into account Resolution IX of the Congress of Saragossa, the Council has decided to send to the General Council for inclusion in the agenda of the next International Congress the following subject:

"Revision of the General Rules.—Method of practically establishing working-class solidarity between all the Regional Federations."

But not judging this to be sufficient and considering that for the reform of the General Rules it is essential to unite all the ideas and to point out all the disadvantages as well as the necessities that experience has taught us, this Council has decided also to address itself to all the Federal Councils proposing to them a study of all the means for practising solidarity.

For this purpose we submit our ideas to you in advance, hoping that the examination you make of them will result in your agreement and consequently our common action for the organisation of the proletariat.

We believe that for the workers to have their own life as a class aspiring after its emancipation and consequently after the destruction of the bases on which the present society reposes, solidarity is absolutely necessary. This belief, which is so widespread at the present, is the principal support of the International, but unfortunately, despite this belief being so widespread, solidarity is more a desire than a material fact. This is a grave evil. International propaganda is usually conducted by demonstrating the advantages of solidarity, the workers hasten to join our Association, trusting it, and in many cases practice does not correspond to their

hopes, producing bitter disappointments in many. If this state of things persists, if a stop is not put to this evil, the present generation may be overcome by indifference and there will be no means of raising it again.

To correct this evil we consider solidarity as being divided into economic and revolutionary.

By economic solidarity we understand the union of all the workers to struggle by means of resistance to capital.

And by revolutionary solidarity, the union of those same workers to oppose the provocations of the authoritarian powers by means of force.

Both divisions of solidarity can be based only on Association, but this must be universal and single, that is to say, it must fit and harmonise all the groups of all regions in their development and in their action, affording immediate and effective aid to the collectives in general and to the partial collective which finds itself directly in struggle with the common enemy, whether in the economic or the revolutionary field, provided it finds itself in conditions which have been previously defined.

In order to achieve what we consider as absolutely necessary we believe it is indispensable to reform the General Rules in the sense of harmonising them with the programme in the preamble and to introduce all that practice and experience have taught us.

Basing ourselves on this idea we believe that economic solidarity may be achieved by grouping the workers of the same trade in every locality in a *section*; the sections of the various similar trades in one and the same locality constitute a *local grouping*; all sections of the same locality constitute a *local federation*; all the local groupings form a *Regional Union* of their respective trades, and all the local federations and all the trade unions constitute a *Regional Federation of the International*.

Each section collects all the statistical data concerning labour, which are then collated by the local grouping and by the union and are passed on to the federal council of the region, which undertakes to transmit them to all the regional federations and to all the groups of the same region.

Knowing by means of statistics the true relationships between labour and production, it will be possible to apply resist-

ance scientifically from a general point of view, going beyond the narrow limits of the particular interests of a trade or a locality to consider the interests of all the workers.

The resistance funds of all the sections, formed from the subscriptions of all the workers, will satisfy all the requirements of this scientific resistance without any distinction either of trade or of country.

Revolutionary solidarity can be achieved by grouping the workers in the organisation described above and transforming it into a resistant to all the powers of the respective countries or hastening to provide aid when local or regional groups launch into armed struggle because of provocation on the part of the governments.

Such, in broad outline, is our opinion on the great question exercising the International today and which requires to be resolved with the greatest success because the cause of the revolution is closely bound to it.

Comrades. The moment is solemn, let us be inspired exclusively by the justice of the aspiration we have accepted, making abstraction of all petty ideas, and thus we shall place ourselves in a position to find truth.

Greetings and social liquidation.

]By agreement with and on behalf of the Federal Council

The Secretary General *Anselmo Lorenzo*
To the Comrades of the Belgian Federal Council.

First published in Russian

Translated from the Spanish

WILHELM LIEBKNECHT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

Hubertusburg, June 20 [1872]

Dear Engels,

I have arrived: from the health point of view a most wholesome place to spend the summer, from other points of view naturally to be conceived differently.⁸⁹

Do be kind enough to write soon about the result of the steps taken in the matter of Wuttke's book and in particular

to which bookseller Borkheim has applied or will apply. Wuttke wants to know. Tell Borkheim—and please don't forget—he must not be annoyed at me for not having written to him since the trial. I only had time for the *most necessary* business letters, and not even for them; *his pamphlets have been taken care of*. Send me his address, which I have not got here, and write to me occasionally (W. L. Hubertusburg, Saxony).

Of course outgoing and incoming letters—except to and from the wife—are opened.

Greetings to you, your wife, Marx and all of his family.

Yours,
W. L.

Your instructions concerning September *have all been carried out*.

Published in the book *W. Liebknecht. Briefwechsel mit Marx und Engels*, Hague, 1963

Translated from the German

O. V. SUETENDAEL
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Brussels, June 20, 1872

Dear Citizen,

I delayed replying to you thinking that at Monday's sitting I would get to know the name of the Paris correspondent. I have not been able to do so. I did not want to apply too directly to the Committee for fear of letting them guess something. But I hope that with a little patience I shall succeed in satisfying you.

I am very happy that it is understood in London that we are not doing what we should in Belgium. Above all that it is realised that it is not our fault, but that of some men who want to use the International as a step-ladder. We are positively governed today by men who have been crafty enough to acquire excessive influence over us. We are objects of the most shameful despotism, nothing is done but what is wanted by some men, and the will of the worker members is completely ignored. As I do not know what you wish to be

informed about, I am at a loss what to tell you. Nevertheless I cannot let this letter go without requesting you to do all you can so that the General Council will ask the Brussels Section for a copy of its Rules. You would singularly embarrass our people, for we have been asking for the Rules to be printed for more than four years; this has been voted, but as we have to wait until it pleases Citizen Brismée to do it, we are obliged to wait, for we *would not dare* to apply to another printer. Get them to inquire also about the state of the treasury and the number of members; these are things which the Committee is unable to provide you with. There is a lot I could confide to you if I were not afraid of telling you things which would not interest you sufficiently—all the small troubles which go to make up our greatest evil in Belgium. If it were possible to have a new section recognised by the Council it would soon be done, for a workers' federation is in the process of formation in Brussels, it is making serious progress and on a good basis. Most of the societies which it comprises withdrew from the International because of the despotism reigning in it; in Brussels it is a veritable church with its high priests always ready to excommunicate anyone who dares to act with the slightest degree of independence. Finally, Citizen, certain men whom you know of display such absurdity that one cannot imagine it; what they found good yesterday is decreed to be bad the next day. Anyone who dared to say the contrary would risk being expelled.

An example: They promised universal suffrage three or four years ago; today, because another society has been formed whose sole aim is to achieve it, they are fighting desperately against it, the only reason for this being that they have not got the direction of this movement.

Any movement organised by them is sure to abort. All they want is to go and parade in the countryside and to pose as great men before the rural population.

I am very grateful to you for the Council's Circular.* It was very useful to me on Monday in fighting Hins' project. It has little chance of being accepted, for in the Brussels Section I have only heard two speakers apart from Hins

* *Fictitious Splits in the International.*—Ed.

in favour of it, the others are all against. I have my name down to speak on the subject on Monday, and so have two others who, I believe, are against the project; in any case the Belgian Congress gave sufficient proof at its last sitting that it was in favour of preserving the Council. But however that may be, I think this proposal will be submitted at the next Congress of the International. For if they get themselves delegated, as is pretty certain, I am firmly convinced that they will speak about it all the same.

If you could manage to get some information sent to me on what the other countries think of Hins' project it would be very useful to me on Monday; I think that will be the day of the big battle. If you have any English newspapers that speak about it, be kind enough to let me have some; I would translate the articles and then read them to the mechanics, whose treasurer I am, and I have good hopes that it would be the burial of Hins' project. I repeat—here in Brussels it has very little chance of being accepted. Those who defend it are not very skilled, and as Hins is in the provinces it is very difficult for them to uphold a thing whose absurdity is so easily proved.

I would be much obliged to you if you could give me addresses of some mechanics in London or of their secretary, for I would like to put our association in touch with the English and try to federate with them. We shall find out from them what they require of us for that and whether it is possible; Citizen Herman has already made several attempts to do so but they have not given any result, I don't know why; in my opinion it is always better to negotiate on these questions oneself, because it is always difficult to get things done through people not belonging to the profession.

I remain all at your disposal to communicate to you whatever you ask for and I shall always be very happy to do so, because I feel that it is a duty to thwart intriguers who only impede our movement. The federation of the societies would have been achieved in Belgium long ago if the Brussels Section had left us a little more freedom; the proof is that they have never had more than six societies represented on the Federal Council, and societies at that which were of very little importance by their numbers or the individuals composing them; the marble workers, on the other hand,

have already succeeded in assembling every Saturday delegates from more than twenty of the capital's societies, and as soon as their strike is over they will call a congress and form a Belgian federation. Definitively. If this federation could be recognised as a section of the International we would be saved; so would we be if we could have ourselves represented at the Congress of the International this September.

Fraternal greetings. *O. V. Suetendael*

25, rue L'Kint, Brussels

Please keep my letters secret, as I do yours.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

EDOUARD VAILLANT
TO CHARLES LONGUET IN LONDON *

[June 21, 1872]

My dear Longuet,

Failing a special summons to meet somewhere else, please come tomorrow Saturday at 8 p.m. sharp to 7 Leighton Grove, Kentish Town, N. W.

Cordial regards.

Your friend

*E. V.***

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* Written on a postcard with a London postmark. Address: Mr. Ch. Longuet, 132 Malden Road, Kentish Town, London N. W.—*Ed.*

** Then comes the following in Marx's hand: "In the event of the General Council not having the time to consult the federation, this will be replaced by a private conference."⁹⁰—*Ed.*

FROM A LETTER OF KARL MARX
TO FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE IN HOBOKEN

[London,] June 21, 1872

Dear Friend,

Yours of June 7 (with enclosed report) received yesterday.⁹¹

Meanwhile you will have received my second letter and also that of Le Moussu, which definitively establishes the position of the Council for the United States.

The next Congress (the official announcement of it will be sent to New York next week) will be held on the first Monday in September 1872 at The Hague (Holland). It will just not do for you to put us off with a memorandum. *At this Congress the life and death of the International are at stake. You and at least one other person, if not two, must come.* As for the sections which send no direct delegates, they can send mandates (delegates' mandates).

The Germans for me, F. Engels, Lochner, Carl Pfänder, Lessner.

The French for G. Ranvier, Auguste Serrailier, Le Moussu, Ed. Vaillant, F. Courmet, Ant. Arnaud.

The Irish for MacDonnell, who is doing very well, or, if they prefer, for one of the above-named Germans or Frenchmen.

Naturally only one delegate for each section, no matter how strong, unless over 500.

You probably already know the fine Belgian project for the revision of the Rules. It was initiated by an *ambitieux impuissant*,* Hins, who, with his Russian wife, takes his orders from Bakunin. One of its finest pages is the *abolition of the General Council*. The whole project has been fittingly dressed down in *La Emancipación* (Madrid), organ of the Spanish Federal Council. The same newspaper approved our American resolutions.

From the enclosed *Égalité* you will see that the Romance Congress also raps Hins' fingers.

* Ambitious impotent.—Ed.

I am sending you by post 4 copies of the General Council's Circular *Fictitious Splits in the International*. Engels sent you 200 copies per parcel company.

Translated from the German

VLADIMIR BARANOV
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

St. Petersburg, June 10 (22), 1872

Dear Sir,

Specially concerning this nasty trick of Bakunin's I can inform you as follows: As you know, the translation of your work* was undertaken in Russia in 1869. The publisher** wished to entrust the translation to Bakunin because he had asked for work. If I am not mistaken, Bakunin was given the order in May 1869; he promised (I do not know the exact date) to deliver a considerable part of the first volume by the autumn of 1869, but did not do so; he delayed, and finally—at the end of 1869 or the beginning of 1870, the publisher's agent*** received a letter from Nechayev saying that the agent was forbidden in the name of the Committee to demand the translation from Bakunin or *to trouble him any more on the subject of the 300 rubles in silver (1 taler = = 0.90 ruble) paid to him as an advance.*****

The agent wrote a letter to Bakunin reproaching him for this nasty trick, for it was clear to him that Nechayev could not issue that *order* without Bakunin, and telling him that a simple sincere refusal to do the work would naturally not entail any prosecution.—Concerning other tricks of his I can give no exact information, for I cannot entirely rely on my memory in respect of the accounts I have heard.

My best respects to you and your family.

Yours sincerely

V. B.

Translated from the German

* *Capital*, Vol. I.—*Ed.*

** Polyakov.—*Ed.*

*** Lyubavin.—*Ed.*

**** See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 363-64.—*Ed.*

FROM A LETTER OF JENNY MARX (DAUGHTER)
TO LUDWIG KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

[London,] June 27, 1872

You, my dear Doctor, will be glad to hear that Mohr is entirely of your opinion with regard to his activity in the International. He is convinced that so long as he remains in the General Council, it will be impossible for him to write the second volume of *Das Kapital*, at which he has been unable to work during the last year. Consequently, he has made up his mind to give up his post as secretary immediately after the next Congress. Until that time however, he will have to work terribly hard in the Council and out of it, in order to prepare for the great battle that will be fought out at the Congress, which is to take place in Holland.

You will have some idea of this work when I tell you that besides writing manifestos, reading or answering mountains of letters, Mohr is obliged to attend not only the usual weekly sittings at Rathbone Place, but additional ones at our house and that of Engels, the last of which lasted from four in the afternoon until one o'clock in the morning. So much for International business. The remaining time (and there is not much of it) is given up to the correction of the proof-sheets* from Meissner, and the revision of the French translation, which unfortunately is so very imperfect, that Mohr has been obliged to re-write the greater part of the first chapter. The first *livraison*, consisting only of the portrait of the author, after the enclosed photograph by Myall—an autograph letter and answer from the publisher Lachâtre, will shortly appear, in about a week.—Of the Russian translation, which is excellent, a thousand copies have already been sold.

The French translation of the *Civil War* is producing a very good effect upon the Refugees, equally satisfying all parties—Blanquists, Proudhonians, and Communists. It is a great pity it did not appear earlier, as it would undoubtedly have done much towards smoothing down the animosity against the General Council.

Written in English

* Of the second German edition of the first volume of *Capital*.—Ed.

WILHELM LIEBKNECHT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

F. Engels, Esq. 122 Regent's Park Road,
London, N. W.

June 29, 1872

My dear Engels,

With regard to the Congress all is arranged as far as is possible. Besides *Hirsch*, *Rittinghausen*, and *Werth*, somebody or other in addition may come, and there will be representatives of: Leipzig (and environs), Dresden, Berlin, Breslau, Nürnberg, Chemnitz, Mainz, Darmstadt, Cologne, Crimmitschau, etc.

If you have a communication to make which must not go through the prison censorship, address it to *Hepner*.

Hirsch, as soon as he is released from prison—in six weeks—will get in touch with you concerning the Congress. I shall discuss everything with him.

I read in the *Elberfelder Zeitung* that Marx is said to wish to write an article on the International for the *Gegenwart*.⁹² I hope that is a canard. Lindau is a scoundrel of the first magnitude, the more so as he provided proof that he knew the bourgeois mob. If Marx was really taken in, he must *cancel* his engagement. In this case it would be a shame to stick to his word.*

Yours,
W. L.

Another thing: If possible, hold the Congress in *Geneva*; in itself it is probably the best place, and then we have people there and in the vicinity whom we could delegate. *Adieu*, June 29.**

Of course this letter has *not* been through the censorship.***

* Here there is a pencil note in an unknown hand: "Valuable!"—*Ed.*

** The next sentence is written at the beginning of the letter in the left-hand corner.—*Ed.*

*** The last two paragraphs are written in pencil on a separate sheet.—*Ed.*

It would be good, if, in order to avoid irregularities and unpleasantness, you published a *mandate form*⁹³ as we are in the habit of doing for our Congress.

Do not forget the Preface to the *Manifesto*.⁹⁴

Published in the book
*Die I. Internationale in
Deutschland*, Berlin, 1964

Translated from the German

ADOLF HEPNER
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Leipzig,] June 29, 1872

Dear Engels,

1) Received letter of 26 inst. and also today from Marx the General Council decisions concerning the Congress.

2) I believe Bracke, Geib, Carl Hirsch, and Rittinghausen will come to the Congress. These are four who, if necessary, could come at their own expense. I have already written to them and await their answer. We shall probably get a sufficient number of mandates together. Shall inform you definitely about this shortly.

3) Copenhagen address still not received.

4) 100 copies of the *Communist Manifesto* will be sent to you.

5) I can only learn Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish if I get a year in Hubertusburg; I'll hardly have time earlier.

6) Enclosed is a letter from *Boruttau* to me; since he is tireless in his claims I should prefer to be able to give exhaustive answers to his questions regarding Bakunin.

7) Should we translate the Circular on the "fictitious splits"—I read it in *Radical*⁹⁵—or shall we have it sent to us in German?

8) Only another 25 copies of your *Condition of the Working Class* are available at Wigand's. If you originally surrendered all the publishing rights (including later editions) to Wigand,

* The address on the envelope is: F. Engels, Esq. 122 Regent's Park Road, London N.W., with Leipzig and London postmarks.—Ed.

would you not like to get them back from him for us? On October 1 our printshop will go into operation.

9) Could not Marx write a short appendix to Lassalle's *Bastiat-Schulze*, correcting Lassalle's *mistakes*?

10) All is in order with Liebknecht. I visited him on Tuesday and spoke to him for several hours *without any warder*.

Best greetings.

Yours,
A. H.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

THEODOR CUNO
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Liège, June 29, 1872

My dear Engels,

Thank you very much for the newspapers and the Circular** as well as for your constant solicitude for me, the devil knows when and how I shall be able to repay for all your acts of friendliness; it is to be hoped our time comes soon, and then the rest will be all right.

Whenever I attend the section meetings here I cannot help worrying myself sick; there is much shouting over the philistines in Germany, but what is that in comparison with the imbecility and narrow-mindedness of the lot here! We have a strike of marble workers here now; a subscription list has been drawn up to help them and there are people on it earning over fifty francs every week who are down for twenty-five centimes! An unfortunate commercial traveller who deserted from Cologne and came here could not find a job because he does not understand the language; he is running out of money and getting desperate; he is ready to work for any price at anything. I ask a party comrade who is an arms polisher to give him a job; he lets him work for him for a week and then declares his work is no good, he is

* The letter has remarks in an unknown hand. The envelope bears the address: Miss Burns, 122 Regent's Park Road, London, N.W., Liège and London postmarks and the inscription "Cuno".—Ed,

** *Fictitious Splits in the International*.—Ed,

too stupid to learn it, and so on and dismisses him without paying him a penny! There is fraternity for you and all the rest of the stuff these people always have their mouths so full of! Proposals that I made for excursions to the surrounding villages with public meetings there, etc. are sidetracked as being impracticable. In a word, it's enough to drive one mad. There's no question of propaganda publications as in Germany, the newspapers are foul and dull—where is that going to get us, or rather how long can it last?

For my greater security it would be very useful if I had Belgian or American citizenship so that I could never again be treated as I was in Italy; please be kind enough to make inquiries on the subject and find out how it can be managed.

I don't know the slightest bit of news from Germany or Italy because lately I have had no money either for letters or for newspapers; I have nothing at all left, for the Italian swinishness and the five months without a job put me out so much that I must spend every spare penny on clothes, etc. I hope we shall see each other at the next Congress, which I am very much looking forward to; it will be the first really splendid Congress and in any case we shall be able to see all the quarrel-picking and aggressive warriors and fighters, provided there is no international police action concocted and carried out, as I fear there will be.

Incidentally, I still have some hope that I shall be able to go to Spain, but as I said, the time and place cannot yet be fixed.

Well, all the best, dear Comrade.
Greetings and handshake from your

C.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO ADOLF HEPNER IN LEIPZIG

London, July 2, 1872

When mandates are sent,* it is absolutely necessary to send one as well to Cuno, who is now in Belgium. He is

* To the delegates to the Hague Congress.—Ed.

of the highest importance in opposition to the Italian Bakuninists; these people will send nobody but lawyers and other doctrinarian bourgeois who pass themselves off as representants of the workers and have done all they can to prevent the workers from corresponding directly with us. It was precisely through Cuno that the first breach was made and had he remained there a stop would have been put to the whole thing. For that reason Cuno is one of the best men we have; all Liebknecht's mistrust of him is groundless and rests only on the fact that he considered him as an agent of Joh. Ph. Becker in the interests of the Geneva Mother-section, which never entered Cuno's head; only later was I obliged to expound to him the whole ridiculous story about this Mother-section, of which he was quite ignorant. When I *know* what a man has *really done*, I don't let myself be led astray by such things.

It goes without saying that the Congress proceedings will be carried on in all three languages, German, English and French, so that lack of knowledge of the last two need not keep anybody away.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO THEODOR CUNO IN LIÈGE

London, July 5, 1872

Dear Cuno,

Yesterday I sent Herman some English and Spanish newspapers for you.

The Belgians produce the same impression on everybody who goes there. The whole of the International there is nothing but wind with nothing behind it. This is chiefly the fault of the leaders, of whom De Paepe is the only really clever one, though he is lazy, whereas Hins is a blockhead but shrewd, intriguing, ambitious and active. Hins is in contact with Bakunin through his Russian wife and on his instructions drafted the neat project for abolishing the General Council. Hins is now in Verviers. You would be doing a good thing by keeping an eye on him,

In Verviers there is also a German section which corresponds with the *Volksstaat*. I wrote to the correspondent P. Schlebach, rue de Pont 2, (on June 14) and sent *Splits*, but so far have received no reply. It would be very good if you could slip over there and get in touch with the people. I wrote to Hepner that they should send you a mandate for the Congress from Germany, but in any case it would be good, in the event of the Verviers Section itself not sending anybody directly to the Congress, if you also got yourself a mandate from there. Bakunin and Co. will do all in their power to beat us at the Congress, and as any means are good enough for these gentlemen, we must be cautious. They will send delegates from a hundred different societies which do not belong to the International at all and will try to get those people seats and votes as delegates of the International and to place the General Council in the minority by a coalition of the most heterogeneous elements. Schweitzer and Hasenclever are already in avowed alliance with the scoundrels here, Vésinier, Landeck, Smith, Schneider etc., and these in turn correspond with the Jurassians and the American swindlers (on this point see *La Emancipación*⁹⁶ which I sent you yesterday).

How were the *Splits* received there? I sent Herman 5 copies in all, but they must be circulated too. Is Herman doing so? And how does he behave otherwise? At the last Belgian Congress, I heard, he spoke very energetically in favour of the General Council.

It is doubtful whether you would be able to obtain Belgian citizenship. One can only acquire American citizenship after previous registration and five years residence in the country.

The Congress will take place in any case. One is never guaranteed against a police coup on the Continent, but in that case we board a steamer, go to England and hold it there. It was not convenient to have it start in England; although one has peace from the police only here, there would have been attacks on the part of our enemies. The General Council, they would have said, is convening the Congress in England because only there it has an artificial majority in its favour.

Bakunin put out a furious but very weak letter of abuse

in reply to the *Splits*.⁹⁷ The fat elephant is raging because he has at last been dragged out of his foxhole in Locarno into broad daylight where schemes and intrigues are no longer any help. He now declares that he is the victim of a conspiracy of all the European—*Jews!*

What is ruining the old scoundrel is the continued existence of the Alliance in Spain as a *secret society*. Not only have we the proofs in hand, but the affair has become quite public by now even in Madrid and other places, so that there is no longer any denying it. This honest fellow who passed himself off everywhere as the most devoted fighter for the International, had organised this secret conspiracy in order to seize the general leadership and to lead the great mass of the workers by the nose like a blind flock through his consecrated Jesuit brethren! If that had been tolerated I would not have stayed a day longer in the International. To be Bakunin's sheep—that would be the last straw! The hardest blow for him is that we have discovered the affair and threaten him with exposure at the Congress. And now Lafargue (Marx's son-in-law, who has been in Madrid for 8 months) has even accused him of drawing up secret instructions with his own hand and sending them to Spain for the International there to be guided by!

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Brussels,] July 7, 1872

...To my extreme surprise I have not seen the announcement of the Congress in any of the newspapers of my adversaries. If the Council is keen on having something published in our papers it only needs to forward it to me. As for the few lines I wrote in the *Sémaphore* and in which I expressed

* The letter carries the following note in Engels' handwriting: Brussels, July 7, 1872, Glaser. Answered 18th.—*Ed.*

the opinion that the Dutch Government would not oppose the Congress assembling, you will easily understand that actually I know nothing at all about it....

I have heard nothing about Hins, but he will certainly come to the Congress which is being held next Sunday in our city⁹⁸ for the purpose of discussing the revision of the Rules; up to date the Belgian Federal Council has done absolutely nothing. By the way I wonder who could undertake to make a report and what the said document could be about, above all today when very few support the suppression of* the General Council. (I was making a pretty slip of the pen there!)

Yours,

E. Glaser de Willebrord

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

THE ROMANCE FEDERAL COMMITTEE
TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL IN LONDON **

Geneva, July 7, 1872

Citizens,

We have received the Circular concerning the International Congress to be held on September 2 at The Hague, Holland.

This decision profoundly surprised us; we are ignorant of the motives which moved the General Council to choose a place which is so far from being central; since the Conference of September 1871 took place in London, we thought it would have been preferable to fix a place *in the centre* of the groups of federations for the General Congress. We were hoping that Switzerland would be designated, being more central: Zurich or Geneva would have been better situated than The Hague. We cannot conceal the fact that *your decision* has produced a most regrettable impression on the German, Italian, and Romance groups, and we are certain

* In the letter the words "the suppression of" are written over the words "the General Council".—*Ed.*

** The letter bears a round stamp with the words: Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Comité Fédéral Romand.—*Ed.*

that Switzerland will either not be represented or will have only one or two delegates.

If by its decision the General Council wished to avoid *some danger* in holding the Congress so far away, we are certain that it *will not avoid it* and that on the contrary it will deprive itself of a large number of delegates who are resolved to uphold it in the crisis which is approaching. We think that before taking this decision the General Council ought to have consulted the various groups which have always supported its management of affairs under all circumstances; we know of all the criticism which has been organised in view of the Congress and we were prepared to fight it by numbers. Your decision will perhaps have *consequences* which we shall not be strong enough to fight.

Fraternal greetings.

On behalf of the Romance Federal Committee
The Secretary General *H. Perret*

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

HENRI PERRET TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

Geneva, July 7, 1872

Private

My dear friend Jung,

I cannot hide from you the fact that the Circular about the Congress, which the General Council has fixed for The Hague*, has produced a most regrettable impression among our sections, not only the Romance ones, but also the Italian and German ones. So far the General Council had proceeded completely in accordance with our ideas, except for a few slight mistakes of no importance, but at present our opinion and mine is that you have just committed a very grave political mistake which will have the most disastrous consequences for our Association. Your decision will deprive

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 22-24.—
Ed.

you of the forces of the groups which are the most devoted to your policy and which have always supported the General Council. You must know that we are called the *lackeys* of the General Council. If the Congress were to take place at Geneva, you would be perfectly sure of 30 delegates from Geneva alone, plus the other groups of the Romance Federation, the Germans would have a sizable number of delegates, besides having mandates from Germany, the Italians from Geneva would have Turin and other small localities, we *would be sure* of a splendid majority. Your decision has spoilt everything, you will have a Belgian congress and you will certainly be beaten; moreover, the Jurassians, who intend to have themselves represented by amateurs having private means, will be numerically well represented. The Congress will not be in the hands of the workers, and this will lead to disastrous consequences for us. My heart sinks at your awkward decision, you are laying yourselves open to criticism from your enemies and from your friends, we are all grieved by your more than awkward resolution.

Do you think that the Genevese were moved by vainglory in asking for the Congress to be held in their city? No, a thousand times no. We insisted on that demand so that the Congress would be sure of a majority for our common ideas and in support of the General Council; we knew of the intrigues which had been prepared in advance, and we were ready to neutralise them. You are losing through your own fault more than 50 certain delegates resolved to choke all intrigues, and you are placing us in a difficult position, for we shall not be able to do anything. Becker is furious with you and all your friends are appalled. You make even your friends say that the General Council is ruled by one or two men, you are destroying with one blow several years of our work. For my part, I see the International Association threatened and shortly divided into several segments.

I request you in future in official letters of the General Council addressed to the Federal Committee not to put my name at the beginning of the letter, but only in the address. If you have something private to say to me, write a small separate letter; there are things which must not appear in letters addressed to the Federal Committee, it looks too much as if I were maintaining *private correspondence*; do as I

do when writing to you and to the Council, we have new members on the Committee who are very sensitive, I have to spare their feelings.

Ask Engels to inform me where to send the rest of the pamphlets.* Italy has been supplied, as well as Germany, and besides, the co-operative printshop is demanding money; arrange for them to be paid.

You know that Utin was attacked at night in Zurich by 5 or 6 scoundrels and horribly beaten up. He has a very bad eye. Is it true that Serrailier, Dupont, and Johannard have also been attacked at night? What do you think of all these facts? I have just received the *Jura Bulletin*, what a heap of filth against you and us! I received the journal of the English sections, the *International*,** which you sent me. Do all you can for the exchange with *L'Égalité* to be done regularly, we are very keen on keeping in touch with our English friends.

Hoping to have news from you shortly.

Yours truly,
H. Perret

I cannot supply all the documents you asked me for in your last letter. I have no precise document and I shall need time to obtain it for you.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

HERMANN GREULICH
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

Zurich, July 8, 1872

Dear old fellow,

Enclosed is a whole cartload of old *Vorbote*. Don't be angry with me for keeping you waiting so long; recently I have had an awful lot to do, and all for 40 francs a month! The *Tagwacht* suffered a hard blow through the latest events

* The General Council's Circular *Fictitious Splits in the International* printed at Geneva.—Ed.

** *International Herald*.—Ed.

in the co-operative society here; it will require the greatest sacrifices on our part to keep its head above water. I should very much like to write to you in greater detail about the affairs of our organisation and then ask you for your opinion, but you will probably be coming out here and it is very late today, and my eyes, which are in a very bad state and cannot see well, are constantly running. By the way, Remy told me he wants to write to you confidentially, and that, after all, would come to the same thing.

It is rather unpracticable for us that the next Congress is to be held in The Hague—perhaps you could go? Things will be hot there, though not so hot as they would have been in Geneva. The latest *Bulletin* of the Jurassians is very massive! Today I sent Perret in French our changes and counter-proposals which you received in German. I forgot to enclose in the accompanying letter the printer's bill for translation of the Plan of the Constitution Principles⁹⁹, I enclose it in your letter—would you kindly give it to Perret?

I close for today, more shortly.

Hearty greetings,

Hermann Greulich

Neumünster-Zurich

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF KARL MARX
TO LUDWIG KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

[London,] July 9, 1872

...I have overworked myself so badly that today (in two hours) I am leaving London with Engels for 4-5 days and going to the seaside (Ramsgate)¹⁰⁰. After my return until September 2 (when the International Congress opens in The Hague) I shall have more than enough to do, but from then on I shall be a free man again. But this freedom does not begin till the middle of September, since I shall go to The Hague myself.

Translated from the German

A. SABOR TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Frankfurt am Main, July 9, 1872

Dear Sir,

After I had a talk with our representative here, we came to the conclusion that there were sufficient grounds to suspect an individual here—a former member of the International—of spying. The man in question, Gustav Wertheim, unfortunately a colleague of mine, suddenly left for Holland after it was made known that the Congress was to be convened at The Hague. He is small, very dark, with a black beard, round shoulders, about 29 years of age and wears a light sports suit with a small hat.

The man's behaviour seems so suspicious to me, his character so unreliable, and his journey, as well as its purpose, so unexpected, that I feel it is my duty at least to inform you of this. Should you hear from the Dutch members that the suspicions are confirmed, I request you to let me know.

Yours respectfully,

A. Sabor,
Teacher at the Non-Classical and
Elementary School
(Member of the Social-Democratic Party)

Address: Bibergasse 8, III

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

PAUL STUMPF
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

Mainz, July 10, 1872*

My Dear Friend,

I have been instructed to get in touch with you about the Congress in The Hague and to be ready to go there as a delegate, for Mainz must be represented. However necessary I consider this and however great the honour of the call made on me, I can nevertheless not accept to be a delegate.

* The date is written in the margin.—Ed.

The reason is that at the beginning of September I am celebrating the wedding of my only child.

Therefore direct your attention to someone else. I shall make any contribution in my power towards finding a worthy representative for Mainz.

I send Marx and all his family my most friendly greetings, and with no less friendly feelings ask you to pay me a call any time you come here again.

Yours,
Paul Stumpf

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

W. F. COWELL STEPNEY
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON *

July 12, 1872

My dear Jung,

Should you feel inclined to go to The Hague and that the contribution of four pound (£4) towards your expenses is a matter of consideration to you—

That sum is ready at your service.

Ever yours,

W. F. Cowell Stepney

First published in Russian

Written in English

L. DAGOBERT
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

New York, July 12, 1872
68 Grand Street

My dear Jung,

True, I have delayed a little in replying to you, but I was waiting for the American Congress to assemble so as to have something serious to communicate to you. This Congress

* The letter is written on notepaper with the printed address: 57 South Audley Street, London, West.—*Ed.*

ended on Monday evening, 8th inst. I shall begin and give you at the same time my impressions about the cause of the divisions in this country.

It is nearly a year since the disagreements broke out. It was clear to anyone prepared to take the trouble to study the situation that the American sections, and notably Section 12 were composed of intriguing politicians who wished to make the I.W.A. a political clique; the French, who at the time had the most influence in the sections speaking our language, were fatally attracted to this group by their relationships, whereas the German leaders were entirely opposed to it. Unfortunately for all, the brutal way in which the Germans settled the question threw into the enemy's ranks even those who until then had been hesitant, and to get them off that wrong road took nothing less than the stupidities of Apollo Hall, official recognition by the General Council of the Federal Council of the 10th Ward Hotel and, finally, the anti-International statement of the Spring St. Council. From the day I joined Section 2 until the eve of the Congress, I, like *Dereure*, did not cease to call for conciliation and above all for union with the Forsyth St. Council.¹⁰¹ Our efforts were crowned with success, and despite the ill-will of certain of its members, the section decided that two delegates would be sent to the Congress organised by the said Council. Unfortunately I was one of those elected, and I believed it was my duty to accept for reasons which I shall presently explain.

The questions for discussion could be reduced to four as follows: 1) Formation of a Federal Council; 2) organisation of the I.W.A. in North America; 3) the line to be pursued in respect of the political parties; and 4) the sending of a delegate or a memorandum to the General Congress.

On the second and third questions we were in perfect agreement, but the situation was different in respect of the other two; as regards the first, for instance, we could not understand that the memory of the past could not serve them as a lesson and that even despite the General Rules of our Association they could want to give the Federal Council legislative powers. You are too much for decentralisation, they told us; to which we replied: we favour centralisation more than you do because in order to fight the com-

mon enemy to greater advantage we want single centralisation, the General Council, elected by the delegates of the entire Association, and by this means we shall prevent any Federal Council in future being able to draw onto a wrong road all the sections or at least the majority of the sections in a country.

Nevertheless, and despite these observations which, rightly or wrongly, I still think are correct, their proposal was accepted.

At this point, my dear Jung, let me tell you this: I believe the Germans are inspired by excellent intentions, but they are too authoritarian and refuse to take into account at all the aspirations proper to other parts of the American population. The International was not established for them alone, and they know as well as anyone does that the English or Yankee fraction, like the French, Belgian, or Swiss fractions, barely carries the yoke of authority. Why then not make some concessions, why not remain within the spirit and the letter of our General Rules until a new General Congress revises or changes them? Splits would thus be avoided and the Association would only be more flourishing for it.

Now comes the question of sending delegates to a General Congress. The General Council in London has asked for mandates to be sent by the sections for five delegates chosen from among it. I cannot believe that this clause is obligatory; my personal opinion is that you are asking for this to be done, and no more; in that case you are within your rights. But the American Congress has ordered it, and then it is trampling under foot the express Rules of the Association. Art. 1. Every member of the Association has the right of vote. Art. 2. Every section, whether numerous or not...¹⁰²

Besides it has been decided that the Congress would appoint two delegates to represent the United States. At first they had not wanted the sections to be allowed to send any. Then that they should be able to do so, but on the express condition that the delegates they chose should be obliged to receive their instructions only from the Federal Council, and finally that they should be allowed to send them directly. Now this concession is entirely illusory. It is acknowledged that a sum of at least one thousand dollars

is necessary for the five delegates chosen from the General Council in London and the two chosen by the American Congress. The total number of members of the sections represented is about one thousand. That is one dollar per member; it is therefore materially impossible for the sections to accept a new sacrifice to send delegates directly to represent them.

During a conversation between a German delegate and myself, the former asserted that they relied on their *friends* in the General Council to have all that they had done here approved. I know them, I answered him, and I am convinced that not one of them will approve measures which are contrary to our Rules, but should that unfortunately happen, I am sure that you would find in the General Congress a strong majority which would be little inclined to do likewise.

Such, approximately, my dear Jung, is the history of the Congress and the facts which preceded it. I still have to write to you the most delicate part. The subject is *Dereure*.

As a result of continual contacts we had become friends. I had noticed that he was very subjective and that every time he made a speech, he would list, like the nobles of the old regime, the various functions he had held, but all that did not appear of great consequence and I would say to myself: let him who is without any defects throw the first stone.

In the discussions on the questions dealt with at the Congress, Dereure expressed on every point an opinion agreeing with that which I here personally expound: a purely executive Federal Council, such was his view on the first question. As for the second, he had a long time before made known to me his desire to be sent to the General Congress, and I had approved this for the following reason. I do not grant Dereure any extraordinary ability, but in my opinion, if America sent to the Congress a former member of the Paris Commune it was because it accepted implicitly solidarity with its actions, and several delegates whom I consulted during the Congress agreed with me and promised their co-operation.

Contrary to my expectations, Dereure did not prove equal to the circumstances, I would even venture to say he did not prove himself worthy; he spoke with energy at the

section sittings against the authority of the Congress in such matters, he declared that the section should not even permit discussion of the rights granted to it by the different congresses, the Congress decisions had changed all that. He was elected together with Sorge. Do you accept, I asked him, when he came to the Congress to inform us of his decision. Yes, but on condition that the sections give their ratification! There was nothing I could say to that.

He made a speech along these lines, but when he had finished speaking, Sorge said to him: Comrade Dereure, before translating, I would like to know whether you accept or not. Thus called upon to give an immediate answer and fearing to let slip the opportunity, he preferred to go back on his convictions and replied: I accept. (What foolish things vanity makes a man do!)

That very evening we had a quarrel on the subject, and to *punish* me he declared that he would resign, and then to avenge himself he disloyally attributed to me words I had never said. Most fortunately seven witnesses could testify to the contrary. These are the reasons why I accepted to be delegated. Dereure was nominated as well as I among the candidates. Now if the decision of the Congress were not favourable to the spirit of the section, knowing his attachment to certain members of the 10th Ward Hotel Council, they would not have failed to reproach him, and his chances of success at the General Congress would have been considerably diminished. I told him my impressions, he warmly approved them and urged me to accept (may the infernal spirits preserve me from doing so again). Such are the facts, my dear Jung. Judge and assess them.

Oh, I was forgetting to tell you that we had several disputes, Davoust and I; in his eyes you are all *reactionaries* and *thieves*, you included. He will probably be delegated by his section and pass through London. If you see him, you can show him this passage, and I repeat here what I told him to his face—that he is of too bad faith for an honest man to condescend to speak to him.

Do not resign, my dear Jung; I understand how you must feel, but reflect that too many intriguers are slipping in among us, those who are dedicated must not yield their places to them.

I have only seen Taylor once. I followed his instructions concerning the Universal Federalist Council.¹⁰³

For my part, I am still in good health and hope it is the same with you. I always have work, but for the last 15 days I am having a rest owing to stock-taking.

Please give my respects to Mrs. Jung. Embrace your children for me. My kind regards to my old friend Norbier and to his wife. A hearty handshake to Le Moussu, Romanet, Wolfers—in a word, to all my London friends; don't forget my pal Léger if he is among you.

Your affectionately devoted friend

L. Dagobert

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

PAUL LAFARGUE

TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

Madrid, July 12, 1872

My dear Engels,

Send the letter which follows to *L'Égalité*; you will be receiving at the same time ten copies of my Circular¹⁰⁴; tomorrow I shall dispatch ten more. In case you should need further copies, I shall put about fifty aside for you. We have not so far received the *private Circular*. Is it true that they seized bundles of your circular in Paris and have arrested Internationalists on this account? You will have learnt from *La Federación* of the effect it had here. The Alliance renews itself like a cut worm; and unfortunately its members are in the public eye and the only ones to be heard in Spain, which deludes people; but the Federal Council, though composed entirely of Allies, does not have a good word to say for the Alliance in public; the most they can do is what Soriano and Morago have done, that is, try to prove that in Spain the Alliance produced good results and served the International. My circular will probably elicit a statement to that effect; but the International in Spain will never go over to Bakunin. The greater majority of the Internationalists is totally indifferent to these quarrels, of which it understands

nothing; but it sets great store by the International and harbours no ill feelings towards the General Council; the best proof is that only one federation—that of Palma—has come out for the Jurassians. I have had a thousand copies of my circular printed which I shall have distributed to all the Councils and to every Internationalist with influence; we shall see what comes of it.

The Madrid Allies, as a consequence of the Circular—of which you have a copy—dissolving the Alliance, have expelled the signatories from the Federation, but they formed a new Federation¹⁰⁶ at once and demanded that the Federal Council dissolve the old one, deemed to have committed breaches of the International's Rules and duties. The Federal Council rejected their demand, but will probably do nothing to prevent them organising themselves.

The General Congress will settle all this. What is happening to the Belgians? Do you think it would be an advantage if I went to the Congress as a delegate? Answer promptly.

Have you received Mesa's letter?

Mesa believes that you should send an official but friendly letter to the local Barcelona Council and the Federal Council, protesting against the article in *La Federación* which talks of *pan-Germanism*, *Anglo-Germans*, etc.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE *BULLETIN DE LA FÉDÉRATION
JURASSIENNE*

Citizens,

I place before you a copy of a *Letter to the Spanish Internationalists* wherein I adduce certain details about the Alliance, which I would ask you to complete for the enlightenment of the members of the forthcoming Congress.

By denying the clandestine existence of the Alliance you think to render all your machinations invisible; unfortunately in this depraved era people place more faith in documents than in pious oaths. An Alliance membership card, emanating from Switzerland, has been laid before the Commission in Madrid charged to look into this society; I have in my possession an official letter from the local Seville Council of the International intimating that at one of its

meetings "the programme and aims of the Alliance were made known by a reading of its Rules". To spare your Holy Father, who has been personally canonised,* the trouble of bluffing, I may as well tell you that in a café last January Morago, an Alliance man, read out to Mesa, a member of the Federal Council in Spain, a letter written entirely in Bakunin's hand setting out the attitude to be adopted towards the International.

Your latest *Bulletin of injuries*** is invaluable: the bourgeois and the police agents will be able to make copious use of it when it comes to vilifying the General Council and taking action against the Internationalists. By way of titbit it contains an anecdote related by that scandal-monger Malon about myself, which is in exquisite taste, but slightly compromising to you. If at the end of 1869 Malon, the poet, was not aware of Karl Marx's existence, one might be tempted to think that *Marx and the "General Council he leads"* had not yet made its authoritarianism felt; and surely you would not wish to suggest that authoritarians of that stamp, whom you have so loudly denounced to the bourgeoisie and the police, had been able to play an underhand game for so long? Perhaps it is your friend Robin—admitted to the General Council towards the end of 1869—who introduced into it the Alliance's spirit of authoritarianism? Malon has the unfortunate habit of talking too much. At Bordeaux, in front of Johannard, Prudhomme and myself, he blithely recounted the little intrigues set afoot by himself and his friends to get his name on the list of several electoral committees. Thanks to these tricks, Malon was elected, while Blanqui, Varlin, Jaclard, etc., polled barely thirty thousand votes.

The enemies of the Alliance are putting it about that you entertain the gallant intention of replying to the *private Circular* with something other than insults. This is a plain trap set for your frankness. Let it pass, as you let pass the *Circular of the Romance Committee*; do not stoop to odious and untenable denials; stop talking of metaphysics,

* Bakunin said of him: "*He is a saint; it's his incredible candour, the purity of an infant*" (from *Bulletin* No. 7)¹⁰⁶.—*Note by Lafargue.*

** A play on words: *Bulletin Jurassien.*—*Ed.*

of deductive, absolute and convergible method; shun all scientific discussion, for there lies the danger! Take warning from the blunder of His Infallibility who, seeking to make an oblation to worldly vanity, formulated a theoretical programme, and, so that it should be startlingly revolutionary, felt obliged to imitate Mme. Goegg, who called for "the political, economic and social equality of the *sexes*", and proclaimed the "political, economic and social equality of the *classes*".

Frustrate the designs of these heretics by sticking to your customary behaviour: insult, abuse and slander, even if your insults, your abuse and your slanders should recoil upon your own heads. What matter? You will have done your duty and obeyed the dictates of your nature and position. Experience has, in any case, taught you that in the field of ideas which you have made your own and where you have set up a notice saying "*This is mine*", you are unvanquished and invincible.

Greetings and stick to your guns,

Paul Lafargue

Madrid, July 12, 1872

Frederick Engels, Paul and Laura Lafargue, *Correspondence*, Vol. III, Moscow, 1963, pp. 464-68

FROM A LETTER OF WILHELM EICHHOFF
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Leipzig, July 14, 1872

You will have received my last letter via Liverpool. Yesterday I conferred with the treasurer of the Social-Democratic Workers' Association in Berlin, and a delegate will soon be elected to the Congress; the necessary talks on the subject are to begin already tomorrow at a party meeting.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

THE COMMITTEE OF THE JURA FEDERATION
TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL IN LONDON

Sonvillier, July 15, 1872

Citizens,

We have learnt, first through the socialist newspapers, and today by an official letter of our Swiss correspondent, Citizen Jung, dated July 10, that the General Council has chosen The Hague as the place for the next General Congress.

On this subject we have a very serious remark to address to you, hoping that you will take it into account and will accede to it.

The General Rules permitting the General Council, in certain cases, to change the seat of the Congress were certainly not intended to exempt the General Council from consulting the convenience of the various federations before taking a decision. It being in the interests of every federation and of the Association as a whole to see as many delegates as possible taking part in the Congress, common sense indicates that the place of the Congress should be as far as possible a central point, within reach of all the federations, or at least of the majority of them.

But The Hague does not fulfil these conditions. It is on the contrary far from central, and the choice of this city would make it impossible for some of the federations to send delegates in view of the enormous expenses they would have to bear.

The country which appeared to us naturally indicated as the seat of the Congress is Switzerland, by its central situation as by the relative freedom enjoyed there. We are therefore asking you, in the most formal manner and with the assurance that after a further examination of the question you will be unable to do otherwise than to share our opinion, to come back on your decision and to choose some town in Switzerland as the seat of the Congress.

We appeal to your feeling of equity; it cannot be your intention to close, indirectly, the doors of the Congress to the delegates of certain federations; you will not wish the General Congress, at which so many grave questions must find their solution, to see its moral authority weakened by this fact; you will wish, on the contrary, to give public

proof of the loyalty with which you accept debate by satisfying our claim, the more so as it comes from a federation which disagrees with you on several points.

Greetings and solidarity.

On behalf and by order of the Jura Federal Council:

The Corresponding Secretary,

Adhémar Schwitzguébel

Published in the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*, supplement to No. 13, July-August 1872

Translated from the French

FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hoboken, July 15, 1872

Dear Friend,

Some newspapers, etc., are going off to you today. I was absolutely wretched last week, and that is why I am only today giving you a reply and information. Our Congress went very well. Twenty-two sections were represented by twenty-three delegates and in the three days some splendid work was done. *I* had refused all mandates, but at the last moment I accepted one from the French Section in San Francisco, precisely *because* it was from a French section. *You* will be satisfied with our work, for we centralised things as much as we could and it was *over that* that there were some sharp debates with the French. S. Dereure (of the Commune) and I were elected delegates to the Congress in The Hague. Besides, a few more mandates are to be sent. So when the money has been collected you will soon see me, and if our opponents here really do send delegates to the Congress, we shall send them packing. The French (i.e. New York Section 2) refuse to admit that our Congress has the right to send delegates to the General Congress and to divide the expenses over the whole organisation. They are bitterly opposed to this, but they will be *forced* to give in. Dereure personally accepted to be elected by our Congress, but now he wants to withdraw owing to backbiting. It is to be hoped

we shall prevent this, otherwise I shall go alone. I shall send you either the printed Minutes of the Congress proceedings or else my own report. Today I am telling you only what is of the greatest interest to the General Council.

A committee specially appointed for the purpose proposed the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

"Considering that for a long time ambitious intriguers, paid and unpaid agents of the governments as well as of various parties, have been making use of all means to undermine, or to divide, or to dominate the I.W.A.;

"Considering that some of these men by their eloquence or their ultra-radicalism have gained a certain popularity and influence among unenlightened workers;

"Considering that they have been using this influence to spread suspicion and false rumours against the General Council;

"Considering that through these intrigues public opinion is being led to believe that there is no unity in the ranks of the International Working Men's Association,

"the American Federation assembled in Congress resolves:

"1. We assure the General Council of our entire sympathy and support.

"2. We declare our agreement with all the actions and measures of the General Council insofar as they are known to us.

"3. The American Congress will take the necessary steps to send at least two delegates to the General Congress with strict instructions (imperative mandate) to support the General Council in its measures and to testify to our European fellow-workers our unanimity and enthusiasm for the common cause.

"4. *We recognise the profound necessity of strong centralisation, without which we would be powerless in the face of the constantly growing centralisation of the ruling classes, but we believe that, after the abolition of all class rule, the federative system, i.e., independent communal administration, will prevail.*"

It is to be hoped that this will please the General Council. A letter of the Federal Council arrived recently from Madrid containing proposals for the revision of the Rules and a plan.

An awful lot of general expressions and "glittering generalities"* without any date or address.

I have received the *Fictitious Splits* (4 copies from you and 200 through Engels) and also *L'Égalité*. Many thanks. I am distributing the 200 among the French cheaply and will hand the money received to the General Council.

H. Meyer of Pittsburgh is here and sends greetings.

The money matters with the General Council will be settled by the delegates.

It is a good thing that Engels has come out against the gossip in the *Volkswille*.¹⁰⁷

If you have any more information or instructions for me, please write *by return of post*.

I suppose Ch. Hubert brought you the things?

Most sincerely yours,

F. A. Sorge

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FRIEDRICH BOLTE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hoboken, N. J.
131 Garden Street
July 16, 1872

My dear friend Marx,

This is to ask you to be so kind as to convey the enclosed letter to General Council member Le Moussu, whose address I do not know.

You will see from the letter that the Federation which I represent will be sending two delegates to the Congress at The Hague; perhaps one section or the other will also send mandates to London, but this is doubtful, because individual sections are hard pressed lately in all respects, but especially in money matters. The so-called Prince Street Council recently held a congress in Philadelphia at which, according to reliable private sources on the spot, five sec-

* The two words in quotes are given in English in the original.—
Ed.

tions* and eight according to another version were represented.

The sittings were *secret*.

Yesterday the *Herald*** carried a report on the proceedings there, written by Mr. Elliot. According to this report they decided:

1. They wish to have nothing more to do with the General Council, but nevertheless

2. are sending *three* delegates to the Congress at The Hague among them Wm. West, the notorious retainer of the Misses Woodhull and Claflin.

I believe that the true workers will have the upper hand at the European Congress, and if it comes to the worst, what is it that the social reformers from the high school of imbecility really want? No power in the world can destroy the *International*, at most the workers' struggle can be made more difficult.

More on this subject shortly.

Sincerely yours,
F. Bolte

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FRIEDRICH BOLTE TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL
IN LONDON

Hoboken, U. S.
131 Garden Street,
July 16, 1872

TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE I.W.A., LONDON,
LE MOUSSU, COR. SEC. FOR AMERICA

Sir,

It becomes my duty to inform you, that the Congress of the I.W.A. in America, called by the Prov. Federal Council, held on the 6, 7 and 8th day of July at the 10th Ward Hotel, N. Y. City, has been a success.

* The word "sections" is inserted instead of "delegates", which is struck out.—*Ed.*

** The *New York Herald*.—*Ed.*

Twenty-three delegates, representing 22 sections, of which every member is a wages labourer, were in counsel during 6 meetings by a considerable heat of 94° and trying to do their best for the great cause of labour.

THE SECTIONS REPRESENTED IN THE CONGRESS
WERE AS FOLLOWING, VIZ:

San Francisco	3 sections	(French, Engl. German)
St. Louis	2 "	Eng. and German
Baltimore	1 "	German
Philadelphia	2 "	"
Chicago	3 "	"
West Hoboken	1 "	French
Brooklyn	1 "	Engl.
New York	9 "	French, German, Italian, Irish and Scandinavian

total 22 sections counting about 1,000 members.

You will receive a full report as soon as the proceedings are printed.

The Congress resolved to send two delegates to the General Congress in Haag—F. A. Sorge and Dereure were elected delegates.

The definite Federal Council consists of 9 members elected by the Congress, and permission is granted to the Council to elect 5 other members if necessary.

In the first meeting of the Federal Council Sunday July 14th, the undersigned was elected Cor. Sec. for America and Europe and at the same time requested to beg your pardon for the negligence of the old Prov. Federal Council to settle the account between the Federal Council and the General Council; time and circumstances prevented it to wind up every affair at the proper time.

Our delegates will go over London and settle the said account before they start for Haag.

Please note my address.

Fraternally Yours,

F. Bolte, Cor. Secr. of the Federal Council

LUDWIG KUGELMANN
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hanover, July 16, 1872

My highly esteemed and dear friend,

Enclosed is the reply received today from Meissner, which, it is to be hoped, will calm you somewhat, since meanwhile the first delivery is ready.¹⁰⁸ The layout, the letter says, will make the book more readable to many; for the sake of usefulness I also welcome the addition of a detailed index.

If it is certain that you are going to The Hague, and if you have no objection, be kind enough to let me know *very soon* when you will arrive there and where you can be reached at once. I would then also go there to see you again.

Cordial greetings to all from

Yours truly,

L. Kugelmann, Dr.

Can you not send me the Private Circular of the General Council on the Bakuninist Intrigues* mentioned in the latest *Volksstaat*? But *in a letter*, please, otherwise printed matter generally gets lost.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS
TO UGO BARTORELLI IN FLORENCE¹⁰⁹

[*Rough Draft*]
Citizen,

[London, July 18, 1872]**

In reply to your letter of June 27 postmarked Florence, July 6, which, being inaccurately addressed, reached me

* *Fictitious Splits in the International*.—Ed.

** The letter bears a note by Engels: Florence, June 27, 1872. Workers' Society. Replied July 18. Reply appended.—Ed.

only on the 16th inst., I inform you that we have no other banner than that of the world proletariat, the red banner.

From your same letter it appears to me that your society was constituted as and considers itself a section of the International. Consequently it is my duty to point out to you that the Regulations still in force prescribe certain formalities for the admission of new sections.

Section II, Art. 4, says:

"Every new section or society wishing to join the International must immediately inform the General Council of its adherence. The General Council has the right, etc." (Resolution of the *Basle Congress*).

And Section V, Art. 1, says:

"Every section has the right to work out its own particular rules adapted to local circumstances and to the laws of its country; but they must not in any point be contrary to the General Rules and Regulations" (Resolution of the *Geneva Congress*).

And as, according to Section II, Art. 2, "The General Council is obliged to carry out the resolutions of Congresses", to which it is responsible, the General Council cannot recognise as sections of the International any other societies except those which conform to these Articles and have adhered to the General Rules and Regulations of the Association, and whose own Rules have been made to conform with the General Rules and Regulations. Not doubting that you have omitted to do this only owing to ignorance of these regulations, because there is no authentic Italian edition, I am sending you enclosed a copy in French with the Articles in question marked in red.

As the Congress is drawing near (September 2, at The Hague, Holland), I draw your attention also to Art. 7 of Section I, which says:

"In the future only delegates of societies, sections or groups affiliated to the International and who are in order with the General Council concerning payment of subscriptions (10 centesimos per member) will be allowed to take part in the Congress with the right of vote."

Greetings and fraternity.

Translated from the Italian

E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Brussels, July 19, 1872]

Dear Citizen Engels,

I hasten to reply to your note dated yesterday.** If I had thought you were not informed of what is going on here I would have informed you immediately.

1. In its meeting on Sunday 7th inst., the Brussels Section voted unanimously minus one vote for the retention of the General Council. The one against was Laurent Verrycken.

2. The extraordinary Belgian Congress assembled a very small number of delegates—only 13, of whom 4 from Brussels, from affiliated corporations. The retention of the General Council was resolved by 9 votes to 3 with one abstention. The delegate of the Vesdre Federation, which represented 32 sections, voted for. Hins did not come to Brussels and De Paepe did not put in an appearance, absorbed as he is by his examinations, which he passed with distinction—except the last, the practical examination, which is to take place some time next week. The opposing delegates were from the coal-mining districts and their vote was as insignificant as their co-operation in the Association. Antwerp was represented by Calewaert, who voted for. Neither Ghent nor any one of the sections was represented—to tell the truth they really do not exist there. Brismée and Hins, well coached—you can guess by whom—spoke well and that vain fool who answers to the name of Verrycken kept quiet. I have nearly forgotten to point out to you one incident, namely, that at the opening of the sitting a letter from the Federal Council of Barcelona was read out which was addressed to the Belgian Congress, congratulating it on the motion that had been tabled concerning revision of the Rules and exhorting it to persist in the opinions expressed.***

* The letter bears a note by Engels: Brussels, July 19, Glaser. Replied August 19.—*Ed.*

** Engels' note to Glaser has not been preserved.—*Ed.*

*** See pp. 344-47 of this volume.—*Ed.*

Herman read out a project for new Rules which was adopted after a short debate and some slight modifications.

There were no changes made in the preamble or in the considerations, and the modifications proposed were aimed mainly at limiting the powers of the General Council, which it is desired to deprive of all authority. Thus the Council would not have the right to intervene in any way in differences which might arise between the various federations, and consequently it would not be able to suspend either sections or federations. The differences arising between sections would be judged—without appeal—by the federation to which they belonged. If a federation were in disagreement with the General Council, the various federations would be the ones to judge.

The Council would be composed of three delegates from each nationality, to be nominated by the nationalities themselves. The nationality would also appoint the one who would act as secretary. Each nationality would have only one vote. The delegates could be revoked only by their nationality, but the General Council would have the right to suspend them until it had informed of its motives the nationality to which the delinquents belonged.

I am writing all this from memory and in a great hurry, but I do not think I have forgotten anything important.

There was also discussion of the delegates to be admitted to the next Congress and there was unanimity on the point that only representatives of affiliated workers' societies whose mandate was in order should be admitted: this means that the adherents of Vésinier, as well as the Tolains and their ilk would be flatly shown the door.

I have sent notes to several of our bourgeois papers but I only saw them printed two days ago in the *Echo du Parlement* and in addition the announcement of the Congress without any comment; true, there are many newspapers that I do not read for lack of time.

In respect of the parcel for Switzerland I must say that so far I have not been asked to pay the postage for the printed matter sent to Perret.*

* The pamphlet *Fictitious Splits in the International*.—Ed.

For the time being I have nothing else to tell you that could interest you, but do not doubt that if anything turns up I shall inform you immediately.

Please remember me to the Marx family, and my sincere fraternal greetings to you, dear Citizen Engels.

E. Glaser de Willebrord

Jung asked me for some Belgian stamped paper for Dupont—I've heard nothing more about this matter, which seemed to interest Dupont greatly.

Pindy has written to Brismée to tell him that he is continuing his propaganda work in Switzerland. He is sorry about the existing disagreements.

Naturally I know nothing about the intentions of the Dutch Government, and it is only by logical deduction that I presume hostility, but it seems to me there is a way of making sure: *it is to lease a hall in The Hague, saying for what purpose, and immediately the owner will go to the authorities to ask if he may let the premises.*

It is perhaps not a very ingenious way, but it will do for lack of a better one.*

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

WILHELM LIEBKNECHT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON **

[Hubertusburg,] July 20, 1872

Dear Engels,

I am taking the opportunity to send you this. That the Congress is to be in The Hague is very good. People can come from Rhineland and Westphalia, not many, of course, because money is scarce. But there should be no lack of man-

* Appended to the letter is a card bearing in print: *Dépôt de Fabriques anglaises, françaises et allemandes*, and the inscription: *E. Glaser. 24, rue de la Pépinière, Bruxelles.—Ed.*

** The letter is written on paper with a printed heading crossed out by Liebknecht: *Redaktion des Volksstaat, Leipzig.—Ed.*

dates. Only see to it that a *model form* is published in time, if possible giving all the formalities to be observed.

Unfortunately it is doubtful whether H[lepner] can attend the Congress, as he is "*wanted*".* But in any case we shall see to it that the most precise instructions are given and do everything else in our power.

Letters for me to be sent as up to now.

Greetings to you, M[arx], etc.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

O. V. SUETENDAEL
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Brussels, July 20, 1872

Dear Citizen,

I have only time to write you a very short letter today, my personal affairs do not allow me to devote as much time as I should like to matters concerning the Association.

All that I can tell you is that the Congress of the Belgian Sections rejected the measure that had been proposed to it (suppression of the General Council); I was unable to attend the debate, but I intend to buy the *Internationale*, which must give an account of it.

Our meetings now take place on Sunday evenings. Shortly we are to appoint a delegate to the Congress of The Hague. When we have appointed him I shall inform you and tell you at the same time who he is.

I am almost certain that it will be a *non-working man* again. We have to reconcile ourselves to this to some extent.

Could not the General Council speak about the stamps again at the next Congress, for it is high time that all the members of the International were provided with a stamp or a card which all the sections would be familiar with. The system that we practise at present cannot go on, because it leads to very unpleasant things; recently, at the large

* The words: "as he is '*wanted*'" are in English in the original.—*Ed.*

workers' demonstration in New York one of my friends found himself side by side with a fellow who had been expelled from the International in Brussels because of his grave immorality: he had been stealing and living on the income from a house of ill fame. Such a thing can happen again any day and you will easily understand that an honest working man does not care to find himself in the company of that sort of individual.

In this connection I should like to submit to you an idea which is certainly not new, but which is not practised: could not a kind of passport be produced for members of the International certifying that they had left their country as honest men, and made in such a way that it would be very difficult to counterfeit. That would provide a far greater guarantee for sections which receive travellers, who often have no means of proving that they are really members of the International and honest people. What I was telling you about my friend in New York happened in very much the same conditions in Paris, with the difference that in Paris they would not trust the man because they were not sure enough that they were dealing with a member of the International.

Hearty greetings,

O. V. Suetendael

Rue L'Kint 25

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

PAUL LAFARGUE
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Madrid, about July 21, 1872]

Dear Engels,

The Alliance affair is assuming grave proportions here; there is a veritable plot involving the Federal Council; Lorenzo, who is very weak, has retreated and left the others in command of the field. Yesterday we were apprised of a private circular of July 7 by the Federal Council, which

* The letter bears a note by Engels: Madrid, Mitte Juli 1872; P. Lafargue.—*Ed.*

they took good care not to send to us, and probably not to you either. This circular is about the nomination of delegates; the Council proposes an additional subscription for sending delegates; according to the amount received it will inform the federations of the number of delegates they may elect by ballot. You realise that it is the Alliance that will hold the election and will send Allies on International's money. In this circular they have used the two paragraphs from *La Federación* beginning with the words "Our examination of the Belgian plan" and ending the first paragraph with "the most fervent of revolutionaries". The second paragraph "These facts known to everyone" to "eminently noxious tendencies".* We have only one copy of the circular, but you could ask them for one as evidence in the Alliance case.

In face of their attitude Mesa thinks that the General Council should act energetically and even provoke a split before the Congress; but first it must write to the Federal Council telling them that it is aware of all their tricks, demanding to know the names of all the members of the Alliance in Spain and asking them to institute a public enquiry into the Alliance for the purpose of furnishing the General Council with these documents; also that they should reply to you by return of post and that if they fail to satisfy your wishes, you will openly denounce them in Spain as having violated the Rules and being members of the Alliance.

Here we are resolved to act energetically in face of the situation. To parry the blow of the private circular, we shall demand that no member of the Alliance be sent to the Congress on International money, and therefore we have decided to publish the names of all members who have belonged to the Alliance.

Have you received a reply from the Federal Council about the Mill Workers' Union? If the Federal Council have done nothing about this, it would be a grave charge which would weigh against them and which you would do well to expose, accusing them of neglecting the business of the organisation in order to concentrate entirely on the Alliance's affairs.

* These phrases are in Spanish.—Ed.

La Emancipación is impatiently awaiting your articles.

I think it would be best to publish my letter which, if not refuted, would become documentary evidence. Have no fear, you will be sent further ammunition against the Alliance/.

Act promptly and vigorously.

Regards to everyone.

Ever yours, P. Toole*

I shall send an extract of my letter to *La Liberté*. We are leaving for Lisbon this week; we shall take the boat North and I shall go to the Congress.

The *Condenado* does not answer a word to my letter, but calls it *una crecida dosis de venenosa baba*.**

Frederick Engels, Paul and Laura Lafargue, *Correspondence*, Vol. III, Moscow, 1963, pp. 469-70

HENDRICK GERHARD
TO FRÉDÉRIC COURNET IN LONDON

Amsterdam, July 21, 1872***

Citizen,

Prepare yourself to hear nothing good in my account of the present situation of the Dutch sections of the International.

Let us begin with figures—the most eloquent. The Section of The Hague numbers 21 members. In our good city of Amsterdam there are (belonging to the International) the Tailors' Union, 50 members strong; the Locksmiths' Union, 34 strong; the Lithographers' Union, with 52 members; and the Union of Various Trades, 90 strong. Then in Utrecht we have another eight persons who are members of our section, so that there are in all 255 members of the International

* Paul Lafargue's nickname in Marx's family.—*Ed.*

** An increased dose of venomous slaver.—*Ed.*

*** The letter bears an oval stamp: Internationaal Werkliedenverbond Amsterdam.—*Ed.*

in the whole of Holland—a small number, isn't it? And then I am counting the stamps we have used, but there are sure to be some people who have received a stamp and have since then ceased to contribute.

As for public opinion, it is not hostile to us. A strange situation: It was the International that founded here the bakers' union, the coopers', the basket-makers', the ship's mechanics', the sawyers', and several others. They like us fairly well but do not dare to side directly with us, or else they think a national union is enough. The National Federation also totals 3,000 members at present, and several more trades will join them. Such exactly is our situation. The papers, when mentioning our forthcoming Congress, generally display calm, curiosity, or indifference, and all that with a shade of benevolence; only the Hague newspaper* cannot find enough venom to pour over us; it calls us murderers, thieves, etc., and has reproved the government for allowing us to hold the Congress there; *Temps*, the ultramontanist newspaper, is also of the same opinion; but I repeat, one feels more fear than hatred of the International.

So you see, Citizen, the Congress will encounter no serious obstacle, at least not from the Government or, with a little prudence, from the people either.

But there is another question which is more embarrassing for me, it is that of money; you can understand that with such a small number of Internationalists our funds are almost inexistent. You will recall that we have to pay for the hall a fortnight in advance; well, we shall be hard put to find that sum, and besides those 60 francs we need a lot more; I told you that expenses would come to about a hundred francs, but now I think I did not reckon enough. What do you think of a reception committee? Shall we need to be at Rotterdam when the delegates arrive on the steamer? I think that would produce a good impression, but you understand ... this accursed money!

Tell me in your next letter whether the General Council has already decided how much it is going to give to help us. As I have just said, we have used 255 stamps, that is

* The *Dagblad*.—Ed.

25 $\frac{1}{2}$ francs that we owe for subscriptions; I cannot send this sum because we need it here now: also we thought, given the circumstances we could keep it on our account without being too insolent—poverty must be excused. Could you tell me approximately how many delegates will come? It's for the accommodation, we have got to think a little about that too. I have not yet received any letters from anybody; nothing but the account of Saragossa*; unfortunately I do not know much Spanish, but I understood that Anselmo Lorenzo is of exactly the same opinion as I am on the question of property. Let me know if the delegates of the General Council will come a few days before the opening of the Congress—I should like them to.

Greetings and fraternity,

H. Gerhard

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

EUGÈNE DUPONT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

Sunday evening
Nottingham, July 21 [1872]

My dear Engels,

Here, roughly, are the most important points of the three sittings of the Congress.

1. Admission of *reporters* to all the sittings.
2. Federal Council in London.
3. Congress at Manchester.
4. Proposed by Hales and Clark:

*that the Federal Council shall place itself in direct communication with all other federal councils belonging to the Association to promote a more thorough solidarity and shall exchange organs with them....***

* This document has not been preserved in the materials of the Hague Congress.—*Ed.*

** The proposal is given in English in the original.—*Ed.*

I do not need to call your attention to this resolution which, coming from Hales, is nothing more nor less than a betrayal. Now compare with this resolution what was published in the second edition of the *Nottingham Guardian*¹¹⁰ on Saturday and the conclusion is quite simple! (Hales knew about this small paragraph, I made him read it).

5. Proposed by Hales: That a working-class party should be formed and that it should be acknowledged that only *by political action*, etc. (that is the spirit if not the letter of his proposal).

I do not need to tell you that I did all I could to defeat them. But this element was too new. I did not have enough time to talk to the delegates, who for the most part are very good, but they know nothing at all about the intrigues of these gentlemen. I have already opened the eyes of some, and shall continue.

Smith is a fool who warned Hales that there was going to be a proposal to transfer the Federal Council to Manchester and who voted against us. Just like the Liverpool delegate.

I could tell you a lot more, but I am very tired and worried by these three sittings. Fortunately the Congress will smash what these filthy puppets have built!

I shall try to send you by Tuesday the resolutions and the changes adopted; by the way, our friend Lessner will be there to fill in the details.

There is a *French Section* here which can become a good point of support for us. Here is the reason why. There are about 80 of them and they speak both English and French, having been born in Nottingham; they are going to call a meeting for next Wednesday. I am to give them the history of our Association. *Send at once*, c/o Gouppy, 8 Mount Street, Strangeways, Manchester *Splits* and *Civil War** (in French). I shall pass through Nottingham again to attend the meeting. Do not fail to send me what I ask you for.

Yours,
E. Dupont

* *Fictitious Splits in the International and The Civil War in France.*—Ed.

P. S. Hales has modified his resolution No. 5. I am sending you a checked copy.

5. That it is the opinion of this [Congress] that while we recognise the fact that the social emancipation of the working class is the great end to which all efforts should be directed: we also recognize the fact that it is necessary to take political action to work out that social emancipation and we hereby pledge ourselves to establish a distinct "Labour Party", based upon the principles of the I.W. Association and to create an agitation to carry out the same.

That this Congress hereby pledges to accord the same right to Ireland as we claim for England by promoting a thorough system of Federative Government with local Parliament for all parts of the so-called British Empire, and the Irish people are hereby cordially invited to cooperate in carrying out the same.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

KARL MARX
TO LUDWIG KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

[London,] July 23, 1872

Dear Kugelman,

If nothing prevents me, I shall be in The Hague on September 2 and shall be very glad to see you there. I had already sent you the *Splits* etc."* but they seem to have been intercepted. So I am now enclosing them in this letter. You must excuse me for not writing any more today. I have *épreuves*** to send to Paris and am in general head over ears in work.

Yours,
K. M.

Translated from the German

* *Fictitious Splits in the International.*—Ed.

** Proofs of the French edition of Volume I of *Capital.*—Ed.

FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hoboken, July 23, 1872

My dear friend Marx,

I am in a hurry! I hope to see you soon and to bring mandates for our friends. Today I have a personal request:

My aged father (a clergyman in the Province of Saxony) and several of my brothers and sisters would very much like to see me when I come over. I can no longer wait for an answer from them here and have therefore taken the liberty to have letters for me addressed to you so that I shall have news on my arrival in London. I hope you will be kind enough to excuse me.

I shall write to you again next week giving details.

Sincerely yours,
F. A. Sorge

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

RAYMOND WILMART
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Manchester, July 24, 1872

Dear Citizen,

I have just received a letter from Bordeaux, where they suggest that I should represent the Section at the Congress. If I did not write at once on the subject it was for fear my intentions might be misinterpreted.

I have already replied that I am prepared to accept, but that I think I could propose somebody more capable than I am. If Lafargue represents a branch in Spain, as is probable, please give me some other names (more or less known, if possible) which I can propose to them.

If Lafargue has not yet been delegated and wishes to be, please tell me and I shall desist in his favour. Dupont is known to one member, Longuet to another and Johannard to yet another.

I have not mentioned any name yet and have offered myself with the reservation that I shall write again as soon as I receive your reply.

Hoping that you are in good health and that the Congress has favourable prospects, I send you as well as your wife and daughters my devoted respects.

R. Wilmart

39 Rosamond Street, East

In the event of Lafargue having returned, please give him and his wife my friendly thanks.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

CARL FARKAS
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

Pest, July 25, 1872

TO CITIZEN JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

Dear party comrade,

My silence has evidently given you occasion for various suppositions. I have been obliged up to now to refrain out of different considerations from any correspondence, and as these considerations are no longer of account I allow myself after all this time to seek continuance of our association.

The events which have meanwhile taken place in Pest, namely, persecutions, imprisonments, etc., are probably sufficiently known to you. Therefore I refrain this time from any explanation concerning the eleven months' arrest and the famous trial for high treason¹¹¹ and only ask you kindly to answer the following.

After the changes which have taken place in our Association as regards both organisation and administration and which make a renewal of my powers necessary, and moreover after the verdict of the Pest tribunal has *not* declared our Association in Hungary illegal or dangerous to the state, I consider it my duty to address myself to you in order, on the one hand, if I once more enjoy your trust, to obtain through your initiative the renewal of my powers by the General Council and, on the other hand, to get to know

your opinion concerning the sending of delegates to this year's Congress.

A speedy settlement of this matter would be advisable if only because we have a lot of preliminary work to do in Pest in order to be able to send delegates to the Congress.

If the General Council should favour me with its trust, kindly arrange that I should receive the corresponding number of members' certificates at the same time as the order for my appointment. The soil has become favourable for us as a result of the ending of the police rule in Hungary, particularly among the Magyar rural population.

Above all give me a reliable address, for it is not advisable to address correspondence in your name; I myself do not use my own address. I allow myself to send you the enclosed photographs.

With Social-Democratic greetings and handshake

Carl Farkas

My address:

Ignatz Uhr, Instrument-maker, Pest, Theresienstadt, Rákos-Graben Gasse 9, Door 26

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

THEODOR CUNO

TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Liège, July 26, 1872]

Dear Engels,

According to your instructions I wrote to the Chemnitz people asking for a mandate, but so far I have had no answer. On July 21 I was in Verviers at a "monster meeting", where I got a good insight into the accursed tactics of Bakunin, Hins and Co. At the beginning the French sections voted according to Bakunin's line against the General Council, but the Germans were not so stupid and worked on the

* The letter bears a note by Engels: Liège, July 26, 1872, Th. Cuno. Answered August 4.—*Ed.*

numskulls so that at the last Congress in Brussels all voted for the General Council. Hins, noticing in advance that he would be beaten this time, spared himself the disgrace and did not appear at the Congress; but the influence of the German Section had to be rendered harmless and a means was soon found for this. A short time ago a considerable proportion of the German members, and also of Germans who stand aloof from the section altogether, about sixty men in all, were summoned to the police and told that they were "*not to engage in politics*" in Belgium; of course they did not let themselves be intimidated and did not fall for that police trick. Things are going well and nobody is thinking any more about it until the time of the Congress comes. The German delegate from Verviers was maligned in Brussels by one of Hins' henchmen as a police spy for allegedly betraying the list of members to the police; the Section is ordered to expel him and as it does not comply is itself expelled! Herr Hins has achieved his aim. A meeting was called to expose this dirty trick and to protest against such action; there was abuse in Flemish and in German, so that my vocabulary is insufficient to convey everything. I advised the people not to rejoin the Federation but to correspond directly with London and also to adopt another name and to send a decent delegate to The Hague, which they solemnly promised to do. For the past fortnight we have had a German section here bearing the name: *Society for the Protection and Support of the Germans in Liège*. It took a lot of effort to get the people together and it will cost a great lot too to organise them and to teach them reason, for most of them have been away from Germany for a long time already and therefore know nothing about the movement there; and the worst of all is that we have several brothers here from the *Neuer Social-Demokrat*, adherents of Hasenclever and Hasselmann, including one by the name of *Sauerborn*, who has already done a lot of harm in Germany. These people oppose everything that "Lassalle did not say", the "trade unions", etc., etc. For this reason I am in a very difficult position, but the worst of all is still to come: I had called a meeting for today, to be held in the premises of the International Joiner, and this morning our director called for me and met me with the newspaper in

his hand. "Are you with this band?" the fellow snarled. "Yes, I am," I replied, adding that I did not know of any band. "You shall withdraw from that society, for its premises have a bad name here, the International holds its meetings there. If you absolutely must belong to some society, join the German Skittle Club, there are 'decent people' in it." "A society in premises like the Pelican will never have decent people, but only the scum of society; in general the workers are scoundrels. They are to be used, exchanged, or *sold to the knacker* like horses!" (word for word). Those are the words of a man who came here as a joiner journeyman and is now a millionaire!—Well, just wait, you "scoundrels", perhaps soon we'll sell you to the knacker! Of course all I can do now is to appear to withdraw and to work on the quiet. It is not so much to be feared that I will be sacked, for I was given a rise of fifty francs the very next month of my employment. Under these circumstances it is questionable whether I shall be able to come to the Congress, at any rate it will have to be done very cleverly. But we shall see. Herman looks very bad, but never complains; on the contrary, he drinks a lot of *schnaps*, I've seen him drink as many as ten glasses. Like that he is using up more strength than his body produces and I am afraid that sooner or later he will be done for. It is very sad, but you can't help one who won't listen to advice. You can hardly ever rely on him turning up regularly at meetings and he has often left us in the lurch. He will not agree to proposals for more energetic propaganda: "We are not advanced enough" is his stereotyped answer. And then he has too many private acquaintances who are a hindrance to him. Precisely what is wrong with most of our people is that they call themselves Social-Democrats but still cannot get rid of their old stupid prejudices and social conventions. If you have anything important for me or want me to tell you or give you something, please write to me before the Congress.

Fraternal greetings and handshake from

Yours,

C.

HERMANN JUNG
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON *

London, July 26, 1872

Dear Marx,

You have not sent me Vaillant's¹¹² resolution.

Dereure and Sorge have been appointed delegates by the American sections.

Best regards to Madame Marx [and] family.

Fraternally
H. Jung

First published in Russian

Written in English

KARL MARX
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

[London, end of July 1872]

Dear Jung,

Here are the French and English texts of Article 8:

"Dans la lutte contre le pouvoir collectif des classes possédantes, le prolétariat ne peut agir comme classe qu'en se constituant *lui-même en parti politique distinct, opposé à tous les anciens partis formés par les classes possédantes*. Cette constitution du prolétariat en parti politique est indispensable pour assurer le triomphe de la révolution sociale et son but suprême, *l'abolition des classes*.

"La coalition des forces ouvrières déjà obtenue par ses luttes économiques doit aussi servir de levier aux mains de cette classe dans sa lutte contre le pouvoir politique de ses exploiters.

"Les seigneurs de la terre et du capital se serviront toujours de leurs privilèges politiques pour défendre et perpétuer leurs monopoles économiques et asservir le travail.

* The letter is written on a post-card with the address: Dr. Karl Marx, 1 Maitland Park Road, Haverstock Hill. The letter bears the stamp: H. F. Jung, watchmaker, 4 Charles St., Clerkenwell, E. C. — Ed.

“La conquête du pouvoir politique devient donc le grand devoir du prolétariat.”

“Against the collective power of the propertied classes the working class cannot act, as a class, except by *constituting itself into a political party, distinct from, and opposed to, all old parties formed by the propertied classes.*”

“This constitution of the working class into a political party is indispensable in order to insure the triumph of the Social Revolution and its ultimate end—the *abolition of classes.*”

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

“The lords of land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies and for enslaving labour. To conquer political power has therefore become the great duty of the working classes.”

Greetings,
Karl Marx

Written in French and
English

JOSÉ C. NOBRE-FRANÇA
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Council of the Local Federation
in Lisbon
July 27, 1872

Citizen,

Today is July 27, and we have received nothing but No. 13 of the *International Herald*.¹¹³ Have you not received our communication of June 24 together with our Rules?¹¹⁴

On the 5th inst. we received yours of June 28.** We did

* The last page of the letter bears a note by Engels: Lisbon, July 27, 1872. Answered 15/8.—*Ed.*

** Engels' letter of June 28, 1872 to J. C. Nobre-França is not extant.—*Ed.*

not immediately reply because we hoped to reply also to the following one.

A local council has been constituted and it held its first sitting on the 4th of this month. Every ten or more persons of one trade form a section and elect a delegate per ten members, but not more than three in all. The section of various trades elects three; that of day labourers, three; that of workers, one; and of smiths one. A new section has been formed, that of caulkers, with 16 members.

We place the greatest hopes in this class. It is very united and includes very energetic and intelligent individuals. You can read about its recent actions in the *Pensamento*. Only those who direct the work of resistance are members of the International. Next Sunday the caulkers and carpenters intend to found a resistance society (trade union) and sections of the International at Seixal and Setubal (besides the one at Tejo).

The section of various trades expelled two founding members of the International. One of these is believed to be or to have been connected with Morago. He was going to form a section of *fish processors* and was recruiting people for a revolt which was expected from day to day.

Concerning the provinces, we have no relations with them except with a quarry worker in Leiria who seems to be a good man and is trying to form a section.

Concerning Porto we know nothing for certain. Anselmo de Moraes is still working to form a consumers' co-operative. There are active elements there, republicans and socialists, but they are giving no thought to the organisation of the working class. They are only politicians and spiritualists.

It is well known that the Portuguese people is oppressed owing to many causes and demoralised by its education, but nevertheless it preserves a great sense of consciousness. Thus the idea of the International is generally well received, and if we were not entirely lacking in resources we could do quite a lot.

When the caulkers decided to hold their last strike (*Pensamento* No. 21), which they did not succeed in holding, they

relied to a certain extent on resources from the *Fraternidade*, which had in its account in all £ 50, and also on resources from the International in other regions. It is possible that they are still experiencing difficulties but we have no resources of our own. Is it possible to find resources? These workers, owing to their cohesion in all the localities, and to their solidarity, are in exceptional conditions. Their strikes must be successful.

We ask you to inform the regional federations of our constitution and to send us their addresses. Could you also request them to send us (either at the *Pensamento* printshop or to me at home) a copy of their rules, including those of the women's sections if there are any? (Because we intend shortly to found a section of dressmakers.)

As for the reports about us published in the Spanish papers, they were supplied to Morago by Fontana. They are exaggerated. We have already informed you of the true situation.

You may assume that we shall not elect or send a delegate to the Congress. We know that Authero wishes to go and perhaps will go. Authero believes that historically a revolution such as we envisage it cannot be carried out; he believes that the emancipation of the workers can be achieved only in the distant future by means of political evolution.

Nos. 14 and 15 of the *Pensamento* were a week late. We send it to you regularly. From No. 19 onwards we shall send three copies, asking you to oblige us by sending one copy for exchange with the *Herald*. We are already rather considerably in debt owing to the publication of the newspaper, but we hope to settle it.

Will you oblige us by sending a copy of the Congress materials and other documents of the International? Shall we pay when we have funds coming from the subscriptions from the sections (5 reis a week)? So far no sections have paid.

We are now distributing membership stamps. Although we received a certain sum in the past economic year, do you authorise us to continue the distribution?

Rebello da Silva's book, from which we took the statistical data which we sent you, provides no data concerning

the property structure. Only one article, recently published in the *Jornal de Comercio*, says that in *Alemtejo* there are properties of 1,000 hectares and more, but that these properties are of no great value because of the low level of cultivation. Nearly all the proprietors cultivate their estates on their own account. The tenants are in great distress. There are thousands of hectares of public meadow lands administered by the municipal councils or parishes; they produce poor fodder; one of the biggest brings the municipal council 70,000 reis. The Alemtejo workers are intelligent; they provide a large number of emigrants. Cattle breeders earn (wages and food) £ 15 annually.

In the north contracts relating to agricultural plots (*métayage*) are predominant.

We request you, Mr. Engels, to give us your opinion on our particular affairs and also on the activity of the Association.

Make use of us as you consider most profitable to our common cause.

Greetings and fraternity.

The Secretary, *J. C. Nobre-França*

First published in Russian

Translated from the Portuguese

JOSE MESA
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Madrid, July 28, 1872]

Dear Citizen Engels,

You must have received *La Emancipación* yesterday. I draw your attention to the circular which the New Madrid Federation has sent to all the federations of the Spanish region.¹¹⁵ It was called forth first of all by the necessity to justify our separation from the old Madrid Federation, then by the Federal Council's circular, which is a real coup d'é-

* The letter has a note by Engels: Madrid, July 28, 1872, José Mesa, R. 30. Answered August 7. Engels' letter of August 7, 1872 to J. Mesa is not extant.—Ed.

tat in the federation. That audacious circular, which was sent *secretly* to all the localities, is a reproduction of all the attacks made by the *Bulletin du Jura* and the Barcelona *Federación* against the General Council, and aims at nothing else than having the Alliance people appointed delegates for the forthcoming Congress. Fortunately we realised this in time and decided to raise our voice, to reveal everything; we can be said to have burnt our boats; we shall not go to the Congress, but the men of the Alliance will not go there either. At Barcelona and Valencia the struggle against the Federal Council has already begun and it is intended there to protest against the *private* circular on the elections. We have only one copy of this circular and it does not belong to us, which is the reason why we are not sending it to you; but you must demand it from the Federal Council. Perhaps it would be fitting, once this intrigue is known, for the General Council to take a decision which would serve as a basis for the accusation of the agents of the Alliance in Spain.

From now on I think you will be able to act in all freedom in regard to the Alliance, for there everything has been revealed and we shall abandon the field only as vanquished or victors. Take heed only of the interests of the Association as a whole and the position of the General Council, which must waste none of its advantages.

I am sending you officially a copy of the circular with the stamp of the New Madrid Federation.

We are collecting all the documents in order to send an address to the General Congress on the Alliance in Spain.¹¹⁶ I shall do my best so that you will receive it before the opening of the Congress. We shall try also to obtain the adherence of most of the Spanish federations.

Excuse me, dear Comrade, for my scribble and my kitchen French. I am writing in a hurry and am not used to writing in French. I would appreciate an immediate reply.

Greetings and social emancipation,

Mesa

THE GENERAL COUNCIL'S REPLY
TO THE PROTEST OF THE JURA FEDERATION
AT THE CONVENING OF A CONGRESS AT THE HAGUE ¹⁷

GENERAL COUNCIL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

33 Rathbone Place, Oxford Street, London

TO CITIZEN SCHWITZGUÉBEL, CORRESPONDING SECRETARY
OF THE JURA FEDERAL COMMITTEE

I have placed your letter of July 15 inst. before the General Council and it has instructed me to inform you that its decision to hold the next Congress at The Hague was reached after due consideration of all the arguments contained in your letter, and that this choice was dictated by the following considerations:

The Congress could not be held in Switzerland, since that is the place of origin and focal point of the disputes; the Congress is always influenced to some extent by the place in which it is held; in order to add more weight to its decisions and enhance the wisdoms of its debates, the local character must be avoided, for which it was necessary to choose a place remote from the main centre of disputes.

You can scarcely be ignorant of the fact that three of the last four congresses were held in Switzerland, and that at Basle the Belgian delegates were most insistent that the next Congress should be held either at Verviers or in Holland.

In spite of the relative freedom which she enjoys, Switzerland can hardly claim the right to monopolise congresses.

The Romance Federal Council has also expressed its dissatisfaction with the General Council's choice and does not approve it.

Fraternal greetings,

H. Jung, Corresponding Secretary
for Switzerland

July 28, 1872

Written by K. Marx

Translated from the French

KARL MARX
TO LUDWIG KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

[London,] July 29, 1872

Dear Kugelmann,

At the International Congress (The Hague, opening Sept. 2) it is the life or death of the International which is at stake, and before I withdraw* I want at least to guard the International against elements of disintegration. Therefore Germany must have as many representatives as possible. As you are coming at any rate, write to Hepner that I ask him to get a delegate's mandate for you.

Yours,
K. Marx

Translated from the German

WILLIAM WEST
TO JOHN HALES IN LONDON **

New York, July 29, 1872

Citizen Hales,

Some time since, Section 12 of the I.W.A. in this country learned through the secretaries of each of the Federal Councils that it had been arraigned, tried, convicted, sentenced and punished by suspension until the meeting of next General Congress, upon charges too vague and general to put it upon its defence.

Now, that Section will be represented in the Congress referred to for the purpose among other things of meeting any charges that may be proffered against it.¹¹⁸ But that it may be enabled to do so fairly and justly, it has a right to know in advance what those charges may be and I herewith in behalf of that Section respectfully demand a "bill of par-

* From the General Council.—*Ed.*

** The letter is written on notepaper bearing the stamp: Woodhull, Claflin and Co., Bankers and Brokers, and Editors and Proprietors of *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly*, an organ of the Cardinary News and of General Scientific Reform. No. 44 Broad Street, New York. "Bankers and Brokers" is crossed out in West's hand.—*Ed.*

ticulars" (as we term such things in this country) and respectfully request that this demand may be laid before the General Council. Answer at once.

Yours fraternally,

Direct 48 Broad St. William West,
Corresponding Secretary,
Section 12

First published in Russian

Written in English

FRANCISCO TOMÁS
TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL IN LONDON *

Valencia, August 1, 1872

No. 764

Comrades,

We have received your latest letter, which, being written in French, prevents us from acquainting ourselves with its contents, since our usual translator is away from Valencia. We have applied to another comrade asking him to translate it with the least delay in order that we may answer it. We should have liked you to write in Spanish as you have been doing up to now, in which case it would have been possible for us to acquaint ourselves with its contents at once.

The Romance Federal Committee has informed us that with the agreement of the German sections it has asked the General Council to revoke its decision in respect of the resolution it adopted for the Fifth Congress of the International to be held at *The Hague*.** We are convinced of the great necessity to hold the next International Congress in an active centre of our Association and at a central point so that the different regional federations and groups of the International may be represented, and not that it should be held in a place where it would probably fall into the hands of elements that are not purely of the working class, which would be an evil for our Association. In the belief that it

* The letter bears a round stamp with the inscription: Asociación internacional de Trabajadores Consejo federal, España.—Ed.

** See pp. 362-63 of this volume.—Ed.

thus expresses faithfully the desires not only of the Spanish Regional Federation, but also of most groups of our beloved Association, we adhere to the just demand of the Romance Federal Committee for the General Council to reconsider its decision and indicate a central and active place for the holding of the Fifth International Congress.

Greetings and Social Liquidation.

On behalf and with the agreement of the Federal Council

The internal secretary general

Francisco Tomás

To the Comrades of the General Council
London

First published in Russian

Translated from the Spanish

FROM A LETTER OF GUSTAV LUDWIG
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Heidelberg, August 2, 1872

Dear Sir,]

Best thanks for your letter and dispatch of the circular.

Concerning your wish to see a section founded in Heidelberg, I regret to have to inform you that there are small prospects of this among the students here, who belong mostly to the wealthier classes of North Germany. Of the not very numerous workers here some belong to the General Association of German Workers, many seem to be entirely losing interest in the good of their brothers and their own advantage; at a popular meeting held in the spring by agitators of the Association of German Workers little enthusiasm was shown for the collection of applications for membership, some people even took pleasure in making sarcastic digs at the agitators. However I shall see what can be done. Perhaps you could occasionally send me a few copies of the Rules, the Manifesto and the like, which could be of use to me.

I would be eager to accept your flattering proposal to be a delegate and would have no difficulty concerning the ne-

cessary funds for attending the Congress, but I am afraid that time and circumstances will not be in my favour. I hope I shall be able to give you a definite answer soon.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

AUGUST GEIB
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hamburg, August 2, 1872

Dear Sir,

I still owe you a reply to your note* which was delivered to me by Otto Meissner. The cause of the delay was an application which I had made to the police authorities here concerning permission to become a member of the International Working Men's Association.

First of all I must inform you that my request was rejected, so that according to para. 2 of the law on associations in force here, official activity on behalf of the International Working Men's Association is impossible. Nevertheless we have undertaken steps here for delegates to be sent to the Hague Congress by the Germans. It is true that J. Dietzgen from Siegburg has not yet definitely accepted but it can certainly be assumed that he will go to The Hague. I shall write to him once more to encourage him. M. Rittinghausen will be coming from Cologne and Schumacher, also from there, will join him. The delegate from Brunswick will be Bernhard Becker, editor of the *Braunschweiger Volksfreund*.

Whether it will be possible to send any other delegates I cannot say definitively yet today. Nobody will come from here; those who could come from here will be going to Mainz, because the Mainz Congress is in great need of North German *elements*.

Things are now going well with the party movement; York, who for a long time saw everything on the black side, is again enthusiastic over our success. The membership is increasing in numbers and ability to pay the subscriptions, so that now sufficient money is available for agitation.

* This letter from Marx to A. Geib is not extant.—Ed.

What we lack, above all in South Germany, is competent speakers. The General Association of German Workers is holding its own tenaciously, it is true, but is not growing any more. In Hamburg too it is getting gradually shaky.

The trade unions are multiplying everywhere in Germany, as a consequence the trade union movement will soon have a firm footing at last and the workers will be really organised.

The socialists of the Chair are also beginning to stir. As I learned recently in a roundabout way, they are to hold a congress in Eisenach (!) in October of this year for the purpose of drawing up a programme and establishing an organisation. It is intended to invite some socialists to it—what do you say to that? The aim of these professors will be to win seats at next year's Reichstag elections.

A Congress of the English members of the International Working Men's Association was held recently.¹¹⁹ Will there be no report on it to the *Volksstaat*? I consider it indispensable that more regular reports should be given in our paper than has been the case so far on the work and the development of the International Working Men's Association. Can something be done from London for this purpose?

Things are going well with the second edition of your book *Capital*, Meissner tells me. In co-operation with the dispatch service of the *Volksstaat* I shall distribute about 300 copies directly among party comrades. Admittedly that is not brilliant, but the workers of Germany will not so soon be in a position to buy expensive and strictly scientifically written books. And besides, the first edition has already been widely spread in party circles.

You asked me whether I received a newspaper from you. The answer is no. Probably it had been intercepted by Stieber's men. Recently, letters from London, and also from America, have been arriving damaged or opened.

I am sending this one indirectly. Address your letters to me as enclosures through Meissner, that is the safest way.

With heartiest greetings I remain

Yours,

August Geib

FROM A LETTER OF WILHELM BRACKE JR.
TO LUDWIG KUGELMANN IN HANOVER *

[Brunswick,] August 3, 1872

...It is a good thing that Marx is coming to The Hague, and a still better one that after the Congress he will devote himself exclusively to his scientific work.

From here Becker, if anybody, can come; he, by the way, is ready. But it is probable that he will not make a very favourable impression in The Hague. Various things in his past and *little* vigour of delivery would be more than sufficient cause for that. For the rest he is a man of ability. If the party is prepared to pay his fare we shall delegate him. Here we have placed 100 copies of the Rules and membership stamps for 1872. But we have so many liabilities here that we could hardly provide his fare.

Would you, if necessary, be prepared to represent the Brunswick members at The Hague?

(I am just writing to Leipzig about another 100 copies of the Rules and the membership stamps.)

After the result of the Belgian conference I hope Bakunin will be sent packing.

One more request:

My printshop is now well equipped. *Should the General Council require it, it is at their disposal.* For the "I" ** only cost prices will be reckoned.

I am also quite willing to accept pamphlets and works for publication on the most accommodating conditions.

You will probably have an opportunity to inform our friend Marx and also some other members of the General Council about this. It may be appreciated by the latter.

If need be I also recommend myself to you.

To whom could one apply there concerning the distribu-

* The letter is written on a printed form bearing the heading: W. Bracke jr. Buchdruckerei. Braunschweig. On the fourth, blank, page there is a note by L. Kugelmann: "1872. W. Bracke junior, Brunswick, August 3. Answered 5/8."—*Ed.*

** The International—*Ed.*

tion of Party writings printed in my publishing house? It must be an energetic and *reliable* member.

Cordial greetings.

Yours,
W. Bracke jr.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS TO
ADOLF HEPNER IN LEIPZIG

London, August 4, 1872

Dear Hepner,

Just now I wanted to write to you a short article on the latest Bakunin business when the necessity arose for the General Council as such to speak. So the article has been transformed into an address,¹²⁰ the German translation of which you will receive on Wednesday.

It may be supplemented shortly by the Spanish documents¹²¹ lately received. Bakunin has preserved the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, of which you know from the *Splits*,* as a *secret* society in order thus to bring the International under his leadership. But we found out about this and now have the proof. So now there will be a public arraignment, because otherwise the elections to the Congress in Spain would be directed by the Alliance and the results would be in its favour. This business will be Bakunin's ruin.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO THEODOR CUNO IN LIÈGE

London, August 4, 1872

Dear Cuno,

The Belgian Federal Council could have rendered us no greater service than it has done by its action against the German Section of Verviers.¹²² It thus proves how necessary the existence of the General Council is to protect the independence of sections *against* the *Federal Councils*. However,

* *Fictitious Splits in the International*.—Ed.

the Belgian Federal Council cannot expel the German Section from the International, but only from the Belgian Federation: General Rules, Section IV: Federal Councils or Committees, para. 4. Any Federation may refuse to admit or to expel sections or societies, *without, however, the power to deprive them of their international character*. Consequently, the German Section of Verviers now has, as an independent section according to para. 7 of the General Rules (end of the para.), the right to correspond directly with the General Council. Call people's attention to this and urge them to write here; so far nothing has arrived.

Has Schleibach in Verviers received my letter, and why does he not answer?

I am sending you an issue of the *Emancipación* and a circular* by Lafargue (Marx's son-in-law) in Spanish, which I ask you to study closely. You will see from it what the point was for Bakunin. A secret society within the International, in order thus to get it in his hands. Fortunately the plan was thereby revealed, and in good time. This business will be Bakunin's ruin. The General Council will publish on Tuesday** an address on the matter which at the same time will arraign the Spanish Federal Council, which includes 5 members of the Alliance.¹²³

I am in a great hurry—I must edit this address, and I have a terrible lot of other work to do for the International for the Congress.

Yours,
F. E.

Translated from the German

FREDERICK ENGELS
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

London, August 5, 1872

Dear old chap,

That the Congress is meeting at The Hague is above all the fault of your unfortunate disagreement over the revi-

* P. Lafargue, "To the Members of the International in Spain".—*Ed.*

** August 6.—*Ed.*

sion of the constitution*; we could not foresee what it would lead to and had no time to lose. But henceforth we must also bear in mind the following:

1. We did not overestimate the strength of the Jurassians. According to their own figures and subscriptions they number 294 members, including the Longemalle Section with 62 and 74 newly joined engravers and *guillocheurs*** . But we know their manoeuvres. *Every one* of the 62 Longemalle members would have obtained a mandate forged in some way, and added to them the men actually from the Jura, say a dozen, plus some 20 Italians and 6 Spaniards, making a total of more than enough. In these circumstances the Belgians would in part have gone over to them as well.

2. As regards the forged mandates, they could have got some 30-40 from America (from the Woodhullians); about a dozen from here (from the sections which, never having belonged to the International, formed the Universal Federalist Council ¹²⁴); 50-60 from Schweitzer's German supporters who had directly joined the Council; and with a little skill a good number from Spain too. I shall speak just now of Italy. Therefore all chances were to hand that at the checking of the mandates, which in this case decides everything, the societies which want to *force themselves* on to the International but have never belonged to it, would have been admitted with a majority, particularly when one considers how good-natured the workers are mostly in such things and how it happened at all previous Congresses. And we must not forget that among us also there will be enough sections which are not up-to-date with their subscriptions and will therefore have to be lenient in their voting so as to obtain lenience for themselves. And if that happened all that would remain for us to do would be to get our hats and withdraw from the International.

3. You underestimate the strength of the Alliance in Italy. In the whole of Italy we have only one section, that of Turin, which we know to be good; perhaps Ferrara too. Milan, since Cuno's departure, is entirely in the hands of the Bakuninists; Naples has always been so; and the Fascio Operaio in Emi-

* See pp. 34-42 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** Chequer workers.—*Ed.*

lia, Romagna and Tuscany are entirely in Bakunin's hand. These people form an International of their own, have never applied for admission and never paid subscriptions, but they act as though they belonged to the International. Directed by members of the secret Alliance, they are very numerous and at a rate of 1 delegate for 50 members they could easily elect 40 delegates, 15-20 of whom would be sent from there, the rest being members of the Longemalle Section to whom blank mandates would be sent.

4. The Belgians will not flood The Hague, they grudge paying. And besides, the last Congress in Brussels proved that when the decisive moment arrives they are not all that bad.¹²⁵ They have decided that only formally recognised sections may be represented at The Hague, and that is the main thing.

5. Lastly you should have read Schwitzguébel's hypocritical letter of complaint in which he laments the fact that the Congress is not taking place in Switzerland and in which there are already faint hints of a future protest.* That, if anything, proves to me that we acted correctly.

At any rate, pack up and come there. You will see that things are going well. But *only if*, on our side, we muster all our forces. The others** are fanatics, they have various rich bourgeois behind them to do the paying while they themselves have no outlays the whole year round.

If our friends were but half so active as theirs, things would not have reached such a pass. Sorge and Dereure are coming from America, the others (the Woodhullians) are sending 3 delegates, including a missy. Of course we shall all come. See to it that the Swiss do not shy at the costs this time and are decently represented. And particularly the German Swiss.

Incidentally, tomorrow we are going to hurl a bomb which will spread no small scare among the Bakuninists; to be precise, a public statement on the Alliance of Socialist Democracy which still continues to exist as a *secret society*. We have obtained at last the necessary material and documentary evidence from Spain and are also attacking at once

* See pp. 377-78 of this volume.—Ed.

** The Bakuninists.—Ed.

the Spanish Federal Council, of which 5 are members of the Alliance.* The Madrid *Emancipación* already opened fire a week ago last Saturday and there's going to be a jolly to-do. You will naturally get a copy for the *Égalité* at once. The filthy dogs imagined that with their secret organisation they would be able to rule the whole International from Locarno.** But this exposal is going to be their undoing and if Switzerland and Germany do their duty to any extent so that the men of the Alliance do not get a majority all the same *through the negligence of our friends*, the whole caboodle will go up and we shall at last have tranquillity.

I shall pass on your instructions to Frankel and Lessner tomorrow.

Vaillant is still living a quiet life pursuing his chemistry and his revision of the Rules¹²⁶ in which he is so interested.

Marx sends greetings.

Yours,
F. Engels

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF CARL SPEYER
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

New York, August 5, 1872
76 South Fifth Avenue

Dear Marx,

I wanted to enclose a few lines to you with my official letter, but other written work prevented me.

All of us here would like to be able to attend the Congress and to see what faces the American delegates of different shades will make there.

We are eager to know whether the Congress at The Hague will be worthy of the International Working Men's Association and will cook the goose of those humbugs and the empty-headed Frenchmen here. I have fulfilled my duty as regards making out a mandate for you and as regards the three man-

* "To the Spanish Sections of the International Working Men's Association".—*Ed.*

** Where Bakunin was living at the time.—*Ed.*

dates from Chicago, but I admit to you that I did it only by way of precaution; at the bottom of my heart I cannot believe that Bakunin's clique will be in a position to play the trick we fear on us. I was and am still today in favour of making out these mandates because I know by experience that the enormous sacrifices a Congress costs can only bear fruit if the German element is sufficiently represented; this is a fact, we can say so boldly without any prejudice to our internationalism; when many of our most sensible people here say that earlier Congresses encouraged a lot of trash, I cannot deny they are right, and the fault lay precisely with the German element being insufficiently represented.

I should have liked to send you a copy of the official report of our Congress,¹²⁷ but we appointed three persons to draw it up at the Congress who were formerly on the enemy's side and are therefore not accustomed to work as we had to in the provisional Federal Council; in a word, the report is not yet ready.

What does Eccarius say about the latest events here? Has he not got rid of some of his obstinacy? Eccarius has had his views poisoned owing to his correspondence with gossips and political hagglers here, and incidentally we can easily prove to him, and it is to be hoped that Sorge will do so, that he has sunk to the level of a common rogue; if I were a delegate to the Hague Congress I would move that he should be expelled. I believed the chaps whom we threw out of our organisation were capable of a lot of things, but not of the colossal swindle they tried to put over in respect of their Philadelphia Congress.

Not a single paper published anything about that Congress, simply because it did not exist, and then all of a sudden on the Monday following it the *Herald* published the Report of the Philadelphia Congress¹²⁸ as it was read in the Federal Council in New York: 23 representatives of sections, it said at the beginning, the same as at our Congress; this report even contained certain resolutions adopted by us. Probably the whole clique consists only of their Federal Council. How I pity the Congress if it has to listen to the long-winded chatter of that buffoon West....

Something else now occurs to me: you, as No. 1 Section's delegate, might be interested to know that we do not agree

with the composition of the General Council. In the future no delegates from branches should have the right to speak at the General Council without the latter's consent, and in any case they may not vote; such delegates are of no use at all and should be kept away.

Greet Jung, Pfänder, Dupont, Applegarth, etc. from me, and your family too, and let us hear from you soon.

I wish you all besides to have plenty of patience at the Congress and hope that you will send packing all intriguers, here as over there.

Cordial greetings.

Yours,
C. Speyer

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF NIKOLAI DANIELSON
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

St. Petersburg, July 20-25
(August 1-6), 1872

Is it confirmed that the Congress is to be held at The Hague? Would you be so kind as to send me the programme of it.

Translated from the German

FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hoboken, August 6, 1872

Dear friend Marx,

I hope to be at your place in a fortnight with Dereure, and leave details till then. Today I am sending you one copy of the *Herald* for August 5 with the latest nonsense of the Spring Street clique. We are having great difficulty in getting money for the expenses, since Section No. 2 (French) of New York, numerically the strongest, is seceding. For that reason it has been expelled.

I shall bring mandates with me for you and Pfänder and 3 blank ones *in case of need*, and, besides, some money for the General Council.

The *World* for August 3 carried a very mean item from London on the General Council and yourself. I shall bring it with me.

Since I have no other safe address I have taken the liberty to have all letters for me sent to your address.

S. Borkheim has not replied to me for nearly six months, and for that reason I must ask for another favour, namely to find decent, inexpensive lodgings for Dereure and me. For this purpose I shall wire you from Liverpool or Southampton and will you be kind enough to wire back immediately *the exact address of our lodgings in London*. That parasite West will leave next Sunday too.

Siegfried Meyer died on July 24 at Joliet, not far from Chicago, of lockjaw following a foot wound. A great pity!

Your sincerely devoted

F. A. Sorge

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF LUDWIG KUGELMANN
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hanover, August 6, 1872

In spite of my insistent request I have still received no reply to my letter to Hepner.

Lack of businesslike punctuality seems to be a notable defect of these gentlemen as far as I know them, with the exception of Bracke, from whose enclosed letter* you will see that I can get a mandate from Brunswick if need be.

You will no doubt note the offer made to you concerning the printshop.

If I can get accommodation there I shall leave tomorrow week for Norderney, where I intend to stay till the end of this

* See p. 413 of this volume.—Ed.

month, until I go to Holland. I think I shall be in The Hague on September 1.

If you know where you are going to put up there, I should be pleased to know in advance, for I would like to stay in the same hotel as you. If I find no accommodation in Norderney I shall inform you where I shall be staying.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

WILHELM FINK

TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

[Leipzig,] August 7, 1872

Dear Party Comrade,

As the Congress is approaching there is so great a demand for membership stamps and the Rules that I have sold out what I had. I should like, but cannot with the best will in the world manage to get some as quickly as I need them, nor can I have the Rules printed before we have set up our own printshop. For this reason I request you to send me at least 200, if possible 500 copies of the Rules and the same number of stamps to be returned in due course or against payment.

I also ask you to send me a receipt for payment of members' subscriptions to the amount of the cost of printing the Rules, in return for which I shall send you a receipt in full settlement of the bill for the cost of printing the Rules.

In this way the postage for sending money once in each direction will be saved.

Please oblige me by informing Citizen Marx of this and expediting the despatch of the above to me as much as possible. Please address the letter to my private address: Wilh. Fink, Hohe Strasse 4/0 and register it if enclosing stamps or anything else which I and not Stieber am to receive.

Greetings and handshake.

W. Fink

I am applying to you because I think you receive letters sooner than Marx because of Stieber.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

PAUL LAFARGUE
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Lisbon, August 8, 1872

My dear Engels,

Laura and I have now been in Portugal for eight days. The journey was a trifle long, a trifle hot and a trifle arduous: thirty hours in the train in heat that would have hatched out lice on a pane of glass. Fortunately we had bought an enormous *sandia* (water melon) weighing 18 lbs. which slaked our thirst in the La Mancha desert, the country of Don Quixotes and windmills. Once we were in Lisbon we felt capital. Thanks to the sea, the climate is rather cool, and Lisbon is the most picturesque city we have ever visited. Its inhabitants are exquisitely kind and courteous. Our people here with whom we are in touch are charming and extremely intelligent. Portuguese is much like Spanish: Laura and I talk to them in Spanish and they talk to us in Portuguese, sometimes we make howlers, but we succeed in understanding each other. During the last few days in particular, our ears begin to grow accustomed to the *çã*-s and *sh*-s which grace all Portuguese words, making the language sound like a perpetual whistling.

Our people here could not be more favourably disposed; they welcomed me in the most affable way and, by the same token, they are very ill-disposed towards the Alliance. The Portuguese Internationalists began by being Alliancists before they were Internationalists. Tedeschi told me that they had looked upon the Alliance as a bridge leading to the International. Morago, with a view to exercising control over Portugal, organised a group of the worst kind in opposition to these people; that is what has given rise to their hatred of the Alliance. However, they have seen through the Jura intrigue and have emphatically refused to publish anything against the General Council. There is a letter here from Papa Bakunin which I have not read wherein he applies himself to attacking the General Council. I shall do what I can to have it sent to you in London; Mora also has a letter

* The letter bears the following note by Engels: Lisbon, August 8, 1872, P. Lafargue.—Ed.

from Bakunin, but I do not know whether he will wish to let you see it. Mora is a rum customer.

They will not be able to send a delegate from Portugal, but I have advised them to send an endorsement of the organisational plan published in *La Emancipación* and at the same time to ask for the dissolution of the Alliance and the expulsion of all its members, though leaving the members with the option of rejoining the International after publicly denouncing the Alliance and undertaking never again to belong to a secret society. This is the same proposition that *La Emancipación* is going to make. I am trying to put another idea into their heads, namely, that you should be empowered to represent them at the Congress, where it would probably be better if you figured as the Portuguese delegate rather than as a member of the Council.

The question of politics is a great problem to them here. All Portuguese politics are confined to, as they say, *palaciana** politics, in which it would be most unwise to involve the working class. There are some men with the gift of the gab in the International who long to become deputies and form a Socialist Party in Parliament, and these men are trying to use the International purely for their own personal ends. In consequence, the better elements here are opposed to any political action before the working class is finally constituted. Since the International cannot come out into the open, they have set themselves to organise resistance groups, which has greatly annoyed the politicals; that is why I wrote an article, called "Working-Class Solidarity", for *Pensamento*, which they liked very much. I look to you to set them on the right path and have offered them your collaboration, which they accepted with enthusiasm. The *German Social-Democratic* Party worries them a good deal here and the politicals, in opposing them, are always citing this Party to them. I told them I would ask you for a history of that Party's organisation, which can serve as a model to constitute their political party; I shall ask Mesa to translate these articles for *La Emancipación*, which would be a way of helping forward the International on the peninsula. We shall be seeing each other at the Congress and talk the matter over. These

* Backstage.—Ed.

articles could be written in French, which they understand well.

França, one of the best people here, tells me that he has written to you twice without receiving any answer.

Do not reply to me, for it may be that before my letter reaches you I shall have left Lisbon.

Our love to the whole Marx family and your own.

Ever yours,
P. Lafargue

What do you think of *Emancipación*? Has it caused ructions in the Bakuninist camp?

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Brussels,] August 9, 1872

Dear Citizen Engels,

Your last letter was of the 18th ult.** and in spite of the promptness with which I always reply to you I have had no news from you since. I ask for nothing better than to keep you informed of what goes on in Belgium and on the Continent and which is of a nature to interest you, but in order not to write useless letters it is preferable for you to apply to me for all you want to know. This time I am going to make an exception and am sending you a bundle of information.

Hins has been in Brussels for a few days for the purpose of calling in the money. He can neither live nor die in Verviers and is leaving soon for Russia, where they are looking for a place for him. In Verviers he wanted to direct the Association a little but he does not seem to have succeeded, so it is not certain whether he will go to the Congress as a delegate.

* The letter bears a note by Engels: Brussels, August 9, 1872, Glaser de Willebrord. Answered 19/8.—*Ed.*

** Engels' letter to E. Glaser of July 18, 1872, has not been preserved.—*Ed.*

De Paepe is now a doctor of etc., etc., etc. He is going to marry a poor young lady and he himself is as poor as Job. He does hardly anything for the Association and says that he is neither willing nor able to go to The Hague. Brismée says the same.

Roch Springard will go as a delegate from the Jemappes Section and at his own expense. He is the son of a rich municipal councillor.

There is little to say about the others. Only the associations (workers' corporations) intend to send delegates.

It appears that the situation is the same with the *French Brussels Section*, which seems to me to be extremely imprudent.

I have sent you, and also Marx, a number of newspapers in which the forthcoming Congress was mentioned. I learned at the editorial office of *l'Indépendance* that according to information received by the correspondent at The Hague the Dutch government had no intention of hindering the assembly of the delegates. If we are to believe *la Chronique*, the Belgian government exchanged numerous communications with the Dutch government concerning the Congress.

On the other hand it is claimed that the local authorities have rented all the halls which could have served as a venue in the belief that this would prevent the holding of the Congress. In any case, it is certain that a place will be hard to find. You must know whether the Amsterdam Section has managed to find premises, for it appears that there is no section at The Hague. Here they are seriously blaming the General Council for not having consulted the Belgians; the Antwerp Section, they say, could have been entrusted with the necessary measures. Has anything been done? Who will receive the delegates?

Another remark: at this time of the year all the hotels, every nook in The Hague is occupied by people who come to take the waters at Scheveningen; where will the delegates—who are nearly all hard up for money—find lodgings in a city where the cost of living is high in ordinary times?

Jung has written to me that he will not go to the Congress, and Applegarth informs me that he is ill. Tell Dupont that I have instructed my solicitor to take the necessary steps to

obtain a patent and that I shall let him know the cost in a few days.

When we have finished with everything concerning the Congress I shall take the liberty to talk with you about the small matters of

Your devoted

E. Glaser de Willebrord

Do not forget to remember me to the Marx family.

First published in Russia

Translated from the French

HUGO HELLER
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

2 Rose Villas
(or 13 James Street)
Oxford
August 9, 1872

Dear Doctor,

Please send me the kindly promised pamphlets (Rules, etc.) of the International and make use of me to enclose letters to all cities in Europe. I have correspondents, etc., in all the larger cities, mainly in Paris, Berlin, Leipzig, Ghent, Brussels, Turin, Rome, and I write almost every day. Everything will be safe.

Please remember me to Mr. Hales.

Yours devotedly,

H. Heller

(Delayed)

P. S. As I happened to hear on my return journey that the Dutch know about the Hague Congress (?) and are not to be trusted, I warned Herr Eichhoff to be cautious in a letter enclosed in another to a man who is devoted to me, to whom I promised to write. I used only allegorical expressions which only H[err] Eichhoff can understand.

H. H.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

ADDRESS OF THE ZURICH SECTION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

TO ALL GERMAN-SPEAKING SECTIONS OF SWITZERLAND*

Dear Comrades,

The efforts of the Zurich Section to form a Swiss national union embracing *all* the Swiss sections and existing federations—these efforts, which are expressed in our proposals, encounter resistance from our Romance comrades. The Romance Federation, whose seat is in Geneva, and the Jura Federation, whose seat is in Sonvillier, have, it is true, neither the one nor the other officially pronounced themselves, but the tension between these hostile brothers has mounted to such an extent recently that at present union is as good as impossible.

It is just as impossible as useless to present these disputes in their origin, their causes and all their unedifying details, and indeed all the more as questions of persons and of principles are so involved here that it is almost impossible for an unprejudiced person to disentangle them. For the rest we feel that we are by no means authorised to judge of this matter. That is the business of the next General Congress, whose decisions, it is to be hoped, will be complied with.

From what has been said our German-speaking comrades will see that union with only *one* of the mutually hostile federations, for example with the Romance, would at the most draw us also into this unedifying struggle, since by uniting with one party under the present conditions we should be automatically obliged to form a front against the *other* party. Such an action would completely prevent us from further spreading our principles and our organisation in German Switzerland.

The German-speaking sections in Switzerland must therefore strive to unite independently of this party dispute into a single language group. It is to be hoped that we shall thus succeed in forming a strong branch of our great Association which will one day be able to bring the hostile brothers together again.

* The document bears an oval stamp with the inscription: Internat. Arbeiterassociation. Sect. Zürich.—Ed.

The German Section in Geneva, on the proposal of our old unflinching union member Joh. Ph. Becker, called on the Zurich Section "to appoint as soon as possible a provisional committee able to assume the leadership of the German-speaking group". The Zurich Section, at its meeting of July 27, decided to accede to this call.

Informing the Sections of this, we add that this provisional committee will take up its functions unless the majority of the Sections object to it within fourteen days.

At the same time we request all the Sections to let us know as quickly as possible what changes are proposed in the draft Rules of the German language group which we have distributed. As soon as the question of the Rules is settled, we shall begin public propaganda with the publication of the Rules in our press organ.* We further request that in the reply the exact number of members be given.

Now we still have one matter to mention. The Basle Section informs us that it would readily unite with other Sections to send a delegate to the General Congress at The Hague. Unfortunately the Zurich Section is unable, after its numerous recent outlays, to contribute much to this, the more so as our printed organ again requires assistance in the near future. However we are perfectly prepared to do our share if all the German-speaking sections unite for this purpose and some contributions can be obtained from societies with similar convictions to ours. In this connection we observe that the Geneva German Workers' Association proposed at the rally of German Workers' Associations in Switzerland that our Citizen Becker should be sent to The Hague. It is true that the German Workers' Associations will probably reject this proposal, but it would all the same be possible for some of these Associations to join us if we delegate our tested Becker. We request an early reply on this score as well. The Congress begins on *September 2*.

Dear Brothers, consider these matters and give us an answer soon. May your replies provide the foundation for a greater unity of our Sections and lead us a small step further towards the high objective for which we struggle.

* *Tagwacht*, a newspaper.—Ed.

With fraternal greetings.
In the name and on behalf of the Zurich Section

The Correspondent

Hermann Greulich

Neumünster-Zürich
August 9, 1872

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

NORTH AMERICAN FEDERAL COUNCIL
TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION IN LONDON *

Hoboken N. J.,
131 Garden St.
August 9, 1872

TO CITIZEN LE MOUSSU,
CORRESPONDING SECRETARY FOR AMERICA

You have received my letter dated July 16th,** I hope. Today I have to inform the General Council that Section No. 2 (French) in New York City is excluded from the North American Federation for this reason:

The first Congress of the I.W.A. in North America, on which the said section had been represented by two delegates, passed a resolution according to which two delegates should be sent to the General Congress at The Hague, Holland, at the expense of the Federation.

Section No. 2 afterwards declined to pay its share of the money due to the Federation to meet the expenses of the said delegates.

Art. A para. 4 of the Rules and Statutes of the American Federation adopted by the last Congress, of which I send you one copy in German, the English ones are in printing, invested the power in the Federal Council to exclude a section

* The letter bears an oval stamp with the inscription: North American Council of the International Workingmen's Association.—*Ed.*

** See pp. 381—82 of this volume.—*Ed.*

from the Federation without depriving the section of its international character. The Federal Council has done so and at the same time has instructed its delegates to refer the whole matter to the General Congress at The Hague.

By order of the Federal Council

F. Bolte, General Secretary

First published in Russian

Written in English

FR. J. BERTRAND
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

New York, August 10, 1872

Mr. Frederick Engels,

As the Congress of the International Working Men's Association of North America has proposed to individual sections to send mandates to European comrades in order thus to be represented at the General Congress, Section No. 6 of New York has unanimously decided to send credentials to you and to ask you to represent the section at The Hague if you consider this representation acceptable and necessary. The fact is that a great difference of opinion has been revealed here whether such a representation is acceptable, for which reason Section No. 6, moved by the desire to provide support for the General Council in the spirit of the decision taken by the Congress here on the subject, but at the same time being reluctant to commit a violation of the Rules, resolved to leave it to you to decide whether you wish to go to The Hague or not. The matter of the expenses will be settled by Mr. Sorge.

So that you should have some knowledge of the body which has appointed you as its representative, we here outline the history of the section for you.

Section No. 6 was founded on September 14, 1870, at the end of a general meeting of the local joiners' association. The purpose of this meeting was to ensure pecuniary and moral support for the workers' newspaper at the time, *Der*

* Page 4 of the letter carries calculations made by Engels.—*Ed.*

Arbeiter Union, which adopted the internationalist standpoint during the Franco-Prussian War and was therefore persecuted from all sides. However, during the proceedings it became clear that the patriotic tide was running so high that there could be no question of carrying the relevant motions, and as much depended on the success of this meeting, the newspaper had to be abandoned. For this reason the most progressive men immediately proceeded to found an association, in order to have at least a meeting place for the future. This association was given the name "Social-Democratic Workers' Association". The meetings of this association were and still are today used for mutual information, discussions and reports on economic and social subjects. When a central committee for sections of the International was formed here, the association declared itself to be a section of the International and was given No. 6, which designation it still preserves. The name "Social-Democratic Workers' Association" was dropped in accordance with the decision of the 1871 London Conference.¹²⁹ Today the section numbers 104 members, only 63 of whom, however, we officially report, since the others are in arrears with their subscriptions. Officially the section took part as a Social-Democratic Workers' Association with other associations in holding an anti-war meeting in November 1870,¹³⁰ as was reported at the time in the *Volksstaat* and the *Vorbote*; otherwise it only had the opportunity to call and hold a few mass meetings with other sections for propaganda purposes. On the other hand, most of its members were engaged in the Eight Hours movement as belonging to trade unions.

As for the section's view in respect of our organisation in general and of the questions on the agenda of the Congress in particular, it adheres to the resolutions taken by the American Congress and asks you to act in union with our Federation's delegates, Mr. Sorge and Mr. Dereure. However, we permit ourselves to draw special attention to one point which we, from our experience, consider very important. The General Rules leave very vague the notions of branch society, group, branch, local committee, and so on; secondly, it has turned out that the confusion is considerably increased by lack of precision in translating these words into the different languages. It is therefore the section's wish that the or-

ganisation should be simplified in this direction and any ambiguity avoided for the future by using the same words in all languages and countries. The American organisation seems to us to be very appropriate and simple.

With social-democratic greetings

Fr. J. Bertrand,
Temporary Corresponding Secretary

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

L. DAGOBERT
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

New York, August 10, 1872

My dear friend Jung,

I seize with pleasure the opportunity offered by the passage through London of another friend, Citizen *Sauva*, to talk with you mentally for a while.

Within the limits of my poor intelligence, I see, my dear Jung, that the decisions of the Congress will result either in the death sentence for our Association or in its real strengthening. What role are the members of the General Council going to play? Unfortunately I am not very certain on this point. I trust you, Jung, I am convinced that you will always remain loyal to the principles that I was so happy a year ago to hear you expound. But you are not the only one! Others perhaps, thinking that they are in the right, will try to impose on our Association a direction which will overwhelm our common enemies with joy in presenting to them the sight of new dissensions. I am giving you no advice, but I am afraid! I still take a gloomy view of everything! Therefore I am requesting you to do all you can—and you can do much—for the success of our cause. Be the same with *Sauva* as you are with me, whom you call your friend; explain to him the situation in Europe, what you want to do, and listen to his remarks; he is very much like you, sincere, loyal, too much perhaps? In a word he is one of the most dedicated that I know. That is all I can tell you, my dear Jung; I thought I had *a lot to say to you*, but I cannot find words to express it.

If it can be of any pleasure to you, you can speak of me with *Sauva*, he knows me well enough to inform you on all points.

My respects to Mrs. Jung, my love to your children and to all the friends in London,

and to you, my dear Jung, a sincere handshake from your friend

L. Dagobert

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

FROM A LETTER OF LUDWIG KUGELMANN
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hanover, August 11, 1872

The day after tomorrow I am going to Geestemünde and on Wednesday (the 14th inst.) to Norderney, where I shall expect at the *address of the chemist Ommen* your reply, which I request most urgently.

At first I had intended to go to Scheveningen and to wait there for your arrival. To an inquiry concerning accommodation I received the enclosed reply from Dr. Mess, which I am sending you because of his remark about the overcrowding of hotels in The Hague. Perhaps you know whether one can get private lodgings there and through whom—for payment, of course.

Hepner wrote me that he would send me a mandate in time. According to the *Volksfreund** Bernhard Becker will be delegated to The Hague by Brunswick.

If Jenny has got married in the last few days I send her once more my heartiest wishes of happiness.

I shall stay in Norderney till about the 27th inst. and shall be in The Hague about September 1.

Cordial greetings to you all.

Yours truly,

L. Kugelmann, Dr.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

* The Brunswick *Volksfreund*.—Ed.

PAUL LAFARGUE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Lisbon, August 12, 1872

My dear Marx,

You must be furious with me for not having written to you more often; the only interesting things I had to write about concerned the affairs of the International in Spain and Portugal and I believed that in order to keep to the division of powers I should write about them to the secretaries of these two countries; and besides this political scruple I had this reason that Engels and you are the Siamese brothers of the International and that consequently writing to the one is writing to the other.

The preamble being ended I shall tell you that we shall leave Lisbon on the 16th or 17th for Liverpool, where we shall probably arrive on the 21st or 22nd; there we shall take a steamer for Belgium or Holland. As soon as I arrive at Liverpool I shall write to you to ask you for the address of the organisers of the Congress at The Hague. I have just received a letter from Madrid in which I am informed that Mora has been offered to be the representative *de las tres clases de vapor* (of the factory workers of Catalonia)¹³¹ and that he has accepted; the reasons given are that Mora enjoys the trust of the working class and is in a better position to judge the question of the Alliance.

You see that victory is entirely for us in Spain; the progress of the *Emancipación* must already have reassured you on this score. As for me, I shall be representing Portugal, with the imperative mandate to defend the organisation elaborated by the *Emancipación* and to demand of the Congress the dissolution of the Alliance and the expulsion of all its members, with the permission to rejoin the International after a public protest against the Alliance and the promise never to belong to any other secret society. Besides I shall have a petition from the Resistance Societies in Portugal asking the Congress for a federation of the Resistance Funds and the creation of an International Union of cigar-makers.¹³² I shall try to take from here the letter from Bakunin which

I had mentioned in an item in the *Emancipación*, so as to have at least one proof.*

I have just received a letter from Lachâtre, from which I copy out for you the following passage:

“When times are less fearful, after the siege at Paris has been raised, if Marx judges it opportune to have a newspaper published, I shall place myself at his disposal for this work and shall contribute half of the necessary funds.”

I don't know what you made poor Maurice take, but you seem to have driven him mad. If the Alliance men knew of that they would shout: there is the influence of the Great Chief.

It is a very long time since we had news of the family and of the Longuets: I hope the affair is settled, or at least very nearly so, and that we shall have the pleasure of seeing the young turtle-doves at The Hague, where we shall offer them our congratulations and our wishes for their future happiness. As for us, we are very comfortable in Portugal, and our health is good.

I see from Lachâtre's letter that the publication of the book** was not going very quickly and that it was the translator's fault. It is a great pity that at least one or two parts have not been published before the Congress, that would have had a great effect. But in any case the French translation will be welcomed with enthusiasm here in Portugal; opposite our house there is an English bookshop where to my knowledge there have been several requests for your works, in the belief that they had been translated into English. In Spain and Portugal the scientific language is French, so that your book will have a wide circulation.

Laura and I send our love to the whole family and to all our friends.

P. Toole***

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* The letter in question is probably that of Bakunin to Mora dated April 5, 1872. See: *The Hague Congress of the First International. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 637-39—Ed.

** Volume I of *Capital* in French.—Ed.

*** A nickname for P. Lafargue used in the Marx family.—Ed.

TH. REMY
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

Zurich, August 12, 1872

Dear Citizen Jung,

On the request of citizens Karl Bürkli and Greulich I am sending you the appended Italian document,¹³³ which arrived here today, so that you may communicate it to the General Council.

Permit me to add a few observations which are quite personal, although I am not alone in my way of seeing things.

I have not the slightest doubt that that declaration was instigated directly or indirectly by M. Bakunin; it is even his style, translated into Italian. I have been a member of the German Section in Geneva and one of the founders of the famous *Alliance*. With time I came to the conviction, like J. Ph. Becker, Th. Duval, Guétat, Rosetti and so many others, that M. Bakunin, whatever be his true motive, exerts influence which is baneful for the International, and I fought against him openly and energetically within the *Alliance* itself. Naturally I would consider the abolition of the General Council as a most disastrous measure for the whole of the International.

And yet I regret that I do not agree with the General Council on two points: its pamphlet on the *Fictitious Splits*, and then the choice of The Hague as the venue for the Congress.

As for the pamphlet, permit me to tell you that I have never understood its necessity or suitability. Bakunin had almost destroyed himself in Geneva; with your pamphlet you gave life back to him. I pass over the indirect accusations that you level against Bakunin himself; but you attack more or less all the former members of the *Alliance*. It would take too long to start a discussion here on the *Alliance*; only allow me to assure you that many devoted and tested men have been members of it, and that in the circumstances in which the International found itself in Geneva, there was a reason for the existence of a society of energetic and resolute socialists. But according to your pamphlet all those men were—for anybody who can read between the lines—

only fools and dupes of Bakunin or else traitors of the type of Alb. Richard and Co. Such an insinuation is neither fair nor apt. I do not wish to go so far as to say that your pamphlet raised an army for Bakunin, but it hardly increased the number of the General Council's friends, while it hurt the feelings of many sincere men. Bakunin pays you back with *German Jews* for the *Russian* that you inflict on him. I was not the only one to regret that the General Council let itself be carried away so far as to use such language.

Let us pass on to the venue of the Congress. There is no doubt that the General Council has the right to fix the venue where it thinks fit; but it will never be able to avoid criticism. This right, like any other, has its natural if not legal and explicitly stipulated, limits.

Why, it has been asked, should we not be convened in London, or at Inverness, or at John O'Groat's? The Federal Council had the right. But why, in the present circumstances, select The Hague? Do you know what they will say? They will say that in view of the great distance and the enormous expense it would be very difficult for the enemies of the General Council to be represented in sufficient numbers, whereas the General Council would probably be there *en masse*, with its supporters from German Switzerland, from Geneva, etc., and could arrange everything in its own way, almost in family. If you had selected Brussels, for example, or Basle, nobody could have attacked you, since congresses have already been held in those cities without any opposition being raised. If you feared the influence of the Bakuninists, I think you were doing them too great an honour. And perhaps—you still have time—perhaps you could still change and convene the Congress in Brussels. In the Zurich Section, to which I now belong, Citizen Artus, one of Bakunin's most fiery opponents, proposed that the General Council should be asked to abandon The Hague; admittedly most of our section voted *against*, but those who voted *for* do not like Bakunin any more than you or I do.

I hope, Citizen, that you will accept in a spirit of fraternity these lines, which have been written frankly and without the slightest pretension. The General Council, though it includes a good number of capable and even eminent men, is not infallible and will not take it amiss if it is informed

now and again of the point of view of its brothers on the Continent.

You are naturally too busy with the Congress for me to hope that you will answer me now. But if later you have the time and are willing to write me a few lines, it will be a great pleasure for me.

Meanwhile, I greet you fraternally.

Th. Remy

80 Limmat-Quai, Zurich

P. S. Excuse me for any errors in this letter which I wrote in great haste.

Do all these Italian sections really exist? Do they pay their subscription to the General Council? What is their total membership? Or perhaps they are imaginary sections? It would be good to know this.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

EDWARD JONES
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

107 Sanderson Street,
Miles Platting, [Manchester]
August 13, 1872

Dear Citizen Engels,

I have seen A. Davisson and left him my address; he promised to communicate with me if he heard of anything.

Dupont wrote to me and asked me to assist in forming a French Section in M.*; from whom will they get their recognition?

I suppose our Federal Council has paid in its subscription, if not it will not be legal for us to send delegates to the Congress. We have commenced to subdivide our members into different sections—is it necessary that each section should be acknowledged by the English Federal Council, or is it sufficient if they are recognised by the Council of the Manchester Federation? These questions are very impor-

* Manchester.—*Ed.*

tant. I cannot say how many delegates we can send; what do you think will be the expenses?

We are organising a demonstration to take place in the Hulme Town Hall on August 27.

Yours fraternally,
E. Jones

First published in Russian

Written in English

NIKOLAI UTIN
TO ELEANOR MARX IN LONDON

N. B.

No.7*

Confidential

Switzerland (Thoune)
August 14-19, 1872

My dear Sister,

Certainly there must have been something very abnormal for me to remain silent for so long, for indeed I have not written a thing for months, either to you or to our friend Engels, from whom I believe I have received two letters.**

Yesterday I received your letter*** addressed to Geneva, and to my very *great surprise* I had to conclude that you did not know anything of what happened to me; I thought as much, not having received a word of sympathy from you, my sister, in my sad predicament; nevertheless I thought that correspondence between London and Geneva, apart from me, was more frequent all the same! It is very sad, I see one can die or be assassinated without your being informed of it.

Well, my sister, we are getting pretty things from the Bakuninists. Listen and excuse the brevity of my account: I *am* still *suffering* a lot with my *eye* and this letter will take me several sittings to write. Now for the facts.

You know that I left Geneva to go at first to Zurich: 1st to consult the doctors, 2nd to have a look at the Zurich Section

* In Marx's handwriting.—Ed.

** These letters from Engels to N. Utin have not been preserved.—Ed.

*** Eleanor Marx's letter to N. Utin has not been preserved.—Ed.

(a very poor and weak section which has been unable to recruit any workers!). Hardly arrived and settled in Zurich and returning home *by chance all alone and without a revolver* at 11.30 p. m. on **June 18**, I was attacked by *eight individuals*; I tried to defend myself against the first assailant and pushed him aside, thinking he was a drunkard or a German student who had *mistaken me for somebody else*, and I had set off again towards my hotel (the Hotingerhof) when I received a hail of blows on *my head* from behind on both sides; the struggle lasted a few minutes, but what can you do in the dark alone against eight when you can't even see them; they succeeded in shoving me towards a *heap of stones* near a canal under construction and there I received a stone on the forehead, which injured my *right eye* and my nose; really, I was about to lose consciousness and that was the moment my assailants were waiting for naturally to murder me, when fortunately four German students arrived on the scene and my assailants took flight!

I was escorted by my German *rescuers* back to my friend Artus's, where I remained for a whole week in bed under the care of two *eye-doctors*,* who managed to save my eye, but ... not *entirely*; my right eye (it was the *better* of the two) has suffered internal damage and this cannot be cured, so that I shall always be in danger of losing my eye as the result of an effort, excessive fatigue, a shock, or a blow! At present it hurts me' greatly, the pupil is dilated, producing a haze—that is the result of the blow after seven *weeks* of uninterrupted treatment by all possible means.

Meanwhile, only a few days after this occurrence, I was obliged to rise from my bed to be present with my wife** at the *death* of my *eldest* brother, an *ex-professor* of the St. Petersburg University, who came to Zurich to die of cancer of the lungs; my other brother, the younger one, Eugene, a friend of Johannard's, is threatened with court proceedings for a *duel* in which he killed on the spot his opponent,*** an official in literature, over some political case in which my brother was the lawyer for the defence of a young man con-

* Erisman and Horner.—*Ed.*

** Natalia Utina.—*Ed.*

*** Zhokhov.—*Ed.*

demned to be deported for spreading proclamations, and in which my brother's opponent played a dubious role!...

And now, who was behind this attempted murder? Were they agents of the Russian government, for example? No, my dear sister, they were agents of *Bakunin*—I am telling you so and authorise you to repeat it anywhere. Those assassins, when they attacked me, shouted insults at me—in *Russian*, and with a *bad Russian pronunciation*,—they were *Serbs*; my witnesses, the German students, recognised *one* of them; others had already seen this band watching out for somebody (me) since 10 p. m. near the place where the scene occurred; still others have *positively* assured me that an individual, *claiming to be a Pole named Turski*, was one of my *aggressors*; this Turski related all the details of the assault to somebody in such a way that it will be difficult for him to deny that he took part in it. Now this *Turski* is one of the three *signatories* of the Rules of the Slav Section in Zurich (not recognised).¹³⁴ This same individual went this winter to *Munich* with a special authority to found a *separatist* Slav section there too; I was informed of this by a young Pole, who wrote to me that this Turski had insulted *Marx* and me at a preparatory meeting, wishing to convince his listeners that the International was directed by *Jews* (a theme which Bakunin develops in his lampoon in the *Bulletin jurassien*). Turski did not succeed and returned to Zurich, where he is *well* known to all the Poles as a *blackguard*; I lodged a complaint with the Tribunal, though I do not think that the bourgeois will do anything for me. Meanwhile, Bakunin himself hastened to come to Zurich and goes walking in the students' district surrounded by precisely these Serbs and this Turski and other individuals whom the examining magistrate has reasons to suspect of being my assailants. There is no doubt either that *Alexandrov* played a big role in it (he is an individual who does nothing); he has been to Geneva and found it more convenient to go and set up a small *clandestine*(!) Russian printshop in Zurich, where some Serbs who are also presumed to be members of the band *work*(!) for him. This *Alexandrov* is also a member of the Nechayev-Guillaume-Bakuninist band and as such he bears me a terrible grudge. (Nechayev is also in Zurich now, but I know nothing definite about his actual relations with Ba-

kunin.) It is probable that Bakunin is there to direct some new trap; at the same time, as you will have easily realised by the *programme* published in the *Bulletin*, he has founded a dissident *Polish* section in Zurich, certainly with a view to the number of delegates to the Congress¹³⁶; it would be a good thing to ask for the names of the *Polish workers* and to obtain information about them from the Committee of the Zurich Swiss Section....

So there is the secret of my silence; it is only a few days since I was permitted to write and to read, and my most bitter regret is that the date of the Congress is so near. It is very possible that the Bakuninists attacked me and tried at least to blind me so that I would not be able to make the revelations against them promised in the private circular on the Nechayev affair. They have largely succeeded; I can no longer *dream* of *publishing* the pamphlet that I intended to write against them; there is no longer enough time either to print it or to spread it before the Congress; this is very sad, and here is what I propose to do: I shall make a *report* in *writing* to the General Council both on the split (its causes, its effects) and above all on the principal chief and motive force behind this split—Bakunin.... I stopped here two whole days ago; you see that it is very difficult for me as yet to write much. I shall try to be briefer.

I shall append to my report some documents on the Nechayev affair, Bakunin's role of initiator in it, and the close *connection* between the Russian affair, the Alliance and the present intrigues. Oh, if I had had the time I would have made an interesting pamphlet out of it! I shall see again how the best use can be made of the documents which I have in my possession: one of my friends has just communicated to me the most valuable documents: they are the programme and the *secret* rules of the *secret Alliance* organised by Bakunin in October 1869; in this programme one can see clearly all the stupidity and the villainy of this *Herostratus* of the social revolution and how he has decided to seize control of our International Association; I have no doubt that the documents will carry *great, decisive weight* in the struggle at the Congress; I am having them copied now and perhaps I shall send you the copy as early as *tomorrow*. But I demand the greatest discretion, that is to say, that you *will not breathe a word*

about them to anybody; you will hand them to your father* and it is to him and to Engels personally that I trust the secret that these documents come from *me*; later we shall see how we shall arrange this; meanwhile they can read them out to the General Council at a secret sitting and vouch *on their honour* that part of these rules was written by *Bakunin* with his *own hand*, another part by his wife,** a third by Mme Obolenskaya, and a fourth under Bakunin's dictation by one of my friends. You understand that it would be *scandalous* and *impossible* to denounce Mme Obolenskaya publicly (we would be accused of being Russian government informers), but it will suffice to know that Bakunin and his accomplices will be unable to *deny* these rules, for citizens Marx and Engels will declare that they are in possession of his *own writing*, which they will exhibit if necessary. For this purpose, if your father considers it necessary, I shall send him the original, that is to say the parts in the handwriting of Bakunin and his wife—but⁴ for that you must *copy quickly* what I send you and send it back, and then I shall send you the *original*, because I cannot relinquish everything at once. In general I demand also that the *copy* I send shall be *copied*, for it would be *impossible* for me to have the handwriting of the copy recognised by our enemies at the Congress, this writing being that of a person who would be seriously compromised if this indiscretion were committed. Lastly, I don't think it either urgent or necessary for anybody at all to know that these documents come from me—the General Council could very well receive communication of these documents from anybody, though of course in case of need I shall certainly not conceal the fact, the more so as I shall quote them in my Report. Finally, I trust your father and Engels, confident they will know how to do it in such a way that it will not appear to be a *personal* matter on my part, because thus the effect would be lost. I now need to know whether Engels has done anything on the Nechayev trial or not. Reply without delay. It is really terrible that the Congress is so near and I am deprived of] my sight for the moment; that is why I was desperate when I learned that the Congress had been fixed for

* Marx.—*Ed.*

** Antonina Bakunina.—*Ed.*

September 2, when I felt sure that it would not be before the 17th as always. I was distressed also, as were all our friends in Geneva and Zurich, that the General Council had selected *The Hague* and not *Geneva*: we would have been sure of victory in Geneva,—now I don't believe that the Geneva sections will send more than *one* delegate (instead of 20 at the least!), and I do not know who it will be. As for me, I shall not be at *The Hague*; neither my health nor my means allow me to think of it. It would require at least 300 francs, and I haven't got any; as for being nominated as delegate for Geneva, as there will not be more than one I would never have accepted, insisting that it should be a *worker*; and for the rest my absence from Geneva for these three months would alone be sufficient for me not to be delegated; finally, and this is the major reason, my throat is in a pitiful condition; I have been very near to making preparations for my journey *ad patres*; now I hope that I shall recover, but it would be *impossible* for me to speak at length and loudly and to bear the fatigues of the journey. Therefore it is not to be thought of, it is very sad for me; our meeting is thus put off perhaps till spring of 1873, unless I die or am assassinated before then.—Believe me, it is I who lose the most, I was thinking of it as a real feast to be able to see you all again at Geneva at this Congress, which will be decisive, and which, I think, will end in a *resounding split* within our Association rent by these wretches.—Oh, if this rending could be avoided, what would I not have given for that!—It will be sad, though in the final account those of the *workers'* groups which leave our Association to be taken in tow by adventurists worse than *agents provocateurs* will soon come back to us, disgusted with these schemers.

What the deuce! I can't believe my eyes. I have just been brought the *Journal de Genève* for Friday, August 16, where a report from Italy says word for word: The *Gazetta di Torino* reports on a congress of the *Italian sections* held at *Rimini*; a federation of the sections has been founded there; it has been declared necessary to abolish the *legal family* (Oh, Bakunin, you old idiot, I recognise you and shall find you again!), to abolish *the State*, etc., etc.; the *economic union* of the workers of the whole world has been proclaimed, and "all solidarity with the *Grand Council* of London for its

intrigues has been repudiated". Finally, an invitation has been extended to all European *revolutionary* sections to assemble at an international congress on *September 2 at Neuchâtel, Switzerland*.—What do you say to that? The correspondent says that the *Gazetta di Torino* had difficulty in obtaining this very accurate information, and you can be certain that these decisions have really been taken! Upon my word! It will seem strange to you, but I think it is urgent to explain the whole matter to ... *Garibaldi* and to press him to declare himself against these adventurers of the Bakuninist band; you would not believe what influence *Garibaldi's* word would have in such an affair.

You will tell me, won't you, in your letters what you think of all this and what our people intend to do in view of such an eventuality. Don't you think it would be better if the Congress could be put off for two weeks, under the pretext that the General Council is waiting and gives the federations another fortnight to complete the *programme* of the Congress? Who knows, that could be a good thing; the *infamous* resolutions of the separatists would then be known and that would stimulate the efforts of the sections to send delegates to the true Congress? Though on the other hand this spontaneous postponement could also irritate some sections. I beg your pardon for these irresolute reflections, they are the effect of my present isolation from all matters. Soon I shall return to Geneva after finishing my throat treatment here and I shall remain there as long as my health permits.

Now I am at the waters at a little place in Switzerland where I remain unknown to everybody; as for you, I ask you to address your reply to my friend, M^{me} Olga Levashova, c/o Frau Wittwe Luginbühl, Aeschi bei Thoune (C^{on} Berne), *Switzerland*, and that is all. Madame will send the letter on to my residence as soon as she receives it. I ask you to keep this address carefully and not to communicate it to anybody at all. Anybody can write to me at Geneva, from whence letters will be forwarded.

I must tell you as well that I probably did not receive one of your letters—you say you asked me for my photograph, but I have not read that in any of your letters, from which I conclude that the letter went astray. The last I received contained an account of the attacks on Dupont, Johannard

and Serrailier, it arrived the day after my incident and my friend Artus read it to me as well as he could.

Do not forget to greet all our friends; my regrets to Citizen Lafargue and his wife, whom I do not know personally but whom I have learnt to esteem because of the attacks of the *Bulletin*.

I still have to tell about the *Combault* business. My dear sister, after mature reflexion I see that I cannot write to him directly about such a delicate affair in which the name of a lady who is dear to us is involved. First of all I do not know him well enough personally: I have only spoken to him one single time in 1868, at a dinner, in Malon's presence. Then Hedwig spoke very unfavourably to me about him (this must remain between us): it appears that at a popular meeting under the Commune Combault demanded the heads of Malon and other traitors and Mme Dmitrieva had the unfortunate idea of *defending* him! In general you must obtain very exact information about Combault: Longuet and Vaillant and Frankel must know him well. So all that I have been able to do is to enclose in this letter an *official* letter to *you* about Malon and Mme Dmitrieva; you may make any necessary use of it, that is, you may, if necessary and if you trust Combault, give it to him. I hope that satisfies you.

What else must I tell you? I am making very slow progress, it is now Monday the 19th, I have not been well these days: my eye and my throat have made a hellish agreement to prevent me from working....

This very minute I have received the *Tagwacht* and the protest of *Bakunin* and his confederates against *Nechayev's arrest in Zurich*—(the fact is true, I have received word from Zurich that it is *Nechayev* and not a *Serb* as *Bakunin* would have us believe who has been arrested). Just imagine that this miserable liar says in his protest: Mr. *Nechayev* is *completely alien* to us (!) and we *wish to have nothing in common* (!) with the principles rightly or *wrongly* (!) attributed to him; but inasmuch as he is persecuted by the Russian government which we hate, *he is sacred to us*.... So because this *assassin and thief* is persecuted by the Russian government he should be sacred to us! I regret that *Greulich* has been stupid enough (not the first time unfortunately) to speak of him in the *Tagwacht* as of a man of *politics*! ... But let us remain silent

about our colleagues' stupidities, otherwise we would never see the end of it.

Adieu, my dear sister, enclosed on a separate sheet is a personal request from me to you.

I wish you good health. If you go to *The Hague*, be generous, write me a few lines from there every day of the Congress to give me news of it. You cannot imagine how my heart will beat during those days for our Association... But I have said it, and it is decided—I *shall not be there*, it is absolutely impossible for me, so let us not speak of it any more.

Send me a quick reply to this long missive.... Adieu for the present, affectionate greetings to all your family. I am happy to learn from you that your father has at last decided to be present in person at this Congress.... I have no idea how matters stand at present in Geneva, but I regret that little *Reggis* will not be at the Congress—the Italian Section would certainly have given him a mandate, but money is lacking.

I shake your friendly hand.

Your devoted brother and ever

Nicolas

Translated from the French

FROM A LETTER OF KARL MARX
TO NIKOLAI DANIELSON IN ST. PETERSBURG

[London,] August 15, 1872

Today I write in all haste, for one special purpose which is of the *most urgent* character.

Bakunin has worked secretly since years to undermine the International and has now been pushed by us so far as to throw away the mask and *secede openly* with the foolish people led by him—the same man who was the manager in the Nechayev affair. Now this Bakunin was once charged with the Russian translation of my book,* received the money for it in advance, and instead of giving work, sent

* Vol. I of *Capital*.—Ed.

or had sent to Lubavin (I think) who transacted for the publisher* with him the affair, a most infamous and compromising letter.** It would be of the highest utility for me, *if this letter was sent me* immediately. As this is a mere *commercial* affair and as in the use to be made of the letter no names will be used, I hope you will procure me that letter. But no time is to be lost. If it is sent, it ought to be sent at once as I shall leave London for the Haag Congress at the end of this month.

Yours very truly,

A. Williams***

Written in English

FROM A LETTER OF ADOLF HEPNER
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON****

Leipzig, August 15, 1872

2. I received today your letter of 12th inst.***** with 528 marks, in which Marx writes:

"The address of etc. Ludwig, about whom I *wrote* to you, etc."

I have *not* received any letter in which there was anything about the above-mentioned Ludwig. No more have I received the address of the General Council on the *Bakunin* affair of which you informed me over a week ago. Since the above-mentioned letter nothing has at all arrived here from London.

3. Marx's letter of the 13th, in which the despatch of 500 copies of the Rules was announced, has just arrived. I shall get a Leipzig mandate for Vaillant. Whether I come to The Hague or not depends on whether the *Frank-*

* Polyakov.—*Ed.*

** See: *The Hague Congress of the International. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 363-65.—*Ed.*

*** Marx's secret pseudonym.—*Ed.*

**** The address on the envelope is: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London, N.W., and there are Leipzig and London post-marks. The back of the envelope bears in Engels' writing: Gustav Ludwig till October 8, 49 Waldstrasse, Darmstadt, then 62 Plöchstrasse, Heidelberg.—*Ed.*

***** The letter of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels to Hepner dated August 12, 1872, and Karl Marx's letter of August 13, 1872, mentioned lower have not been preserved.—*Ed.*

furter Zeitung accepts a report from me on the Congress, presuming that there is something to report; otherwise I have not got the fare. I dare not ask our Hamburg Committee to send me as a reporter of the *Volkstaat* due to the limited understanding of certain things that one finds in those people. And it suits me still less to have the associations collect the money for me, because a journey to The Hague is a pleasure trip for me, who have never been there, and there is nothing that I fear more than the reproach of amusing myself "on the workers' pennies".

I have written again to the Hamburg Committee that they should send Geib from Hamburg to the Hague, but the blighters are doing nothing. And yet the journey to our Mainz Congress (September 8) could very well be combined with the journey to The Hague.

4. We shall send Hirsch's article against Bakunin to the Hague in the form of a pamphlet.¹³⁶

Greetings.

Yours, A.H.

Did you get the letter from Copenhagen 3-4 weeks ago? I have no news at all from there now.

Published in the book
*Die I. Internationale in
Deutschland*, Berlin, 1964

Translated from the German

E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Brussels,] August 16, 1872

Dear Citizen Engels,

Please advise me what I must do with the pamphlets** which I have here; if they are to go to London, the simplest thing will be to send them to The Hague with the delegates,

* On the back of the envelope in Engels' handwriting is: August 16, 1872, Glaser de Willebrord, Replied August 19, and in Glaser's writing the address: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London.—*Ed.*

** The French edition of *The Civil War in France*.—*Ed.*

unless I go there myself, which will depend largely on the friends who come from London.

You know that *La Concordia* hall has been retained. I shall be obliged for a word from you.

Your very devoted

E. Glaser de Willebrord

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

BRUNO LIEBERS
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON *

The Hague, August 18, 1872

Citizen,

Although I understand very well that you have plenty of work because of the forthcoming Congress, I cannot help worrying you, if it can be called that, inasmuch as I do so in the interest of the Association.

Charles Rodenback (Monterossi) instructed me to let you know (he is a member of the Hague Section and was editor of *Toekomst* and *Vryheid*—Future and Freedom, which has ceased publication because of lack of participation) that he has been assigned to go to the Congress as reporter for the *Rappel*, and would therefore like to have a seat reserved near the Bureau.

I should like to get a reply from you on this matter, and now for something else.

You can form no idea what the conditions are in this country as regards the social movement—worse than stagnant, though it is true there has been a little more activity recently, but the bulk is so far behind that if one did not know that things are different in other countries one would be discouraged; it is as if everything here conspired to prevent the seed from sprouting; no cohesion, no solidarity, fear of authority, distrust, not forgetting phlegmatism; and then the Dutchman is so tied to his locality, you can say that most of them are born, go to work, marry and die in

*The letter bears an oval stamp with the inscription: International Werkliedenverbond, s'Hage.—*Ed.*

one town without ever leaving the town or their place of work; now there are indeed more people who subscribe to our principles but cannot become members for one reason or another. When one is alone one is laid open to everything; and then all the newspapers exert themselves to cast suspicion on our cause and there is not a paper to refute this; only in Amsterdam is there a paper, *De Werkman*, published by the workers, but it is too colourless to keep itself afloat by tacking about; the working man reads hardly anything, and moreover the people who founded the International here were not distinguished by a staid way of life; hence it is no wonder that the Section has no more than some 20 members. The difficulty now is to find a delegate who is familiar with the conditions in the country and *does not only speak Dutch*, since he would then not be understood, and moreover can take time off (there is also the risk of losing one's job). Considering all this, Monterossi pointed to Victor Dave, a former member of the *Vryheid* staff. But then a new difficulty arose: he is now in Belgium, and this would cost us 75 francs, and former committee members have left us debts but no money. Perhaps you could help the Section with an advance? In this respect too I am waiting for your reply.

Although we managed with difficulty to get a hall (by the way, it is not very large but we could not get any other), everything is being done to deprive us of it; the proprietor has been offered hundreds, but we paid about fourteen days ago, and the receipt, which was made out in the presence of five members, is in the name of our treasurer and Gerhard has it in his possession in Amsterdam. It says that the hall has been rented to him from September 2 to 8 inclusive and that 30 gulden has been paid for it.

You cannot imagine what lies the papers here foist on to the public, especially the Hague daily paper,* the organ of the Conservatives. It conjures heaven and earth and swears like a trooper, naturally with the idea of intimidating the high and mighty and inciting the scum of the people; among other things it published the following circular the day before yesterday under the title "Conspiracy":

* *Dagblad*. — Ed.

"Citizens,

"The Grand Council of the International, which has its seat in London, forced by the events which have taken place in France, is desirous of introducing important changes in the Rules of the Association and has decided to invite all the supporters of the great principle to hold a general Congress in The Hague.

"You are therefore requested to attend the meeting at which Citizen Karl Marx will report on the activity of the French, English, German and Russian divisions. Citizen Ranvier, who was a member of the Paris Commune, Andrieu, Bellay, Royer, and others will likewise speak. The sittings will be held in the Harmonie hall, Lombard-str., The Hague.

The Secretaries of the Grand Council:
Le Moussu, Royer, Ranvier for the French;
Endly, Lindray Haave for the English Sections;
 The General Secretary *K. Marx*"

The hypocrites also circulated for signature two addresses to urge the Minister to prohibit the Congress. But no fear need be entertained on this score, for the Conservative organ made the mistake of alleging that the Liberal ministry is on the same side as the International; the Liberal organs dispute this; they are naturally not for us either, but the organ close to the Ministry says that the holding of the Congress cannot here be prohibited, and as the Liberals do a lot of boasting about Dutch rights and freedoms, their papers say these would be violated by prohibiting the Congress and they flatter the workers, saying that they are too reasonable to side with the International. In a word, the International or its Congress is now the talk of the day.

If it is at all possible, try to arrange that you and the other delegates arrive here on Sunday the 1st, as far as possible at the "Rijnspoor" so that, everybody being free on Sunday, the reception committee, recognisable by a blue ribbon in the buttonhole, can be more numerous. The Rijnspoor station is also better built and one can go on to the platform, while the Rotterdam station is in Rotterdam, close to the harbour.

With social-democratic greetings.

Bruno Liebers.

Correspondent of the Hague Section

148 Jacob-Catsstraat, the Hague

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

WILHELM LIEBKNECHT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Leipzig, August 18, 1872.
F. Engels, Esq.,
122 Regent's Park Road, London

Dear Engels,

If possible, write something about the second edition of *Capital*.

The fact that the Bakuninists want to hold their separate congress in Neuchâtel simplifies and eases things very much. Thus they are only admitting their impotence and their tiny minority, whereas the tiniest minority would have been capable, if not of wrecking, certainly of plunging the Hague Congress in the most fatal confusion. We know that from Messrs the Schweitzerlings.

What is being done from our side—I mean from Germany—for the Congress, you know from others. I intend to send you a letter for the Congress which was written by Bebel and me *before our imprisonment* (this must be explicitly noted), which may perhaps be of use there.

And now a question: *Do you wish to be nominated at the next Reichstag elections in a good Saxon constituency?* And if so, are you prepared to deliver a couple of speeches? At least *to show* yourself to the voters once? I should like to get an answer *soon*, because this time we must begin our preparations in good time, and it is a good thing to get the people used to candidates who are far from them and personally unknown to them a considerable time before the elections. It is extremely regrettable that Marx no longer has his German citizenship; it would have been a great trick to send him to the Reichstag.

How about Jenny's wedding?

Address the reply to this letter to Hepner or my wife. Greetings to all.

August 18, 1872

* On the back of the letter there are pencil notes in an unknown hand: E. M. and L., *poste restante*, The Hague, Bruno Liebers, 148 Jacob-Catsstraat, and in Engels' hand: Hepner, address in The Hague, 18.8.1872.—Ed.

Please tell *Sorge*, who will visit you, he must *at all events* come here once. So far as I know he was not a Prussian *soldier* and therefore should have no fear of the Prussian police since he is an American citizen.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD IN BRUSSELS ¹³⁷

[London,] August 19, 1872

You probably already know that victory is henceforth assured. The Italian so-called Internationals held a conference at Rimini,¹³⁸ where representatives of 21 sections adopted the resolution: "The Conference, etc., etc."

It would be a good thing to publish that immediately in *l'Internationale* and the *Liberté*. Bakunin, whose style is recognisable in the whole of the document, seeing that the game is lost, orders a retreat along the whole line and leaves the International with his adherents. Happy journey to Neuchâtel!

But here is something still more ridiculous: out of the 21 sections which usurp the right to convene an international congress, only the Naples one belongs to the International. The other twenty, in order to preserve their autonomy, have continually abstained from taking any of the steps prescribed by the General Rules for obtaining admission. Their principle is: *L'Italia farà da sé**; they form an International outside the International. The other three sections which are in order with the General Council—Milan, Turin and Ferrara—did not send any delegates to Rimini.

So that side by side with the *Universal Federalist Council* consisting of societies which do not belong to the International and for that very reason claim to direct it, we now have an authoritarian congress convened by societies outside the International and claiming to lay down the law for it.

For the rest, this comes just in time to open the eyes of the Spaniards; there we have succeeded in rooting the

* Italy will go by itself.—Ed.

fox out his earth. We have forced the Alliancists themselves to publish the "top secret" Rules of the Alliance. The present Federal Council (of Spain) with 5 Alliancists out of 8 members, has been unmasked and publicly denounced as a traitor to the International. The struggle has broken out everywhere between the Alliancists and the Internationals. The oldest trade union in the world, that of the spinners and weavers of Catalonia¹³⁹ counting 40,000 members, has declared itself on our side and sent Mora, one of our men, to the Congress because, the mandate says, he knows better than anybody else what the Alliance is.* The Rimini resolution will be the end of the Alliance in Spain.

The Danes are sending 2 delegates, the Germans at least 5 or 6. Sorge and Dereure are on their way from America, the dissidents there want to send 3.

Lafargue is arriving with a mandate from the Portuguese.

There is yet another advantage. From now on all public scandal at the Congress will be avoided. Everything will be done with dignity in presence of the bourgeois public.

As for the Neuchâtel congress, it will be obvious that only the Jura Federation and a few Italian sections will be assembling there, it will be an absolute fiasco.

At last everything is going well, but that is no reason for somnolence. If the Internationals do their duty, the Congress at The Hague will be a great success, it will establish the organisation on a solid foundation and the Association will be able to develop again in tranquillity inside and face the enemies outside with renewed energy.

Translated from the French

BENJAMIN LE MOUSSU
TO THE SECRETARY OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD
OF THE NEWSPAPER *CORSAIRE* IN PARIS

London, August 19, 1872

Citizen,

Various French newspapers have published a letter reproduced in the *Corsaire*, according to which the General

* Mora did not attend the Hague Congress.—*Ed.*

Council of the International is said to be convening the members of the Association to a Congress at The Hague.

This ridiculous item originates neither with the General Council nor with citizens Karl Marx, Ranvier and Le Moussu, whose names it treacherously quotes; and I should be very much obliged to you, Citizen, if you would kindly deny its authenticity by inserting the present note in your paper. Greetings and equality.

Le Moussu

59 Charlotte St., Fitzroy, London

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

FROM A LETTER OF LOUIS PIO
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON ¹⁴⁰

Civil Prison of Copenhagen
August 19, 1872*

I very much regret that I cannot come to the Congress; I had very important proposals to make concerning the agrarian question. The 500 membership stamps which you sent me were confiscated by the police; nevertheless I shall see that the money is sent to you as soon as I am allowed to speak with the leader of the Section of the Association.¹⁴¹ Meanwhile I beg you to excuse me.

Published in the book:
Borge Schmidt, *80 Years of Louis
Pio Breve*, Kobenhavn,
1950

Translated from the Danish

JOSEPH DIETZGEN
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Siegburg, August 19, 1872

My dear Friend,

I rejoice in anticipation of seeing you again on September 2 at The Hague. Concerning the mandate I applied to Hepner, who has also promised to see about it.

* The letter bears the note in Engels' writing: Louis Pio.—*Ed.*

Shortly after receiving the *Splits** I also received the *Reply*¹⁴² from Geneva, so that I am fully informed. This time the splitters will be defeated. I learned with pleasure from you that after the Congress you wish to leave the General Council and devote yourself more to theoretical work.

So good-bye till The Hague. I shall probably find out more precisely from our *Volksstaat* where we shall meet there. Many cordial greetings to you and your family. Also special greetings from me to Miss Jenny and my sincerest congratulations on her forthcoming marriage.

Yours,
J. Dietzgen

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

CARL KLEIST
TO THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION IN LONDON

Cologne, August 19, 1872

After recruiting some 100 members in Cologne and nominating Rittinghausen as a delegate to the Congress at The Hague, we are endeavouring to attract workers likewise in the surrounding localities to the International Working Men's Association so that at least one more delegate from the Rhineland besides Rittinghausen can appear at The Hague. In Solingen there are prospects of about 100 workers joining, and they are disposed to delegate our friend Schumacher from here. If it can be managed it would be desirable that on Friday evening or Saturday morning at the latest 150 cards, Rules and stamps should be sent to Solingen at the address: Carl Klein, Goldstrasse, Solingen. So the things in question should be posted (by book post or letter) on Wednesday evening at the latest or Thursday morning at the outside. By parcel post the transport would probably take longer. If it cannot be done as desired the Solingen

* *Fictitious Splits in the International.*—Ed.

workers will elect Schumacher all the same. Then he can hand in the subscriptions at The Hague and receive the required material.

Be kind enough in any case to have news sent as soon as possible to the Solingen address.

The disposition of the population there is good. Here also the movement is making progress. We should have liked to see Germany better represented, but for the time being we must be patient in the hope that next year it will be better.

With social-republican greetings.

Carl Kleist,

Member of the International Working Men's Association

Published in the book:
*Die I. Internationale
in Deutschland*, Berlin,
1964

Translated from the German

NIKOLAI LYUBAVIN
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

St. Petersburg, August 8 (20), 1872

Dear Sir,

I heard through your correspondent* that you want to have the letter which I received two years ago concerning the Russian translation of your book. I consider that my personal account with Mr. Bakunin, who was entrusted with the translation, was closed with the letter which I sent him at the time, and to which he did not reply. If I nevertheless comply with your desire it is only because I consider that gentleman to be very harmful, and I hope that the business of the translation will contribute to his discredit. All the same I must already now observe that the proofs which I have in my possession against him are not of such an obvious nature as you perhaps believed. It is true that they are to this person's discredit, but they are not sufficient for his condemnation. This man has already caused

* Danielson. — *Ed.*

many misfortunes* and yet he still preserves a certain prestige in Western Europe and with our inexperienced youth,** so that it will be to the general advantage if he is discredited.

I am enclosing in this letter the one from the "Bureau" which you wish for, but only on condition that after having made the necessary use of it you send it back to me as soon as possible, since it could be useful here too. As for its use, I only observe that you are mistaken if you believe that my acquaintance with this gentleman was exclusively of a commercial nature. He can cause me great unpleasantness by publishing my letters to him; he has even expressly promised to do so if I have the matter of the translation raised again.

To make this matter clear to you I must relate the following.

I learned from my friend Negreskul, now deceased, in Berlin during the summer of 1869 that Bakunin was in great distress and needed help as soon as possible. At that time I still knew Bakunin only very little but considered him as one of the finest heroes of the liberation struggle, as many Russian students did or still do. I at once sent him 25 talers and at the same time addressed myself through a friend of mine in St. Petersburg to a publisher asking for work for Bakunin. It was decided to entrust him with the translation of your book. He was promised 1,200 roubles for the translation. According to his wish he was sent through me a whole package of books which he needed to help with the translation, and he was paid, also according to his request, 300 roubles in advance. On September 28 (1869) I, meanwhile having moved to Heidelberg, sent him this 300 roubles at the address of Charles Perron in Geneva, and on October 2, I received a receipt from Bakunin.

On November 2 Bakunin wrote to me from Locarno that he had now been freed from all superfluous political work

* It is now rumoured here that the assault on Utin in Zurich was perpetrated by a band on Bakunin's orders.—*Author's note.*

** Of which I have quite recently had occasion to be convinced.—*Author's note.*

and would begin the translation "tomorrow". The whole of November went by, and I did not receive a single sheet of translation from him. Then at the end of November, or more probably even at the beginning of December, I asked him, as a result of the letter from St. Petersburg, whether he wished to translate or not. Unfortunately I did not keep any copy of that letter and I cannot say exactly what I wrote then. As far as I remember, my friend in St. Petersburg, through whom I had communicated with the publisher, wrote to me that if Bakunin did not wish to translate, he should say so frankly instead of procrastinating, and that as for the 300 roubles, they could reach an agreement on that. I wrote that to Bakunin, and received an answer on December 16. He began this letter with the explanation that he had not written for so long (the last letter I had received from him before that had been written on November 2) "partly" because I had been rude to him (in regard to another matter, not the translation). He went on to write: "How could you imagine that once I had undertaken this work and even received 300 roubles for it in advance, I would give it up?" He affirmed that he had based his budget for the whole year on this work. Circumstances quite beyond his control had prevented him from making a serious start on the translation before the beginning of December; and secondly, the work he had undertaken was much more difficult than he had previously believed. Then he mentioned various difficulties of the translation. I shall quote one of them to you, because I strongly suspect that in this Bakunin was lying. He quoted the sentence from your book: "Value is a clot of labour" and said: "Marx was only joking. By the way, *he admitted it to me himself*". He was hoping to have the whole translation finished by the end of April 1870 and insistently begged me to persuade the publisher not to take the work away from him. In the event of the publisher taking the translation from him, we should inform him (Bakunin) as soon as possible, and then he would take steps to return the 300 roubles.

On December 19 he sent me the first sheets of the manuscript. "From now on I shall send you every two or three days the translated and recopied sheets."

On December 31 I received another few sheets of the translation and they were the last. In all I received one or at most two printed sheets from him.

On March 3 (1870) I finally received the letter from the "Bureau" in which you are now interested. Although this letter was not written by Bakunin (in all probability it was Nechayev's work), I considered Bakunin to be responsible for it because at that time his participation in it seemed to me beyond doubt, and I sent him an abusive letter. The winter term was over and I had to go on a journey; all the same I waited two and a half weeks after I had sent Bakunin the letter, but I received no reply. Later Bakunin wrote to an acquaintance of yours and mine, Lopatin, that he had sent me a short reply in which he said that he had given up the translation because of my rudeness. But I do not believe that reply ever existed, otherwise I would have received it. He also gave the same friend of mine a receipt which said that he, Bakunin, had received from the publisher through me 300 roubles which he undertook to return as soon as possible. But that was quite useless, because I already had a receipt written with his own hand, and his promise to pay *soon* was not kept. Not a rouble has been received from him so far, but recently he sent a lady to the same publisher asking him to give Bakunin another translation and promising that the story of *Capital* would not be repeated. What impudence!

To conclude I shall tell you my present opinion about the letter I received in 1870 from the "Bureau". At the time Bakunin's participation seemed to me beyond doubt. I must say that when I now go through the whole affair with a cool head I see that Bakunin's participation in it is not at all proved; the letter could really have been sent by Nechayev quite independently of Bakunin. Only one thing is certain, that Bakunin showed complete unwillingness to go on with the work he had begun, although he had received money for it.

I ask you to inform your usual correspondent here that you have received this letter. Please return the letter from the "Bureau" to the following address: Mr. N. Ljubavin, 34, Nevsky Prospect, St. Petersburg.

Please wrap the letter in a piece of paper and write on it:
for *Nic. Lyubavin*.

Yours,

N. Lyubavin

Translated from the German

G. ORPIN TO AN UNKNOWN

August 20, 1872

Dear Citizen,

After receiving your last card I assembled my very few clients. I communicated your missive to them.

It was decided by the majority that for this year we would not have ourselves represented. The motives alleged by my clients were the following.

1. That the funds of which they could dispose were negligible and that they hardly dared to send them.

2. We looked in our little notebooks for Article IX, of which you speak, and we found nothing. I had intended to come in the near future; because of your hasty departure I shall put my journey off.

I have to announce a new client to you; you can make a note of him. Here is his name:

Sauron Maurice, 34 years of age, landowner farmer. No. 183 in group No. 180.

Although the majority decided not to have themselves represented, you can let the delegates know on my behalf that the section in our town existing since only very recently, not having any funds yet and being hardly organised, regrets not to be able to give you full powers.

I only ask you to tell them that in a little town of the Tarn département, we all exist and all have good will.

Cordial greetings,

G. Orpin

P. S. Inform me immediately on your return and I shall come a few days later.

NIKOLAI DANIELSON
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

St. Petersburg, August 9 (21), 1872

Dear Sir,

You have, I believe, received the letter* you wanted with some explanations.** You will see that it is not at all of a *commercial* character *only*, and in the use to be made of it this ought not to be forgotten. In particular some Russian residents in Switzerland are to be feared: long ears and especially long tongues were the causes of our mutual friend's*** misfortune. The one who gave you from me the news of our mutual friend should remember with whom he has spoken about these matters; in the future he must therefore beware of such *faux frères*.****

In May I inconsiderately wrote to you that there could be no question of Bakunin's influence*****; however it turns out that visits are paid to him from time to time to render him worship.

I should be very glad to know whether the rumour that Bakunin had a part in the assault of which Utin was the victim is true.

You would oblige me by informing me of the result of the affair. It would also please me very much if you would send me the accounts of the Hague Congress.

I am very grateful to you for the book***** which you sent me.

Our mutual friend asks me to inform you that he considers all the little things which he left with you as a pledge that

* See pp. 459-63 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** Here is something more: On May 20, 1870, Bakunin wrote among other things: "In mid-February this year *I was called upon by the Bureau to refrain from all other occupations*" (i.e., the translation) "and to move to Geneva to devote myself exclusively to Russian affairs. I and many others expected a popular movement in the autumn of 1870" (which is not exactly a credit to his sagacity). "These expectations proved groundless (!)... In expectation of the popular rising, *I wished to promote it with all my strength.*" (Locarno, May 20, 1870.)—*Author's note.*

*** Lopatin's.—*Ed.*

**** False brothers.—*Ed.*

***** See pp. 337-38 of this volume.—*Ed.*

***** Second German edition of Volume I of *Capital*.—*Ed.*

he feels it is his duty to appear at your place, and that he will endeavour to carry out this intention soon.

Yours respectfully,
N. D.

Written in English and German

RUDOLF SCHRAMM
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON *

Hotel Bellevue,
The Hague, Holland.
N. O. Krainer

August 21, 1872

I permit myself most humbly to request Dr. Karl Marx in London for a visitor's entrance card to the meetings of the Internationals which are to be held here in 11 days on September 2. Insofar as the proposals and subjects of discussion are made public, I request you obligingly to inform me of them beforehand. Apart from general human interest, I am interested in obtaining exact knowledge of the attitude of the Internationals to the Christian Church, and in particular to the Italian knaves and windbags who have been brutalising and exploiting the nations of North and West Europe for one thousand years. Should Dr. Marx come here in person, I would ask him for an interview. I shall return to the Rhine and to my place of residence in Milan in the first days of September.

Rudolf Schramm
Former Prussian General Consul in Milan

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

* The envelope bears the address: Doctor Karl Marx, 1 Modena Villas, Haverstock Hill, London, N.W. and a London post-mark.—*Ed.*

ADOLF HEPNER
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

[Leipzig,] August 21, 1872

Dear Engels,

1. Received letter of 17th inst.*
2. Enclosed a letter from Liebknecht. Where he gets the whimsical idea of wanting to send you to the "Reichstag" I cannot understand.** Also enclosed a mandate from Breslau for you.***
3. *Wigand* is now no longer selling us your book at the old price but is charging 2 *talers*, since stocks are running out.¹⁴³
4. Vaillant will probably not be able to go to The Hague at all; I read in the *Leipziger Zeitung* that the Dutch government intends to extradite the Communards.
6. ****Whatever the conditions I shall come to The Hague.
7. *Fink* sent Marx the paid bill for the printing of the Rules in time; as the owner of the printshop is away, he cannot at present get a copy. Concerning the sale of *stamps* Fink gave me the following receipt:

	<i>Stamps</i>
First lot	868 marks
given to the Committee	366
still in hand	502
received from Josewicz in Berlin	50
Second lot	528
	1,080
in hand	380
	700 expended
	<i>Fink</i>

* Engels' letter to Hepner of August 17, 1872 has not been preserved.—*Ed.*

** See p. 454 of this volume.—*Ed.*

*** See *The Hague Congress of the First International. Minutes and Documents*, p. 322.—*Ed.*

**** So in the original.—*Ed.*

Fink has 2,500 copies of the Rules, including 500 obtained from London.

Greetings.

A. H.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

J. PATRIC MACDONNELL
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

8 Southboro Terrace,
Carlton Grove, Peckham
August 21, 1872

My dear Engels,

I am truly sorry that I have been unable to attend the Council and Sub-Committee meetings for some time past. However you may accept my assurance that my absence on all occasions was quite unavoidable. I have all the more deeply regretted my absence on account of the now rapidly approaching time for the Congress. My wife, I regret to say, has been very ill for the last eight or nine days and I have been unwell since Saturday. I hope all things have been going on satisfactorily.

My wife joins me in kindest wishes to you and Mrs. Engels.

I am, dear Engels,

Always yours faithfully,

J. P. McDonnell

P. S. I will quite make up for all my lost time shortly. Coleman and I are about to purchase a small patent printing press with which we can "pull off" handbills and small pamphlets for propaganda purposes, to be distributed freely amongst the Irish here and at home. We are powerless without something of this kind.

First published in Russian

Written in English

* On the second sheet of the letter Engels has noted Milner's address: Milner, 79 Bolsover St., Portland Rd.—*Ed.*

E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

[Brussels], August 21, 1872

Dear Citizen Engels,

I received your interesting letter of the 19th inst.*; its contents gave me great pleasure, but I am too sincere a friend not to tell you the truth about the disposition of my fellow countrymen. All of them are against the Bakuninists, all of them are in communion of ideas with you on questions of principle,—but all—without a single exception,—agree on the necessity to limit the powers of the General Council, whichever it may be.

The Belgians are so little inclined in favour of the Jurasians that Laurent Verrycken, the only one who has so far shown hostility towards the General Council, tabled a motion tending to expel from the Association any groups which resorted to publicity to reveal their differences and the affairs of the Association. This motion will be submitted to the Congress.

No delegate has yet been nominated—the ballot has been postponed till next Sunday. The amount of cash in the treasury will decide how many will be sent.

The lawyer Eugène Robert is said to have accepted the mandate of the Federation of the Centre, Roch Spingard that of Borinage, and the lawyer Arnould is aiming at that of the Antwerpians, but whether he is nominated or not he will go for the sole purpose of getting to know *the London men*: I use his expressions. We shall also have that bore Rittinghausen.

I am told that you are going, and Dupont writes that Marx will be travelling—as for me, the pleasure of shaking hands with you makes up my mind—only my wife would like to take the journey and it will need heaps of promises on my part to leave her to look after the house.

Tell me what other friends are coming. How is Jung getting on?

Does Marx know sufficiently well a man named Vogelaar? He is a very poor devil of a shoemaker—at present unem-

* See pp. 455-56 of this volume.—*Ed.*

ployed—who sells nougat in the streets. I don't suspect anybody, but I always think that poverty is a bad advisor ... and there is no lack of temptations.

Where will you be staying in The Hague? It would be useful to make provision in advance. If you intend to pass through Brussels my house is entirely at your disposal. I make the same offer to Marx.

Please send me the information asked for on the business house in London; my man is being hurried as regards payment and he is afraid to comply because if the house is bankrupt he would be obliged to pay a second time.

Remember me to everybody and be assured, dear Citizen Engels, of my sincere friendship.

E. Glaser de Willebrord

Please tell Dupont that I have asked the solicitor for the documents and that I shall do what he asked, but it is *indispensable* that his signature should be certified.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

CÉSAR DE PAEPE
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

Brussels, August 22, 1872

My dear Friend,

As we have no Belgian correspondent with the General Council (Herman and Rochat both having left London), I am sending you this hundred francs asking you to kindly hand them to the General Council as an instalment on the Belgian Sections' debts. It is already some time since I was instructed to send this, but other occupations (all private) have taken up my time and I did not hurry particularly because I knew that the modest sum of 100 francs could not save the situation.

Please ask the secretary or the treasurer of the General Council to be kind enough to give the receipt for this hundred francs to one of the London delegates to the Congress at The Hague so that it can be handed there to one of the Belgian delegates to the Congress.

You will doubtless be going to The Hague. As for me, I shall not be there. I do not know yet who the Belgian delegates will be. I hope this Congress will put an end to the splits which are appearing in the International. I should like to tell you a lot of things about these splits, but I know that I have not the time to write you a long letter and perhaps you have not the time to read it. I shall merely tell you that I personally (and the majority of the Belgians with me) am by no means with the Jura, but certainly with the General Council.

Yours devotedly,
De Paepe

Translated from the French

FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

122 Regent's Park Road, London
August 22, 1872

H. Jung, Treasurer G. C.

Fellow Workman,

I have on hand fifteen dollars and eight cents from the North American Federal Council, dues, etc., for the General Council. I shall add twenty dollars of my own money to cover as far as possible our debts. Be therefore kind enough to bring with you tomorrow night a receipt for me to the amount of thirty-five dollars and eight cents as asserted. Please find out the value of this sum (American currency) in English money and draw or call for the amount on Fr. Engels.

Anyhow you can and will have it tomorrow night at the G.C. meeting, where I will be happy to meet you.

Fraternally, yours
F. A. Sorge

First published in Russian

Written in English

NIKOLAI UTIN
TO ELEANOR MARX IN LONDON

Geneva, Thursday, August 22, [1872]

My dear Sister,

It is Thursday already and I am surprised that I have not received back the *copy** which I sent you. Yet it is time I did, and I am afraid it may have gone astray.—This evening one of my friends will post this letter in Zurich; enclosed in it is the first sheet—the most important, since it is in *Bakunin's* hand: the beginning (p. 1, 2, and half of 3). †

I am waiting impatiently for the return of the copy, and besides—the *address at The Hague* which I asked you for and which is absolutely necessary for me to send my long and, I presume to say, interesting *report* on Bakunin, the split, and the conspiracy in Russia. It will be ready—after a fashion—this *Saturday*, so I rely on it arriving at The Hague on *Monday* if I have the address in time.—If you have not yet sent the address I asked for in my last letter, I pray you to *wire* it to me at the following address:

Interlaken, Bönigen, Chalet Lac, Dr. Shcherbakov.

Nothing else. Everything which arrives at this address will be immediately handed to me. Also your letters which I rely on receiving during next week, above all if you go to *The Hague*—address them to me at this new address. There is no need of a second envelope, my friend will know they are for me.

I am surprised that I have not had any news from Geneva yet about the mandate for Miss Harriett Law; but my aunt—Mrs. Olga Z.** (ask Leo***, he knows her well, and she ask me to give him her love) instructs me to tell you that she is almost sure that the mandate will be sent either in your name or at The Hague address which I am waiting for and which I shall wire to Geneva to the chairman of the Section**** as soon as I get it. I also believe that the mandate will come without fail... .

* See pp. 443-44 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** Levashova (née Zinovyeva).—*Ed.*

*** Frankel.—*Ed.*

**** Tinaire.—*Ed.*

I don't know much of what is going on in Geneva; we are keeping up intensive correspondence these days for the delegate to be sent, for it appears that the Genevans are above all tired of the intrigues of the Bakuninists and say that they refuse to spend money to hear the wretched dance-and-song of *those rascals* again; that as for a review of the Rules, they are not asking for that in Geneva—it is a matter of applying and carrying out what the Rules prescribe and not of reviewing them so as to do nothing.—Such is the argument of the Genevans, who have been sorely tried these last months by several strikes which resulted in victory for the *10 hours*. The Federal Committee must have sent you a *memo* for the Congress. Nevertheless I found it worse than *unforgivable* that Geneva was not represented by a Genevan delegate and I insisted energetically that one should be sent.—I don't know whether my arguments were successful and whether they have decided to send one—I shall know this evening.... In any case the old man Becker is going tomorrow, that is, to The Hague.

Au revoir for the time being. How I wish that it were a real *au revoir*!

Fraternal greetings to all the family. I shake your hand affectionately.

Your devoted brother

Nicolas

Please let me know without delay when you receive this letter to *Interlaken*. (Keep that address strictly to yourself.)

Translated from the French

E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

[Brussels,] August 23, [1872]

My dear Teacher,

I hope that you will quickly recover and that you will give me the pleasure of seeing you at The Hague.

Have made a note concerning the delegate from Toulouse—in any case for him to be very prudent here. Brussels is on

the point of having a whole cohort of French, German and Belgian police; these last are too stupid to be of any harm.

If the pamphlets are to go to The Hague, give me timely warning.*

The pettyfogging lawyers of *La Liberté* are not precisely the Benjamins of the Internationals, but the choice could have been worse. Arnould is in my opinion a deserving man and wants nothing better than to bow down before real superiority. As for Robert, he has an original talent as a speaker, but I believe he is very ambitious.

To travel at their own expense is not a merit that all the delegates have, but considering the present state of the Federations' treasuries, it is a real merit.

In a great hurry, dear Teacher,
and most sincerely all yours,

E. Glaser de Willebrord

Please tell Engels I shall give a copy of the pamphlet on the split** to each of the delegates as soon as I receive them.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

JOSE C. NOBRE-FRANÇA
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

Council of the Local Federation
of Lisbon Sections, August 23, 1872

Citizen,

We received on the 21st your letter of August 15*** and presume that the delay was due to the causes which you indicated, for we are guided by your works and your example.

You have probably already received through our common friend and comrade in the Association, Mr. Lafargue, the

* The pamphlet in question is probably *The Civil War in France*.—Ed.

** *Fictitious Splits in the International*.—Ed.

*** Engels' letter of August 15, 1872 has not been preserved.—Ed.

most important things we have to inform you of today. He has probably rendered account to you of the stamps. We return to you 196 stamps and the value of 332 to the amount of 6,640 reis at the rate of 20 reis instead of 18. The difference results from the exchange rate.

We inform you also that we profited by the presence of Mr. Lafargue here to invite him to represent the Portuguese Internationals at the General Congress. He rendered us a great service by accepting our invitation.

Not supposing that you had sufficient material for your general report in the information we sent you, we gave our representative a short memorandum on the general conditions of industry and the living conditions of the working classes,* which, for the rest, is also insufficient because of our ignorance, lack of statistics and time to compare it and make up for some deficiencies.

If you still have time and if you deal with the production of foodstuffs, add that this country, which is considered as maritime by its nature, imports annually more than 12 million kilogrammes of cod (28 million francs). That this country produces 2 million kilogrammes of corn, and imports 30 million kilogrammes (10 million francs). That maize (bread made from it) is the principal food of the population, particularly the rural population.

As for tobacco, *legal* imports of it amount to 2 : 2,001,400** kilogrammes to the value of 3.2 million francs and customs payments of 10.5 million francs! (besides the profit made by the industrialists).

Concerning the Alliance, you probably guess that it existed in the initial group of the International. But nearly all of us endeavoured to join the International when we were confronted with the Alliance. For the rest, it had no influence here, and after the Jura circular*** we discussed its dissolution several times but did not suggest it to our Spanish brothers out of deference for them.

* See *The Hague Congress of the First International. Minutes and Documents.* pp. 257-64.—*Ed.*

** So in the original.—*Ed.*

*** The Sonvillier Circular of the Jura Federation.—*Ed.*

Our opinion concerning the general influence of the Alliance was expressed in the proposal we sent you, which was the substance of what was said at our meetings on this matter. If you consider it appropriate, submit that proposal to the Congress. It could be better formulated and discussed.

We believe that the Alliance should be condemned not only because of its existence within the International. There is a question of principle which would be very interesting to define, like the idea of *autonomy*, for example, which is greatly vaunted by the Alliancists. We consider this idea as being antagonistic to *federation*, and we also believe that it does not express freedom. And when one idea and the other is expressed, we cannot consider autonomy as a means which is not harmful to freedom. When *uniting* of forces is necessary, *cohesion* of the molecules of the immense social body, autonomy does not express a reality. Natural absolute freedom of the individual coexists with a more intimate closeness of the natural links, just as the guarantee of one's own right is a necessary condition of duty towards others. In the reciprocity of relations the personality becomes confused and tends to disappear. The disappearance of the social personality consummated in the perfect equality of social conditions is contrary to the idea of individual autonomy and is the greatest testimony to the existence of links connecting man with man. It is to join up those links that we revolutionaries work. Those links are the International.

That is why we believe that the idea of *autonomy*, *independence* is erroneous. Nobody is independent. Independence does not mean *freedom*. One man is no more independent of another than they both are of society, or than society is of nature. Freedom in no way means *isolation*.

Autonomy is a legal concept.

As for *anarchy*, it cannot be disorganisation; and if it is the result of absolute freedom, let us organise anarchy. Let us organise to become anarchists.

Concerning the influence of the General Council. The Council has no force nor any power inside the International. Its activity is carried on outside it. Inside: it has no means

of coercion, of repression, of restraint. Outside: it suppresses, represses, restrains. If it influences the direction of tendencies in a people or peoples, the direct relations with those peoples would influence in the same way. Therefore, in order to free ourselves from extraneous influences, would it be necessary to be *autonomous*?

Such are our summarised and incomplete ideas on the questions discussed. It would be a good thing if we could expound them at the Congress!

The resistance society is developing satisfactorily. Fontana communicates more precise data than mine through Mr. Lafargue. Nevertheless it must be noted that the number of members joining every month is more than 200, and that this number shows prospects of rising. This fact of the growth of our organisation is excellent. We expect the work of the Congress to provide a general organisation for the Association. Were it not dangerous, we would do publicly and all at once what we will not do in private and with reflection—we would make the resistance *societies* adhere to the International, basing ourselves on the significant manifestations on the occasion of our speeches at meetings in connection with the Congress at The Hague. Excuse us for the worry we caused you because of the *Pensamento*.

The demands of the caulkers have been satisfied: legal sanction has been obtained for the payment of half of working days which had been formerly withheld over a period of many years in certain kinds of work. Fines (of from one to three working days) for absence from work have been abolished.

Mr. Lafargue told us that you are a tireless research worker. On the subject of your inquiry, we have a young man here, *at present in Porto*, whose book we shall send you and with whom we shall bring you in contact, *which would be very useful*.

With fraternal revolutionary greetings

J. C. Nobre-França

PAUL LAFARGUE
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[The Hague, after August 23, 1872]

My dear Engels,

You must know through Marx that I have been in Holland since last Thursday; we ran like hares through the city to find cheap lodgings; the hotels here are at prohibitive prices, with poor food 7 to 9 francs per person per day.

In the end we managed to find furnished rooms in a district very far from the centre; they are let by the month, and happily so; everywhere else rooms are let by the year.

We are rather out of our element here, after Spain and Portugal. Luckily they understand French well here; when I cannot make myself understood somewhere I advance my rear-guard, that is Laura, who comes out with her gorgeous German and the bibble-babble starts: she speaks German and they answer in Dutch, sometimes neither being able to understand the other.

But Laura is making smashing progress.

I hope the organisers of the Congress will have bothered about lodgings for the delegates. If I can be useful I am at your disposal.

Here is my new address:¹⁴⁴

Mr. José Mesa y Leompar
c/o Mr. C.H. van den Pauvert:
Fagelstraat No. 1
The Hague

Remember me to everybody there.

All yours,
José Mesa

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* The letter bears the notes: "Mesa" and "Date".—*Ed.*

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT IN HUBERTUSBURG

London, August 24, 1872

Today we learned that the Jurassians are coming to The Hague all the same, but will withdraw at the first decisions taken against the Alliance and then hold their Neuchâtel congress. Bakunin must have been over-hasty in sending his instructions to Italy, and the Spaniards will have shown him that it would just not do, and that they had to go to The Hague if only to lodge a protest. The fact is that the Spanish Federal Council has an Alliancist majority and set a voting system in motion, by which they will probably send four of the Alliancists¹⁴⁵. On the other hand, the Union of Catalonian Factory Workers (40,000 strong) is sending one of our men—Mora. The Italians will be careful not to come after their Rimini resolution.

Sorge is here with me and sends greetings.

Yours,
F. E.

No scuffle is to be expected from the Bakuninists. They are of a cowardice without limits, though insolent with their tongues. They won't attack unless they are eight to one.

Translated from the German

THE CORRESPONDENCE COMMISSION
OF THE ITALIAN FEDERATION
TO THE JURA FEDERAL COMMITTEE
IN SONVILLIER

Imola, August 24, 1872

Dear Comrades,

With the object of solemnly asserting and maintaining the autonomy of the Sections of the International, the Italian Federation, assembled in conference at Rimini, has unanimously voted in favour of a resolution by which, breaking off all links with the General Council, it demanded the assembly of a Congress at Neuchâtel in Switzerland. This decision was so solemn, the delegates who approved

it felt so strongly the necessity for it, that we could not now revoke it without betrayal of our feelings.

If it is not possible for us to go with our brothers from Switzerland and Spain to the impending Congress of The Hague to take part in the struggle of the Revolution against Authority, we shall follow them at least in our hearts, and we hope at the same time that before long we shall be able to come to an agreement with them and shake their hands in Switzerland; for we do not believe that their free proposals will be well received by those who will be representing Authority at The Hague.

We wished to eliminate once and for all the dangers to which you drew our attention in your circular of last November¹⁴⁶: you began the job, we believe we have completed it.

It is therefore not through vain pride, Brothers, that we are not revoking our proposal and that we shall send no delegates to The Hague; it is because we believe we would be betraying the cause to which we have dedicated ourselves. It is not a question of personalities which moves us to act, but a question of principles.

That the General Council is and considers itself to be invested with authority is proved by many acts, and one of the most important is the dictatorial letter which Frederick Engels, in the name and on the instructions of that Council, wrote to the Spanish Regional Federal Council and in which the members of the General Council assume the role of policemen.¹⁴⁷

The General Council, finally, is not the International; and if we have broken with it, we assert, on the other hand, once more economic solidarity with all the workers of the world. And we shall go forward. When the Revolution encounters the Bastille on its path, an explosion of the people's wrath is sufficient to blow it down.

Greetings and fraternity.

For the Correspondence Commission

Andrea Costa

Published in the *Bulletin*
de la Fédération jurassienne,
Nos. 15 and 16,
August 15-September 1, 1872

Translated from the French

J. PATRIC MACDONNELL
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Bath Cottage, Eton Place, Bath
Road, Cranford, Hounslow
August 24, 1872

My dear Engels,

I have been expecting a letter from you. I have been down here for the last few days as my wife has been too ill to remain in London. I will however without fail attend the Council meeting tomorrow night, when I hope to have the pleasure of meeting you. I suppose all arrangements are now completed about the Congress.

With kind regards to Mrs. Engels

I am ever yours faithfully,

J. P. MacDonnell

My father-in-law left England on Saturday for America.

First published in Russian

Written in English

JOSE MESA
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON **

Madrid, August 25, 1872

My dear Engels,

I am writing to you in haste to send you the memorandum on the Alliance in Spain and the documents which bear testimony to it.¹⁴⁸ As you will see, there are some very important letters, such as the one by Alerini from Barcelona and the one from Bakunin to Mora. I fought for a long time to get this letter, and that was the cause of my delay in drawing up the memorandum, which I did not finish till yesterday.

* On the back of the letter there are numbers and calculations in Engels' hand.—*Ed.*

** The letter bears underscorings and a note by Engels: J. Mesa.—*Ed.*

In view of this letter of Bakunin's I believe it is useless to send you the statement for which you asked me about the letter of the same Bakunin to Morago: that blackguard would deny everything. He will probably go to the Congress with Marselau, Soriano and other Alliancists. They had passed round instructions to go to Neuchâtel, but it appears that at the last minute they received an order from Italy, communicated by Fanelli, to go to The Hague.—I hope you will keep me posted on everything.

You will notice that all the letters and other documents are numbered and quoted in the text of the memorandum. I would point out to you also that letter No. 1, from Lisbon, is a decisive proof of Morago's manoeuvres in Portugal to serve the men of the Alliance and its disorganisation projects.

My friends tell me to ask you to return the letters to us as soon as you have made use of them at the Congress, because they are a weapon which we wish to preserve in our struggle with the men of the Alliance.

I also ask you to send us the address of the Congress at once so that we can send congratulations and an encouragement to the worker delegates.

I shall also send you some copies of *La Emancipación* containing the *general organisation project*, and some copies of the last issue as well containing Mora's letter to Morago in which he told him some harsh truths.¹⁴⁹ It might be a good thing to circulate this letter among the delegates so as to show up Morago, who is a humbug and a regular rascal.—I shall write to you again tomorrow to send you the mandate from the New Federation for Lafargue;¹⁵⁰ I am not sending it to you today because I expect a letter from Lafargue this evening informing me of the day of his departure: I don't think he has left Lisbon yet.

Greetings and fraternity.

Mesa

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Sunday evening
[Brussels, August 25, 1872]

Dear Citizen Engels,

I made some notes on the Rimini affair, but *L'Internationale* said that this communication might cause confusion among our sections and refrained from publishing it; as for *La Liberté*, it replied by publishing a news item from Rome.¹⁵¹

In this situation, and not seeing anything in the newspapers about the Congress of the splitters, I thought it more prudent to keep silence, for fear that my communication to the bourgeois newspapers might be accompanied by commentaries which could be harmful.

This afternoon I am going to the meeting of the Brussels Section in order to acquaint them with your note of this morning concerning the delegates; I shall give those who are nominated a copy of the private circular on the fictitious split. At the end of this letter you will learn which delegates will definitely go to The Hague.

Please tell Dupont that, having to put my commercial affairs in order before departing, I intend to leave Brussels on Saturday morning, having to stop over at Antwerp. If he does not find me, my wife will hand him his documents. As for the delegate from Toulouse announced by Marx, I believe he will come before I leave.

Awaiting the pleasure to see you, I send you my most affectionate greetings.

*E. Glaser de Willebrord***

Delegates to the Hague Congress: Fluse, Brismée.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* The address on the envelope is: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London N.W. On the back of the envelope is the note: Glaser to Engels, 1872.—*Ed.*

** The following words are in an unknown hand.—*Ed.*

KARL MARX
TO LUDWIG KUGELMANN IN HANOVER

[London,] August 26, 1872

Dear Kugelmann,

At The Hague delegates are to wear a blue ribbon so that those who meet them will recognise them.

In case they fail:

Private address: Bruno Liebers, 148, Jacob Catsstraat.

Official premises of the Congress: Concordia, Lombardstraat. In a great hurry.

Yours,
K. M.

Translated from the German

JOSE MESA
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Madrid, August 26, 1872

My dear Engels,

I send you enclosed the two mandates from this Federation and the one from Alcala for Lafargue. It is now ten days since I had news of him; yesterday I was expecting a reply to my last letter, in which I asked him to inform me of the day of his departure. The mail has just arrived and no letter, so I am very anxious. In any case, I pray you, dear Comrade, to write to me at once and tell me if you know anything and acknowledge receipt of this letter and yesterday's, in which I sent you the memorandum and the documents on the Alliance.

Greetings and revolution.

Mesa

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* The letter bears a note in Engels' handwriting: J. Mesa.—*Ed.*

ADOLF HEPNER
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Leipzig, August 26, 1872]

Dear Engels,

1) I am sending Marx a *Leipzig* mandate in two days at the latest.¹⁵² It is impossible for me to get blank mandates because when you suggest to people to make them out, they consider the International as a "swindle". I have written to the following places for mandates:

Magdeburg (for Marx)
Munich, Chemnitz and Celle (for Kugelmann)
Breslau (for you)
Regensburg (for me)
Königsberg and Eszlingen (for Scheu II)
Stuttgart and Frankfurt (for Cuno)
Werdau (for Carl Hirsch)
Dresden (for Dietzgen)
Düsseldorf (for Ludwig)

Of these towns mandates have so far been sent by Breslau and Dresden; the others have not yet despite two or more reminders. I am sending off half a dozen more reminder letters tonight.

Berlin has delegated *Milke* (type-setter, a clever man); Crimmitschau is probably sending Kwasniewski. So Germany will have a somewhat stronger representation this time in any case.

Except for the above-named places our dispatch service does not know of any in which there are *formal* members of the International. The first 2,000 copies of the Rules were nevertheless *sold* long ago; but not so many places have ordered *stamps*. So long as our committee has the "shits" to take the matter in hand, there can be no thought of the International achieving a membership of 100 in Germany. In general I am now in a difficult position in respect of the Hamburgers. They want to have me under their thumb, and of course I don't feel like that; they want to

* The address on the envelope is: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London N.W. There are Leipzig and London postmarks.—*Ed.*

make the *Volksstaat* "Lassallean" and insist on a "leading article" after the manner of the *Neuer** in every issue, whereas I (like the Hubertusbürgers**) am of the view that the paper is not intended for ABC learners; let *them* learn the "iron law of wages" from *Lassalle*, in the *Volksstaat* we cannot bore our old readers with that all the time.

The letter to Liebknecht will be delivered; I am going to Hubertusburg tomorrow.

Best greetings,

Yours,

A. H.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

NIKOLAI UTIN
TO THEODOR DUVAL IN GENEVA ***

[Berne, August 27, 1872]

Dear Brother,

I've been working like a Negro all this time and here's the result of it; get it to M.**** quickly and beseech him to read and make others read it—that will settle the fate of these miserable *agents provocateurs* and traitors; the documents in it are striking.¹⁵³

Artus wires me that Bakunin has published something else against me, he wishes absolutely to provoke my assassination. I have not seen what it is yet.

Tomorrow I shall send you the remainder. Write and tell me how you are keeping, what you are doing. Tomorrow I'm going to Interlaken.

Love to you and all the friends.

You know what to do if funds are short.

Nicholas

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* The *Neuer Social-Demokrat*.—*Ed.*

** Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel.—*Ed.*

*** The letter bears a pencilled note in an unknown hand: Berne, Tuesday, morning.—*Ed.*

**** Marx.—*Ed.*

E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Brussels,] Tuesday [August 27, 1872]

Dear Citizen Engels,

I read out your communication about the delegates at the meeting on Sunday evening; by way of thanks I received a vehement protest from the fanatic baker Laurent Verrycken, who feels *his dignity* offended because the communication was not addressed to one of the Belgian secretaries. I did not judge it fitting to reply to the illustrious correspondent of the Jura gentlemen. I distributed your pamphlets about the split.**

You know Brismée, one of the delegates, so I don't need to tell you anything about him,—as for Eberhard, delegated by the affiliated associations, he is a German tailor—has been in Brussels for a long time and is not very clever, you need not fear the length of his speeches.

De Paepe, Steens, Hins and the above-named baker are all fairly vexed at not having been offered the honour to go to The Hague, and we must expect to see them there either as interested spectators or as delegates of some federation or other.

I draw your attention to the following points:

1. All the Belgians will ask that the powers of the General Council should be purely administrative and that it should in no case be allowed to intervene in differences which could arise between sections or between federations in the same country. To put it briefly, they wish to reduce the role of the Council to that of a post-box.

2. The workers refuse to pay their subscriptions on pretexts which are as specious as they are ridiculous—the delegates are to demand that the subscription be lowered to *five* centimes a year. (Try to do something with men like that.)

* The address on the envelope is: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London, and there are Brussels and London postmarks. On the back of the envelope there is a note in an unknown hand: Glaser to Engels, 1872. The Hague Congress, England.—Ed.

** *Fictitious Splits in the International.*—Ed.

Note. If you don't want the Belgians to detach themselves and form a group apart something has got to be done.

The Toulouse delegate arrived yesterday afternoon. They made him leave in all haste (a letter from Serrailier, it appears) but I wonder what for. He departed in such a hurry that he could not take the money, and now it is blocked here until Sunday, for if it is true that I am leaving on Friday it is because I need to stop over in various towns, and I can't drag him behind me.

As I shall probably be at The Hague before you, dispose of me if I can be of any use to you, but as I don't know where I am going to stay, write to me *poste restante*.

As for my address, I shall leave it at the Concordia.

My compliments to all, and until I have the pleasure of shaking your hand, be assured of my devotedness.

E. Glaser de Willebrord

We have two Belgians here, Huart and Wilmart, who are going as delegates to the Congress, the former for Bordeaux, the latter for Rheims.

The Belgian delegates are: *Fluse, Herman, Calwaert, Brismée, Eberhard* and also Emile Robert, Roch Splingard, V. Arnould.

I am not absolutely certain about these last ones.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

MALTMAN BARRY
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

56, Gremford Street,
Portman Square
August 27, 1872

Dear Sir,

Credentials received—many thanks. Think shall start (via Calais and Brussels) tomorrow or Thursday. If you deem it advisable and have a few minutes to spare in the

course of today, you might jot down a few facts about the general situation for my enlightenment in my professional work and hand it to me tonight.

Others are well posted up, and, unless you help me, I shall not be in a position to correct misstatements. I presume you are coming to Liebers'. I shall be at the station waiting for you.

Can you recommend a good hotel in Brussels, where English is spoken? I mean to spend a night there.

Yours faithfully,

M. M. Barry

First published in Russian

Written in English

O. V. SUETENDAEL
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Brussels, August 28, 1872

Dear Citizen,

I should have wished, like you, that the Brussels associations had been represented at the Congress; in spite of all the efforts that I undertook for that purpose it did not happen, because the associations which wish to found the federation have different ways of acting; while some believe that they will succeed in reorganising the International in Belgium by imperceptibly eliminating the elements which are hostile to it, others wish to engage in an open struggle with them; as for the question of the Congress, the few men who pretend to form the Brussels Section have spread the rumour that the societies which have not joined the International will not be admitted to the Congress. But it must be noted that the Brussels Section no longer has a workers' association affiliated to it, with the exception of a few tailors, about thirty, and although it has not the number of members required by the Rules to have the right to send two delegates, it permits itself nevertheless to send to represent it two men who only had 52 votes between them:

Brismée 24,
Eberhard 28.

I believe I am even making a mistake of two votes in their favour.

I believe, Citizen, that this is certainly another proof of the decadence of the International here.

At the Congress of the Belgian associations, which was held some time ago, a large number of sections stated that they wished to adopt the system of federation and manifested great hostility towards the Brussels men who want the management of affairs; in particular delegate Brismée was accused of something which I shall confide to you later, as first I must know whether it is not some form of calumny, because it happens only too often that one exaggerates the facts when one wishes to confuse an enemy.

If you go to the Congress, do me the favour of inquiring of our delegates about the state of the treasury, about the Rules, and also about the number of members they represent, in order to see whether they will lie very much. Try to speak to Brismée, because the other is purely and simply a fool who knows nothing about anything; he is a man of straw. The Brussels Section admitted him to secure the friendship of the tailors, his colleagues.

On Saturday there was only 56 francs in the treasury. It is thanks to the prizes, the subscriptions and the anticipated payments that the delegates can go to The Hague.

The Rules of the new federation will be printed this week. I shall see that you get a copy and you can judge of them. The *big men* uttered cries of fear when they learned that we comprise 18 associations already and they have already started spreading all sorts of infamy against us; unfortunately in the jewellers' section there is a man whom they do not like, and that is enough for them to find the whole thing bad.

Yours,
O. V.

J. PATRIC MACDONNELL
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

8 Southboro Terrace,
Carlton Grove, Peckham
Wednesday, 12 o'clock.
[August 28, 1872]

My dear Engels,

I have only just now arrived from the country and received your letter. My wife has been so ill that necessity alone compelled me to come to town this morning. I have been indeed very deeply grieved at absenting myself so many times from the Council meetings, but I really could not help it. I hope to commence our new session in better spirits and downright earnestness.

Things have got into confusion in some places, but we shall put them all right after the Congress. With a little printing press which Coleman and I have secured we will commence a very active propaganda. I have not asked for Credentials as yet from any of the Sections, but I can easily procure them. I need hardly say how anxious I am to attend the Congress, but I am not yet certain whether circumstances will allow me to do so.

I received a letter from De Morgan this morning. He is doing great good in Yorkshire.

I think I will be able to see you this evening *between 7 and 8 o'clock*. At your own place. If I can call at that time, a friend of mine and an excellent member—Mr. McCarthy—will be with me. I will not however be able to remain very long.

Very faithfully yours,

J. P. McDonnell

First published in Russian

Written in English

J. PATRIC MACDONNELL
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

[August 29, 1872]
Thursday, 2.30

Strictly private

My dear Engels,

I regret not having seen you last night. Mr. McCarthy and I did not leave the locality until half past eleven. I received your note this morning and will do my best to see you tonight. As to the Congress I regret that I cannot command sufficient ready cash to go. There is a considerable amount of cash out from me and if I could only get in [a] quarter of it I would be all right.

If I could get the loan of £10 I think we could manage for another delegate besides myself. If you would act as security *for me* I would no doubt be able to get the money by Saturday. This I could readily repay by weekly instalments or the total at the end of a given time. I could get it to pay back at 5/—per week—a very small sum. If urgent private business had not recently taken up all my time I could have organised a concert on a large scale by which £20 or £30 would have been realised. If I should go I could not leave before Saturday night. However I suppose that time would do. It would be necessary for you to give me all directions as to travelling etc., also some address at The Hague. If I go I will have to pull out to finish up some business matters by Saturday. It is very doubtful whether I can go to your place tonight. It would be equally agreeable to pay back the money by weekly instalments or at the end of a given time and to give a bill. Pardon great haste. Give answer by Bearer.

Tomorrow you must write as to directions etc.

Always yours faithfully,

J. P. McDonnell

Dear Engels,

If you have any prejudice against doing what I ask do not hesitate to say so. I would not, I can assure you, have left the thing as late, only I expected to be all-right myself.

J. P. McDonnell

FRIEDRICH LESSNER
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

12 Fitzroy St. Fitzroy Sq.
August 29, 1872

Dear Engels,

Yesterday evening it was carried in struggle with Weiler that I should be sent as a delegate to the Congress.

A sum of £ 3 was granted, almost £ 2 of which was collected through voluntary contributions, but I still have to get the third pound in from members who are in debt; I shall only be able to get a little for myself at the moment, for I cannot leave my wife without money as she is expecting her confinement any day, so you see how matters stand. *Solomon*, my lodger, immediately returned to the country that time and so I have received no more than £ 5 since then.

Friendly greetings from your

F. Lessner

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE, VICTOR SCHILY
AND HENRI BACHRUCH
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

Paris, August 29, 1872

Dear Jean Philippe,

Once more I cordially invite you, set out immediately on your journey to The Hague. To make it easier for you I am assigning you, jointly with friends Schily and Bachruch, the sum of 100 francs, which you will receive from me at The Hague.

Fraternally yours,

F. A. Sorge

Here sit three rascals
In a tavern and guzzle
And vote you francs one hundred and ten
Towards your trip to foreign parts

But demand that on your journey there or back you pass through Paris.

Schily

Dear Citizen Becker,

Hearty greetings! Hope to make your acquaintance in person on your probable passage through Paris.

Henri Bachruch

In The Hague wear a blue ribbon, and follow the man with a blue ribbon. The session will take place in the Concor-
dia Hall, Lombardstraat. Here is the address of a party comrade:

Bruno Liebers, Jacob Catsstraat 148.

Yours,

Sorge

A fourth rascal, Petersen, states he is incapable of writing or signing, in witness whereof he makes his mark X with his hand.

Schily

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

LEWIS WINGFIELD
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

August 29, [1872]

Dear Sir,

I called on you this morning but failed to find you— I had no letter of introduction to you, as my friend Mr. Arthur Richards promised me one but failed to keep his promise.

I had better be quite frank with you and state my case clearly and shortly.

I belong to the *Times* newspaper-staff, was their special correspondent on the French side during the war, was through the Siege and afterwards through the "Commune". I made many friends there, who have unfortunately since died violent deaths. I knew Rossel well, and Delecluze and Raoul

Rigault. I was there in an official capacity and was treated with uniform kindness by these gentlemen. Were they alive now I would refer to them of course, but in their absence think it wiser to go straight to you.

My editor sends me to The Hague to say something of the International.¹⁶⁴ Shall I be admitted, or shall I be *mal vu**? Of course I do not go there to laugh at it but to state calmly, and without bias either way, what they are doing and how they are getting on. Can you and will you give me any assistance in this matter? I will call on you tomorrow morning *at nine* in hopes of seeing you, should your business give you the time to do so.

Yours truly,
Lewis Wingfield

Thursday

First published in Russian

Written in English

EDOUARD VAILLANT
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT AND AUGUST BEBEL IN LEIPZIG **

London, August 30, 1872

*Please hand to Citizens Bebel
and Liebknecht*

Dear Citizens,

I am very late writing to you, because for a long time I wished to write to congratulate you on your courageous struggle and your attitude, which is a real consolation for us in exile. I also wished to express once more my gratitude to you for the kind sympathy which you have always shown towards me. Unfortunately, greatly disturbed and then troubled in recent times by numerous worries which befell me in exile, where the Versailles police tried to cause trouble, I could not find the time to write. I wished all the more

* Undesirable.—*Ed.*

** On the inside of the envelope there is a note: "To Mrs. Liebknecht for kindly forwarding." Wilhelm Liebknecht's visiting card is enclosed.—*Ed.*

to do so as Citizen Marx had informed me that the socialists in Leipzig intended to do me the honour of sending me as a delegate to the Hague Congress. I was really moved by this; nothing could have caused me greater pleasure than this proof of trust from a party which is standing up to the Prussian Empire and represents the Revolution in Germany as the Commune did in France. But I found myself, like the French members of the General Council (who had belonged to the Commune) in a most delicate situation. Making us the object of all their attacks, declaring that we had not been regularly appointed to the Council, our enemies, and above all those pretended friends who are a thousand times worse than outright enemies, did not shrink from any treacherous insinuation. You have heard how I in particular was attacked and how they wanted to make people believe that my sympathy towards Germany (they forgot to say that it was towards revolutionary Germany) was but a desertion of French ideas. Hence the rumours about posts accepted in Germany, then the articles by the Jurassians saying that it was no wonder the General Council was exploiting the international movement for the profit and the interests of Germany, since the Germans not only played the chief role in it but were helped in that respect by those whom their education in Germany had drawn away from France. Of course, I despise calumnious stupidities and shall always protest against them. No more than my friends am I chauvinist enough and foolish enough to let them have any influence on me. But at the Congress those ideas were to be attacked which the majority of the French had supported in the Council (political action etc.), almost always in agreement, I must say, with Citizen Marx, and we felt that our enemies were going to exploit the national aspect by attributing the initiative in these proposed measures to the Germans. It therefore seemed to us useful from the point of view of the Revolution and necessary from the point of view of defending the actions of the Council that we ex-representatives of Paris should come to the Congress with French mandates in order to have the authority necessary to proclaim our intention, defend our actions and reveal them in their true light. It was these considerations that led some of our friends, and also myself who as

yet had no other authority but that of my special position, to believe that I should avoid a delicate situation which would be treacherously exploited by our enemies against us and the Council. It was therefore with great uneasiness that I submitted these considerations to Citizen Marx, requesting him to lay them before you for you to decide. At present I have no mandate, and if I am not given any by tomorrow I shall not go to The Hague. Had I not been deterred by these scruples, I would then have had the pleasure and the honour to represent men who, like you, have always fought without ceasing and always defended the Commune during its triumph as after its defeat. I have deprived myself of this honour for purely tactical reasons and in abstraction of my personal feelings. Have I done rightly? You will be the judges. My intention was good and I considered only the success of our efforts. What I desire above all is that you should be assured of the affection and the solidarity which bind me to you, bonds which are so strong as far as I am concerned that nothing can break them. I therefore pray you, citizens editors, to forward these explanations and my letter to Citizens Liebknecht, Bebel, and Hepner and all the brave citizens of Leipzig whom I should have been so happy to represent. Tell them that I expect a reply from them and that I should be unconsolable if they judged my conduct otherwise than as dictated by the interest of the cause and the closest fraternity with them, nothing being able to compensate for me the loss of their esteem.

It is to them, it is to their efforts combined with those of the French proletariat that the next revolution will owe its triumph. And I shall always direct all my efforts towards bringing closer together those whose disunion would be the joy of our enemies and whose union will be their ruin.

Good hope! France is not so dead as she appears to be. The bourgeois Republic will consummate the ruin of the proprietor and capitalist regime. The proletariat, cured of all ideas of compromise, will resume the struggle with increased energy, and I have no doubt that in a few years from now we shall have the joy of seeing the German and French communes stretching out their hands to each other in their triumph.

I leave you with my renewed assurance of the entire devotion of your brother in socialism,

Ed. Vaillant

7 Leighton Grove, Kentish Town,
London N. W.

Dear Citizen Bebel,

Marx tells me that you are not coming to The Hague, so this letter will probably be handed to you. Therefore I do not wish to end it without assuring you of my friendship and of my desire to see you. Let us hope that you will not have to enter that prison where Bismarck would so much like to detain you, and that our friend Liebknecht will come out of it sooner than the Prussian government would wish him to. Remember me to Liebknecht and to all the good citizens of Leipzig, particularly our friends of the Stuttgart Congress. If you write to Citizen Hepner at The Hague, please tell him whether you have received this letter and whether our friends have been acquainted with it. Terror is preventing our friends in France from assembling and sending their mandates which could mean the ruin of the signatories. Nevertheless I shall doubtless undertake the journey. But as soon as the Congress is over I expect a letter from you in London.

Meanwhile, I fraternally shake your hand.

Your friend

Ed. Vaillant

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

HERMANN JUNG
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON *

August 30, 1872

Received from Citizen de Paepe the sum of one hundred francs for subscriptions from the Belgian Federal Council.

H. Jung, Treasurer

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* The letter is written on notepaper with the printed heading: International Working Men's Association, 256 High Holborn, London

HENRI PERRET
TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN ZURICH

Geneva, August 30, 1872

Dear Friend,

I am sending a mandate for you from the Federal Committee,* and I hope that you will firmly support our rights against the Jurassians, moreover you will receive several reports which you will make known to some delegates.

Besides I am enclosing a mandate from the Section of Carouge, the space for the name being left blank.¹⁵⁵ If you meet a citizen devoted to our ideas you will trust him with the mandate, adding his name. Do for the best at the Congress and write to me the result of the first day.

I shake your hand.

Your friend

H. Perret

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

FRÉDÉRIC COURNET
TO THE BELGIAN FEDERAL COUNCIL IN BRUSSELS **

London, August 30, 1872
95 Islip Street,
Kentish Town, N.W.

Dear Citizen,

I am instructed by the General Council to write to the Belgian Federal Council requesting it to give its delegate or delegates to the Congress at The Hague the justification documents and the Minutes of the Commission appointed by the Brussels Congress of 1868*** to decide on the demand for the expulsion of Mr. Pierre Vésinier submitted to that Congress by Citizen Varlin.¹⁵⁶

W.C. It bears a round stamp with the inscription: International Working Men's Association. Central Council. London.—*Ed.*

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 30.—*Ed.*

** The letter is written on notepaper with the printed heading: International Working Men's Association, 256 High Holborn, London W.C. (with the address in the heading crossed out) and bears a round stamp with the inscription: International Working Men's Association. Central Council. London.—*Ed.*

*** The original has 1869 by mistake.—*Ed.*

I should be extremely obliged if you would kindly hand these documents to the Belgian delegates, and thank you most sincerely in advance.

Greetings and Equality,

F. Cournet

P.S. I profit by this opportunity, dear Citizen, to remind you of myself and to send you a cordial handshake.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

J. PATRIC MACDONNELL
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

8 Southboro Terrace,
Carlton Grove, Peckham.
Friday morning
[August 30, 1872]

Private

My dear Engels,

Your note to hand last night. I need not again say that I am most anxious to be present at the Congress, but as I said yesterday, circumstances have proved quite unfavourable to me. Not being elected a delegate from the General Council I cannot accept money except on the condition of repayment. If you will and can conveniently lend me £ 5 or £ 6 I will accept it as a loan to be repaid at the very earliest opportunity. I can go tomorrow night by the 9.30 train. — Do I take a through ticket to The Hague, and when I get there where do you advise me to turn my steps? — By going I am compelled to go to a few pounds additional expense and therefore it is that I ask for the sum on the other side. I will get credentials tonight from the Marylebone Section and I hold 8 shillings in hand. I will do my best to look up the rest. I will give notice for the money to be paid in directly. There is about £ 3 to come from Cork. Will you go by the train tomorrow night? I cannot call a minute my own today or the best part of tomorrow, or I would go up to you. Bearer is perfectly trustworthy.

Ever yours faithfully,

J. P. McDonnell

First published in Russian

Written in English

SERGEI PODOLINSKY
TO PYOTR LAVROV IN LONDON

The Hague, August 31, [1872]

I am in a hurry to give you my address, and for that reason I am writing this very evening, because perhaps the post here leaves in the morning. I left Paris the day before yesterday in the evening, arrived in Brussels yesterday morning and stayed over there till this morning. I was at Brismée's yesterday evening and spent rather a long time there, for he is a very sympathetic man and has nothing against a chat. I shall not write any details now, because it will all be cleared up better during the Congress; I shall merely say that Brismée's words confirmed my opinion that the Belgians are the most correct and impartial in the latest disagreements in the International Association.

Hins, unfortunately, will not be at the Congress, and as apparently his affairs have not yet been arranged, I shall see him and have a talk with him when I pass through Verriers on my return journey so as to be better able to arrange his affair in Russia if it is not arranged without that. For the time being I shall not write any more because I have just been to Scheveningen and returned from there on foot and therefore feel tired; besides that I have to write to Paris and Zurich.

I shake your hand.

S. Podolinsky

My address: The Hague, Hotel des deux Villes.

First published in Russian

Translated from the Russian

NIKOLAI UTIN
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

[Bern, end of August 1872]

To Citizen Karl Marx

Dear Friend,

This note, as well as all the necessary documents,* will be handed to you by my best friend and brother, Duval.

* See p. 485 of this volume.—*Ed.*

I recommend him to you as I would recommend someone far better and far more worthy of your friendship than I am. Speak as frankly with him as with me—he will be able to understand you and support you in everything.

Good-bye. Go ahead.*

All yours,

Nicholas

You must *absolutely* read these papers and then judge for yourself what you will do with them—I rely entirely on you and I will sign my name to all these documents with both hands.

Translated from the French

ARTHUR BARNEKOW
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

Editorial Office of the *Socialisten*
Ravnsberggade 21, Copenhagen
[end of August-beginning of
September 1872]

Dear Mr. Secretary Frederick Engels,

As I have known for a long time, you formerly corresponded with the actual leader and organiser of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party here, editor of the *Socialisten*, Louis Pio. You probably received no reply to your last letter to him. I have found among his papers an unfinished letter addressed to you. However that may be, you probably know that he and the less significant agitators Paul Geleff and H. Brix were unexpectedly arrested in the night before an imposing mass demonstration fixed for May 5, which had been prohibited by the police. Through this act of violence harmful disarray was caused in our ranks, and although it has been overcome in a certain measure by our party organ, it is still noticeable in the branch of the International Working Men's Association here.

* "Go ahead" is written in English in the original.—Ed.

The fact is that certain more or less disreputable forces managed to come to the fore, and to these forces belongs, unfortunately, our present editor *de jure*, C. Würtz, who, as you know, is also leader of the International. Our former nominal editor, a certain Alfred Jörgenson, had to be dismissed after a few weeks as quite unsuitable.

Having at his command a certain Svada and a great love for claptrap, Würtz succeeded, by utilising the circumstances, to raise himself to his present post, that is of *manager*, but not of "responsible" manager, since he was engaged by me as such with short notice, and to maintain himself in it with the support of a small clique. He used this post only for personal aims (childish ambition, moneymaking etc.). His election as a delegate to and participant in the Hague Congress should therefore also be considered of no significance, inasmuch as he would be able to present himself to advantage but would be useless for representing others. It was he who recommended himself for this election!

The second delegate, *Pihl*, is, on the other hand, far, far better, although he is by far not so talented. He may therefore be sent with the necessary powers. Besides, the Jutland circles (federations?) will perhaps send *one* delegate. If not we shall send a mandate to Mr. Cournet. In any case I shall write to him tomorrow.

On the instructions of the editorial board, consisting for the majority of young academic forces who adhere to socialist ideas,

With social-democratic greetings and handshake

Candidate of Philosophy *Arthur Barnekow*

Cl. Kongevej, 90

P. S. As I have given the above information most confidentially please be cautious in making use of it.

P. S. Both your esteemed letter and that of Mr. Cournet were insufficiently stamped.

P. S. If you wish to answer the editorial office *privately* please write to *my* address.

FREDERICK ENGELS
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

[The Hague, beginning of September 1872]

Dear Jung,

In the whole of financial year I find payments for Rent¹⁶⁷

1871 October 31—Truelove	£7.7.-
and two payments to Martin	£5.
	<hr/>
	£12.7.-

but *no* payments to Truelove on leaving the *old shop*. Now this must have been paid—have you forgotten to enter it? Please write to The Hague to address on other side if this payment has been omitted on the books. I know last year at the Conference we owed six months rent and now we owe none.

Yours fraternally

F. Engels

Bruno Liebers
148 Jacob Cats Straat
The Hague, Holland

Note on inside of envelope that it is for me.

Written in English

HUGO SPEYER
TO THE BRUNSWICK ORGANISATION *

Bielefeld, September 1, 1872

Dear Sir,

As I hear, some of the friends in your town have appointed a delegate to the general assembly of the International Working Men's Association. As there are also a few members here who, however, are too small in number to elect their own delegate, we have agreed to transfer our representation to the delegate of your town, and request you to arrange this.

The paying members here are:

* The letter bears a pencilled note in English in an unknown hand: Credentials for Bernhard Becker.—*Ed.*

C. Baer, manufacturer.
 P. Grundmann, tailor.
 H. Heitbrink, cigar worker.
 Ludwig Kuhlmann, general agent.
 Fritz Meyer, architect.
 Hugo Speyer, merchant, and in Herford:
 Engelbert Schönfeld, manufacturer.

In spite of our small number we nevertheless believe we must exercise our right of vote through your representative and are sure that, in the event of his already having left, you will take care of the forwarding of our mandate.

It goes without saying that we shall bear our share of the representation costs.

Cordial greetings,
 Yours,

Hugo Speyer

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

ELEANOR MARX
 TO KARL MARX AT THE HAGUE

[London, September 1, 1872]

The enclosed came immediately after you left on Saturday. Helen* went to Bishops Gate Street hoping to catch you up, but arrived only in time to see the train start. Jung gave her the address to which I send this. Utin sent a telegram last night to say a mandate would be sent to The Hague for Mrs. Law.** It's no good now. Is it?

In this morning's *Daily News* there is a telegram from the "Special" announcing the arrival of the delegates. It gives a few names—yours—and those of the other *secretaries*. So I suppose they are taken from one of the printed addresses. They also say that Hales is there. I suppose this is a mistake. Has Vaillant gone?

* Demuth.—Ed.

** See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 313.—Ed.

Old Tibaldi was here yesterday. He said something about a letter you'd promised to write for him. I hope you're well. How is Laura? Love to her and Mama—and remember me to all my friends.

Good-bye. *T. M.**

First published in Russian

Written in English

J. PATRIC MACDONNELL
TO FREDERICK ENGELS AT THE HAGUE

[September 1, 1872,] 6 o'clock

Private

Dear Engels,

There is plotting going on. Mr. Guillaume and his *confrères* are at work. They have a meeting just while I am writing this and our beautiful English members are with them, *Sexton, Roach, Mottershead* etc. They are securing the addresses of the disaffected and have even—in a mild way—essayed to catch me. I fear they will work harm to us in The Hague. Mr. Eccarius is a leader. He says the most shameful things of Dr. Marx. As for the English members, they are a cruel and treacherous lot.

Ever yours truly,

J. P. McDonnell

irst published in Russian

Written in English

SERGEI PODOLINSKY
TO PYOTR LAVROV IN LONDON

The Hague, September 1, [1872]

I said in my letter yesterday that my conversation with Brismée had confirmed me still more in the opinion that the Belgians' views concerning the organisation of the International Association were most correct. Brismée is very

* Tussy Marx.—*Ed.*

dissatisfied with the behaviour of the Italians and the Jura Federation—for example, in a leading article of the *Internationale* they are called “*faux frères*”*; but at the same time he told me that in his opinion the Council is partly to blame and that although the Council had always behaved very well towards them, i.e. the Belgians, this had not been so in every case. Accordingly Brismée is thinking of proposing to the Congress projects of local organisations, for instance for France, then a decrease in the subscription to the central treasury, a change in the manner of voting which would equalise the representation of the different countries—all measures of decentralisation,¹ as you see. Moreover he informed me that, however sad and harmful this is, things will probably go so far that all workers in the field of thought will be expelled from the International Association, since they are the chief cause of the disagreements. He himself is of the opinion that such expulsions would be very harmful, but apparently the workers' mood is tending that way.

All this morning I was in a rather confused state of mind, for which the Dutch are mainly to blame, for they have not even printed the announcement of the Congress or even posted anything on the doors of the hall where the sittings will be held, so that outwardly on the whole the arrangements are very bad.

At four o'clock I went to the railway station in the hope of meeting Brismée. I did not meet him but I encountered a noisy crowd of some 40 persons, among whom were Marx and his wife and Engels. They had just arrived and were discussing where they should go. Incidentally, they were met by a delegate from here with a pink flower in his button-hole. Their appearance, their number, and apparently their good humour livened me up somewhat, otherwise I was afraid the Congress would turn out to be a complete failure. Today the first sitting takes place at 11 o'clock in the Concordia hall, but it appears it is not a public one.

I shake your hand.



S. Podolinsky

First published in Russian

Translated from the Russian

* False brothers.—Ed.

SERGEI PODOLINSKY
TO PYOTR LAVROV IN LONDON

The Hague, September 2, [1872]

I have just learned to my great satisfaction that the Neuchâtel Congress did not take place and that the Italians, Spaniards and even the Jura Federation had sent delegates here. In all there are between 60 and 70 delegates, including 3 from America. There are very many Germans and Frenchmen. In general one can say that it is a numerous congress, because there are not very many Belgians and Dutch, whereas usually the local delegates were the majority.

From 10 to 2 today the first private sitting took place, at which a commission was elected to check the mandates, and besides there was a discussion on who was to be allowed to be present at the closed sittings, and the newspapermen, even those belonging to the International Association, were excluded. The Jura delegates (there are two of them—Guillaume and Schwitzguébel), have not yet quarrelled with the members of the General Council but apparently their relations are very strained so that it seems that even people belonging to the opposition to the Council, Vaillant among others, noted with displeasure that Guillaume was behaving badly, for instance was addressing the members of the Council as "gentlemen" and so on. How the affair will end one cannot say yet, but in any case it is a good thing that they have sent delegates and that consequently the question of their expulsion from the International Association is posed in quite a different manner than if they had arranged their own congress at Neuchâtel; there is reason to think that Brismée, for example, who in that case would probably have been in favour of their expulsion, will now most likely vote against it, and probably so will many others. I have just returned from Brismée, with whom I was while he was having lunch with Dupont, Vaillant, Lissagaray (who is not a delegate) and others. They were apparently rather satisfied with the sitting, in any case the first sitting at least had gone off better than could have been expected. Of course I am deducing all this from scraps of sentences which I heard, since I was not at the sitting and shall not manage to attend

before tomorrow, as they will only decide this evening at the second closed sitting when there will be public ones.

I shake your hand.

S. Podolinsky

First published in Russian

Translated from the Russian

JOSÉ MESA

TO FREDERICK ENGELS AT THE HAGUE *

Madrid, September 2, 1872

My dear Engels,

I am writing to you in a hurry, sending you my statement on Bakunin's letter to Morago and greetings from the New Madrid Federation to the Congress.**

I am also sending you in an issue of *La Emancipación* a copy of the Council's circular of July 7, which you might need.

I don't know whether it will all arrive in time, but I only received your letter yesterday, and yesterday too Lafargue wrote to me; his silence had made me very anxious. I had no address to write to The Hague, and I did not dare to write to London any more.

You must have already seen the four Spanish delegates — Marselau, Alerini, Farga and Morago — four Alliancists. The elections were carried out in the bourgeois way; that means that there were all sorts of fiddling. We have proof of this. I am sending you an issue of *La Federación* with the imperative mandate concocted by the Federal Council.***

La Emancipación was not able to appear this week. Tell Lafargue I shall write to him tomorrow at his address.

Cordial handshake.

Mesa

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* On the letter is written in Engels' hand: José Mesa.—*Ed.*

** See *The Hague Congress of the First International. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 361-62, 243-44.—*Ed.*

*** *Ibid.*, pp. 325-29.—*Ed.*

SERGEI PODOLINSKY
TO PYOTR LAVROV IN LONDON

The Hague, September 3, [1872]

I received today your letter of the 30th in which you express concern that the letter you sent to Dieppe may have fallen into the wrong hands. I have already written to Dieppe and shall probably manage to receive it during my stay at The Hague; in any case nothing can happen to it, for either it will remain in Paris or will return there if it does not reach me, and in Paris it will be in absolutely safe hands. It would be good if you repeated in outline what you wrote in that letter and replied to me as soon as you receive this letter; and after the 6th do not write to The Hague any more because on the 8th or 9th I am leaving via Brussels for Russia. I don't quite understand your question about the number of my flat in Paris. It is No. 84 bis, but that is what you wrote in the address. As regards the Congress I can say that all the sittings so far have been closed ones and that there will be no public ones, it appears, until the 5th. Today I did not see any of the delegates, because they are busy at the Congress almost the whole day long.

The people of The Hague take a very great interest in the Congress and there is a big crowd near the doors of the hall, especially in the evenings; they make attempts to shout greetings and sing the Marseillaise, but there are so many soldiers standing at different places in the street that no demonstrations can take place. At the same time as your letter I received one from Ginsburg in which he says that the anarchists intend, if they are expelled or offended in any way (for example if they are censured) to call another Congress about the 8th at St. Imier (it appears that is the name), the more so as the Italians refused to send delegates to The Hague. Nothing particular is reported about Nechayev except that he is in prison and that nobody is allowed to visit him, that the émigrés are preparing a new protest. Nechayev betrayed to the Russians by a spy whose name is Stempkowski,* about whom I told you that he used to be a police informer and Polish ringleader in Zurich.

* The original has Stempkowski.—Ed.

In this connection a jury is being made up with the participation of elected representatives of the Swiss workers who are displeased by Nechayev's arrest and presumed extradition.

I shake your hand.

S. P.

First published in Russian

Translated from the Russian

JULES JOHANNARD
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

The Hague, September 4, 1872
10 a.m.
Concordia Hall,
Lange Lombard Straat

My dear Jung,

I have just received your letter. You need not be worried about what may be said about you. You know quite well that I have the gift of the gab and shall not allow you to be attacked in any way. Incidentally there is nothing of the sort here so far.

Concerning what you say about the General Council, it shall be done as you wish.

As for Vaillant, he had his credentials for France recognised valid, at the same time accepting the other, which, by the way, was contested by *Guillaume*, who denied that there is a French section of the Association at La Chaux-de-Fonds. At the Congress Vaillant stated that he had been sent a mandate. I did not think it my duty to say out loud at the moment that he had asked for it after intriguing everywhere to get a mandate from France. But I passed him a short note in which I observed to him that he had asked for it himself and that the mandate had only been sent to him on his formal request. I added that he should not have made use of equivocations in respect of his adversaries; that note cannot have caused him great pleasure, but that kind of man has no guts, he did not say a word to me about it.

Yesterday a sitting of 10 hours—everybody was dead tired. Zhukovsky's mandate was suspended until after the discussion on the Alliance.

The mandate from Section No. 2 of New York was declared null and void, there was a heated discussion on this point. Lively argument between yours truly and Citizen Sorge of New York. Sauva showed great skill in all this, but he was beaten all the same. Spanish mandates declared valid after a terrible discussion. The Spanish delegates are truly intelligent and skilful. Incidentally, you know them: Farga, Marselau, Morago, and another one whose name slips my memory.

This morning Section No. 12 of New York was discussed. It will be beaten, I suppose. It is the last mandate to be checked. Afterwards the bureau will be appointed, Dupont has chances. This evening there will be a public sitting, discussion of the Alliance, I suppose. On this score I shall tell you some very interesting things. Guillaume is friendly towards me, more than that—he makes approaches. But I said to him: My dear fellow, I have only one good quality and I shall keep it in spite of all: I am of good faith and can be neither bought nor imposed upon. I want to maintain absolute independence in the middle of all these intrigues, but I shall tell you all that by word of mouth and that will be better.

My dear fellow, I am certainly being sent to Coventry by our old friends. You know whom I mean. This morning they did not even say good day to me, but I don't care. I said yesterday during a discussion that nothing would be hushed up and that everything had to be brought to light; that is what I think, and you too, I am sure.

Credentials to make a report came from St. Francisco this morning for Vaillant, they say, though the letter was addressed to Dupont. After all I think the end of this holds some little surprises in store for us. I fear we shall have to note many a blunder on the part of the General Council. It's hard for me to say so, I admit. Hales has left without official notice of his departure. The Congress is dissatisfied: why did he do so? Barry's mandate has been contested by Sauva and Mottershead, but on the other hand Barry was defended by Marx to the bitter end and was naturally recog-

nised. This is very strange coming from men who were accusing Barry to everybody's hearing only a fortnight ago.

Speaking of Mottershead, he has not sobered up since he arrived here; I met him the other night on a bridge over a canal which he seemed to be trying to fill.

Today or Monday, the Commission on the Alliance is not yet ready to make its report. That will perhaps keep us here a day longer. For my part, I should like to leave, this way of doing things disgusts and sickens me. Dupont shakes your hand, Serrailier ditto, Vichard ditto.

Our very best wishes to Mrs. Jung.

Yours,
Johannard

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

JULES JOHANNARD
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON *

[The Hague, September 4, 1872]

...what was rankling in his heart. A poor figure he cuts, this gentleman. At the moment it is the messiah who is speaking, a champion of *free love*** (you smile and say J. J. must sympathise with that fellow), I shall reply later on. Tomorrow I shall write you another letter and tell you, I hope, the result of the discussion on the Alliance.

As for this morning, I don't think you can complain. I am leaving you, because the messiah is too amusing. I want to listen to him attentively.

All best wishes from Schwitzguébel who has just whispered into my ear: Tell him we have not yet come to an agreement! This being done, remember me to Miss Jung and believe me to be

Your devoted friend

J. Johannard

P. S. A splendid country, my dear fellow. Astonishingly beautiful! This evening after the sitting I think we shall go

* The beginning of the letter is missing.—*Ed.*

** William West.—*Ed.*

to the seaside. We get good meals here, the beds are fair, but the price, good lord! My cash is disappearing with such a speed that I can't help being afraid. But I don't care, they can leave me in part payment if they like; the women here are not too bad, believe me, but ssh!!! Let's be serious.

J. J.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

E. GLASER DE WILLEBRORD
TO FREDERICK ENGELS AT THE HAGUE *

[September 5, 1872, The Hague]
Thursday morning

Dear Citizen Engels,

As Mrs. Marx might have found it very impolite of me not to have gone to see her, and you yourself might think it strange that I did not visit you at Pico's, I owe you a word of explanation; on my return from the Indies I was expelled from Holland; when I left the Hague, Pico kept my belongings and gave up my papers to the police, hence the relations between your hotel owner and myself which are easily understood. Many years have gone by since then, but every time I come to The Hague or Rotterdam the police does me the honour of inviting me to leave, and in order to avoid this annoyance I keep to myself and avoid coming in contact with the owner of your hotel. Please oblige me, dear Citizen Engels, by conveying my apologies and my regret to Mrs. Marx and also to the doctor, with whom I spoke yesterday but who was so strange towards me that I shall not feel the desire to do so again.

I warned you more than a fortnight ago about the mood of the Belgians**; I have no influence over them and I fail to see how I can be held responsible for their actions; that is the only way I can interpret Marx's bad humour.

* On the envelope is written "Citizen Engels" in Engels' hand and a note of the contents of Hepner's speech at the evening sitting of the Congress on September 6, 1872. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 667.—Ed.

** See p. 486 of this volume.—Ed.

I think I told you that I had brought a parcel of pamphlets: I thought they could have been sold at the public sittings, but Rodenbach told me that *The Civil War* had been translated into Dutch and that he thought there were no prospects of selling the French edition.

Yours very devotedly,

E. Glaser de Willebrord

Hotel du Lion d'Or

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

JULES JOHANNARD, EUGÈNE DUPONT, PAUL VICHARD
AND AUGUSTE SERRAILLIER
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

The Hague, September 5, 1872
Concordia Hall,
Lange Lombard Straat

My dear Jung,

This morning there was an administrative sitting from 8 o'clock, and at 10 o'clock a public sitting. A commission has been appointed to inquire into the Alliance affair. The bureau has been appointed. Ranvier is chairman, and the vice-chairmen are Sorge and Gerhard (Dutch). Dupont had been appointed vice-chairman but he refused, holding back for the discussions and for another reason which I shall tell you over there. Another little piece of hypocrisy coming from the same question. At last!! 10.30, the public sitting is opened. Quite a lot of people, but less than I would have thought, it is not yet very well known that there is a public sitting. By the way, it will be very short, more probably another will be held at 4 o'clock.

Ranvier opens the sitting with a few well-spoken words which are well applauded. The report has been recast and is much better, it was very effective.¹⁵⁸ The passage on the press was drowned in hear, hears, the French translation was very good and Longuet read it very well. I did not expect it, I admit. I sincerely complimented him, and from me

that is a proof, for I no longer like him, the jesuitic juggler, but one must be fair even to one's enemies.

The newspapermen are present in great number. They felt very much offended at the reading of the report. There are quite a few informers among them too, but we do not know them yet....

The Amsterdam Section sent the Congress an invitation to hold a meeting at their place. The proposal will be discussed today, in committee, I suppose.

The struggle is going to begin on the powers of the General Council, it will be a hot one, to be sure, for we have opponents who, in my opinion, are lacking neither in intelligence nor in arguments. At any rate, we shall see how it ends.

Another letter from me tomorrow. At least I shall do what I can for that. Many good wishes to your wife and believe me

Yours,
Johannard

My dear Jung,

Since our friend J. J. keeps you abreast of the sittings I shall confine myself to shaking your hand and reminding you of the assignment I gave you concerning the *newspapers*.

My compliments to your wife, kiss the baby for me.

Yours,
E. Dupont

I shake friend Jung's hand,
his devoted
Paul Vichard

Please find out under what name my wife sends my letters. There is one for me according to Le Moussu, and I cannot get it.

Greetings and thanks,
A. Serraillier

Quick, if you please.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

SERGEI PODOLINSKY
TO PYOTR LAVROV IN LONDON

[The Hague, September 5, [1872]

Today, as a reward for a long wait, there were two public sittings one after the other, from 10 to 1 and from 4 to 7.30. I shall not describe the purely factual side, because you will find it in full in the newspapers since the number of journalists is very considerable, and, by the way, there are some who know delegates and consequently will have all the data which can be made public. I shall only note to begin with that you must not attribute any particular significance to their exaggerated descriptions of the small scandals that took place today, which will certainly appear in the reactionary papers. Scandals there were, but very insignificant ones considering that such a delicate subject as the existence of the General Council was under discussion.

In the closed sessions it was worse, judging by some accounts and by the shouting, which could be heard in the street.

In order better to clarify the position I must say at the very beginning that between the Belgians and, in part, the Dutch on one side, and the Spaniards and the Jurassians on the other, there was an agreement: to be precise, the Spaniards and Jurassians adopted the Belgian decision concerning the General Council (still at the section stage) and for that reason the Belgians now naturally oppose any violence against them on the part of the Council. Although the anarchists (that is how I shall call this side for brevity's sake) all the same represent a minority, that minority is rather significant and for that reason the General Council has already considerably loosened the rein; thus today, for example, Lafargue was already proposing that in countries where, as in Belgium, the federal councils are well organised, they should be allowed to admit sections. The anarchist minority is particularly significant considering that the Italians did not turn up, that the Spanish delegates have several thousand votes each, that the Belgians, partly out of impartiality, sent no more than 5 or 6 delegates, and that, naturally, these delegates represent a far greater number of workers than the 12 members of the General Council.

If the way of voting suggested by Brismée had been adopted, the Council would have been in the minority, particularly if the Italians had been present. To sum up one may say that the Council, despite all the more or less unseemly efforts, achieved a far from full success; it is true that the Germans and the French, according to the Belgians' expression, *voient comme des soldats prussiens** (together and as one, although it is exhausting) according to the order of the Council, all the same a kind of general sympathy seems to begin to incline towards the anarchists, which, of course, is due in part to the good choice of delegates. James Guillaume (notwithstanding what was said by Johannard, and not Vaillant as I wrote by error**) deports himself very well and on the whole is such a sympathetic man that even his opponents treat him without any particular malice; for instance, when he protested today against the offensive expressions used in respect of Malon and Bakunin, almost everybody supported him and the letter containing these expressions was not translated into the other languages (the letter was from the Ferré Section).

The second scandal was caused by the American delegate, the German Sorge, *qui est plus marxiste que Marx**** and again he was called to order. On the part of the anarchists there were no excesses (except, incidentally for one Belgian, Spingard, it appears, who shouted out during Sorge's speech); on the contrary, the speeches of Guillaume and Morago (a Spaniard) were distinguished by greater objectivity, Guillaume's, in particular, delivered in a somewhat naively sarcastic tone, was very good both from the point of view of oratory and that of restraint and dignity. Morago spoke passionately and with gestures but without any abuse or personalities. Justice demands that it be said that, with the exception of Sorge, the speakers for the Council namely Lafargue and Longuet, also behaved with great propriety. On the whole people have calmed down a little now, in comparison with the beginning at least, but at the beginning as Brismée said, *il y avait de bien tristes choses.*****

* Vote like Prussian soldiers.—Ed.

** See p. 507 of this volume.—Ed.

*** Who is more Marxist than Marx.—Ed.

**** There were some very sad things.—Ed.

However this may be, the Council will not make up its mind for expulsion, and besides, the question is posed differently now: it is the anarchists who threaten to leave (incidentally the Belgians threatened to depart from the Congress if, as the Council desired, the credentials of the Spaniards were not recognised). It is understandable that if the Spaniards, Italians, Belgians, Swiss and Dutch leave, the International Association, except for the American and English sections (which, by the way, have divided) will be turned into a secret society without any particular significance, and it is to be thought that the Council, though commanding a majority at the Congress, will not want to carry things to such an extreme. That is what I conclude from the fact that Lafargue's proposal already reveals certain concessions. I shall note by way of conclusion that all the speeches, both for and against, are rather weak from the point of view of proofs; as a rule propositions are advanced and supported with assurances and phrasemongering more than with logical arguments. Factual principles are also given, but the matter never goes as far as any scientific theoretical elaboration. Guillaume's speech also suffers from this weakness, though it is better than the others all the same.

Excuse me for not informing you of the content of the speeches but that would be very long and, of course, superfluous in view of the journalists. I note that the Council's reply as read by Longuet produced a very good impression; it was glibly written, obviously by Marx, and good on the whole, though a little abusive. Marx himself read it out in German, but hardly anybody listened to him, and in general he was unlucky today.

First published in Russian

Translated from the Russian

IVAN GOLOVIN
TO KARL MARX AT THE HAGUE

[The Hague, about September 5-7, 1872]

Dear Sir,

Together with Herzen I defended Bakunin in the *Morning Advertiser* in London against your namesake.¹⁵⁹ This

time I will not do so. A Russian section in general seems to me to be of little use. But in order to set forth the state of affairs I have asked to be allowed to speak and I shall be very grateful to you if you will please inform me when I shall be able to do so.

Yours respectfully,

Ivan Golovin

Translated from the German

EUGÈNE DUPONT
TO KARL MARX AT THE HAGUE

[September 7, 1872]

My dear Marx,

If we are to go to Amsterdam I would ask you to tell me whether you can add a little money to the sum you have already given to Serrailier, in order to enable us to wait until Tuesday.

Please be kind enough to let me know this evening, because the train leaves tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

Yours,

E. Dupont

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

SERGEI PODOLINSKY
TO PYOTR LAVROV IN LONDON

The Hague, September 7, [1872]

Yesterday morning, at a closed sitting (though the question had been discussed at a public one) a decision was taken on the question of the General Council. Naturally the decision was in favour of the Council, that is, its present rights are recognised, though with a slight limitation; to be precise, the Council has the right to refuse to admit a section only if the local federation agrees to this, otherwise the matter is settled at a Congress. Understandably, the federalists will

readily admit sections. Then the Congress went on to debate the question of the political role of the workers' associations.

The speakers were Vaillant, Hepner, Guillaume and Longuet. Longuet's speech was not a bad one, but despite the fact that he was the last to speak, it was not quite to the point; for example, for a large part of the time he discussed Proudhon's theory of political abstention, which nobody was defending, for Guillaume had said at the very beginning that he had no intention of abstaining from political (i.e. revolutionary, but not parliamentary) activity. Moreover Longuet allowed himself such expressions as: "*Votre maître** Bakunin", and "*je vous prendrais pour un économiste déguisé***" and so on. Vaillant, who spoke first on this point, expressed himself becomingly but said practically nothing, so that of those who defended statehood it was Hepner who delivered the best speech, though also in a rather insolent tone and with a Jewish way of proving things by the number of copies of the *Guerre civile**** sold and of new subscribers to the *Volksstaat*. He cited all this as proof that the idea of authority had not been foisted on the German workers but was an integral part of their outlook and that the Commune fell because it lacked authority and power. These last expressions roused indignation even among the Communards, who supported the Council, and Longuet said in his speech that he did not agree with Hepner, that his expression was "*malheureuse*****" and that it was only authority that was lacking in the Commune. Guillaume began by saying that he did not at all think that the ideas of the Council were foisted on the Germans, that on the contrary they had arrived at these ideas quite independently, but that other nations had also arrived independently at the idea of federalism; then he developed his own understanding of the political role of the International Association in the sense that it should not take over the bourgeois state but should destroy (*applatir*) the state itself as a bourgeois institution. Then he added that, not finding in the Council's

* Your master.—Ed.

** I would take you for an economist in disguise.—Ed.

*** *Civil War*. What is meant is the General Council's address on *The Civil War in France*.—Ed.

**** Unfortunate.—Ed.

present activity any definite plan of action, he had turned to the manifesto of Marx and Engels of the year 1848 as to the best expression of these thoughts. Discussing various points of this manifesto, he said that there it was a matter of the instruments of production being centralised by the state and a social overturn being carried out. To that Engels observed that Guillaume had the French translation and that in German it was put differently, that they also wished to destroy the political state and intended to maintain only economic centralisation. To this Guillaume replied that he considered any kind of centralisation as a form of state and that such mode of action was contrary to the principle of free federation which he represented. Still earlier he had said that he was convinced that a social overturn, in the sense, too, of an overturn through the agency of the International Association, was the direct expression of the thoughts and feelings of the workers and that only if people really penetrated with these thoughts and feelings united freely would there be among them that solidarity which could never be created by a central power and would never be destroyed by the absence of such of a power if it really existed. The hall was full of people, more than half of whom were workers, and Guillaume's speech, briefly but energetically translated by Van den Abeele, produced such an impression on them that Marx, finally getting angry, shouted that Van den Abeele had not translated correctly, which was quite unjust according to the Belgians and the Dutch, and by the way I also understand Flemish when it is spoken loudly and not too fast, as was the case with Van den Abeele. After the meeting Brismée said that Marx and Co. would not dare to speak and act as they had done at an ordinary meeting of workers and not at a congress where more than half were Jacobins and so on. Even some French Communards are beginning to be dissatisfied, and if the workers were really counted then more than half of them would be federalists. Marx in general behaves unbecomingly; for instance he prompts the chairman what he should do—it would be better if he were in the chair himself.

Tomorrow probably the whole Congress will go to Amsterdam to a public meeting, I intend to go too. You still have time to answer me: Brussels, *poste restante*.

I was forgetting to tell you that there is a Russian delegate by the name of Zhukovsky, but it appears his mandate was not accepted.

In Zurich the jury that assembled over Stempkowski decided to print his feats and accompany them with his photograph.

First published in Russian

Translated from the Russian

SERGEI PODOLINSKY
TO PYOTR LAVROV IN LONDON

The Hague, September 7, [1872]
9.30 p. m.

This evening the Congress ends, the last public sitting has just been held and now the last closed one is going on.

However, there will also be a meeting tomorrow in Amsterdam, and I intend to go there. This morning at the closed sitting it was decided that in 1872-73 the Council will be in New York and the 12 members of whom it will consist were named. The names are American and unknown to me. These 12 men have the right to co-opt another 3. The Congress decided, moreover, that the next Congress would meet in Switzerland, the Council being left to name the city.

As you see, in principle, though with concessions, Marx has won, but I am astonished that such an intelligent man as he could attach so much importance to the external side of victory when it was already clear from all the facts that public opinion was inclined towards the other side. If Marx does indeed intend to give up all practical activity for a time or for good he would have done better if he had yielded where, as he himself saw, he could only achieve a purely formal result in spite of all his endeavours. At least he would have left the stage with honour if he had remained with equal rights with the others, whereas now he is subjected to a shower of accusations, partly just. The Congress ended with two speeches in Dutch to the public and a speech by Brismée on the all-round significance of the Association. One of the speeches in Dutch was very well received, and Brismée's

speech had, as the French say, "*un succès fou*"*; indeed, he is a good popular speaker and more over his imposing and at the same time pleasing appearance was bound to produce the very best impression. Then various letters, greetings and so on were read.

I go on to my general conclusion: although no particularly unpleasant incidents took place at the Congress and most of the delegates behaved well and personally produce a good impression, all the same I am dissatisfied with the Congress, not because disagreements were clearly revealed at it (the last, in my opinion not of a particularly important kind), but because there was revealed a general weakness of the International Association which I had long suspected. There are things, such as, for instance, the lack of figures in reports, which have a very bad effect on any person who is at all sceptical, and figures were too carefully avoided. Besides this there are naturally also other signs of weakness, which it would take too long to dwell on. If you write to Brussels *poste restante*, I shall still receive your letter.

Translated from the Russian

CARL FARKAS
TO KARL MARX AT THE HAGUE

September 7, 1872

AUTHORITY

I hereby give Citizen Dr. Karl Marx authority to receive all letters and, if occasion should arise, money remittances which may arrive for me.

Carl Farkas,
from Pest in Hungary

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

* A tremendous success.—*Ed.*

JULES JOHANNARD
TO HERMANN JUNG IN LONDON

The Hague, September 8 [7], 1872
Concordia Hall,
Lange Lombard Straat

My dear Jung,

I have just at this moment received your letter, which confirms me in what I wrote to you yesterday. There is a manoeuvre which I do not hesitate to qualify as unworthy on the part of men whom I had been used to consider honest. For the rest, I shall tell you all that is going on here; since the very first day it has been nothing but a centre of base intrigues, they have not feared to sacrifice the Association for the sake of having their proposals adopted. You will be surprised to learn, I suppose, that the General Council is to be transferred in future to *New York*! Yes, my dear fellow, to America. You can imagine the resolution declaring that the Association was to become a political party, and moreover the General Council in the New World. You can imagine the General Council sending *orders or communications* to the Parisians, the Germans, the Spaniards. I swear there will be a good laugh when that is known, but we shall talk about it soon.

The Blanquists left this morning, there was a furious attack on them yesterday evening. I have no need to say that it was yours truly who pushed them to that. The monstrous way in which the discussion was carried on was so revolting that I could no longer contain my indignation. The best of it was that Marx and Engels asked for me to be called to order, which incidentally was not done, because the majority of the Congress was on my side. My poor friend, where is our impartiality, our justice? If I had foreseen what was going to happen I swear I would have entreated you to come. It is almost a crime to have allowed the poor International to be mutilated as it has been for the last week. This morning I thanked Marx and Engels for their call to order, they who had asked us to wait for the Congress to get rid of the Blanquists. Well! Well!! Well!!! This morning an address from the Parisians has just been read out at-

tacking the Blanquists,* that is to say those who misuse the name of that worthy and honest man, that champion of the revolution, who, if he knew about it, would drive away all these charlatans who besmirch his name and dishonour his talent by placing their jesuitic names side by side with his loyal name.

When I read that sentence over I see that it is constructed idiotically. You will understand it by imagining the feverish state in which I find myself. They all left because I promised I would attack them today, they evaded discussion as they always do, and went to a small room to condemn me with *Marx*—but patience, I shall find them again and we shall have a talk.

Barry left this morning with many others. The vote is taking place on the composition of the General Council, which they are trying to put into the hands of Mr. Sorge, the man who will be fatal to the Association, mark my words. The vote for the General Council resulted in 19 for, 5 against, 19 abstentions, at least 10 declaring that they could not understand.

Marx and *Engels* are making unheard-of blunders and are displaying an unprecedented passion against any opposition; their clumsiness is revolting even their friends. They have been reduced by this vote to demand that it should be annulled because they were in too much of a hurry to have it taken. It is going to begin all over again. What a fine subject for a comedy, isn't it? Between you and me, if it were not so gloomy one would have a good laugh. When the votes are being counted they produce a list which nobody knows but Mr. Sorge.

I believe we are going to hold a meeting in Amsterdam tomorrow. I don't know whether the Congress will be over.

I may write once more between now and my departure.

Yours,
Johannard

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 233-36.—*Ed.*

NATALIE LIEBKNECHT
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT AT HUBERTUSBURG *

[Leipzig, after September 8, 1872]

My dear husband,

Mr. Hepner returned this afternoon and is with me now, telling me, while I write, about Marx, Engels, Sorge, the sittings, etc. He says the first-named gave him the impression of an old man, although his bearing is still thoroughly smart; he is difficult to get on with because he is very nervous and highly irritable. Engels, he says, is still quite jovial, but also very irritable. Likewise Sorge, who by the way impresses one as being very good-humoured. Marx did not want to be on the General Council any longer so as to be able to finish his *Capital*. His wife and Mr. and Mrs. Lafargue were also there. They all send us greetings. Sorge had received letters from his relatives which were so unfriendly that he did not come for that reason. In Mainz all proposals were rejected—that was all. Herr Hepner considers the accusations against Eccarius (he was also at The Hague) very exaggerated, says he only committed indiscretions through carelessness, and that there was nothing so dangerous about his strike either, he wanted 30 shillings a week instead of 15, and his intrigues in America had not gone so far.¹⁶⁰

Mrs. Marx also sang Mr. Hepner a long lamentation, much more complaining than mine; you see, my dear husband, that I have a right to do so, I would be glad to believe in a happier future but know it will never be for us; you will never feel happy and satisfied alone with your family; you will always be the first in the battle line, even if it ruins your family.

Your letter caused me great pleasure, and the intention remains good even if we do not fulfil it. I had a bad dream last night but still I can say for your consolation that I am feeling better. Mr. Hepner is on the whole satisfied, but

* The envelope bears the address: Mr. W. Liebknecht, Hubertusburg, Wermsdorf. Sender: N. Liebknecht.—Ed.

the journey was straining and expensive, the sittings lasted from morning till evening.

Sleep well, my darling. I send you a thousand kisses.

Your
Natalie

H.S. brought newspapers and sausage.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

ADOLF HEPNER
TO WILHELM LIEBKNECHT AT HUBERTUSBURG *

[Leipzig, after September 8, 1872]

From Hepner

1. The Congress went very well, though this is not so obvious outwardly because of the Bakunin debates.

2. Marx, Engels, Mrs. Marx send best greetings.

3. Sorge cannot come here because otherwise the return ticket would not be valid.

4. Marx will now come out against Bakunin in his own name.

5. An additional reason why Marx and Engels wanted the General Council moved to America was so that the Frenchmen in London would be given no opportunity for stupidities** for which Marx would always be held responsible.

6. Not our Hepner but the New York one was secretary.¹⁶¹

7.*** wants proof for the *one who writes the letters*.****

8. Delagate Hepner was from New York.

9. Vaillant sends greetings.

10. I may come next Friday *with the Minutes of The Hague*.*****

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

* Enclosed with Natalie Liebknecht's letter.—Ed.

** The end of the sentence is inserted in pencil instead of "from which everybody would have to suffer", which is crossed out.—Ed.

*** Illegible word.—Ed.

**** Points 7-10 are written in pencil.—Ed.

***** The end of the letter is written on the back of a fragment of a report by correspondent Rudolph Seiffert.—Ed.

EDWARD JONES
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

107, Sanderson Street,
Miles Platting,
[Manchester]
September 10, 1872

Dear Citizen Engels,

It was owing entirely to a "chapter of accidents that Manchester was not represented at the Congress—" I have explained all to Dupont—it is no use crying over "spilt milk".

We held a meeting of representatives from our Sections and affiliated Societies last *Wednesday* and decided that the money they should have paid for our delegates shall be applied towards bringing out a journal in Manchester—we have sufficient money to issue a very good journal. It is to be monthly at first.

We are complete "Novices" at the work—would you be kind enough to give us your opinion as to the best course to pursue—we are confident of a good circulation but the thing is to start in the right *groove*. Will you allow us to republish the *Manifesto* of which you gave me a copy in *German*?

A speedy reply

will oblige.

Yours fraternally,

E. Jones

If Sorge has not returned I have a parcel of "Trades Societies Reports" for him.

E. J.

First published in Russian

Written in English

KARL MARX
TO THE EDITOR OF THE *CORSAIRE* NEWSPAPER IN PARIS

The Hague, September 12, 1872

Dear Sir,

The *Figaro* of September 11 reproduces a conversation which I am alleged to have had with the correspondent of the *Soir*. The *Figaro*-type press can allow itself any calum-

ny without anybody taking the trouble to point it out, but when the mercenary imagination of a correspondent goes so far as to put into my mouth grave accusations against my friends of the ex-General Council, I feel bound to say that he has violated all the rules of truth in daring to claim to have exchanged a single word with me.

I profit by this opportunity to let our friends and enemies know that I never dreamed of resigning from the International and that the transfer of the General Council to New York was proposed by me and several other members of the previous General Council.

It is false to report that Bakunin and his acolyte Guillaume were expelled as heads of a so-called federalist party. The expulsion of Bakunin and Guillaume was motivated by the creation within our Association of a secret society, the *Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, which claimed to direct the International to aims contrary to its principles.

The Resolution of the London Conference of the political action of the working class was approved by the great majority of the Congress, and its insertion in the General Rules was voted.

The working-class public of The Hague and Amsterdam were most sympathetic towards the Congress.

So much for the value of the reports in the reactionary press.

Yours sincerely,
Karl Marx

Translated from the French

FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

On board the "Atlantic" from
Queenstown,
September 13, 1872

Dear Engels,

See to it that the Minutes books of the General Council are sent on to me, as well as the seal, etc. for the new General

* On the back of the letter is a note by Engels: September 13, 1872 (on board) *F. A. Sorge*.—*Ed.*

Council. Hales will have the seal and Eccarius must still have one Minutes book, Jung tells me. Those fellows must retain nothing belonging to the General Council, and our people in the General Council need the things in order to orientate themselves. I shall write just now to Jones in Manchester to send the things to you for dispatch to me. Be so kind as to send me either the *Beehive* or the *International Herald* for one of my friends who wants them. Note what you spend for me and I shall remit it to you as soon as the total exceeds £ 3 to £ 4. Cuno is swearing blue murder at having to travel steerage. Dereure has shown no sign of discomfort yet. This afternoon I am going to start work on my Congress report.* Remind our people to put everything in order and send it in. Hearty greeting to the Moor, his and your family.

Yours,

F. A. Sorge

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

ADOLF HEPNER

TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON **

[Leipzig] Jail

September 15, 1872

Dear Engels,

Seiffert will be running affairs during my imprisonment and therefore also correspondence with you. As the resolutions have been confiscated from me, kindly send a few notes containing what is most worth knowing about the Hague Congress to the *Volksstaat*.*** They have confiscated from me: 1.) the nominal roll, which indeed will be my salvation, for it follows from it that I am *not* the *New York Hepner*; 2.) an *absolutely worthless* bit of my Minutes which I made for myself. It is written in such a way that *nobody* except me can read it.—One cannot tell yet how long the

* See pp. 303-49 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** The envelope bears Leipzig and London postmarks and the address: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London N.W.—*Ed.*

*** See pp. 105-16 of this volume.—*Ed.*

investigation will last. The whole thing boils down to personal revenge by Rueder against me.

Greetings to all.

A. H.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

SERGEI PODOLINSKY
TO PYOTR LAVROV IN LONDON

Berlin, September 16, 1872

You are probably surprised that in spite of my long-standing promise I have not written to you for so long. The one to blame is the Belgian government, who played the following trick on me. In Brussels I was foolish enough to stay in the same hotel as the delegates, thinking that nobody there was paying attention to such trifles. It turned out just the contrary: I was summoned to the chief of the *Direction de la sûreté publique*,* who stated that he considered me also as a delegate, subjected me to a formal interrogation and after that told me I had to leave Belgium. He did the same to Zhukovsky (the remaining delegates were not taken). The worst of it all is that he promised to make inquiries about me in Russia and that if my statements turned out to be untrue I should be punished. My statements cannot turn out to be untrue, because I said everything as it was in fact, that is, that I had been to The Hague and attended the public sittings, and I shall say the same thing in Russia if I am questioned, because I consider that I was perfectly entitled to be present at the public sittings in order, for example, to make out some kind of account, and the like, but all the same it is an unpleasant business. As I was busy with the police and moreover had other things in Brussels and Ghent which I had to attend to in a hurry, it is understandable that I did not have time to write anything to you from Brussels, and besides, I did not want to write before the business with the police was over. It is very bad also

* Direction of Public Security.—Ed.

that now I shall perhaps not be able to fulfil my programme and, what is highly possible, that I shall not be allowed to go abroad again. In that case, of course, I shall write to you and somebody else will go. I met Ginsburg in Leipzig and we travelled together to Berlin; from here he is going to St. Petersburg and I to Kiev gubernia.

I shake your hand, hoping that in any case we shall see each other somewhere in the autumn.

First published in Russian

Translated from the Russian

J. PATRIC MACDONNELL
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

8 Southboro Terrace,
Carlton Grove, Peckham.
Monday evening
[September 16, 1872]

My dear Engels,

I have seen Lessner and Dr. Sexton and from them have learned the proceedings of the British Federal Council on Wednesday evening last. A resolution condemning Dr. Marx and proposed by Hales was carried. Sexton voted against it and of course Lessner. Hales and his friends threaten secession, non-recognition of the General Council and a host of other equally terrible things. Sexton will be *with us* but we must not lose sight of him. Resolute action on our part will completely stamp out these mannikin foes. We must rouse to action the English opposition members such as Boon, Yarrow, Milner, etc. This unprincipled fellow Eccarius attended the Federal Council meeting, also Mottershead, who is little better. Both went of course for the purpose of supporting Hales etc. but such a rotten alliance cannot last long. It seems that Eccarius has not quite lost *his good opinion* of me. He has said to some one that as I did not visit the *Hotel Pico* very often, he did not think I was "*Picoed*". By the way, I understand that Hales hinted that Dublin

* The envelope bears the address: Frederick Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, Primrose Hill, N.W. and a London postmark.—*Ed.*

should be communicated with about me for the purpose of having some one appointed in my stead. I hope they will do so. I have communicated all particulars to Dublin and elsewhere and will lose no time in reorganising the old and organising new Sections.

If you should require my presence at any meeting, kindly give me a day's notice. If possible I will give you a look on some evening this week.

I received a letter from Sorge on last Wednesday night but too late to meet him at the time he appointed at your place.

Kindest regards from my wife and self to you, Mrs. Engels, Dr. Marx and family.

Always yours faithfully,

J. P. MacDonnell

First published in Russian

Written in English

KARL MARX

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *DAILY NEWS* NEWSPAPER IN LONDON

Modena Villas,
Maitland Park, N.W.
September 17

Sir,

On my return from The Hague, I find that your paper attributes to me the intention of removing to New York, in the wake of the General Council of the I.W.A. In reply, I beg to state that I intend and always intended remaining in London. Months ago I communicated to my friends here in London, and to my correspondents on the Continent, my firm resolve not to remain a member of the General Council, or indeed of any administrative body whatsoever, as my scientific labours would not permit me to do so any longer. As to the distorted reports of the press about the proceedings of the Congress at The Hague, they will be set at rest by the impending publication of the official Congress Minutes.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Karl Marx

Written in English

RUDOLPH SEIFFERT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

[Leipzig], September 17, 1872

Dear Mr. Engels,

After his return from Mainz Hepner was arrested for his participation in The Hague Congress to serve the four weeks with which he was threatened by Director of Police Ruder. Hepner instructed me to inform you that his arrest has made it impossible for him to carry out his assignments.

A few lines from Hepner are enclosed.*

Best greetings.

Rudolph Seiffert

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

THOMAS S. TOWNEND
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON **

September 18, 1872

Sir,

I see by a letter which you have addressed to the *Daily News*, and published in that paper today, that there is shortly to be issued an official report of the International Congress at The Hague. I shall deem it a favour to receive a copy of that report as soon as you feel at liberty to issue it to the press. Should it be sent, by you or by your directions, to the London papers, will you please give instructions that a copy should be forwarded simultaneously to this office.

I am, Sir,
Yours obediently,

Thos. S. Townend,
London Manager

First published in Russian

Written in English

* See pp. 530-31 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** The letter is written on notepaper with the printed heading: Office of *The Manchester Guardian*, 9, Northumberland Street, Strand, W.C.—*Ed.*

JOSE MESA
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Madrid, September 19, 1872
(Calle San Pedro, 16, 3)

My dear Engels,

I did not reply earlier to your letters from The Hague because these last days I have had an attack of a chest disease which still tires me very much and which prevented me from writing; then I was waiting from day to day for a letter from Lafargue, who has not replied to the numerous letters I addressed to him in Portugal and later at The Hague, and in which I explained the situation here to him and asked for his advice on certain points.

I am very satisfied with the results of the Congress—although I regret your departure and that of Marx from the General Council, and many of my friends regret it too—I see we have carried off a beautiful victory; we issued an extraordinary supplement to *La Emancipación* announcing our triumph and the defeat of the Alliancists as soon as we received your letter. You must also have seen *La Emancipación* of last Saturday, which was not sparing in details.¹⁶² All that has produced an excellent effect, we have received congratulations from several places. But the battle is far from being finally won in Spain; the Congress has only given us a point of support; but the arrival of the Spanish delegates will no doubt produce a reaction: they have decided to disobey the Congress resolutions and not to recognise the powers of the General Council under the pretext of autonomy. You must have seen their statement, called the statement of the minority,** at the Congress; it is a very strange way of interpreting the organisation of the International; but it favours the projects of the Alliance, which is going to start its work again with more ferocity than ever.

In a word, we must act swiftly and energetically, the new

* The letter bears a note by Engels: Madrid, September 19, 1872, J. Mesa. Replied September 24. The letters of Engels to J. Mesa mentioned have not been preserved.—*Ed.*

** See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 199-20.—*Ed.*

General Council must call on the Federal Council to recognise us in conformity with the resolution of The Hague Congress, and as the Federal Council will refuse, the General Council will have to make use of its new powers to remove the Federal Council of Spain from office; we must profit by this circumstance to call an extraordinary Congress or Conference—at which only the federations *which recognise the resolutions of the Hague Congress* will be represented—to elect a new Federal Council. That is what I think should be done. But for that we need men, and I am alone, and to top it all, ill. There were three of us who could have done something—Mora, Lorenzo and myself, above all the first two, who joined the International before me and were very much loved; but you already know of Lorenzo's unworthy conduct. Mora, never daring to pronounce against us, but having constantly hindered our action since the beginning of the struggle, has just departed for Barcelona under the pretext of looking for work, and has left me alone with Pagés, who is a fine lad, but is quite young, and Iglesias, who is very irresolute. In this situation I proposed to Lafargue to return to Spain, as the only means of saving everything.

Now here are three points which I submit to you, requesting you to reply as soon as possible:

1. Do you think that we should ask Lafargue, for the sake of the cause, to make the sacrifice of returning to Spain to help us reorganise the Spanish Federation and put *La Emancipación*, which is dying, on its feet again? Do you think that someone else could replace him in this delicate mission? Do you know him? Would you undertake to speak to Lafargue or to write to him—because I do not know where he is?

2. What do you advise us to do in respect of our recognition by the Federal Council and by the new General Council?

3. Could you get us the *Documents of the Hague Congress* before they are put on sale so that we can publish them in *La Emancipación* and thus make sure of subscriptions?

I repeat my request for a quick reply and cordially shake your hand.

Greetings and fraternity.

José Mesa

Remember me to Marx and congratulate him for me on his speech at Amsterdam,* which pleased me enormously. We shall publish it in *La Emancipación*.¹⁶³

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE IN HOBOKEN

[London,] September 21, 1872

Dear Sorge,

I hope you arrived safely in New York and that Cuno has got over his fear of steerage.

Of the materials of the Congress you have taken with you:

1. the new Articles 2 and 6 of the Administrative Rules, Section II *on the General Council*;
2. the report of the Commission on the Alliance;
3. the statement of the minority;
4. the resolution on the transfer of the General Council and on the election of 12 members of the General Council with the power to co-opt 3, and also the list of those elected.

So you still have not got:

1. the resolution of sympathy with the martyrs of the proletariat;
2. the resolution on the subscriptions;
3. the resolution on the cancellation of powers and
4. possibly the text of the article of the General Rules on politics. I enclose these four.

The remainder of the papers you left here are: 1. documents received on which no decision has been taken, 2. proposals which were not adopted, 3. one or two procedural proposals which were adopted and settled by implementation at the Congress. These belong to the Minutes and are of no interest to you.

It occurs to me that you perhaps

5. have not got Lafargue's proposal on international trade unions, so I am translating it from the Spanish and enclosing it.

* See pp. 33-35 of this volume.—*Ed.*

As soon as we have the report you promised on the debates on the mandates (of which, as you know, through the stupidity of the Chairman no minutes were taken down because no secretaries had been appointed), the official collection of the Resolutions will be made up and published.

As soon as Lucain, who has taken the papers of the commission to Brussels and is now putting the witnesses' statements in order, sends us these papers, which he has promised by the end of the month at the latest, the evidence concerning Bakunin and the Alliance will be prepared and printed. We have received more very useful things which could not even be submitted to the commission because they arrived too late.

Then preparation of the Congress Minutes for publication.

I enclose all the addresses I know for correspondence with Germany, Italy, etc.

Hales caused a big scandal here in the Federal Council, had a vote of censure carried against Marx for saying that the English working-class leaders were bought, but an English section here and an Irish section have already protested and declared Marx to be right. Those fellows, Hales, Mottershead, Eccarius and others, are furious because the General Council has been taken away from them.¹⁶⁴

Guillaume told Wilmart in Brussels (and the latter wrote it to us) that the Spaniards would organise the Alliance again, that it is now more necessary than ever.

West is still here and has no money for the return journey.

Hearty greetings to Cuno and tell him to keep up correspondence with me wherever he goes.

Best greetings.

Yours,

F. Engels

The Dutch say that the principal reason why they voted with the minority was that they want reunion with Belgium and therefore must please the Belgians!

Hepner has been arrested and threatened with four weeks imprisonment because, as you know, the Director of Police in Leipzig has banned the International off his own bat!

Resolution carried at the first public sitting:

"The Congress of the International Working Men's Association, assembled at The Hague, expresses in the name of the world proletariat its admiration for the heroic fighters for the emancipation of labour who fell victims of their devotion, and sends fraternal and sympathetic greetings to all those who are at present persecuted by bourgeois reaction in France, Germany, Denmark and the entire world."

(Moved by A. Schwitzguébel and 7 others.)

On members' subscriptions:

"We propose that the subscription should remain as fixed by the General Rules."

(Moved by E. Dupont and 3 others, *adopted* on the Saturday morning.*)

On the cancellation of old powers:

"I propose that all powers granted by the General Council, the councils, committees and sections in the countries where the International is banned should be cancelled and that the General Council alone should have the right to nominate representatives in those countries."

(Moved by A. Serrailier and 7 other French delegates, adopted on the Saturday.)

I have only the *Spanish* text of Lafargue's motion, unanimously carried on the Saturday morning, and therefore it will not be quite the official text.

"In the name of the Portuguese Federation and of the New Madrid Federation I propose:

"That the new General Council be charged with the special mission of setting up international trade unions.

"For this purpose it will draw up during the month following the session of the Congress a circular which it will have printed and will send to all the workers' associations whose addresses it knows whether affiliated to the International or not.

"In this circular the Council will invite the workers' associations to set up an international union of their respective trades.

"Every workers' association will likewise be invited to fix the conditions on which it wishes to be a member of the international union of its trade.

"The General Council is instructed to collect all the conditions proposed by the societies which have accepted the idea and to draw up a general project which will be submitted for the provisional approval of all the workers' associations which wish to be members of the international trade unions.

"The next Congress will formally sanction the project."

* September 7. —Ed.

(Seconded by 10 others, unanimously adopted without any discussion.)...

Article 7a of the General Rules, adopted on the Saturday morning by 28 votes to 13 (including abstentions), i.e. with more than a two-thirds majority. —

“In its struggle against the combined power of the propertied classes, the proletariat can only act as a class by constituting itself into a political party distinct from and opposed to all the old parties formed by the propertied classes.

“This constitution of the proletariat into a political party is indispensable to ensure the triumph of the social revolution and of its ultimate aim, the abolition of classes.

“The coalition of the working class forces already effected by the economic struggles must also serve as a lever in the hands of this class, in the struggle against the political power of its exploiters.

“The lords of the land and the lords of capital will always use their political privileges to defend and perpetuate their economic monopolies and to subjugate labour. The conquest of political power therefore becomes the primary duty of the proletariat.”

Translated from the German
and the French

ADOLF HEPNER
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Leipzig Jail
September 21, 1872

Dear Engels,

For the pamphlet on the trial I need “Confidential Information” (about Bakunin), 1869, which was read out during the proceedings.¹⁶⁵ If you no longer have it, we must make do with the newspaper account published in March. In either case I ask you to *answer quickly*.

* The envelope bears the address: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London, N. W. and Leipzig and London postmarks.—Ed.

As the Hague resolutions are in the *Liberté*,¹⁶⁶ I can translate them for the *Volksstaat* and that is my previous letter dealt with.

Greetings to all.

A.H.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

ADOLF WEGMANN
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

Manchester, September 22, 1872
42 Moreton Street,
Strangeways

Dear Engels,

I have received yours of the 19th inst.* and your few remarks on the Hague Congress were very welcome, for, like the other sections, we know nothing about anything except the abuse in the London newspaper *Hermann* and other papers, which write a lot of dirt such as certainly no German paper in Germany would. Among us the general impression is that the whole Association is about to fall to pieces, for all the papers tell us is how the delegates quarrelled among themselves and calumniated one another, how only big police forces could protect the Congress against the Dutch working population, how Dr. Marx resigned from the Association, you yourself were going to America, and Switzerland, Italy and Spain broke with the Association, etc. And with all these rumours or facts the English Federal Council is doing nothing when it should give all the sections the exact Minutes of the Congress as quickly as possible so that the members would not be kept for weeks in uncertainty and their heads would not be muddled up by the bourgeois papers. To put it briefly, we know nothing. Instead of the Minutes the Federal Council has other business to attend

* Engels' letter to Wegmann of September 19, 1872 has not been preserved.—Ed.

to—to cancel the decisions of the Congress, to denounce members of the General Council, etc.

Formerly I knew John Hales as an ambitious man and heard him so described.

Last week we read articles in the *Herald* and the *Guardian* and so on and decided to hold a meeting in this connection. By Wednesday I got $\frac{3}{4}$ of the society together and proposed we should elect a delegate to the Federal Council and draw up a protest; this was carried unanimously. On the previous Sunday we had written to the editor of the *International Herald* warning him against publishing an article that had been promised on the members of the General Council, and that had its effect.¹⁶⁷ We elected as delegate Ch. Boon from London, who happened to be here. The protest was approximately as follows:

The Federal Council should refrain from any decision concerning annulment of powers or expulsion of members of the Hague Congress or in general (we had appended the newspaper article) anything concerning disputed questions based on newspaper items,

Until 1) all the sections of England are represented on the Federal Council;

2) exact Minutes of the Hague Congress are in the hands of every British section so that they can empower their delegates with full knowledge of the facts;

3) if the Federal Council does not respect these proposals of our section, we shall invite all sections in England to protest against eventual decisions.

Nevertheless, up to the present we have no news about Thursday's sitting.

I am now also on the Manchester District Council and shall do all I can there too. Then I proposed to break through by writing ourselves, to enter into close contact with other foreign societies in England so as to be able to act more effectively.

The French people in our section are very apathetic and it takes great effort to pull them along.

I have not visited the English Section for about four weeks because I was overloaded with work every evening. I think they have cooled off a little because of Jones's situation.

I shall send you more information from time to time and hope for the same from London.

Excuse my scribble, I still have a lot to write.

With respectful greetings.

Yours,

A. Wegmann

42 Moreton Street, Strangeways

I live with the secretary.

A very active, and probably the best, member is Mr. Dickmann, 6 Mashell Street, Manchester.

It is probably three months since I was at the Moor's.

On Monday fortnight I shall be accepted in the Trade Society of Engineers. My foreman is recommending me.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

ADOLF HEPNER
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Leipzig Jail
September 26, 1872
not censored

Dear Marx,

1) Enclosed is an enquiry from Dr. Boehmers (from some place in Silesia, I forget the name) concerning the "*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*—George Sand—Bakunin"¹⁶⁸ affair about which we spoke at The Hague. I ask you for a few lines which I could communicate to him privately or through the paper as a reply. The first article, with which the polemic began, is in the issue of Wednesday, September 4.

2) The Amsterdam speech on "violence" as it is given in the *Liberté* is of no use to us in Germany; any Public Prosecutor would make material for a case out of it. If however the Belgians translate into French as well as the Dutch into Flemish, then the speech in the *Liberté* is distorted and I ask you, if I cannot get it *in extenso*, to send me at least a few notes on it for the *Volksstaat*.

Best greetings,

A.H.

Liebknecht was here today—here in my cell too, he has three days leave because of a summons to court.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

HENRY VAN DEN ABEELE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON *

Antwerp, September 26, 1872

Dear Citizen,

I have just received your communication** in reply to which I hasten to state that I never said a word of the calumny which is attributed to me.

You would oblige me infinitely by *formally giving the lie* on my behalf to those who have the effrontery to make such a vile assertion.

Greeting and fraternity.

Henry Van den Abeele

To: Citizen Karl Marx
1 Maitland Park Road,
Haverstock Hill, London N.W.

P.S. Please remember me in respect of the first part of your work *Capital* as soon as it appears.

Greetings.

H.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

HENRY VAN DEN ABEELE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Antwerp, September 27, 1872

Dear Citizen,

I should be very much obliged if you could send me as soon as possible a few copies of the account of the Congress

* The letter is written on notepaper with the printed heading: Henry Van den Abeele.—*Ed.*

** Karl Marx's letter to Van den Abeele has not been preserved.—*Ed.*

of The Hague with all that goes with it as well as the report of the London General Council to the aforesaid Congress, which report the Flemish sections have not yet received and which I need for the *Werker*—in future you will receive this journal regularly.

If I can be of use to you, dispose of me without hesitation.
Greeting and fraternity.

Henry Van den Abeele

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hoboken, October 1, 1872

Dear Marx,

Enclosed as promised is a copy of the Minutes which I prepared for the commission.* Please see to it that the Minute Books of the General Council are forwarded and send me at once instructions for August Vogt to give me *Herr Vogt* and *Enthüllungen*** so that I can send them to you. I am up to my ears in work. A longer report next week.

Greetings to your family and to the General*** and the others.

In a great hurry.

Yours,
F. A. Sorge

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 108-77.—*Ed.*

** Karl Marx, *Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne*.—*Ed.*

*** Frederick Engels.—*Ed.*

R. MCNEILL
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON *

Liverpool, October 1, 1872

Dear Citizen Marx,

So many accounts respecting the disagreement between you and the Federal Council are afloat, and the press taking advantage of the much wished-for opportunity retail so many stories respecting the origin of these dissensions that the members of our section have instructed me to write to you as a means of obtaining some information alike positive and trustworthy.

Some of the members carried away by accounts from London and elsewhere have supported Cit. Hales' motion; but as many are not satisfied with those accounts, and as they wish to show as well as meet with fair-play—they are anxious to hear *your* version of the misunderstanding.

There are several points on which a great deal has been said by your opponents amongst which are:

Cit. Barry's retention on the General Council in opposition (as it is stated) to the wishes of the Federal Council, and that after his expulsion by the latter.

His *GERMAN SPEAKING*—
Chicago Credential. How obtained.

Likewise your speech in Congress in defence of Barry—in which you refer to the corruptibility of the English working-men leaders; a speech our members feel sure has been unjustly treated.

The suspension of Section XII without any motive being assigned (whether that statement be true or false) and if so what reasons weighed with the General Council.

Dr. West's rejection by the Congress at The Hague—on what grounds.

Your views respecting Centralisation versus Federalisation.

As dissensions amongst us are calculated to injure us very much in the eyes of our fellow-workers, our members desire

* The letter is written on notepaper with the printed heading: International Working Men's Association. Liverpool Branch. Above the letter is written in Jones's hand: League Temperance Hotel, Christian St., Islington.—*Ed.*

to have something reliable to enable them to disprove the assertions which are being constantly made respecting the motives etc. of those who have at all times been at the head of our movement; and as you are and have been *the* principal, your statement will carry with it the weight of authority, amongst outsiders, and will be best calculated to allay doubts such as are certain to be felt by many.

If you can make it convenient, please let me have your reply by Saturday as our meetings are held on Sunday and I wish to have it to read to the members at our next.

I remain

Yours fraternally,

R. McNeill
Secretary*

Dr. K. Marx

First published in Russian

Written in English

P. VAN DER WILLIGEN
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

London, October 2, 1872

Dear Sir,

I take the liberty today to send you by post a small pamphlet which I published in Amsterdam before the Hague Congress assembled, and I should be very glad, at your convenience, to know your opinion of it.

Kindly inform me when and where the official report on the Hague Congress will be published. You would oblige me very much by informing me of this.

Always at your service, I remain yours respectfully,

P. van der Willigen

2 Bellevue Road,
Wandsworth Common

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

* Below the signature in Jones's hand is: c/o E. Jones, League Hotel, Christian St., Islington.—*Ed.*

CHARLES ROCHAT
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Quaregnon, October 3, 1872

Dear Citizen Marx,

I received on the 29th ult. your parcel with the five instalments of the translation (*Das Kapital*).*

I thank you warmly for this token of friendship with which I am pleased and flattered.

Not until today did I receive newspapers informing me (in their way) on what happened at The Hague; they are: *L'Indépendance belge*, *La Liberté*, *L'Internationale*.

If you are not in possession of the account of the Congress given by *L'Indépendance*, it will be a pleasure for me to send it to you; the editor must have been inspired by one of your enemies who was too cowardly to dare to write himself what he prompted to the reporter; it contains the usual calumnies of dissidents, and word for word.

La Liberté and *L'Internationale* are disgusting to read, their editors are downright scoundrels, and it is a real misfortune for the workers of this country to be represented by people of the sort.

Incidentally I do not know very well who it is they represent. I who live in the heart of the *Borinage* seek in vain here any trace of the Association; I can assure you that they have no influence over the working masses here.

When they claim to speak in the name of sections they are lying; they are useful at the most for forming mutual-aid societies or roughcasting resistance societies, but their action goes no further. *They are too much afraid* of being compromised and going to prison to risk anything else (it is brutally put, but it is the truth; there lies the secret of their abstentionism).

They have a section in Brussels, it appears, but bourgeois free-thinkers are the oracles there and Proudhon is the god whose prophets they are; in Liège the big master is the famous Herman, an emaciated Danton who has lost his teeth commenting Proudhon, whom he has never seen. Incidentally, you know him.

* The French edition of *Capital*.—Ed.

Their newspapers are rags of a coterie of pettifogging lawyers or *déclassé* bourgeois dreaming of local immortality.

It is revolting to hear them constantly making themselves the mandataries of groups which do not exist or which are not international; if we are to believe them today France, Italy, Spain, Switzerland *and the Slavs* (what are they?) are on their side; they are doing great harm to the Association because the bourgeois press gives them all the publicity it commands, rejoicing in the trouble that they cause the Association. I am writing this letter under the impression of reading *L'Internationale*, for this newspaper has made me sick, I don't know what to think in the face of such formal declarations. Can it be true that since my departure there have been such great changes that they have succeeded in winning over many sections? Or are they simply continuing the manoeuvre of Bakunin's seventeen Swiss fanatics who claimed to have the other sections in Geneva and the Confederation in their pocket? I should like you to send me through *Auguste* some information on what has happened and on the value of their assertions.

I have sent *Auguste* (35 Gaisfort-st, Mr. Auguste Daniel) an issue of *L'Etoile belge* in which Landeck's filth is greatly appreciated.

What would confirm me in my conviction that I am on the right side, if I could have any doubts, is the excessive zeal the bourgeois show to collect all the mud that these people keep slinging at us and count it as victories over us.

So I ask you to write me a few lines through Serraillier. Always devoted to you and your family.

Ch. Rochat

Best wishes and respects to the Engels family and Serraillier.

Handshakes to Le Moussu, Frankel, Vaillant.

How is your *in-law* Longuet? (There's a word which will certainly anger him.)

Best of health to all.

I have begun *Capital* and I am holding my head with both hands.

A kiss for Serraillier on the left eye.

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE IN HOBOKEN

London, October 5, 1872
122 Regent's Park Road, N. W.

Yesterday I sent you Nos. 65, 66 and 67 of the *Emancipación*.

The fact that Guillaume declared to Wilmart in Brussels that the Spaniards would reorganise the Alliance, that now, after the Hague Congress, it is more necessary than ever, was written by Wilmart himself to Lafargue; I read the letter.

I wanted to enclose also the report to the General Council on Spain, Portugal and Italy, but I shall not be ready for this post. On the other hand I am enclosing my report to Section No. 6¹⁶⁹ which I want you to give to Bertrand.

Here Hales has launched against Marx and me a tremendous campaign of calumny, which is already turning against him, however, without our needing to move a finger. The pretext was what Marx said about the corruptibility of the English labour leaders. Some London sections and the whole of Manchester have protested energetically and Hales has lost his former majority in the Federal Council so that he will probably soon come flying out of it.

That damned Lucain has still not sent us the papers he took with him on the Alliance, so that we have not yet been able to begin. The documents received later from Switzerland, which also embrace the whole of the Nechayev trial, as well as Bakunin's Russian publications, are highly interesting and will give rise to a fearful scandal. Such a vile band of rascals I have never come across yet....

Do not forget the Minutes about the discussion of the mandates, without which we shall not at all be able to include that part in the Minutes,* nobody here has anything about it.

We are expecting from post to post news from you and signs of life from the new General Council.

* The intended publication of the Minutes of the Hague Congress.—
Ed.

Best greetings to Cuno, I hope he will write soon.

Poor Hepner has indeed got four weeks in jail because the International is banned in Leipzig!

Yours,
F. Engels

Translated from the German

CHARLES DOBSON COLLET
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Sunny Bank, HERNSY LANE,
October 5, 1872

My dear Sir,

I am much obliged to you for your kindness and shall read *Le Capital* with great interest. I forward the other copy, by this post, to Mr. Urquhart at Montreux, where, as usual, he has just taken up his winter quarters.

The expulsion of Bakunin from the International was certainly mentioned in the *Times* or *Daily News*, but the newspaper reports, sometimes from ignorance, sometimes from design, are so confused and incorrect that I am very glad to have this confirmed by yourself. I shall always esteem it a favour whenever you can direct me to any authentic documents of the International and shall be quite willing to go to the trouble of ordering them if I can learn when they are published. I believe I have every document of this sort published by Truelove.

I remain,

my dear Sir,

Yours faithfully

C. D. Collet

First published in Russian

Written in English

JOSÉ MESA
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Madrid, October 5, 1872

Dear Engels,

I received yesterday your letter with the article on *imperative mandates*,** which I found very good and very opportune; I have also received your two previous letters, one of which contained the General Council's report and the first instalment of Marx's book (two copies); please thank him for me. Your article will be published in the next issue, this week's having been already made up when your letter arrived. I am also thinking of translating for the next issue or another the preface to *Capital*, which would serve as an announcement of the book, subscriptions for which I am thinking of receiving at the office of the newspaper; I have ordered 20 copies (i.e. I have asked for them) through Lafargue; it is immensely important and urgent propaganda for reasons which I shall tell you of lower.

As for the *Minutes* of the Hague Congress, which we have already announced and promised to subscribers to *La Emancipación*, here is what I have imagined to do: with the report of the General Council and the report on the Alliance, which you must send me *in full*, I shall make a sort of introduction containing only documents, in anticipation of the *Minutes* proper. So I most instantly request you to tell me by what time we could have the first sheets of these *Minutes*; for it is perhaps a matter of the newspaper's life.

Could you not, as you make up the manuscript to be sent to New York, have a second copy made with a letter-press? I think this way would be simple and not expensive. It is also very important to make known in Spain as soon as possible the discussions and resolutions of the Hague Congress, the more so as the Spanish delegates are preparing to put out all sorts of lies and fictions about them and we have nothing positive to reply to them; we must not go to sleep, we must not let ourselves be forestalled.

* The letter bears a note by Engels: José Mesa. Answered 16 and 18.10.—*Ed.*

** See pp. 280-85 of this volume.—*Ed.*

And respecting the Congress resolutions, will not the new General Council publish these resolutions before the publication of the Minutes, without that we cannot do anything, we are completely paralysed. We quite agree with your advice to form a new Spanish Federation, but previously we must again intimate to the Federal Council that it must recognise us as the *New Madrid Federation* in view of the resolutions of the Congress, which recognised our delegate*; but for that we need to have those resolutions officially.

You will see by the issue of *La Emancipación* which will reach you at the same time as this letter that I am beginning to attack Proudhon, and for that I am making use of *The Poverty of Philosophy*. This is highly important today in the Spanish Federation. Just imagine that those humbugs of the Alliance now want to make Proudhon their prophet. Have you read the *Mirabeau* article reproduced by the Brussels *Internationale*? Well, *El Condenado* has also published a very stupid article in which it calls the author of *Contradictions* "el mayor amigo que ha tenido hasta la fecha el proletariado, que armonizó la libertad con la autoridad, par medio de la federación",** etc. Proudhon enjoys a certain popularity here among the workers; he is the only revolutionary socialist who is known. That is why I told you above that propaganda of Marx's book is of immense importance at present. I hope, with the excellent material provided by Marx, to be able to dethrone Proudhon shortly in Spain, relegating him to the bookcases of the bourgeoisie, which is the right place for him.

As for the situation of the newspaper, here are the details:

The circulation today is 1,000 copies (exactly half of what it was three months ago): so much work has been done to take our subscribers away from us. *El Condenado* has sent agents into the provinces to carry on propaganda against us; the Federal Council has spent money from the sections to print circulars, letters etc. against *La Emancipación*. Those who had the courage to buy our newspaper have been insulted and calumniated; yet we still have ardent suppor-

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 287.—Ed.

** The best friend the proletariat has had up to date, who harmonised freedom with authority by means of federation.—Ed.

ters and the paper has prospects of regaining its former circulation if it can hold out a while. The costs of each issue are: setting: 25 francs; printing and publishing: 10; paper: 12.50; postage: 8; distribution in Madrid: 7.50. Total per week: 63 francs.

The paper's debts do not exceed 150 francs today; on the other hand we are owed more than 200 francs. If we are not paid we shall find it very difficult to last longer than October, for at present we are collecting the returns for the quarter which began on September 15. Such is the situation for which we have to thank these gentlemen of the Alliance.

Yesterday *El Condenado* published the resolution adopted by the Alliancists at the Congress of St. Imier¹⁷⁰; we mention it at the end of the paper. It is no more and no less than the reorganisation of the Alliance in the form of a *pact*. I am thankful to you for the information you give me on Eccarius; I shall be on my guard. However, the work that we take from the *Internationale* seems to me of a certain use, that is why I translate it.¹⁷¹ Nothing about Lafargue. Perhaps his wife is worse. I shall go on sending you *La Federación*; reply to all these gentlemen's lies which you consider worth rectifying. You are in a better position to do so than we are.

All yours,
Mesa

Kindly remember me to Marx.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

ADOLF HEPNER

TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[Leipzig,] October 8, 1872

Dear Engels,

1) In the very near future Mülberger will be replying to you—almost as sharply as he was attacked.¹⁷² I myself think that in *secondary* things he has been misunderstood;

* The envelope bears a note by Engels: Hepner, address: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London N.W., and Leipzig and London postmarks. In the margin of the letter opposite point 4 there

he indirectly admits that he is $\frac{3}{4}$ a Proudhonist and disagrees that Proudhon was a "reactionary". For this reason I hope—if Mülberger's article appears—to get a work by you on Proudhon, whose writings are *hardly known at all* here, just as Marx's counter-work.* There is *no* great hurry about it. If I had the work in 3-6 weeks it would be in time enough.

2) Received Marx's letter, also French edition of *Capital*, Series I. Why are not the *English* quotations translated in the *German* edition just as in the *French*? It would have been very useful.

3) So the Jurassians have become completely rebellious. Have just read *Bulletin* 17/18. In the near future I shall bring to light the untruths about the Hague Congress. For this purpose also the letter overleaf to Frankel, whose address I do not know.

4) It is not precluded that in the near future I shall be *deported*. In consequence of my appeal, however, three months would elapse before the ukase came into force. Then I would go to Berlin and be—a merchant. In any case, it is better than being a writer at a loose end, which is what mere "corresponding" journalists are *mostly*. Besides, there is no German newspaper except the *Volksstaat* in the whole world for which I *could* write. *Quod erat demonstrandum*.

Best greetings to all,
A. H.

October 9

5) Are the Blanquists sulking then? And how are things with your people respecting the International?

6) Cowell Stepney, a member of the Central Committee of the Peace League; elected in *Lugano*. What does that mean?

7) Who, besides Marx, Ranvier, Frankel and Serraillier, was on the Mandate Commission? No Belgians or Dutchmen?

is a note by Engels: Letter from Marx to Hepner about Bakuninists? Sent registered 10/10 1872.—Ed.

** Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*.—Ed.

The *Bulletin* says the Commission was "composée exclusivement de nos adversaires déclarés".*

8) Further: "Le programme de cette Alliance et les statuts de la section, qui a porté ce nom à Genève, ont été *approuvés* en 1869 par le Conseil général de Londres."** I believe the *circulaire privée**** says the *contrary*.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

GABRIEL RANVIER
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

October 8, 1872

Dear Citizen,

One of my friends desires the text of the mandate from the Ferré Section, having left it at The Hague. Perhaps you know to whom I could apply for it. You would very greatly oblige me by letting me know it.

Best wishes to the ladies.

Yours truly,

Ranvier

160 St. John Street
Clerkenwell

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

SIGISMUND BORKHEIM
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON ****

London, 44 Mark Lane
October 9, 1872

Dear Engels,

I have been here again since Sunday. I saw old Becker in Basle and old Schily in Paris.

* "Composed *exclusively* of our declared opponents". Opposite this point in the margin there is a note by Engels: Marx, Ranvier, Frankel, Roach, M.D. [MacDonnell], Gerhard, Dereure.—*Ed.*

** "The programme of this Alliance and the statutes of the section which bore that name in Geneva were *approved* in 1869 by the London General Council."—*Ed.*

*** *Fictitious Splits in the International.*—*Ed.*

**** The letter is written on notepaper with the printed heading: S. Borkheim.—*Ed.*

I suggest to you to have your *Letters on the War*¹⁷³ published in German. *I wish to translate them.* Inform me soon of your decision. The Prussian officers do not believe that you can have become so much like Moltke, and a lot of lies are told on this score in Germany, Switzerland and Paris.

Greetings to Marx and family.

Yours,
Borkheim

P.T.O.

By the way! Liebknecht writes to me, September 18:

"Do tell Marx and Engels it is absolutely necessary for them to write a short report on the Congress for the *Volksstaat* so that the frightful impression that the meetings made according to all, even the friendly, reports, may be to some degree effaced. In particular the transfer of the General Council to New York must be made to sound plausible. But quickly, the more so as Hepner, who has been in jail since Friday, has been silenced for four weeks."

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

PETER IMANDT
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Broughty Ferry, [Dundee,]
October 9, 1872

Dear Marx,

I thank you most warmly for sending me the French translation of your *Capital*. The Introduction in the German volume, as you know, had seemed to me for years to be a rather hard nut. On the other hand I understand the matter completely now that I have studied the first part in French. You need not send me the following parts, since I have naturally ordered the whole work at once. But the price is really too low for you at least not to be out of pocket even with the best of sales. The Dundee Advertiser man in London saw the first part and called it *un ouvrage de luxe** because

* A luxury job.—Ed.

of its pretty drawings and general getting up.* As to the contents he understands nothing and modestly remains silent.

I am gratified that you thought of me also because I would gladly have written to you already long ago to ask you for some information about the consequences for the International that have arisen or will arise out of the assembly in The Hague. Have you constituted yourselves anew and into a secret society? The debates and your speeches have probably been printed. Be so kind as to send them to me. I had intended to come to London and visit you in my now ended holidays; but two of my children had a fever and so my plan was thwarted. I have a great longing to see you and Mrs. Marx again, and when the holidays come again I hope I shall be in a position to come to London. Karl is in Lille and is doing good business in yarn. Robert is tutor in a family in Edinburgh. My children (3) are growing, and I myself am becoming an old Scottish schoolmaster who heartily greets you all.

Yours,
Imandt

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

EDOUARD VAILLANT
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Thursday, October 10, 1872

Dear Citizen,

I am so late in answering you that I do not know how to excuse myself, although I am guilty neither of indifference nor of negligence. I have been so busy with personal affairs that I have not been able to find a moment since my return. And all that happened to be complicated by a removal and a new installation which is not yet over, so that I do not yet know when I shall be able to come and see you. Meanwhile I want to thank you for sending me the first

* The last three words are in English in the German original.—
Ed.

instalment of your work* and am sorry that I could not do so at once by word of mouth.

What I wanted to tell you at the same time is that I would not like you to believe that the events at The Hague had left any trace in my mind from the personal point of view. Whatever happens, I shall never forget your benevolence and that of your family towards me, and I assure you of the esteem and sincere affection

of your very devoted

E. Vaillant

Please present my affectionate compliments to Mrs. and the Misses Marx. Cordial handshake for Longuet.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

RAIMOND WILMART

TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON**

Madrid, October 11, 1872

Dear Citizen,

Going to Bordeaux on Sunday to arrange for my passport to Buenos Aires, I had to hand in to the emigration agent the only passport I had—my expulsion passport. Fortunately the clerk who was sent to the passport office to inquire was, unknown to me, one of my old friends. He returned all in a fluster and asked me if I remembered him: on the way he had read my passport. He said to me: Leave at once, you are wanted. A formal order arrived yesterday evening (Saturday) from the Ministry; you are given as an affiliate of the International, and all the emigration agents (appointed by the Government) have orders not to let you through. I had been asked whether the individual was here; I said I believed it was not him, it was a tall dark man, very well dressed, it was not him.

So I took myself off for Bayonne and crossed the frontier on foot. Here I am at Citizen José Mesa's, whence I am

* The French translation of *Capital*.—*Ed.*

** The letter bears a note by Engels: Madrid, October 11, 1872. Wilmart-Mesa. Answered 16-18/10.—*Ed.*

writing to you. We are collecting notes on the Congress in reply to the *Jura Bulletin* etc. Do not fail to send immediately a *word-for-word* copy of the report on the inquiry and of Roch Splingart's letter* about the Alliance. Mesa is to publish in Sunday week's issue a leading article of great importance for which he will need the said report and the said letter.

I am going to try to stay here instead of going to bury myself at La Plata. Mesa, who has been very kind to me, will endeavour to find employment for me here.

I have read your letters and I believe you are mistaken in saying that the Jurassians abstained after the vote on the General Council's powers. It seems to me that they abstained only on questions of *little* gravity where they had no hope of forming an imposing minority, but that they voted on all questions of importance, excluding the affair of the Alliance.

In a few lines which I shall communicate to Mesa I endeavour to prove, basing myself on facts, that from the very first moment the Jurassians and the Spaniards had only one thought since they had recognised that they could not constitute a majority. It was "to form an opposition body by exploiting the dissatisfaction of a minority *whose opinions they did not at all share*".

There are, as you know, personal facts and incidents which prove this assertion from the first to the last sitting, and I was well enough placed at the Congress to be able to note all these peculiarities.

II

Walter wrote to a member from B.** under the influence of Arnaud, Vaillant, Cournet and Ranvier. I saw the letter, and the one who received it is vacillating but has no influence. You know that Walter *had withdrawn from the Commission* for the purpose of "conferring" with the four B[lanquists] on the way to the station: he went to London afterwards and conferred again. Listen:

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 481-83.—*Ed.*

** Probably Bordeaux.—*Ed.*

"After having maturely, seriously, and above all knowingly conferred again, they came to agree on the timeliness of a *scission* and the foundation of a society free of any 'anti-revolutionary' tendency. I (Walter) count on Paris, which I am going to agitate, but I *am* not so sure of the* province. We rely on your devotion.... The high priest...."

That is a faithful summary of the letter. Decidedly, these men prove by their simplicity that they were not very dangerous. Did I not say that their valiant chief, or their chief, Vaillant,** only had the stiffness of a pretended pedagogue and the faith of a "petty self-idolater".

III

At a banquet of Internationalists and members of the trade unions to which I had been invited at Bordeaux, there was Louis Mie, a *Hugolater*, also invited in connection with his candidature to the Assembly. I had a very heated discussion with him and protested against the qualification *admirable* which he coupled with *L'année terrible*. Defeated, and finding refuge only in these words: "I only have a memory for ideas and not for expressions, but I would reply to you if I had the book in my hand", he came to talk about the early days of the Commune. Speaking of his intervention in favour of Chanzy, he let drop these words: "On arriving at such a place, I met Lullier (a *Hugolater*) going to Vacquerie (a *Hugolater*) in a general's uniform and said to him: 'It is you people we want to place at the head'." I made an involuntary movement and the fellow stopped without any clue as to what had prompted him to pronounce those words. You know that Lullier was seeking a dictatorship, and that one does so only *after preparing a coterie*, and though I am certain that the Hugolaters are not men who would risk their great personalities, I am practically certain that Lullier had his fellow-thinkers and they could exist only among the men of whom I have spoken.

* Walter did not know the address of Laveau, who did not know him.—*Author's note*.

** A pun: the name Vaillant also means valiant.—*Ed*.

IV

I have read here all of *Capital* that has been sent to Mesa. It is urgent to get copies to the French sections. I think this has been neglected, for at B. it is not even known that this translation exists. See Serrailier, who can do more than anybody else in this matter. It is very important that this work should be read by the Internationalists. For if they learn something about it only from the moderate, royalist, radical or mutualist critics, the effect will be worse than if they never heard of it. Indeed, nothing is easier than to deceive, in matters of political economy, a reader who has never read the work criticised. It seems to me that Maurice Lachâtre, generally very skilful at publishing in instalments, has relied too much on the name of the author and has neglected the means of bringing the publication of the work to the knowledge of all. I am writing to Bordeaux to this effect, because it is of primary necessity to spread it among the French workers.

I entreat you to send me, and above all at once, the Manifesto of 1848,* which you promised me, and which I asked Lafargue for in vain. Give me a German copy and an English one. I shall make a translation of it into French for those who might need it.

I am leaving the rest of the letter for Mesa and thank you in advance for what I ask you for. Greetings to the "authoritarians" and a handshake.

All yours,
Rd. Wilmart

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

JOSE MESA
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON**

[Madrid, October 11, 1872]

Dear Engels,

I am still waiting for an answer from that rascal Lafargue, who is probably angry with his namesake,¹⁷⁴ I don't

* Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*.—Ed.

** This letter was sent to Engels with Wilmart's letter.—Ed.

know why. Does he get the *Emancipación*? I intend to write a word to him in Wilmart's letter, scolding him severely.

I repeat to you my request to send me a copy of the Minutes as they are edited; this is of capital importance. Mora, who is in Barcelona, wrote to me yesterday in a great hurry asking me whether we could publish the Minutes immediately, for everybody in Barcelona wants to know what happened at The Hague. Things are shaping well in Barcelona according to what Mora tells us.... Bragulat, the secretary of the Manufacturing Union, is furious because Farga deceived him as to the elections at the Hague Congress. They are only waiting there to see the attitude the Federal Council will take in order to call an extraordinary Congress for the purpose of depriving the Valencia Council of its powers. The Catalonian sections will take the initiative.

Mora was nearly bludgeoned to death by those gentlemen of the Federal Council when he was passing through Valencia. One of the members of the Council asked him for an interview at the house of one of our friends; then he sent to tell him he could not go there and indicated another place. Mora went there and found himself in the presence of the whole Federal Council armed with big clubs. Fortunately our friends, fearing something, had also come armed with clubs and they besieged the house, thus impressing the *brave* Alliancists who had gathered nine together to club a single one. Our friends in Valencia believe that Lorenzo was *convinced* by this not very logical means and that is why they followed Mora.

You must have seen the last *Bulletin*; it is well filled and has no scruples about the stories it tells. Have you also seen the Spanish delegates' letter to *La Liberté* in which they declare themselves Alliancists to the death¹⁷⁵? It is charming in its awkwardness.

I end, shaking your hand fraternally.

All yours,
Mesa

FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hoboken, October 12, 1872

Dear Marx,

Yesterday I received the *Capital* which you sent. Today and tomorrow I shall forward it to the addressees. You can be assured of their thanks.

I got a letter from Engels on Monday with the texts of various resolutions etc. and news.

Meanwhile I sent you on October 1 by registered letter a copy of the first, larger half of my Congress Minutes, and I draw your attention to the wish contained in the accompanying letter.* The day before yesterday I sent Engels two issues of *World* (Report and West). Today you will get the second half of the Minutes together with notes to be inserted,** a report made on the Congress for the "press" and an item on Eccarius. This last I must unfortunately send in German since I could only get *one* copy of the report in *World* of September 30 and therefore must keep it here. In copying my Minutes Cuno has as a rule left out the text of the resolutions and reports in the second half because you have them yourselves. I have appended a few separate additions on a special sheet under numbers I, II and III. And so now, as far as I know, you have all that I promised and can complete your work.

Two things from you would be most desirable here: 1) an official letter to Section No. 1 from you as their delegate to the Congress, and 2) a letter from you to me intended for communication to our closer party comrades in the General Council (the Germans Carl, Bolte, Speyer, Bertrand) in which you give them explanations and advice concerning the line of conduct to be pursued by the new General Council, especially in relation to communications with Europe. (Perhaps Engels should support this letter through Section No. 6.)

It was a week yesterday since I opened the General Council and informed them of my view of the state of affairs and

* See p. 545 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 169, 172-73.—*Ed.*

the impending work. All the members were there except David, who, according to a note in the *Socialiste*, will resign, for he feels offended as a member of Section No. 2; and neither will he join another section. All present accepted their election except Ward (American), who made a speech in Guillaume's manner in favour of autonomy and to whom 14 days were allowed to think it over and come to a better view. He kept harping on the opposition between Germans and French and he would not listen or understand that it was precisely the French and the Germans who acted so unanimously at the Congress. It is to be hoped that he will stay away, for he is incurable and thinks that the only Frenchmen are those who bear that name *here*, and of whom Sauva is truly one of the best.

This took up the whole sitting, except for the appointment of a committee to submit a plan of organisation for the General Council. St. Clair was at my place a few days ago in that connection, and I told him what I think of it. The General Council, I said, cannot appoint secretaries for every country because a) there are not enough members, b) we have not enough knowledge of languages, c) several of the countries (in particular those in which the International is banned) cannot duly maintain direct contact with us, and d) certain persons (Dereure, for example) cannot be trusted with it. Therefore a *real* General Secretary must be appointed who has to run, or at least to supervise, all the correspondence, and he should, *in case of need*, be given assistants not for countries, but for languages. At the same time I proposed Speyer as General Secretary, since Bolte has quite enough to do as General Secretary of the local Federal Council and also has very little knowledge of French.

Yesterday evening there was another sitting but I was not present. Cuno informed me that the General Council had co-opted me and then appointed me General Secretary, a truly unpleasant thing for many reasons. Levièle was elected treasurer, Speyer archivist, and St. Clair recorder, and a committee was appointed to submit the inaugural address of the General Council at the next sitting.

Bolte's vanity has been wounded because he had reckoned on being appointed General Secretary, which I would not have grudged him if he had the necessary time and strength.

So next week we shall give you further information.

By the way! In my view you should of course continue to deal with Russia, if possible also Germany, Wròblewski with Poland, and Serrailier with France. If I join the General Council I shall try to carry that through.

On my arrival, of course, I found plenty of work and have actually not managed to clear it all up. On the journey I worked like a horse, first of all I did the Minutes—60 close-written folio-size sheets, then my report for the Federation here* (naturally different from the one I sent you today, which was only arranged for the press) in German, English and French, which Dereure also agreed with in spite of the frank language. On the Saturday after my arrival there was a sitting of the Federal Council, at which we made our report. On the next day, Sunday, there was a well-attended meeting of the German sections, which, having heard the report, declared themselves satisfied and decided to support the General Council as much as they could. Next Thursday I am invited to a special sitting of Section No. 6. Dereure was not well received, as you can see from the *Socialiste* we sent you. Section No. 2 expelled him formally, i.e. by a resolution and by force, so that his time-serving did him no good. Our basic American sections have weakened somewhat under the influence of the Presidential elections with their millions; complaints are now coming in about negligence on the part of the Federal Council (Bolte), who, it is said, so rarely sends them reports. I have now helped as much as I could and hope that in the coming late winter we shall progress again. Today one of our best men, Dettle, is going to Philadelphia to deliver a propaganda speech. H. Meyer is going from Pittsburgh back to St. Louis, where he will be very useful. I would willingly have had him here.

I hope you are in good health. Take good care of your health. You must not overstrain yourself any more. I shall write a special letter to your good wife soon. What are the Lafargues doing? And Longuet and...! My warmest thanks to you and yours for your friendly reception. Greet

* See pp. 303-19 of this volume.—Ed.

everybody, your family, Lafargue, Engels, Longuet, Le Mous-su, Serrailier etc., etc.

All the best from your sincerely devoted

F. A. Sorge

Expedite the sending of the General Council's Minutes etc.

As I could not send the letter off yesterday I am adding a few things today. Enclosed, in addition to the rest, is the statement of the Polish Section in Zurich, which was in Cuno's pocket.* I have just been reading a mud-slinging article, namely a correspondent's report from Manchester to the *Neue Freie Presse*.¹⁷⁶ Who is the wretch? Cuno wants to send you another exact report on the work of the Commission, in particular the statements of Guillaume and others and asks you, the editorial committee, to wait for it before you publish the report on the Alliance.**

This afternoon (Sunday) we are having a sort of general meeting of the New York sections. I have not yet had time to resume my regular observation of the movement in the local trade unions, but soon I shall let you have information on *that* too; only in about a fortnight will I be able to find out what I promised you concerning the goldroom and Jim Fisk etc. and send it to you.

You wanted to tell me something about Heinzen. If you think it worth while rapping his fingers, then send it to me. We could possibly make use of the originals of Eccarius' letter (December) to you about Section No. 12 and West and that of West to you.¹⁷⁷ I would naturally send them back to you. If you do not want to send the originals, let me have at least a copy of West's letter.

The so-called Spring Street Council has been very low-spirited; its latest invention is a plan for a Workingmen's Life Insurance Co.

I must make up my mind today whether I accept the appointment of General Secretary, but I am afraid I shall

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 658.—*Ed.*

** See pp. 598-601 of this volume.—*Ed.*

probably not be able to refuse it without placing the General Council in a delicate position.

Yours,
F. A. Sorge

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FRIEDRICH LESSNER
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

[October 12, 1872]

Dear Engels,

The Australian delegate** is leaving in the first days of next week for New York and he would like to have credentials or at least a recommendation from you and Marx. After his departure he will not be returning to London. His address is: W. E. Harcourt, Queens Road, Gosport Hants.

Greetings.

Yours,
F. Lessner

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

WILHELM FINK
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON ***

[Leipzig,] October 14, 1872

Dear Sir,

With reference to your letter addressed to Hepner in August in which you guaranteed him compensation for part of the travelling expenses to The Hague and requested him on this basis to obtain an advance, we advanced Hepner the

* The postcard bears the address: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, and a London postmark.—*Ed.*

** W. E. Harcourt.—*Ed.*

*** The back of the letter bears a note by Engels: Cost of printing: 26.5 talers, including paper, setting, printing. Paper binding 6.16 talers plus 5 silver groschen for packing. The envelope bears a note in Engels' hand: Fink, Delahaye York Road 58, Lambeth; the address: via Bremen, F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London N.W., and Leipzig and London postmarks.—*Ed.*

sum necessary for the journey from the cash-office of the *Volksstaat*. According to the account presented to us now by Hepner for the Hague-Mainz journey, we have taken the liberty—after the above-named cash-office and Hepner had taken over two-thirds of the expenses to their account—to charge the remainder of the twenty talers to your account. Should you find this charge excessive, Hepner is prepared to take yet another part of it upon himself.

Kindly oblige by informing us on this score, and also by notifying us of the *amount of our bill* in respect of Thiele for printing the Rules. Thiele is demanding payment, but his present charge does not seem to agree with the earlier one; for this reason I repeat the above request. Yesterday, after completing one month's police detention for The Hague, Hepner was at once conveyed to the District Court to undergo eight weeks' imprisonment.

Greetings and handshake,

Yours,

W. Fink

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

J. DUMAS

TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

Basle, October 15, 1872

Dear Party Comrade,

I am instructed by the Section here to ask you for a certain explanation. The fact is that the local members were expecting a report from you on your return as agreed. The more so as the press was assiduously spreading the most variegated reports about the Congress, and the party organs were giving only scanty reports (at least at the beginning).

We were therefore waiting most impatiently for you; even when Hartung on his return from Mainz¹⁷⁸ informed us that you had a few other visits to pay and would possibly return by another route.

But then came a man from Lyons named Boussé, who had been in Geneva for a long time and positively maintained he had seen you on the Rhine bridge accompanied by another

man—it was on Sunday, September 22. As we could think of no reason why you had not visited the Section here, some of us interpreted it as a kind of slight. Others, and indeed the majority, considered the information given by the Lyons man as a confusion of persons and qualified the supposition which had sprung from this information as incorrect and premature, which, however, does not prevent questions being continually asked. For this reason a written explanation would be very desirable; likewise in respect of the letters which have been sent,* whether you received them or not.

Meanwhile agitation here is going strong. In particular the revision of the Federal Constitution and the approaching elections to the National Council are dealt with. Agitation in connection with the housing shortage aroused due excitement and caused considerable discredit to the government.

Member of the Great Council Frei is in such a to-do that it is a pleasure to look at him. But on the other hand he reaps abundant gratitude from the fools. It would be very instructive if, as is to be presumed, in spite of the croaking of this prophet, eggs became dearer and dearer and there was a repetition of the Brunswick events.

Citizen Föh has addressed public meetings on two occasions, until he went on a hunger cure and was forbidden to speak. But for all that things are moving ahead.

With social-republican greetings

I remain

J. Dumas

Münzgasse 20

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

W. E. HARCOURT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON

Gosport, October 15, 1872

Dear Citizen Engels,

I received your kind letter enclosing "Sorge's" address this afternoon, and I hasten to thank you for it. I shall leave for New York some time next week.

* See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 268-70.—*Ed.*

With regard to Australia, I may say that as yet I have had no instructions from my society as to future proceedings, nor can I expect them till next mail. Should they decide on affiliating themselves to the International I can carry that out better at New York as the headquarters of the General Council than I could if I remained in London. I had a letter from an old friend (who is also a member of our Society) the other day and he only acknowledged my first letter, so that as yet I have had no time for a reply.

My relatives will forward my letters on as they arrive, so no time will be lost.

I understood from Lessner that Longuet was married to Dr. Marx's daughter the other day. Although not acquainted with the lady and but slightly with Longuet, yet I should like to offer my congratulations, which I shall ask you to deliver for me.

With kind regards to yourself and all the brethren and many thanks,

Believe me to remain

Yours fraternally

W. E. Harcourt

First published in Russian

Written in English

ADOLF HEPNER
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Leipzig, Thursday evening,
October 17, 1872

Dear Engels,

On coming out of prison—where I shall probably spend the winter—at noon today for 10 days' leave because of "nerve trouble", I find your letter of the 14th with the question whether I received Marx's letter (registered) of 10.10. Answer: *No*. I have only received one registered letter from Marx, dated 1.10 (October the *first*), about Dr. Böh-

* The address on the envelope is: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London N.W., and there are Leipzig and London post-marks.—*Ed.*

mer's question concerning Bakunin-Marx—the arrival of which I have already informed you of in my last letter to you. Nothing else.

I shall work on the *Bulletin* as befits it.* Today also I received from Frankel a letter with an enclosure (police letter from Landeck). If I manage in ten days to convince the court doctor that my "nerve trouble" is incurable, I may obtain a walk day or even a liberty day once a week. I am *terribly* sick of the court; *without* the doctor's insistence I cannot expect any mitigation. And into the bargain on July 6 Rüder has already given the court a hint (it has been quite recently divulged to us) to deal with me as quickly as possible, because he wants to deport me. If the scoundrel does not go out of his mind like Gaveau, I don't know what I'll do.

Greetings to all,
A. H.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

KARL MARX

TO THE EDITORIAL OFFICE OF THE *VOLKSSTAAT* IN LEIPZIG

London, October 20, 1872

The leading article in No. 84 of the *Volksstaat*—"On the Hague Congress. III"—contains a factual error concerning me which I consider it necessary to rectify, and that, be it noted, only because it has slipped into the *Volksstaat*. If I considered it worth the trouble to rectify the lies, calumnies, infamy and even involuntary "errors" of the press which is hostile to me, I would not have a minute left for actual work!

The article cited says:

"Lafargue, far from being Marx's 'adjutant', abstained from voting when it was a question of expelling Schwitzguébel, Guillaume's comrade,' although the motion for expulsion was tabled by Marx."**

* This is a reference to Hepner's article IV in the *Volksstaat* containing a criticism of Guillaume's report in the *Bulletin* (see pp. 124-38 of this volume).—*Ed.*

** See p. 123 of this volume.—*Ed.*

In publishing Karl Marx's letter, the editors of the *Volksstaat* gave the following remark as a footnote: "Here unfortunately the word

That motion was tabled by the Commission of Inquiry appointed by the Congress, not by me. What I proposed at the Congress was the *expulsion of the Alliance* and the appointment of a commission of inquiry for that purpose. I appeared in front of this commission, just like others, as a witness for the prosecution. Only towards the end of the inquiry, at the last moment, and indeed during a sitting of the Congress, was I called upon. Previously, one of the members of the commission had desired a private meeting with me to elucidate purely factual questions. I refused, in order to avoid even the appearance of any personal influence on the commission.

When I was questioned by the commission I did not say a word about Schwitzguébel or his bell-wether, Guillaume. I mentioned only *one* of the Alliancists* attending the Congress and expressed my conviction that either he was not a member of the "secret" Alliance or that in any case he had for a long time been excluded from it.

I voted at the last Congress sitting *for* Schwitzguébel's expulsion because the proofs of his membership of the "secret" Alliance were exactly the same as those of Guillaume's. In these circumstances, Schwitzguébel's emotional poor-sinner speech could not shake my conviction. Let it be noted in passing that Mr. Guillaume *lies*—as incidentally every member of a "secret" society is obliged to do—intentionally in the *Bulletin jurassien* when he avers that Schwitzguébel had declared solidarity with him. On the contrary. Guillaume stated with great emphasis that Schwitzguébel would stand or fall with him, but Schwitzguébel turned a deaf ear to this cry *in extremis***! His poor-sinner speech made no mention of Guillaume, and it was this poor-sinner speech that bribed the majority. As a member of the commission for publication of the Congress proceedings I naturally had to go very carefully into the official Minutes of the Congress.

'Alliance' has been omitted by mistake. Because of this misprint one could really think that Marx tabled the motion to expel Schwitzguébel, which in reality he did not.—*Ed.*

* Tomás Morago.—*Ed.*

** At the hour of death.—*Ed.*

In respect of Lafargue it must be noted that the honest Biedermann* is lying when he designates him as delegate for Barcelona. Lafargue was delegated by the Portuguese Federal Council, the New Madrid Federation and also by a Spanish Section.

Karl Marx

Translated from the German

WILHELM LIEBKNECHT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON **

[Hubertusburg,] October 21, 1872
By pigeon post

Dear Engels,

I did not advise Chatelet to go to London; I received a letter here from him saying he had fled from his cutthroat creditors after a talk with Wuttke, and that when *I received his letter* he would *already be on the way to London*, where I was to send him some addresses *poste restante*, which I did, too, out of pity for the poor devil. Let him show you my letter, you will see that I did not picture London to him as a paradise. I designated him as a *non-party* man so that you people would not speak of party matters with him. I wrote to him expressly that except for *advice* he could expect *nothing* from you.

What [I]*** said about the Congress was based not on [information]*** from *Sch.*, with whom I had not yet spoken, but on the accounts of *Oberwinder*. — In respect of the *German [workers]**** rest at ease, they will [fulfil]*** their duty.

Friedländer was, is, and always will be a wretch with whom the party has no business.

I am happy that the *principle* of the International has been saved, I only wish it was the *International itself* that

* A pun on Biedermann, which figuratively means hypocrite and was also the name of the editor of the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

** The envelope bears the address: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London N.W., Leipzig and London postmarks and a note by Liebknecht: Engels.—*Ed.*

*** Here and lower the original is damaged.—*Ed.*

had been saved, the International which exists only in *principle* as long as the General Council is deported to New York. But nothing can be changed about that, and we must make the best of it. Is it not possible to gain ground in *England* and to win the *Belgian* workers away from their rabid, in part equivocal leaders?

Here in the "little castle" it would be *lovely* if one could get out every day for 24 hours. Luckily there are pigeons and balloons.

My congratulations to Jenny and Longuet!

Cordial greetings to you all.

And don't forget the *Volksstaat*, as I don't either.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *

Hoboken, October 25, 1872

You will now be in possession of the Minutes and probably working away at them. I was not able to edit them. As I made my notes in three languages, the order of the sentences must very often be changed.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

CÉSAR DE PAEPE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Brussels, October 26, 1872

Citizen Marx,

A few days ago I was handed the first instalment of the translation of your book *Das Kapital*.

I thank you most warmly for it. I was impatient to be able at last to acquaint myself with this important work, for though I am in possession of the first volume of the book

* The letter bears a note by Engels: Hoboken, October 25, 1872, F. A. Sorge, answered November 16.—*Ed.*

in German, the difficulties of the language added to those of the subject prohibited my making a serious study of it. Please accept my cordial salutations.

C. De Paepe

P.S. I purposely said nothing to you about the Hague Congress and its consequences. I shall merely tell you that I regret the divisions which exist in the International; that I deplore the violent or offensive language that it seems to be the intention to continue on either side, and that I consider as harmful to our Association certain of the measures voted at The Hague such as the expulsions and the extension of the General Council's powers in respect of the national federations and the sections, above all when the General Council is being located in America, that is to say in a country where it will be very difficult to have an exact idea of what is happening in the federations and sections of the old continent.

Moreover, in order to express my opinion with greater knowledge of the matter, I am waiting for the publication of the official Minutes.

Here is my present address, for I have left the hospitals to make myself a practice.

De Paepe, M. D.

24 rue t'Kint, near the abattoir,
Brussels

Translated from the French

FREDERICK ENGELS
TO THEODOR CUNO IN NEW YORK

122 Regent's Park Road,
London N. W.
October 29, 1872

Dear Cuno,

Received your letter of 8th and the Minutes,* thanks for both.

The *Bulletin jurassien*, which you will have received, and the *Brussels Internationale*, which will be sent off today,

* Of the Hague Congress sittings.—*Ed.*

will prove to you that serious action must be taken and that it is absolutely necessary that *Sorge* at least should cast off all doubts and agree to election* so that not only unity of action, but in the first place action itself be ensured. If energetic action is not taken and the suspension of the Jurassians because of their Congress resolutions which trample under foot the General Rules and the Hague Resolutions, as well as the expulsion of the members of the anti-authoritarian Congress, insofar as they belong at all to the International, are not at once declared and motivated, these gentlemen will get too cocky. There is still time: the Belgians have become scared at their own first show of courage and are hesitant; in Spain opposition to the Alliance is growing stronger every day, there are already demands for an extraordinary Spanish Congress to examine the behaviour of the Federal Council and the delegates at The Hague, but all that will cool down again if the insolent behaviour of the Jurassians is tolerated; and you can see from Hales' letter¹⁷⁹ in the *Internationale* that these people will stop at nothing. Hales is a correspondent of the Jurassians and distributes their *Bulletin* with its filthy articles free to anybody who will have it, and sends it to all the sections.

I must close. The post will be going. Marx and I are overloaded with work as we have never been before, what with the Congress and the publishing work as well as with correspondence. *Sorge* will have received the *Emancipación*, you can translate it for him. The next steamer will bring some more issues. Alongside the *Volksstaat* it is our best paper.

We enjoyed the Vogt business immensely.

We all send *Sorge* and you cordial greetings.

Yours,
F. Engels

Lafargue and his wife arrived here the day before yesterday.

Translated from the German

* As secretary of the General Council.—Ed.

FREDERIQUE POTEL TO PAUL VICHART IN LONDON *

Brussels, Monday, 9.a.m.
[October-November, 1872]

Dear Friend,

I did not want to work in my office yesterday, and yet I did not get out of it till one o'clock, so that I could not set to work till four o'clock. In spite of my good will I was unable to finish but I am sending you more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of the material and the remainder will follow tomorrow or the day after at the latest.**

You will see the note I have written to go at the beginning of the inquiry so as to justify our delay in publishing. Please give me your opinion on this.

You now have all the statements made up to the Saturday morning. I now have only that of Dupont and that of Serraillier and Swarm.

I am sending you the documents I have in my possession except those of Serraillier which you will find appended to next lot.

Tell Serraillier that I share his grief. I read the letter he wrote to Faillet and am not angry with him for blaming my negligence. Not being here he could not know what was happening.

In my next letter I shall acquaint you with the notes I have made on the points which seemed to me the most striking in the inquiry; but insist above all that the secret Rules should be printed, without that we shall be striking the water with our fist and we are the only ones that will get wet.

Greetings to our friends and a cordial handshake for you

from yours devotedly,

Potel

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

* The letter is written on notepaper with the stamped heading: Th. Delrez. Ing. Fontes Brutes. Métaux Minéraux, Machines et Rails, Représentant de Mr. Phil. Ab.^m Cohen à Francfort s/Main. Anvers, 4, Poids public. Bruxelles, 13, B^b, extérieur d'Anvers.—*Ed.*

** This refers to the report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Alliance. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 493-503.—*Ed.*

FROM A LETTER OF NIKOLAI UTIN
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Geneva, November 1,
Friday evening [1872]

Dear Master,

Enclosed I am sending you at last the information promised long ago; this information contains: 1) Bakunin's life in Siberia and his escape. 2) His pan-Slavist manifesto dated London, February 1862.¹⁸⁰ 3) His apology to the *peasant tsar*, Alexander II¹⁸¹—a most interesting and very instructive piece.—I have made very long excerpts from these two publications and have added several commentaries;—I believed it was better for you to have plenty of excerpts so as to be able to choose from them, though I admit I was forced to a certain length by the difficulty of the choice—one piece is as good as another—and I let myself go to recall certain episodes, certain features of the period 1862... "*quorum pars magna fui*"*—(*magna* is superfluous);—the fact is that first of all it is impossible for me to speak of this period without trembling at the memory of so many victims who remain dear to me, and then—it would be difficult to understand all the villainy and the idiocy of Bakunin if one did not take into account the *time* when he amused himself singing hymns to the Tsar. Knowing Bakunin well, I can say that if he did not do these things out of pure idiocy then he did them with the desire to draw attention to himself and to earn the good graces of the Emperor. I think one can say of Bakunin that he did not sell himself because nobody would buy him, if indeed nobody did buy him.

2) Appended are your Russian sheets—they are taken from the second issue of the *People's Judgment*, which appeared in Geneva in *December 1869*, although it was dated "St. Petersburg, *winter 1870*";—these sheets belong to the article entitled: "*The Principal Bases of the Social Order of the Future*", with this observation in a note:

"The detailed theoretical development of *our* fundamental principles will be found in the article edited by us, the *Communist Manifesto*; here we *explain* principally the *practical way of realisation*."

* "In which my part was great" (Virgil, *Aeneid*, 2).—Ed.

The *Communist Manifesto* was, in fact, translated and published by them in Russian,¹⁸² among other pamphlets—what an honour for you!—these scoundrels thus appropriated the programme and have falsified and explained it in their own way in the articles, which are similar to those the sheets of which you give me.—Your name is not mentioned anywhere in them.—Incidentally, I mentioned these sheets also in my memorandum when I spoke of the *official appraisers* (see second issue of the *People's Judgment*). Now it must be noted that Bakunin will certainly wish to deny any *relationship* with these *bases of the future*, but he must be forestalled by calling attention to the fact that this *second issue* appeared *before* Bakunin's pamphlet entitled: *To Officers of the Russian Army*, and in this pamphlet (some excerpts from which I have sent you in a little note-book) Bakunin *bases himself* on the *programme* of the Society of *People's Judgment*, declaring:

"The Committee is known to you: *first by its clear and precise programme, which it has published* and which it explains in still *greater detail* to everyone who enters the organisation. In the second place it" (the Committee) "is recommended to you by the absolute confidence" (without any reservation) "which it inspires in persons whom you know and *esteem*" (Bakunin thus speaks of himself), "by that confidence which *orders* you to *enter* precisely this organisation" (Nechayev's) "and not *another*" (p. 8 of the pamphlet).¹⁸³

This clear and precise programme includes precisely those *bases*, for the *catechism*, of which you have the translation, has not been *published*.¹⁸⁴

3) To finish with these publications I must add that I have not mentioned anywhere another pamphlet by him, Bakunin, called *Science and the Revolutionary Cause*, published at the same time as all the other pamphlets originating with the Bakunin-Nechayev committee in the winter of 1869-1870; I omitted this pamphlet because it would be too long to criticise all the absurdities that he advances in it. We must merely note the following: indulging in it in all sorts of philosophical reflections *sui generis*,* he concluded as to the necessity of an *organisation* for Russian youth and as a model of this organisation he suggested the

* Of a kind.—*Ed.*

International Association; that is how he *purposely confused* the International Association with his secret society.—If you wish I shall also send you this pamphlet, but it will be a waste of time to read it.

I draw your attention to some articles published in the *Tagwacht*¹⁸⁵ by a *Russian*,—I do not know his name but there are good things in it....

4) You ask for information on the signatories of the burlesque rehabilitation of Bakunin in *La Liberté*.¹⁸⁶—The first, *Nikolai Ogaryov*, must be *known* to you—he is Herzen's friend in childhood and politics, *his co-editor*; now for some years, he has been an epileptic, nearly insane, almost an idiot; he was also one of the *tools* of Nechayev and Bakunin and he participated with them in all their publications. It was he above all who supported Bakunin to get Herzen to give them and Nechayev the *20 thousand francs* that a young Russian* had deposited with Herzen in 1859 or 1860—for *propaganda* in Russia.¹⁸⁷ Herzen constantly refused to give this money to anybody, despite the sometimes *pressing necessities in Russia (between you and me, even if only to save Chernyshevsky)*, but he delivered it up to Bakunin and Nechayev—and it was with this wasted money that these scoundrels mounted their conspiracy. In the volume in which you are insulted there is an article by Herzen on *that money* in which he insults, by lying, young men, who, according to him, applied to him for the money; he ends the article by saying that he does not want to give the money to anybody¹⁸⁸—*forgetting* to add that he has delivered it all up to Bakunin, Ogaryov and Nechayev.—Hence the reverential sympathy which Bakunin and Nechayev profess for Herzen in their ultra-revolutionary publications. Later, in connection with this money, Nechayev quarrelled with Bakunin, and in his journal *La Commune*, published in London (only 2 or 3 issues appeared), he *publicly demanded* that Bakunin should return to him the money he had kept! I think I mentioned this fact at the end of my memorandum.—I also mentioned in it a *verse* by Ogaryov, destined to immortalise Nechayev by his imaginary death in Siberia.¹⁸⁹

* Bakhmetiev.—*Ed.*

The second—Vladimir Ozerov was one of the vilest scoundrels in the *Alliance*;—he was Bakunin's aide-de-camp in his *Lyons campaign*,¹⁹⁰ and one day he came to apologise to me for all the past, asking me to find 100,000 francs for them to save France (it was during the war); he was satisfied with 100 francs which I gave him then in my stupidity—I admit—not to save France, but to give something to eat to those whom they had succeeded in having thrown into prison at Lyons.—Later, under the Commune, he came to us, swearing that he wanted to act jointly with us to prepare the insurrection at Lyons; he betrayed us by informing the Alliance of everything and acting jointly with G. Blanc and Richard in sending proclamations—signed with several names without authorisation—through Albert Leblanc from Geneva to Lyons—Albert Leblanc was arrested—denounced by no one knows whom (no, I am not saying by Ozerov!)—and the police came into possession of documents the signatures on which compromised many persons unknown to them. It was this affair that led to the failure of the Lyons insurrection and it was in this affair that Ozerov played a vile role.

3) Ralli, Smirnov, Elsnitz and Holstein are young men who fled from Moscow and St. Petersburg because they had been involved in the Nechayev affair; their flight was superfluous, because accused of their category were set free. Of these four, Oelsnitz alone was considered an honest man—up to the assault on me—and only in the summer did he declare himself a supporter of Bakunin;—he was the only loss, for the boy is said to have been serious and to have worked in earnest. Incidentally I am not saying that he took part in the assault on me, but I know that he refused to disapprove it; on the contrary, he approved of it (but the devil take him—he is not worth bothering about, it is sufficient to note that these young men belonged to Nechayev's band).

Then *Goldenberg*—I do not know him. I know he is a scoundrel belonging to the same band, but in the register of the students in Zurich he is said to be a *Serb*.—That, I believe, is all.

5) *Nechayev* has recently been *extradited* to the Russian police¹⁹¹—it could not be otherwise, for the assassination

of Ivanov could not be considered as a political matter; otherwise they would assassinate you in the middle of the Hague Congress and say that it was a *political* murder!

I am sending you the pamphlet which Bakunin published at the time of the Congress.... In the quotations which Bakunin gives from the state prosecutor's speech there are *falsehoods*: the prosecutor did not say that *all the accused* rendered testimony to Nechayev's immense energy; on the contrary, he said that all bore witness that he made use of lies and swindles, that *only one* of them persisted in his blind trust.—Besides, it must be noted that *in Nechayev's absence* the prosecutor's *only task was to inflate the whole affair to the dimensions of a true political plot*: the Government's aim was to profit by the chance to ruin some hundred young people by condemning them as political criminals. Instead of boasting about this, the Bakuninists should hold their tongue and not admit that they succeeded in doing the Government's work by giving it the *opportunity* to condemn so many young people.—In general it would be a *grave error* to want to represent Nechayev as a hero—he was more of a madman (we shall see *yet* whether he was a Russian agent,—extradition does not mean anything) and *he should be killed by being made ridiculous*, for otherwise he will still have a very pernicious influence on that poor uncultivated, barbarous Russian youth, and you will still see that the old swindler Bakunin will *speculate* on the *misfortune* of his young *companion* Nechayev and will try to *excite* the young people against all of us.—It will be possible to say that it was not intended to give *publicity* to the account of all this affair so long as extradition was questionable in order not to give our enemies a false *pretext*; and now the two heroes must be made ridiculous by insistence that the wretched, weak-minded, imbecile figure of Nechayev was only Bakunin's *man of straw*.—That will be the truth—the *odiousness* must be made to fall back onto Bakunin, he must be made *guilty* of the punishment which is to be inflicted on the stupid Nechayev.

5) You ask me for particulars about the murderers; I can tell you nothing as yet—I wrote in my first long letter (after the assault) to sister Tussy all the details that I

knew*; and I think I said that police informer *Stempkovski*, the one who denounced Nechayev and had been his best friend as well as Bakunin's—that police informer *must have been* among those who assaulted me!

6) This evening at last *L'Égalité* appears; I have done all I could for it to appear at last with a clear and precise opinion on the Hague Congress; I was *invited*, it is true, to do this issue, but was requested at the same time *to refrain from personalities* and to speak only of *principles*. It is idiotic that these people do not understand that individuals must be overpowered at once, but what can you do about it—my health does not allow me to go to the Temple-Unique, I am obliged to assemble a few men at my place sometimes.—The attitude of the *English* and the removal of the General Council to New York have produced an equivocal vacillation in some heads and they did not want the journal to say anything about the Congress. I then told some of them that if the Federal Committee pushed its pusillanimity so far, I would still be strong enough to go to the Temple-Unique and provoke a storm there.—I was supported with great energy by Bernard and Duval, and the Federal Committee ended by unanimously voting that the issue of the journal should be devoted to the Congress and accepted my articles in the form in which you will see them in *L'Égalité*—it is better than nothing at any rate.—Now it is sure and certain that the Federal Committee will resolutely support the General Council in New York; it *has undertaken* to do so by this issue of *L'Égalité*, and they came to say that they are addressing a request to London and New York for *material aid*—by means of *subscriptions* to *L'Égalité*, for otherwise the journal would end up by disappearing; since last year, since it was banned in France it has been difficult to meet the cost of printing. Indeed we should get plenty of subscriptions from England and America and then the journal would do well and in return it would undertake to be the *official gazette* of the General Council; that is to say, it would publish all that was sent to it from London and New York.—I am only repeating the arguments of the members of the Federal Committee: they say that *L'Égalité*

* See pp. 440-48 of this volume.—*Ed.*

is still the *only French* organ of the *true* International, and that is indeed true, and it would be a sad thing if it disappeared.—Perret and others asked me to write this to you—I declined saying that it is their business and that I do not want to interfere in their relations, intending to leave here soon.... Then I think they will write to Engels and Sorge.

Here everybody hopes that your report on the *Alliance* etc. will be published in *French*; I have already said so to sister Tussy. They say that it is far more important for Switzerland and France than for England, and as for Germany—the *Volksstaat* would publish the translation. We would have carried the *Report* in *L'Égalité*, of course, but the fact is that we are no longer sure when it will be able to appear, and then the *Report* will doubtless take up more than one issue.

I have thought of the following *arrangement*: if the new General Council had means (money) to publish in French, and if the publication seemed to you to gain a more *official* character by being inserted first of all in an official journal of the International, it could be done in this way—payment would have to be found for the issue, or rather the *double issue* of *L'Égalité*, which would then appear entirely filled with your Report, and immediately afterwards the same type composition could be used to print a pamphlet.—Which amounts to saying that the *name* of *L'Égalité* would always be at your disposal, but the printing costs would have to be taken into account.

7) This morning a French *delegate* from Paris and Lyons was brought to me—the poor man had been sent here to *get information*, to *elucidate* with whom they should *side*: with New York or Geneva, with the *Jura Federation* or with Ranvier, Vaillant and Co. I said that New York and Geneva are both *one* and that the other two are enemies of the International. He will come again today to worry me and then he will go to the Temple-Unique, and tomorrow evening he will be here again with the members of the Federal Committee. If I get to know anything interesting from him I shall communicate without fail in a letter to sister Tussy. Meanwhile, I have already learned this:
1) Ranvier, Vaillant and Co. are *preparing* to launch a *mani-*

fest explaining why they withdrew before the Congress (!!) and announcing the constitution of a political society. 2) Before the Congress, *Ranvier* wrote to Paris, warning the Parisians to beware of *Serrailier* and treating the latter as a reactionary! 3) Also before the *Congress*, a delegate, a *one-legged Pole*, came on behalf of the *Jura Federation* to exhort the Internationalists in Paris to declare themselves against London and to adhere to the *Jura Federation* to form a counter-International, whereupon he was shown to the door.... Believe me, all these abominations are revolting!

I think I have told you everything for the time being, and it is quite enough. I thank Engels for sending me the resolutions, I made use of them "at the very moment of going to press"—unfortunately he addressed them to me at the *Temple-Unique* and it was not until *yesterday* that the manager of *L'Égalité* brought me those two letters containing the resolutions.

Translated from the French

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE IN HOBOKEN

122 Regent's Park Road, London
November 2, 1872

...Bignami is the only one in Italy who has taken our side, though at present not very energetically. In his paper *La Plebe* he published not only my report on the Hague Congress,* but my much stronger private letter to him** as well. As I am to send him newspaper items, we are keeping the paper in our hands. Moreover he has put out a new impression of the General Rules with the changes made at the Hague Congress, and also printed my report at the Congress.¹⁹² He is surrounded by autonomists there and must therefore be cautious.

* See pp. 301-02 of this volume.—*Ed.*

** See pp. 295-300 of this volume.—*Ed.*

I have no more news from Turin. In Milan Cuno must at least find us contacts, so that reports at least will come. Ferrara will be dealt with through Lodi; the section was founded by Bignami.

Marx asks me to tell you that the Minutes* are absolutely needed here *for the moment*. Considering the lies that are spread by Hales, Mottershead, and Eccarius, and likewise by the Jurassians etc. on the Continent, we may any day be faced with the necessity to reply with excerpts from these Minutes. On the other hand, if they are indispensable to you at present, an excerpt containing the administrative decisions and their motivation will be made and sent to you.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE IN HOBOKEN

London, November 16, 1872

I have already informed you of the setting up of two new Italian sections. An official letter is enclosed.

Today I am sending you:

1 *Emancipacion* and the Manifesto of the New Madrid Federation,

1 *Égalité*,

1 *International Herald*—Report of the Federal Council, 7 resolutions of the Hague Congress.

Further I have the following to report:

1. *Blanquists*. Have published a pamphlet, *International and Revolution*, several copies of which we shall send per next steamer. They explain their withdrawal from the International, which they say has killed itself by the deportation of the General Council to New York. They will found their own society and are already intensively intriguing in France. It is therefore absolutely necessary that

* Of the General Council's sittings.—Ed.

Dereure 1) should not get his hands on any addresses in France, 2) but must declare his position. The latter is urgent only if you think it advisable. Serraillier is replying to this concoction in *La Liberté* and *L'Égalité*. Ranvier has told Lafargue that the first draft was full of personalities so that he stated he would never sign it. He had never seen the second, published one, his name was placed under it without his authorisation. He is at variance with them, they allowed themselves to bring him to judgment because he continues without permission to be a member of a refugee club, the Cercle d'Études Sociales,¹⁹³ and he would not accept to be submitted to the schoolmaster's questionings of the court appointed by the "pure" (as the Blanquists call themselves). So you see they are playing at revolutionary Commune in exactly the old way. You will be amused by the rag of a pamphlet in which Vaillant quite seriously declares that all our economical and political principles were discovered by the Blanquists. They have already started squabbles in various places in France, besides Paris, where long Walter is their agent. Harmless as they are, they must nevertheless not be given the means to start more squabbles, and that is why Dereure is not to get any addresses and an eye must be kept on him.

2. *Spain*: Here things are going marvellously. The Federal Council has had a long thing printed and circulated underhand containing

- a) a lying report of the 4 Spaniards about the Congress,
- b) the resolutions of the anti-authoritarians at St. Imier,
- c) a motion of the Barcelona Federation to convene a Spanish Congress on December 25 to decide whether to adopt the resolutions of The Hague or those of St. Imier,
- d) a call to all local federations to state their opinion on this *by November 10*.

The New Madrid Federation replied to this with the Manifesto we are sending you today. It protests against the Hague resolutions being submitted to any international assembly except for information and observance. (We have already sent to Madrid the necessary material against the lies of the 4 Spaniards.)

Translated from the German

GUSTAV LUDWIG
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Heidelberg, November 16, 1872

Dear Friend,

The beginning of the new term at last affords me the pleasant opportunity and the time to devote myself more to our cause. I hope to manage this winter to recruit a small section of students; I know a few old medicals who adhere to a resolute and unreserved materialism and seem to be able to judge impartially in the political and social fields. Naturally they are not Germans, but Americans, Spaniards and Swiss; the most significant of them is a Frenchman whose name is E. Tugin from Morteau; were it possible for you to find out whether he has belonged or belongs to our association, please be kind enough to inform me. Until now I have heard nothing about the Congress proceedings and the new General Rules; should they have appeared, please let me know where they are to be obtained. How is communication with America established? Is it direct or through London? I have no address of the American General Council, and I should be very pleased to have one, since I wish to settle the subscriptions of the Mainz Section and my own.

Mr. Scheu is probably in London, I have sought him here without success; please convey to him my hearty greetings. I also note with regret that your son-in-law and his lady do not intend to spend the winter here.

Asking you kindly to help in the fulfilment of my wishes, I remain always at your service

with hearty greetings,

Yours,

Gustav Ludwig.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
 TO KARL MARX, FREDERICK ENGELS, AUGUSTE SERRAILLIER,
 EUGÈNE DUPONT, AND LEO FRANKEL,
 MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION APPOINTED
 BY THE GENERAL CONGRESS
 AT THE HAGUE FOR REVISING THE CONGRESS MINUTES
 AND FOR TRANSMITTING BOOKS AND PAPERS
 TO THE NEW GENERAL COUNCIL *

New York, November 24, 1872

Fellow Workingmen,

The General Council of the International Working Men's Association at its meeting of November 24th resolved to call on the above Commission for the early transmission of the books and papers belonging to the General Council, especially the minute books.

At the same meeting the General Council resolved to request all the late corresponding secretaries of the General Council, excepting the Secretary for Spain** (who sent his report already), to send promptly to the General Council a report on the situation of the International Working Men's Association in the different countries they were corresponding with.

The above Commission is requested to make known this request to all the late corresponding secretaries, since the General Council is not in the possession of their respective addresses.

Fraternal Greeting

By order and in the name of the General Council

F. A. Sorge, General Secretary

Box 101, Hoboken, New Jersey
 via New York

First published in Russian

Written in English

* The document bears the round stamp: General Council. International Working Men's Ass-n, Nov. 24, 1872.—*Ed.*

** Frederick Engels.—*Ed.*

FROM A LETTER OF BRUNO LIEBERS
TO ADOLF HEPNER IN LEIPZIG *

[The Hague, November 25, 1872]

...Guillaume operates splendidly from Belgium because people here are very much inclined to accept anything coming from there to prove that the old enmity between Holland and Belgium no longer exists.

Shortly before the Congress there again appeared here in Holland a paper called *Het vrye Volk*, which was printed in Antwerp and published in Amsterdam and is Bakuninist. This paper informed its readers in its last issue:

"Hepner has been released from arrest and from prison for considerations of health."

Among other things the Bakuninists try to spread rumours: "Lafargue was delegated only by 9 men for the reason that the majority knew that voting not being according to the number represented (as the Spaniards demanded) the majority then becomes the minority;—the Commission charged with examining the documents on the Alliance was invited every evening to drink wine at Karl Marx's.—The actual General Council still exists in London, in New York it is only a shadow one, and Marx's friend Sorge gets his instructions from London."

Here is a sample of what Guillaume's supporters are worth: As the members of the Hague Section could not represent the Section, one because he had no time, another because he did not want to be dismissed, a third for both reasons, the mandate was offered to the editor of the defunct newspaper *Vryheid*; he wished to be a reporter for *Rappel*, and suggested that the mandate should be given to his friend Victor Dave; this man was in Belgium and as the Section had no money, he would come at his own expense and would stay with him [the editor]. Later he informed

* The letter was enclosed in a letter from Hepner to Engels at the beginning of December 1872. The beginning is missing. There is a note by Hepner in the margin: I provided Liebers with an answer.—*Ed.*

us we could see that we got a loan from the General Council, but this being unsuccessful another change took place: Victor Dave would come and perhaps would accept at the most compensation for his travelling expenses. But contrary to his promise, Dave arrived here late, so that he was, so to speak, unable to find out the opinion of the Section; he did not stay with his friend, but at a hotel. The Belgian delegates at first raised objections against him, but admitted him, probably to ensure one vote more for the opposition. With others he voted for the American Section No. 2, then he interpreted in Dutch with omissions as it pleased him. Every evening after the end of the Congress sitting he was to speak to us. Finally, after making us wait for him, he came with the opposition delegates, all this, in my opinion, to deprive us of the possibility to speak to your opponents. He failed to give us the report that we expected from him on the proceedings. After receiving a modest compensation for his travelling expenses, as much as the state of the Section's treasury allowed, he also asked us later to settle his hotel bill, went to Amsterdam with us, which he did not need to do, if he had no money for the purpose. There he borrowed five Gulden from the clerk of the Amsterdam Section in our name (the Hague Section) under the pretext that he could not carry on. A fine swindle!

To conclude I must make another communication. I have been dismissed as I had long feared, and next Saturday I shall be unemployed. Where I shall then go with my wife and children, or rather where fate's dark hand will sling me, is yet unknown to me. Until further notice my address is as of old.

If you can find anything in these lines good enough to print in the *Volksstaat*, I guarantee their truth. As I have put this on paper half asleep because I have been working for a long time, I hope you will be indulgent.

With social-democratic greeting, also in the name of my brother-in-law

Bruno Liebers

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

WILHELM LIEBKNECHT
TO FREDERICK ENGELS IN LONDON *
WITH ACCOMPANYING LETTER BY NATALIE LIEBKNECHT

[Leipzig,] November 26, 1872

Dear Sir,

My husband has instructed me to forward the enclosed lines. I avail myself of the opportunity to send you friendly greetings and all best wishes.

Yours devotedly,

Natalie Liebknecht

Be so kind to write something about the manifesto of the Blanquists.** I wrote an article, but it shows too much my anger at the deportation of the General Council. So I rather keep it in my pocket. But it is *necessary* that the impression of this document, which meets with much sympathy, is wiped off a little.

First published in Russian

Written in German and
English

FROM A LETTER OF FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Hoboken, November 26, 1872

Private

Dear Marx,

Enclosed is an official letter from the General Council. *We need above all the minute books of the General Council.* The seal of the latter can be of no use to us and can remain for the time being with you. In the letter there is nothing yet about the resolutions and Minutes of the Hague Congress, and for that reason we wish first of all to know how high printing costs over there in London are. For this purpose we ask you to inform us how high the printing costs of the

* The envelope bears the address: F. Engels, Esq., 122 Regent's Park Road, London, Leipzig and London postmarks, and also a pencil note: Mama and Papa.—*Ed.*

** *International and Revolution.* See pp. 177-89 of this volume.—*Ed.*

General Rules were a) in English, b) in French, c) in German, so as to be able to judge by that whether it is profitable to have our printing done here or in Europe....

Yours,
F. A. Sorge

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

ADOLF HEPNER
TO FRIEDRICH ENGELS IN LONDON

[Leipzig, beginning of December 1872]

Dear Engels,¹

I am enclosing part of a letter from *Liebers* (The Hague), since I do not need it. It is *not* necessary to return the manuscript.

As this man was dismissed from his work because of the *Congress* he is very deserving of some kind of support—if any possibility at all *exists* for that.—He worked for us also *after* the Congress, smuggling passages from the *Volksstaat* into *De Werkman*. The letter is of November 25. *Liebers'* present situation is unknown to me.

Greetings to all,
A. H.

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

A. OLDRINI
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON *

December 2, 1872

Dear Citizen Marx,

I have no knowledge of a Blanquist pamphlet. Is it *International and Revolution* by Arnaud, Cournet, Martin, Vaillant, Ranvier, about which Mrs. Marx speaks to me in her letter? I am asking you this because I know that at

* The letter bears a note by an unknown person.—*Ed.*

The Hague they called them "the Blanquists"; but their reply to the Congress having appeared more than a month ago I think you know it. In any case, tomorrow I shall be pleased to bring you several copies.

Our Paris comedians are still playing—one would think it was very serious, wouldn't one?

With a hearty handshake,

Yours always,

A. Oldrini

17 Charlotte St.
Bedford Sq.

First published in Russian

Translated from the French

HERMANN GREULICH

TO JOHANN PHILIPP BECKER IN GENEVA

Neumünster, December 5, 1872

Dear Old Fellow,

My best thanks for your friendly remark in the *Landbote*. You will find in the next issue of the *Tagwacht* a very brief report on Hartung's organising and throwing-out strivings¹⁹⁴ and also the gladdening news that the Glarus Cantonal Workers' Society has declared the *Tagwacht* its press organ.¹⁹⁵

The main reason why I am writing to you has a bearing on your articles about the Congress.* While they are read willingly and with undiminishing attention among us Internationalists, and have ensured the *Tagwacht* great significance in the International as a whole, we are forced to conclude from letters received from here and there that these expositions do not produce a favourable effect and are not understood among the workers who stand aloof from our dissension with the Jurassians, and this goes too for our young sections in Appenzell, Rorschach and Lucerne. It is naturally not for me or for the editorial commission and cannot in the least occur to us to make abridgments in the articles or to venture making any prescriptions for you.

* See pp. 190-218 of this volume.—Ed.

Nevertheless we wish in a friendly way to request you to be somewhat briefer in dealing with the polemic against the Jurassians. We feel sure that you will not resent this request, the more so that you have certainly in any case a positive contribution to make in respect of the Congress.

It would also be a good thing if you would arrange the article in such a way that a definite conclusion can be drawn for the last issue of this year.

Now another matter. The German Mother Section in Geneva has not yet sent in any application for affiliation or membership strength. That should have been done. Likewise we are waiting for the same from the Tailors' Section. Would it not be possible to arrange a meeting in Geneva for the German-speaking workers and to agitate at it for our Group and for the *Tagwacht*? In that way it would probably also be possible to agitate Lausanne as well, where we have some very clever party members and where, with some assistance from you, a German Section could be formed. Could you perhaps consult Gutschmann and Liwenthal on this point? The tailors are defending themselves skilfully.

Thanks to our restraint in the present Zurich squabbles, our section and our influence in the trade unions will increase. The *Sozial-Republikaner* is still only a "well-conceived project".

I now close for this time with cordial greetings from

Yours,

Hermann Greulich

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF KARL MARX
TO NIKOLAI DANIELSON IN ST. PETERSBURG

[London,] December 12, 1872

Dear Friend,

From the enclosed you will learn the results of the Hague Congress. I read out the letter to Lyubavin to the Inquiry Commission on the Alliance under the seal of silence and

without mentioning the name of the addressee. However, the secret was not kept, first, because on the Commission sat the Belgian lawyer Springard, who in fact was only an agent of the Alliancists; secondly, because *Zhukovsky, Guillaume* and Co. had already related the whole affair right and left in advance—as a precautionary measure—in *their own way*, from an apologetic angle. Thus it came about that the Commission in its report to the Congress was forced to communicate the *facts* which concerned Bakunin and were contained in the letter to Lyubavin (naturally I did not give his name, but Bakunin's friends had already known it in Geneva). The question now is whether the Commission which was appointed by the Congress to publish the Minutes (I myself being on it) *may make public use of that letter* or not. This depends on Lyubavin. Nevertheless I must point out that the facts have for a long time—ever since the Congress—been making the tour of the European press without any co-operation on our part. This development of the matter was all the more repugnant to me as I had relied "on" and solemnly demanded the strictest discretion.

In consequence of the expulsion of Bakunin and Guillaume, the Alliance, which had the Association in its hand in Italy and Spain, has everywhere opened up a war of slander etc. against us, and by uniting with all the worthless elements is seeking to lead to a split into two camps. But its final defeat is certain and hopefully it will help us to *purge* the Association of all unclean or weak-minded elements which have infiltrated into it here and there.

The attempt made by Bakunin's friends in Zurich on the poor Utin is a fact. Utin himself is at present in a very dangerous state of health. The blackguardly act has already been related in a number of the Association's papers (among others in the Madrid *Emancipacion*) and will figure in detail in our official report of the Hague Congress. The same band of blackguards has made two similar attempts in Spain against its opponents. It will soon be put in the pillory before the whole world.

FROM A LETTER OF NIKOLAI DANIELSON
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

St. Petersburg, December 15 (27), 1872

Lyubavin is ready to fulfil your wish, i.e. to make public use of the letter, but only on the following condition: as the document was delivered by him; as thereby he is the accuser; as he does not wish to take upon himself the role of an anonymous accuser; as he is convinced that such a document should be published *en toutes lettres**: so he desires that his name be printed. Only on this condition is he ready to fulfil your wish.

Most respectfully,
N. D.

Translated from the German

THEODOR CUNO
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

Paterson, January 8, 1873

Dear Marx,

It is not my fault that I have only now got round to writing to you, but that of fatal circumstances. For months on end I was running around without any rest or peace to find in the end a job as *manual worker*!

Once I had that luck I had to stand at the work bench from morning till night and in the evenings and on Sundays I was naturally so tired and irritable that I had no strength left for written work any more than for reflexion. In the end I could bear the damned torture no longer and I began to write newspaper articles; now I find more time and tranquillity and I reply to your admonition to Sorge at once with what I still have to say about Guillaume, Schwitzguébel etc.

The questionnaire answered and signed by Schwitzguébel** was intended to convince the Jura gentlemen that Bakunin

* In full, word for word.—*Ed.*

** See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 497-99.—*Ed.*

could lie and also that he was a quite incapable, stupid charlatan.

Now Schwitzguébel answered each question after thinking for a terribly long time and with repeated changes in the form of the answer—from which any intelligent man was bound to see *that* the connection with the secret society did exist and that some “oath” or other hocus-pocus, if not the evil intentions of the Alliance towards the International, hindered the persons questioned from answering promptly and frankly.

Our intention to use the signed questionnaire in the sense we had thought of was rendered completely illusive by *Guillaume's* statement:

The whole thing seemed to him like an Inquisition procedure in the Middle Ages and he would not answer any of our questions concerning Bakunin or a secret society.

On the Saturday* at noon, while we were waiting for you, Lucain and I had a private conversation in the billiard room of the Hague Section premises, during which I asked Guillaume: “What must one think of Bakunin, whom you consider so great a man, when one sees Rules for a secret society written by him with his own hand and full of madness and stupidity?” Guillaume replied: “We know quite well that it is one of Bakunin's weak points to be constantly making out programmes and rules, we have repeatedly reproached him for it but he just goes on doing so; that is why it is quite possible that rules of that sort out of his waste-paper basket have fallen into the hands of Marx and Co.”

Those words of Guillaume's tear any halo from Bakunin's head and are his moral condemnation; this fact is all the more incriminating as it was his chief friend and defender who made such a statement. But besides that it testifies that the otherwise so shrewd Guillaume had completely lost his head in this matter, like a dog attacked from all sides no longer defends itself with its teeth but passes water.

Morago produced just the same impression as Guillaume; he did not give a straight answer to *any* of our questions but tossed about words such as radicalism, social revolu-

* September 7, 1872.—*Ed.*

tion, *traidores** etc., etc. instead of telling the truth; he stated exactly the same thing as Guillaume had said.

Before the Spaniards were questioned, the Brussels lawyer of the Alliance—I have forgotten his name—went out and did not return; I went out and found him in earnest conversation with Morago and Guillaume. From this it is clear that he kept his word given to us less than he *broke* it in order to betray everything we had spoken about so far. Concerning the reliability of this “citizen” (Spingard—the name has just returned to me) it is not without interest to note that he was already a little tipsy when *Marx* was being questioned, and later on he was so drunk that he fell asleep and only with difficulty could be shaken out of his torpor! ■

Alerini also adopted the way of acting of Guillaume and Morago, whereas Marselau and Farga Pelicer had difficulty in concealing that they would willingly have been frank had they not been hindered by their “friends”.

In respect of Spingard’s behaviour towards me, I shall merely state the simple fact that he threatened to box my ears and declared that I was “only worthy to be treated with revolver shots” because I expressed the supposition that he also belonged to the Alliance.

What I pointed out in the decisive sitting on the question of the Alliance and what our decision, called a childish report by the *Bulletin*, says, “that there is no *material* proof of the existence of the Alliance, but that it is urged on us only by moral conviction, becomes clear to all from the above-mentioned behaviour of the Alliancists.

“Men defending a just cause are not so stupidly fearful as Schwitzguébel, Guillaume, Morago and Spingard, and therefore we say we are morally convinced of the existence of the Alliance and propose the expulsion of Guillaume, Bakunin and Spingard.”

While the Alliancists protest against a formal court procedure and refuse to answer, as soon as the affair is decided they shout that there was no “*material*” proof, but only moral conviction against them.

* Traitors.—Ed,

These are the additions which I had to make concerning the affair.

At present I am a member of Section No. 29, which is in contact with the Jurassians, Spring Street and Section No. 2, so that I have also the advantage of learning all that these dolts decide, and incidentally I work energetically against them; I have even succeeded in getting out of the Section the statement: "That the Congress of St. Imier has, by its resolutions, made an attempt against the International."

Naturally I always keep Sorge abreast of matters, so that we paralyse at least in something the ludicrous doings of these charlatans.—If I had German pamphlets, or else more money, extensive propaganda could be carried on, for there are more than 30,000 workers here, 10,000-12,000 of them Germans; but for the time being I must keep quiet until I have my feet firmly on the ground.

I cannot say much about New York because I have been away from it for 3 months and Sorge neither sends me newspapers nor writes me decent letters.

I should be very thankful to Engels if he would send me newspapers etc. from time to time; but I must also say that he did me no good turn by sending people to me here like that Chatelet, who are mad, and "as *thinkers* have no time to take part in the social movement" and cause one nothing but trouble and vexation.

Cordial greetings to Mrs. Marx, her daughters, and also Lafargue and his wife.

Yours faithfully,
Th. Cuno

But I am no longer called Cuno here.

Address: F. Capestro,
94 Market Street,
Paterson N. J.

(via New York)

First published in Russian

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF KARL MARX
TO NIKOLAI DANIELSON IN ST. PETERSBURG

London, January 18, 1873

As to Lyubavin, I should prefer suppressing the whole part of the enquiry to be published rather than expose him to the least danger. On the other hand, boldness is perhaps the best policy. According to something which Bakunin has published in Switzerland, not in his name, but in that of some of his Slavonian friends,¹⁹⁶ they intend giving *their own account* of the transaction as soon as *circumstances* will permit them to do so. The indiscretion of their accomplices at The Hague was intentional and, I suppose, was meant as a sort of intimidation.

On the other hand, I cannot judge of the possible consequences of the publication, and, therefore, should wish our friend to communicate to me through you his resolution, after having again quietly *reconsidered* the case.

Written in German and English

FROM A LETTER OF NIKOLAI DANIELSON
TO KARL MARX IN LONDON

St. Petersburg, January 16 (28), 1873

Concerning the publication of the letter, everything is as it was. Lyubavin insists on his name being printed. If you have to hand the newspapers in which this affair is printed, I ask you to cut out this article and send it to me.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO AUGUST BEBEL IN HUBERTUSBURG

London, June 20, 1873

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 non-descript brew, which, the moment it is left to settle, throws up the differences again but in much sharper contrast because they are then 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 Hague 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 an extraordinary impression upon them as this session of the tribunal which passed judgment 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 victorious by *splitting* and being able to stand the split. 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.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE IN HOBOKEN

London, July 26, 1873

The report on the Alliance is being printed—I read the first proofs yesterday—and is to be ready in a week, but I have very strong doubts. It will be about 160 pages; I shall advance the printing costs—about £40. Impression 1,000 copies, price 2 francs = 1/9d. in English. I shall send you the first copies that are ready. But as the thing absolutely must be *sold* to cover the costs, let me know at once how many copies *are ordered* over there, then a few more will be sent. Have a look around too for a *serious* bookseller who will get it sold there. For over there the price will probably be fixed at 60-75 cents because of overhead costs—that is your business—in any case we must get 1/9d. per copy here, except for those sold through the bookseller, in which case his discount is subtracted; otherwise we shall not cover our costs. The thing will go off like a bomb among the autonomists, and if anybody at all must be destroyed, Bakunin will be stone dead. Lafargue and I did it together, only the *Conclusion* is from Marx and me. We shall send it to all the press. You yourself will be astonished at the infamies that are revealed in it: even the people on the Commission were quite surprised.

Translated from the German

FROM A LETTER OF KARL MARX
TO NIKOLAI DANIELSON IN ST. PETERSBURG ¹⁹⁷

London, August 12, 1873

We are publishing the Revelations on the Alliance* (you know the sect of *teetotallers* call themselves thus in England),

* *The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association.*—Ed.

and want to know the *cheapest* way to send you a somewhat larger number of copies. The letter relative to the chief* of that sanctimonious people is still held in reserve.

Written in English

FROM A LETTER OF FREDERICK ENGELS
TO FRIEDRICH ADOLF SORGE IN HOBOKEN

London, November 25, 1873

In reply to the pamphlet Bakunin sent the *Journal de Genève* and the Jurassians the announcement of his political death: I am retiring—dorénavant je ne troublerai plus personne et je ne demande que ce qu'on me laisse tranquille à mon tour.**¹⁹⁸ In which he is greatly mistaken. Otherwise not the slightest attempt to answer anything.

Utin has already been here about a month and has told us still more astonishing things about Bakunin. The fellow had sincerely put his catechism into practice. For years he and his Alliance had been living only on *extortion*, relying that nothing about it could be made public without compromising other people who had to be considered. You just cannot imagine what a band of rascals they are. Otherwise it is very quiet in their pseudo-International, the pamphlet has exploded the swindle and Messrs. Guillaume and Co. must first let the grass grow over it a bit.

Translated from the German

* Bakunin.—*Ed.*

** In the future I shall not trouble anybody and all I ask for is to be left in peace too.—*Ed.*

APPENDICES

**REMINISCENCES OF DELEGATE
TO THE HAGUE CONGRESS
THEODOR FRIEDRICH CUNO**

FROM A LETTER
TO R. F. BARTON IN LENINGRAD *

Elton, Louisiana,
February 15, 1932

Dear Comrade:—Of course it will give me pleasure to write about Marx and Engels for you and our Russians! If they will pay for it so much the better.

Theo. F. Cuno

Now then, my dear comrades in Russia: You think that I am the only fellow living to have known Marx and Engels, just because I am 86 years old? May be I am—so here goes:

It was in 1869 when I had to flee from Austria for having taken part in the demonstration before the Austrian Parliament demanding universal suffrage for all persons above 21 years of age, and I went to Italy to keep from being sent to an Austrian jail. Being a member of the International Working Men's Association, the comrades at Triest, Venice, Verona and Milan assisted me in finding work and when I had at last been firmly settled with the Fonderia Elvetica at Milan, constructing machinery for harvesting and treating rice, I resumed my work of agitating for socialism and organising local sections. As I was a German, I sent my reports to Col. Philipp Becker, in Switzerland, who was then secretary for the German part of the International, but Becker referred me to Frederick Engels, in

* The letter is written on notepaper with the stamped heading: Llano Co-operative Colony Operated by Llano del Rio Company.—*Ed.*

London, as Engels was secretary for the Italian part of the organisation. I therefore corresponded with Engels, who was living at Regent's Park Road. As I could not write under his address, I had to give the name of a young girl living in the same house.

That was the beginning of my personal acquaintance with Engels and Marx. Aside from what he wrote me relating to my duties as agitator and organiser, Engels appeared, in his letters, to be a hail-fellow, well met, as he wrote me about his remembrances of Milan, where he had been studying the Italian silk industry while being a young man....¹⁹⁹

As soon as I had mastered the Italian language, I caused my Fascio Operaio (Workers' Union) to publish a weekly paper, which we called *Il Martello* (The Hammer). When six issues had been published, all of them confiscated by the police, I was arrested, the followers of Bakunin, some of them being members of our union, betrayed me to the police and I was arrested,* kept in prison at Verona for 3 months, and my correspondence with Marx and Engels was taken from my rooms, translated into Italian and never returned to me. The Italians turned me over to the Austrians, who kept me in prison at Innsbruck for several days, then handed me over to the Bavarians and these let me go where I pleased, because there were no charges against me in Germany, although the Italians had told them that I was a "dangerous international revolutionist". From Munich I went to Leipzig, where I met Bebel and Liebknecht. Having renounced my citizenship in Germany, I went to Liège, in Belgium, addresses having been given me by Engels. But soon the Belgian police, who had been notified by the Italians, put me into France, from where I went to Barcelona, in Spain. There Bakunin's men had me given into the hands of the Spanish police and I had to return to Germany, my parents living at Düsseldorf.²⁰⁰ There I organised a section of the International, who sent me as their delegate to the International Congress at The Hague, and as Engels had procured for me a mandate from the Stuttgart Section, I represented these two sections at the

* February 25, 1872.—Ed.

Hague Congress. When I was talking and drinking at the hotel with Marx and Engels, Rudolph Schramm, former Prussian Consul at Milan, sent his visiting card to Marx requesting an interview with him, to get a recommendation to the voters of some district in Germany, that should send him as their representative to the German Parliament. Marx refused to see Schramm and after the first session of the Congress the next day I publicly requested Schramm to have my correspondence with Marx and Engels returned to me by the Italian police. On the second day of the meeting of the Congress, Schramm entered the hall to declare that he never had a letter from me and he challenged me to a duel for having called him a thief. Of course, I laughed at the challenge and Schramm left The Hague, saying that I was a "coward", although the fact that I fought eleven duels when at college, proves the contrary.

When the Congress came to investigate the charges against Mikhail Bakunin for having tried to disrupt the International by organising his secret Alliance within our organisation, I was elected chairman of the investigating commission to which the evidence against Bakunin was referred. The commission found Bakunin guilty and recommended his expulsion from the International by a vote of 3 against 2; the two members being Spanish Anarchists, and, of course, sworn friends of Bakunin. One of the Spaniards drawing his gun and pointing it at me, exclaimed: "Un homme comme ça devrait être traité à coups de revolver!" (A man like that should be treated with shots from a revolver), because I had voted, as chairman, against Bakunin. The furious Spaniard was disarmed and the Congress adopted the commission's report. For years, the Anarchists have denounced and persecuted me for having voted against Bakunin.

When the Congress had adjourned the delegates, among whom there was *not one* representative from Russia (what a change since that year of 1872!), were invited by Marx and Engels to a shore dinner at Scheveningen, the watering resort near The Hague. We all went there, and before dining had a swim in the ocean. Never having bathed in sea-water, I went out nearly a quarter of a mile and could not return as the tide was going out and the rushing waves were too strong for me. But there was Frederick Engels,

who had seen that I was in danger. Being a stronger man and a better swimmer than I was, he swam out to me, grabbed me by one arm and thus enabled me to safely return to the shore.

At Scheveningen Marx also introduced me to his daughters, the one married to Paul Lafargue and the other to one of the French delegates (I don't remember his name,* old age playing tricks on me). Eleanor Marx, whom we used to call "Tussy", was the third daughter....

While I was in London, I frequently met Marx, his family and Engels, who was a confirmed bachelor. We had dinners and theatre parties, and I often conversed with Marx, particularly about how to organise the International in America, and also about the financial question, of which Marx had but a little to say. "What will it be after we win?" he exclaimed. "Tausch!** That's all; don't bother your head about the damned money business!" Nor have I ever done so; I think that *exchange* will solve it all and that is what we are doing at Llano Colony here in Louisiana; and I want your Russian comrades to enter into a lively exchange of products with us. May be that the consequence of that will be the sending of some of our people to enjoy liberty with you in Russia, because liberty has been destroyed in America by sneak-thief capitalism!... The reason why I am not coming over to you is because travelling is too strenuous for a man of my age, and I am happy at my little paradise with Llano Colony, to help which will be a brotherly deed. And I do not doubt that you will do all you can, for this ever-growing branch of liberty's tree in America.

Of my letters from Marx and Engels I cannot send you any, because I gave them to August Bebel and Professor Richard T. Ely, both of whom wanted to publish them. Whether or not they did, I do not know.

I am with fraternal greeting

Yours for the Social Revolution
Theo. F. Cuno

P.O. Box 126
Elton, Louisiana U.S.A.

* Charles Longuet.—*Ed.*

** Exchange.—*Ed.*

P.S. I forgot to tell you that Marx was called by his family and friends "Der Mohr" (the Moor) because he had a very dark complexion and black curly hair. His daughters and wife never called him "papa", or "mann", always "Mohr", and they only spoke to him in the German language.

First published in Russian

Written in English

TO THE TOILING MILLIONS OF RUSSIA ²⁰¹

Elton, Louisiana,
January 1, 1933

My dear Brothers and Fellow-Fighters for Freedom from Capitalistic Robbery and Oppression:—

Greeting and love! From far-away America, over thousands of miles of Land and Ocean, I today stretch my hands and shout a merry New Year and a profound joy from the bottom of my heart,—with a wish that your splendid work since 1917 may bring freedom to the rest of the Proletarians living upon the soil of this our still mysterious globe! I rejoice in still being able to see the glorious progress you have been making ever since you struck out to unite as we all were bidden when Karl Marx and Frederick Engels wrote their grand Manifesto to throw off your shackles of slavery and win the world!

And now let me tell you how I came to write these lines: I have been living here since 1919 at a Colony of Proletarians who freed themselves from wage-slavery in 1914, three years before you did. We publish a weekly paper which one of your fellow-workers, Comrade Barton, of Leningrad, reads. And in that little paper he saw that I, a contemporary of Marx and Engels, am still living and writing, though 86 years and 8 months old, still hale and hearty, still filled with the fervor of youth and warm blood in my unconquered body. That dear Brother, Barton, wrote a letter to me, more than one year ago, asking me to tell you what I know, and still remember, of our two great teachers and brothers, Marx and Engels, with whom I lived, and worked, and fought when I was a young man. I replied to Comrade Barton but I did not hear from him until several days ago when I received a letter from Comrade

V. Adoratsky, of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute at Moscow, requesting me to write some additional facts regarding the founders of the First International, which I joined more than 63 years ago. I am now trying to reply to comrade Adoratsky and his fellow-workers of that Institute and their questions. "Oh that Marx and Engels were still living", I cried to my wife when I read the news of your wonderful uprising in 1917; what a reward it would have been for those two great men whose call you were obeying! But they were then resting in their graves, only to be resurrected, in mind, by the sound of your tocsin of battle. And for all of us they will live as long as the human race will survive, even in the memory of its successors whose brains may be better than those we have. Let us hope so!!

THE LAST OF THE "FIRST"

We are optimists; every one of us. Whatever we do, we do it because we think it will benefit us. No human being, nor any other animal, ever acts against its own interests deliberately. It is for this reason that I do not believe that Marx and Engels wanted to destroy the First International by transferring its General Council from Europe to North America. Nor have I observed them to hold any secret caucus or other meetings behind closed doors at The Hague while the last Congress of the Working Men's International Association was in session. Why should the fathers of that grand organisation want to destroy the child which to bring into the world they had labored and suffered all their life-time? It is not logical to think that men of their type, of their enthusiasm, of their love for humanity should be capable of such a dastardly crime! The enemies of Progress, of the toiling millions have attributed that crime to Marx and Engels. However there were those at The Hague who had been instructed by Mikhail Bakunin to work for the destruction of the International, which he, for years, had denounced to be the tool of the German Centralisationist, Karl Marx, whom he hated as the mythical "Devil" hated "*Heilwasser*" ("holy water") in order to make a wonderful success of his own anarchist Alliance. Nor can we attribute the crime intended to be perpetrated by the dele-

gates Bakunin had sent to The Hague because they were there in a ridiculous minority as I shall now prove to you by copying their names from the official list of delegates which I have preserved for more than sixty years. Here they are:

Alerini, delegate of the Spanish Federation.

Désiré Brismée, printer, delegate of the Brussels Section.

Coenen, shoemaker, of the Antwerp (Belgium) Section.

Cyrille, Commercial Clerk, delegate of the Brussels Section.

Victor Dave, of the Hague Section.

Eberhardt, tailor, delegate of the Brussels Trades-Unions.

Pellicer Farga, typesetter, delegate of the Spanish Federation.

James Guillaume, typesetter, delegate of the Neuchâtel Congress, Switzerland.

Fluse, weaver, delegate of the Vesdre Federation, Belgium.

Rohrhard, tailor, delegate of the Amsterdam Federal Committee.

Gilkens, lithographer, delegate of the Amsterdam Lithographers' Trades-Unions.

Herman, delegate of the Liège (Belgium) Trades-Unions.

Morago, delegate of the Spanish Federation.

Marselau, " " " " "

Roch Spingard, delegate of the Charleroi (Belgium) group.

Schwitzguébel, engraver, delegate of the Neuchâtel Congress.

Van der Hout, delegate of the Amsterdam Section.

Van den Abeele, delegate of the Ghent (Belgium) Section.

These were eighteen, out of a total of sixty-five. And they all voted for the transfer to New York, as well as the majority of the other forty-seven delegates, some of whom had left The Hague (I do not know who they were) before the final vote could be taken. The eighteen followers of Bakunin also voted against his expulsion. The delegates, who, in a solid body were determined, with Marx and Engels, to continue the glorious work of the International, believing that there was a fertile field for extension and success in America, principally in the Republics south of the Rio

Grande, but who were sadly mistaken as to the United States, were:

Dumont, representing Paris and Rouen.

Leo Frankel, jeweller, Intendant of the Paris Commune.

Johannard, delegate of the French Section.

Lucain, " " " " " "

Charles Longuet (son-in-law of Marx), "

Ranvier, porcelain painter, delegate of Ferré Section, Paris.

Swarm, designer, delegate of the French Section.

Serrailier, moulder, " " " " " "

(member of the General Council).

Walter, delegate of the French Section.

Vaillant, civil engineer, representing Paris, Chaux-de-Fond, Switzerland, San Francisco.

Vichard, delegate of the French Section.

Vilmot " " " " " "

Most of the French delegates were fugitives from their native country on account of their having taken part in defending the Paris Commune against the murder of the Paris people by the butchers sent against them by Thiers and Bismarck.

The rest of the delegates came from England, Germany, America, Switzerland, Denmark, Portugal, and only one of them represented Russia, from where he had no credentials, he was

Professor Wróblewski, member of the General Council and representative of the Polish Section, in London.

More names from the official list:

Anton Arnaud, chemist, delegate of Carouge Section, Geneva.

Johann Philipp Becker, German Revolutionist and colonel in General Siegel's army, massacred by the Prussians in Baden 1849, representing three sections in Switzerland.

Barry, shoemaker, delegate of Chicago Section.

Bernhard Becker, journalist and author, delegate of Brunswick Section (Prussia).

Professor Frédéric Cournet, member of the General Council, representing Copenhagen, Denmark.

Josef Dietzgen, tanner, philosopher, writer, representing Dresden Section, Saxony.

Eugène Dupont, instrument maker, member of the General Council.

Duval, joiner, representing the Romance Federal Committee of Geneva, Switzerland.

Theodor F. Cuno, representing Stuttgart and Düsseldorf sections.

Simon Dereure, shoemaker, delegate of New York Section.

Eccarius, tailor, delegate of last-makers, London.

Frederick Engels, representing Breslau Section (Prussia) and No. 6 Section, New York.

Carl Farkas, mechanic, delegate of Pesth, Hungary sections.

Hugo Friedländer, delegate of Zurich Section, Switzerland.

Edwell Harcourt, goldminer, of Victoria Section, Australia.

Adolf Hepner, journalist, of Section No. 8, New York.

John Hales, Hackney-road Section, London.

Heim, delegate of Bohemian Section, Austria.

Karl Marx, member of General Council and delegate of Leipzig, Mainz, and No. 1 New York sections.

Dr. Kugelmann, physician, of Celle Section, Hanover.

Lessner, tailor, delegate of German Section, London.

Dr. Paul Lafargue, Marx's son-in-law, delegate of Madrid and Portugal Federations.

Le Moussu, designer, of French Section, London.

J. P. MacDonnell, of London and Dublin Irish sections.

Milke, typesetter, delegate of Berlin Section, Prussia.

Mottershead, of Bethnal Green Section, London.

S. P. Pihl, of Copenhagen Section, Denmark.

Thomas Roach, delegate of the General Council, London.

Rittinghausen, author, delegate of Munich Section, Bavaria.

Arsène Sauva, tailor, representing sections No. 3 and No. 29, Hoboken, and 42, Paterson, U.S.A.

George Sexton, M.D., delegate of the General Council, London.

Gustav Schumacher, tanner, of Solingen Section, Prussia.

F. A. Sorge, music-teacher, representing New York Congress, U.S.A.

Heinrich Scheu, of Eszlingen, Württemberg Section.

So you see that there was *not one* female delegate at The Hague. The suffrage movement had hardly started at those

times, and the men were too busily engaged in building up their own organisation.

I append the official list, printed by A. D. Wisscher of Amsterdam and distributed among the delegates.*

LIKE A CAT-AND-DOG FIGHT

We assembled, September 2, 1872, at a large hall, The Hague, name and location I disremember. It looked to me like a dance hall in some sort of a hotel, about 50 by 20 feet; with a balcony on one side, where a few spectators were sitting, among them reporters of several local and foreign papers; also Malatesta,** the rabid Italian Anarchist and intimate friend of Bakunin. The general public of The Hague did not take any interest in our proceedings, which were a fierce fight from the very start. Seated at a number of tables put together, Marx at the head and Engels at his right, were the 65 delegates who elected a temporary chairman, secretary and treasurer. The first business was the appointment, by the secretary, of a commission to examine the credentials of the delegates.***

The commission retired and a recess was taken after which the commission made its report advising that the credentials of Section 12, New York and the Spanish Federation be rejected, not only on account of their not having paid their dues for more than one year, but also for their destructive tactics against the International. Up jumped "Billy" West, representing Section 12, and making an incoherent speech favouring "Free Love". "We are proud of being Free-Lovers!" he shouted. From various parts of the hall delegates replied: "Put him out!" in half-a-dozen languages. A vote was taken and "Billy" was told to go back to New York and his Free-Lovers, among whom were Theodore Tilton, editor of the *Golden Age*, and the Republican local paper *Union*, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and his bosom friends, Victoria Wood-

* Appended to the manuscript here was the official printed list of delegates. See *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 330-33.—*Ed.*

** It was not Malatesta, but Cafiero, who attended the Congress from Italy.—*Ed.*

*** The credentials commission was elected by the Congress.—*Ed.*

hull and her sister Tennie Clafin, who in their scandal-mongering *Woodhull's Weekly*, exposed the "relation" of Henry Ward Beecher, Pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, with Elisabeth, Theodore Tilton's wife, the result of the publication being Tilton's suit against Beecher for seducing Mrs. Tilton, damages in \$100,000 being asked by plaintiff. When the case came to trial at the King's County Supreme Court, several years later, I was among the reporters who had to write up the salacious testimony for the papers employing them. Mr. Beecher, when asked the question, on the witness-stand: "Did you ever have sexual connection with Mrs. Tilton?" replied in his soft mezzobasso voice: "*Never, hardly ever!*" The jury failed to agree, 11 to 1 against Beecher, one juror having been bribed with money from the wealthy members of Plymouth Church. And the case was never tried again. Of course we could not afford to associate with a crowd like that and we rejected West's credentials, the Bakunin delegates voting to admit them.

The next battle arose over the motion to reject the Spanish Bakuninists. It lasted several hours, the members of the General Council accusing the Spaniards of having participated in a conspiracy to split the International, while the Spaniards replied with vicious insinuations against Marx and Engels, charging them with being selfish politicians and bourgeois who were fattening upon the proceeds from an organisation the members of which were their ignorant and deceived dupes. As these charges were too obviously ridiculous the majority of the delegates were about to reject the Spanish credentials, when the treasurer of the Spaniards strode up to the temporary treasurer and emptied upon the table before him a bag filled with gold pieces, saying: "There you have our dues, and now admit us, our opinions about the tactics and strategies of the organisation have nothing to do with our rights to membership!" After some more discussion the Spaniards were admitted by a small majority vote, as were the delegates of the *Fédération jurassienne*, against whom similar accusations to those against the Spaniards had been made.

And now the Congress could proceed with its regular business.

QUIETING DOWN—THE OUTLOOK

To systematically conduct the business of the Congress, it was agreed to elect a chairman for every meeting, with power to appoint committees and conduct the days' business according to parliamentary rules, subject to objections from the floor, by delegates. Then the report of the General Council was read, Marx, Engels and other members of the Council alternating in the reading, Engels's versatility as a linguist you may judge from the following fact: We were at breakfast in our hotel, one morning, Engels sitting to my left, while on my right two strangers sat, one a white-haired old fellow, the other middle-aged, and Engels whispered to me: "Look out, don't speak to me, those two fellows are Russian spies", then raising his voice and sneering at the men, he said something in Russian, of which I only understood the word "rusky". The two fellows acted as if they had not heard what Engels said and stopped talking. That Engels had told me the truth I seemed to be convinced when on the days following I saw those two sneaks hovering around the edges of the Congress and in the hotels where delegates were staying, the spies constantly listening and skulking about. Engels had been learning Russian when he was over 60 years of age, a feat too difficult for old persons like myself. I never learned a new language after 50, however mastering English which I could not speak before arriving in New York.

The report was written in English, French and German and it was quite voluminous, my recollection of its contents being that the state of the organisation throughout the world not being altogether too rosy, particularly as far as the financial condition of the organisation was concerned, owing to the small number of regular members in many countries, no mention being made of membership in Russia, no dues having been received from that great country of yours. As the delegates from Italy and Spain did not all of them speak any other language but their own, I was appointed to be interpreter for Italian and Spanish and it was a big job for me to translate the contents of the report as well as any remarks made regarding it, from the floor, Marx and Engels replying extensively. When speaking,

Marx was not very fluent, in fact he was not a practical orator, while Engels spoke in a conversational tone, often sarcastic and humorous, "burschioisically",* as we Germans are in the habit of describing the conversation among college students. When Marx was speaking he, from time to time, dropped his monocle, then slowly reinserting it in place at his right eye. Being fifty-five years at that time, Marx was still in a vigorous physical condition, his bushy hair and beard being only in part streaked with gray, or white. His complexion was a pale yellow, no Jewish trait reminding one of his descent; his fellow students had conferred upon him the nickname "Der Mohr", American boys would probably call him "Nigger". His wife and children always called him "Der Mohr", considering him to be more of a jolly comrade than a stern and bossy parent.

When the Council's report had been read and translated, it was referred to the commission on the state of the organization and then the reports from the various countries were read and partly discussed, many of the delegates submitting only verbal reports. You may imagine that my job as a translator was not a sinecure, as it kept me on the "qui vive" all of the time, added to which was my work as chairman of the special commission appointed to report its conclusions regarding the charges of destructionism the General Council had preferred against Bakunin and Guillaume. The commission, which had to meet after adjournments in the evening, was composed of delegates Lucain, Walter, Springard, Vichard and myself. An enormous amount of letters, printed documents, reports etc. had been referred to this commission and it took us until late at night, for five days, to go through all that "stuff" to arrive at a definite conclusion. What occurred during the commission's session one evening, when one of the "Alliance" members threatened to shoot me, I have related in my letter to Barton** and, therefore, need not repeat it here, only to mention the fact that the man who drew his revolver on me, used to wear a red silken flag around his waist, evidently expecting to unfurl it the moment the Social Revolution had been proclaimed throughout the world....

* i.e. like a Bursch, or German senior undergraduate.—Ed

** See p. 611 of this volume.—Ed.

THAT EXPULSION

While the commission on Bakunin's affairs was drudging through its tedious work of reading letters, documents, papers, excerpts from books until we were tired and sleepy, the other members of the Congress enjoyed their leisure, at their hotels, or going to the theatres, concerts, parks, the seashore.²⁰² I am not aware that any secret meetings were held. Everything was above board: Marx and Engels had laid their plans long before they came to The Hague. They had been corresponding with members throughout the world, particularly with F. A. Sorge and others in the United States of America, and it was thus that the transfer from London to New York was agreed upon before the actual vote was taken. They were also determined to get rid of Bakunin because he was a thorn in the International's flesh. His so-called "alliance" was replete of agents "provocateurs", spies and cranks. That I knew from personal experience while I was working and agitating and organizing in Italy. Everywhere I met with opposition and obstacles from the very inside. Some of those fellows tried to hamper me by denouncing me to their dupes as a "straniero" (a foreigner), "Tedesco" (German) with whom good Italians should have nothing to do. Some of them regularly went to Lugano, Switzerland, to report to Bakunin and return with orders from him. One of these fellows, Vincenzo Testini, who was a flippant youngster, was even making fun of their great Russian god, telling me, among other things, that Bakunin, referring to his young blonde wife, had said: "What a fool have I been to tie myself up to this kid of a female!" Wasn't that characteristic of the big braggart, who all his life made a mess of his flounderings, in Russia, Saxony, France, where he proclaimed the "abolition of the state" at Lyons, when our brothers fought in the ranks of the Commune, 1870,²⁰³ but Bakunin, after having been smoking cigars and drinking champagne at the City Hall one entire day, ignominiously fled when it was reported to him that the government troops had cleared the town of revolutionists, and were now marching to capture the head of the disturbers of bourgeois "Peace and order". That boy Testini was also the fellow who pointed me out,

while sitting in the cafe Gocchi, to the detectives looking in at the window. And the next morning I was arrested to be taken to prison at Verona, from where, after three months, they sent me, chained to an old vagabond, to Ala, the frontier station of Austria, with a threat that I would be incarcerated for life in *domicil coatto** on the island of Sardinia if I ever were to return to Italy. Poor foolish Testini soon after that was rewarded for his treachery being arrested by the police to be sent to Sardinia himself.

Well, our commission, when through with its tedious work, on the closing day of the Congress, reported that Bakunin had been guilty of trying to destroy the International by organising his anarchistic "Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste", a misnomer, as there was neither any Democracy, nor any socialism about that fake organisation, whose evident purpose appeared to be the disruption and destruction of the International. The commission's report was adopted by an overwhelming majority of the delegates and Bakunin and Guillaume were expelled. The documents submitted to the commission were turned over to Marx and Engels, who elaborated from them, in book-form, an extensive exposé, the Introduction to which read as follows: "L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs se proposant de réunir en un seul faisceau les forces éparpillées du prolétariat universel et de devenir ainsi le représentant vivant de la communauté d'intérêts qui unit les ouvriers, devait nécessairement ouvrir la porte aux socialistes de toutes les nuances. Ses fondateurs, et les représentants des organisations ouvrières de deux mondes qui, dans les Congrès internationaux, ont sanctionné les statuts généraux de l'Association, oublièrent que la largeur même de son programme permettrait aux déclassés de s'y glisser et de fonder, dans son sein, des organisations secrètes dont les efforts, au lieu d'être dirigés contre la bourgeoisie et les gouvernements existants, se tourneraient contre l'Internationale elle-même. Tel a été le cas avec l'Alliance de la Démocratie socialiste."**

* Casemate.—Ed.

** The International Working Men's Association, intending to gather in a single cluster the scattered forces of the world proletariat and thus to become the living representative of the community of interests uniting the workers, was obliged to open the door to socialists

AFTER THE BALL WAS OVER

Singing the *Marseillaise*, we adjourned the Congress, *sine die*, which really and literally meant "without a day", even to "die", which the grand old organisation did when it had been taken from European soil, to meet its final fate in the so-called "new world". From The Hague most of us went to Amsterdam, where the local members had hired a hall to hold a public propaganda meeting. The hall was small and there were no chairs nor benches so that the small attendance had to listen to the speakers *stante pede*,* which only few of us did. And there was only a little sprinkling of the outside public. Marx was the first and principal speaker. What he said, I don't remember. Anyhow I did not stay long, but with some of the French comrades went out to take in the sights of old canal-cut Amsterdam and the army of white-capped *meisjes* who were swarming the streets....

After our arrival in London, I spent several days with Marx and Engels at their respective homes and taking a few trips through the streets of London, visiting the Houses of Parliament, the Tower, St. Paul's Cathedral, all of which did not impress me as much as the sight of the chair at the reading room of the British Museum where, for years, Marx sat reading and taking notes, preparing to write the immortal *Das Kapital*. It was Eleanor, Marx's youngest daughter, who showed me that chair.

AND NOW IN THE U.S.A.

What became of the documents of the Hague Congress, or of those of its predecessors for that matter, I do not know. To be sure, almost, Sorge did not carry them in his little traveller's valise when we boarded the big White Star Line

of all shades. Its founders, and the representatives of the workers' organisations in both worlds, who, at the International Congresses, approved the General Rules of the Association, forgot that the very broadness of its programme would allow *déclassés* to infiltrate into it and to found within it secret organisations whose efforts, instead of being directed against the bourgeoisie and the existing governments, would be turned against the International itself. Such has been the case of the *Alliance of Socialist Democracy*.—Ed.

* Standing.—Ed.

steamer *Atlantic*, at Liverpool. Nor have I seen any of those documents later on when the General Council was in New York. In fact, I could not have attended its meeting because I was elsewhere, and too busy working for my living. I had only a few dollars left from my mother's inheritance when we landed at the dock of Hoboken. I did not pass through Castle Garden to be registered as a steerage passenger emigrant because we, first class passengers, were taken from the *Atlantic* on board a tender to be disembarked at the White Star Line's dock. Maybe you remember the fact that, shortly after that trip in September, 1872, the *Atlantic* foundered near the Newfoundland banks with over 400 people drowned.

As Sorge kept a boarding house in Hoboken. I went with him, to stay a few days, during which I attended a meeting of Section No. 1 of the International, at its headquarters, the Broom Street Hotel, where, among its members, I made the acquaintance of that little cigarmaker Sam Gompers, principal founder of the American Federation of Labor and renegade socialist, who to please his owners, the capitalistic class and its prostitute politicians, said of us socialists: "In economics they are unsound and in politics they would be impossible." I attended the Boston meeting of Trades Unionists who founded the A.F. of L. and elected Gompers as its president. The Federation is now rapidly disintegrating owing to the development of machine production and general world depression.

Several days after my arrival at New York I went to the City Hall, in the basement of which the Naturalisation Bureau is located. There I took out my "first paper", a declaration of willingness to become an American citizen by swearing off allegiance to my previous condition of subjection to monarchs or representatives of other forms of government. As I was no longer a subject to German royalty, having obtained release from it for the purpose of emigrating to Spain, where I had expected to find permanent employment as a mechanical engineer, I did not swear off any sort of former allegiance, but when, in October 1877, after the required five years residence in the United States, I received my "citizen's paper" from County Clerk John Delmar, of King's County, Brooklyn, I wrote the sub-

joined declaration which I have preserved all these years.

Having found employment at Grant's Locomotive Works in Paterson, at a weekly wage of \$ 7.00, I joined Section 29 of the International, most of whose members, French, Italian, Spanish (weavers) were followers of Bakunin for which reason I concealed to them my real name, adopting that of "Federico Capestro", dropping the latter when it was no longer necessary for me. Whatever letters and documents of the period remained in my hands, among the letters from the members of the General Council, I herewith append:

Hoboken, 8 November 72.

Lieber Cuno!

Habe Deinen Brief erhalten. Wusste das schon u. werde handeln nach reiflicher Ueberlegung, was der Partei frommt. Dem Triumvirat werde ich zu begeben wissen.

Dein

F.A.S. (Sorge)

Dear Cuno,

Received your letter. Already knew that and will do after mature reflection what is to the Party's benefit.

I shall know how to deal with the triumvirate.

Yours

F A S.

FROM THE MANUSCRIPT:

AN AGITATOR'S REMINISCENCES ²⁰⁴

Brooklyn, January 18, 188[3]**

One of the highest periods of my life as a social outcast was my participation in the proceedings of the International Congress at The Hague in Holland in 1872, where I represented the Sections of Düsseldorf and Stuttgart. I arrived at The Hague when the Congress had just been called to order. The meeting took place in a common dancing Hall in Lombard Straat. When I entered the Hall I saw a number of

* This is Cuno's translation of F.A. Sorge's letter of November 8, 1872, the original of which he appended to his text.—*Ed.*

** The corner of the page is damaged.—*Ed.*

tables arranged like a horseshoe, around which the most interesting assembly had gathered I have ever seen in my life. Many of them I knew personally, of others I had seen pictures, others again had been described to me and others I recognised from their typical national exterior as the representatives of Spain, Italy, France, England, and America. The first man who greeted me was Henry Scheu, one of the noble young men who had organised the movement in Vienna, and one of the few who has been as true as steel and as consistent as a mathematician in advocating political action of the Trade Unions organised upon a socialistic basis. I asked him for Col. Johann Philipp Becker, for whom I had some letters, and Scheu, misunderstanding me, introduced me to a small *blasé* looking bleary-eyed man with a red wig on his bald head, restless and nervous like a monkey. I stood aghast. That could not be Johann Philipp Becker, the hero of the battles of the Baden Revolution, the Organiser of the International throughout Europe where the German language was spoken. And I told the little man, that I did not think he was J.P.B. "Indeed not," he replied with a thin, quaking voice. "I am Bernhard Becker!" Bernhard Becker—he was a repulsive individual—the successor of Ferdinand Lassalle as the leader of the movement in Germany which he afterward betrayed. There are men whose evil thoughts, whose insincerity, is written all over them, but there are few to read their characters. After some exchange of platitudes I looked around, and on the other side of the table I saw J.P.B., as he had been described to me: a giant with a long black beard, high forehead, broad shoulders, his left eye like that of Ben Butler. I went over to him and gave him his letters. Then I saw Engels: He was sitting to the left of the presiding officer, smoking, writing, and eagerly listening to the speakers. When I introduced myself to him he looked up from his paper, and seizing my hands he joyfully said: "Everything goes well, we have a big majority."—It was the deciding battle, you know, between Marx and Bakunin—the question had to be decided, whether the International was to be a well disciplined army, able to fight an organized enemy, or whether it was to be split up into a hundred thousand particles everyone of the members to imagine himself to be a general, and Bakunin the great,

infallible dictator leading them all by the nose by flattering their vanity and thereby making them his blindly obeying tools. Engels' face I knew from a photograph, but he was thinner than the picture showed him to be. He is a tall, bony man with sharp-cut features, long, sandy whiskers, a ruddy complexion, little blue eyes, and a very red nose. His manner of moving and speaking is quick, determined and convinces the observer that the man knows exactly what he wants and what will be the consequences of his words and actions. In conversation with him one learns something new with every sentence he utters. His brain contains a mighty treasury of scientific knowledge; Engels speaks more than a dozen languages, acquired for the sole purpose of carrying the movement into as many countries of the old world. Opposite Engels sat Paul Lafargue, Marx's son-in-law, who had been conducting the fight against Bakunin's secret society in Spain. Introducing me to Lafargue, Engels exclaimed: "Here we have them both, our fighters from Spain and Italy!" Marx was sitting behind Engels. I recognized him immediately with his big, woolly head. His complexion was dark, his hair and beard were gray. He wore a black broadcloth suit, and when he wanted to look at anybody or anything intently he pressed a monocle into his right eye. Engels took me to him; and he received me affably, requesting me to give him an account of different occurrences in Spain and Italy when the session had been adjourned. The next man to whom my attention was called was a young man with Hebrew features and southern German accent; he was translating what the German speakers had been saying into French. Engels told me that he was Leo Frankel, the minister of education of the Paris Commune. Frankel was a Hungarian of great intelligence and extended knowledge. His career of persecution and suffering martyrdom in France and Hungary is well known to the older men in the movement. An interesting personage was Morago, a Spaniard and a fanatical follower of Bakunin; his fiery black eyes, his passionate speech, his wild gesticulation made a diabolical impression. There was another Spaniard, Marselau, a man who peculiarly contrasted with his other countrymen; his manner was quiet, his argument more deliberate; he spoke little and observed continually.

He spoke French and English fluently, a very rare occurrence among Spaniards. Alerini from Barcelona wore a big red scarf around his belly; the reporters said that it was the flag of the Commune; one of the most incarnate enemies of Marx, he behaved like a prize-fighter and a bully. Guillaume, the champion of the *Fédération jurassienne*, was the Jesuit General of Bakunin's forces. With his hollow cheeks, his pointed nose, his fulminant eyes, his sly fanaticism, he represented the soul of the conspiracy formed for the purpose of destroying the International Association. There is a man closely resembling Guillaume in manner and tactics right in our midst here in New York—Moritz Bachmann—but he is only a shadow of the power for evil embodied in this man Guillaume. Ravnier, Dupont, Serrailier, Johannard and Le Moussu, all members of the Paris Commune, made the impression of intelligent, deliberate and logically thinking men. The English delegates were unassuming, but one could see that they had been in the movement for many years. Eccarius, the indefatigable agitator and German tailor was among them; in later years he turned out to be what we call a business-socialist and he has become untrue to the movement. After the first session Marx told me at the hotel where we were stopping that Rudolph Schramm, formerly Prussian Consul at Milan, was at The Hague. He was the man whom I held responsible for the outrage perpetrated upon me by the Italian government at Milan. When they arrested me I wrote a letter to the German Consul, and having seen the name of Rudolph Schramm in the directory I addressed the letter to him. But no answer has ever been made to that letter, in which I demanded that the German Consul should protect me, as I was at that time what is called a "German subject". At the next meeting of the congress, just before a recess was taken, I publicly asked for Rudolph Schramm to meet me, as I wanted to get satisfaction from him. On the next morning the reporters, having misunderstood me, as they misunderstood, or perverted, everything that was said and done by the delegates, published the announcement that Schramm had been sentenced to death by the International Congress. Schramm was thereupon warned by the authorities, and accompanied by two detectives and two policemen in uniform he came to

the congress to ask for the reason of his death sentence. Everybody laughed when Schramm, who was an old *roué*, attired like a dude, his white hair done up in curls and highly perfumed, a bunch of roses in his buttonhole, indignantly made the request that his accuser be confronted with him. Marx pointed me out to him. He straightened himself up, and contemptuously looking at me, he said: "I thought that someone like Louis Blanc, Frederick Engels or Karl Marx had insulted me, but a boy like this one? Bah—But, nevertheless, I challenge him to mortal combat." Again the delegates laughed, and taking my hat, I jumped up, telling the fierce old dude that I was ready to meet him. We both went out, and on the sidewalk, surrounded by a crowd of curious idlers I explained to him that I thought he had purposely neglected his duty in not protecting me. "But my dear fellow," he said, "I was not consul at Milan at that time, and you must have looked into an old directory!" Some further explanation followed and Schramm withdrew, telling the detectives and policemen who were ready to "take me in", that the whole thing was a mistake. When I returned to the Congress we had another laugh at Mr. Schramm's expense. Notwithstanding that the news that the International had resolved to kill Schramm went through the entire European Press, there was not one paper to publish my explanation of the affair. In all my experience I have never seen the least disposition on the part of reporters, as well as editors, to treat socialists even with a particle of fairness—they must have it that socialists are either lunatics or scoundrels. Some of the papers at The Hague cautioned women to look out for the Internationals as they were accustomed to stealing earrings and other jewelry in the public streets.

Of vital interest for the existence and agitation of the International was the investigation of Bakunin's intrigues against the organization. He had formed a second society within the International with the avowed purpose of directing the latter's movements according to Bakunin's dictates. We had written and oral evidence to this effect. Even the secret instructions, and the constitution of the *Alliance Socialiste Internationale*, as the conspiracy had been called, written by Bakunin himself, was in our possession. Delegates Walter, Lucain, Vichard, Roch Spingard and myself were

elected to a commission of investigation, to report in regard to what should be done with the men who had tried to destroy the organization. The commission selected me for its chairman. We took the testimony of Engels, Marx, Serrailier, Dupont, General Wróblewski, Lafargue and others showing that the Alliance existed in Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, England and America, and that its doings were calculated to paralyse the labour movement, as Bakunin had succeeded in making his followers abstain from taking part in politics, to provoke persecution and to decentralize the organized masses of the proletariat. It was also shown that Bakunin was a base character in every respect. Among others we had, for instance a letter, written by Nechayev, one of the tools of Bakunin, who was afterwards murdered by some other tool, because he knew too much, showing that Utin, a Russian socialist, had been threatened that he would be killed if he dared to translate Karl Marx's *Kapital* into the Russian language.²⁰⁵ Bakunin himself then undertook the translation, he was paid 300 roubles on account but he never furnished more than two pages of manuscript to the man who was going to issue the work to the Russian public. In every respect the investigation furnished ample proof that the Saint of the Anarchists, the great martyr of Siberia, Mikhail Bakunin, was not only full of conceit, but a designing tyrant, who not only did not tolerate anyone else beside himself, but also used the most unscrupulous means to maintain his position as infallible prophet and interpreter of reason concentrated in, and emanating from, his brain only. That he was paid by the Russian government to act as a spy has never been proved, but all his actions and all his plans pointed toward this suspicion. The commission reported that Bakunin had made an attempt to split the organization, that he had partly succeeded, and that his principal accomplice was Guillaume, the editor of the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*.* It had been shown, that well known spies of the Napoleonic Government in France, like Malon,²⁰⁶ Gaspar Blanc and Richard had been the intimate agents of Bakunin and foun-

* Here the sentence "They were both expelled" is struck out in the manuscript.—Ed.

ders of the Alliance in France. When the report had been made to the Congress the Spanish delegates, together with Guillaume and Schwitzguébel swore that the Alliance had never existed and that whatever had been said about Bakunin were lies. But the majority quietly listened and then voted to expel Bakunin and Guillaume. For signing the Report as the commission's Chairman, delegate Roch Splingard, who was one of Bakunin's agents, threatened to shoot me, but Lucain, Wróblewski and others took the revolver from him. This was the last Congress of the old International; for the removal of the General Council from Europe to America made communication more difficult, and the general dissension, as well as the universal business crisis of 1873 contributed towards dissolving the great organisation founded by Marx and Engels, to whose agitation we owe our present movement all over the civilized world. But the evil seed sown by Bakunin has ripened evil seeds also, and his numerous followers, unthinking fools and fanatics, are hampering us on all sides to the great delight of capitalists and despotic rulers.

Socialists should practise what they preach. I have observed that few socialists are socialists in their homes, where no business reasons prevent them from being exemplary fathers, emancipated men and good teachers to their upgrowing children. Marx was a socialist in everything he did. You ought to have seen him in his home, surrounded by his noble, and highly educated wife, and his three beautiful and intelligent daughters. There was no domineering air about him as you will find with most married men, even if they call themselves socialists. On account of his black hair and dark complexion his fellow students at Bonn on the Rhine had called him "*Der Mohr*", the *Blackey*, they would perhaps have said in New York, or *Charlie, the Nigger*. This nickname adhered to him all his life; and whosoever was familiar with him, called him *Der Mohr*; his wife, his daughters, his sons-in-law, and his friends. None of his children ever called him "father", as in that word he recognised the origin of all tyranny and conceit; he was of the opinion, that no one should have authority over any one else only for the accident of being father or mother of the respective individual. For this reason Marx never called anyone

“Herr”, “Mr.”, “Monsieur” or “Signor”, for he abhorred all titles and all hypocrisy. “Hypocrisy makes people call each other names they very well know those being called so do not deserve,”—he used to say. When introducing his son-in-law Lafargue to friends and socialists he frequently said: “It is the pride of my life to see one of my daughters married to a colored man.” Lafargue, being a Portuguese, has some Negro blood in his veins, and Marx delighted in having had the good fortune of setting his followers the good example of overcoming the foolish prejudice of one race against another. And so in everything else. Marx held no principle he did not carry out in practice whenever and wherever there was any possibility to do so. As he was in such minor matters, so he was in everything else. From the first enunciation of his doctrine in his early public life as a young journalist in the Rhenish Provinces of Prussia up to his last letters to his friends, through all his great works and controversies he remained the logical master mind, the beacon light of the social movement immovably pointing toward the necessity of centralised action, universal organisation of the Trades and political action in order to accomplish and fructify the expected proletarian Revolution in all countries of the Globe. Here, socialists, is your example, your great teacher whose teachings have never been proven to be irrational or faulty—why not imitate him in every respect? I predict that our ideals can never be reached if we leave the path he has shown us, and therefore I shall ever advocate the centralisation of forces as long as the enemy has not been overwhelmed; and political action, until men have become so rational and so utterly good, that they can live and thrive without any laws and without any delegated power instituted for the purpose of enforcing the laws made by the majority and based upon science and common sense!

First published in Russian

Written in English

REPORT ON THE MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL
IN AMSTERDAM PUBLISHED IN THE *ALGEMEEN HANDELSBLAD*

Having heard that the participants of the Hague Congress of the International, on the invitation of the Amsterdam Section of the Netherlands Federation, were to attend a meeting to be held in the Dalrust hall near Hoogesluis here, we hurried there at the appointed time (12 o'clock noon).

Either because of the long way or for some other reason, we could not help thinking that in the great city of Amsterdam a place nearer and more convenient than this Dalrust could have been found, the more so as a "great meeting" had been announced. Perhaps it was the pleasant name* that had some magic sway over the gentlemen who, after the tiring work of the Congress, cried out like the poet: "*O rus, quando ego te aspiciam*",** wishing to replace the bustle of the town by the quiet of the valley. Of course they were mistaken, for the thing about Dalrust is that it has not much valley and still less quiet.

As we approached the stately entrance we at once saw Citizen Ris, who was well known from the days of the Democratic Association²⁰⁷ and the universal franchise meetings in Warmoesstraat. He stood there and smoked with a calm sense of duty and gave us to understand in not very clear terms that it was really supposed to be a secret "get-together" but that perhaps "one" would not object to "the press" being

* Dalrust means valley of rest.—*Ed.*

** O country! when shall I see you? (Horace, *Satires*, II, 6, 60.).—*Ed.*

admitted. After a brief exchange of opinion between Ris and other *citoyens*, not all of whom we can mention by name, we were actually allowed to enter.

Making our way between small tables at which some foreign-looking bearded men were partaking of coffee, beer and sandwiches, we entered. The hall (?) was not yet full and was not supposed to be since, as we were told, the "get-together" was only to be opened two hours later, when Karl Marx and most of the foreigners were expected.

Remembering Van Alphen's "Patience is such a beautiful thing", we sat on one of the chairs: they were there in great number, of all shapes and sizes, and in the most picturesque disorder. We had ample time to study thoroughly the strange style of the building; the architect of Dalrust had produced something between a summer theatre, a hayloft and a greenhouse—a low room with cross beams from which still hung the remains of theatrical scenery; the lighting was as unusual as insufficient.¹

We had to break off our musing—which anyhow was constantly interrupted by the citizens fussing around us—sooner than we had hoped because there were many signs that the meeting was going to start soon. Citizen Gerhard, accompanied by Citizen Van der Hout, gradually approached the rostrum* erected at the end of the greenhouse and we soon understood that the proceedings** would begin almost an hour earlier than announced.

The chairman, Citizen *Gerhard*, began to fulfil his duties by greeting the foreigners present, whose number he put at twenty. He deemed it necessary to explain once again the intentions of the International, and ended with the wish that the sittings at The Hague would promote still closer co-operation of all the brothers, members of the great Association. To strengthen the fraternity he proposed in the name of the Amsterdam Section a toast to the foreign guests and then ordinary claret was handed out.

Citizen *Sorge* (from New York), a broad-shouldered man of the German American Hans Breitmann type, spoke

* Behind the rostrum was a sort of raised platform where Mrs. Marx, a stately and beautiful woman, sat with her lovely daughter, the wife of Citizen Lafargue.—*Author's Note.*

** This word is given in English.—*Ed.*

French, after which he gave a brief exposal of what he had said in German, which he did far more fluently. He said that the old philosophers had preached peace but practically war was continually waged. With Christianity had come the preaching of love, but it was always hatred that dominated. The revolution of 1789, which is praised to the skies, proclaimed equality, liberty, and fraternity, but later it became obvious how the triumphant bourgeoisie understood that. It wanted freedom in order to trample upon the proletariat, which it wished to exert themselves for its profits. It wanted equality for the sake of preserving its privileges and fraternity only among the members of its own class, to the complete exclusion of the *profanum*.* It turned out that three great forces had not the power to give the world a system of love, peace, liberty, equality and fraternity. The International wants to make use of a fourth means: labour. Labour will restore peace between the classes and transform society. For that reason the speaker praised labour and proposed a toast to it, which was loudly cheered.

After Citizen Sorge, there was a speech by Citizen *Marx*, a member of the (now dissolved) London General Council. Imitating his colleague and brother he spoke first in French (with a strong German accent), and then in German. Marx is a man of about sixty with a heavy crop of grey hair. His hair merges with an enormous snow-white beard. Were it not for his flat nose and thick lips, his head could be said to be handsome.

The speaker said that formerly The Hague was a centre of European diplomacy. Here, hardly had peace treaties been signed when plans of all sorts of war were made. In sharp contrast to that was the congress of workers, whose purpose was to make war impossible. The International had been told that The Hague was the most reactionary city in Holland and that its ignorant population would "tear to pieces" the "scum of the Paris Commune". But that was all the more reason for choosing precisely that "bloodthirsty" city to show that the International did not fear any reactionary excesses. Moreover, it hoped to find here too people

* The common people.—*Ed.*

who sympathised with it, such as are to be found everywhere where there are working people.

Citizen Marx went on to consider the results of the work of the Congress which had just ended. He qualified them as important. Strong concentration of power in the hands of the General Council is an imperative necessity in the face of the conference at Berlin, which, in the speaker's opinion, presages a general attack on the proletariat, persecution and repression of the working class. Until the International comes forward as a closely united organisation, it will not be able to make the movement universal, to succeed in making it arise everywhere simultaneously, and its efforts will produce no significant results. The speaker cited the example of the Paris Commune. Why was it defeated? Because it remained isolated. If simultaneously with the uprising in Paris, revolutions had flared up in Berlin, Vienna and other capitals, there would have been greater chances of success.

The speaker defended the use of force when other means produce no result. Barricades are not necessary in North America because there the proletarians can, if they want, achieve victory through elections. The same applies to England and some other countries where the working class enjoys freedom of speech. But in the enormous majority of states revolution must replace legality because otherwise—by false magnanimity, a wrongly directed sense of justice—it will not be possible to achieve the necessary goal. Vigorous, energetic propaganda must prepare and support this revolution. Owing to these causes it is also extremely necessary to have an enormous centralisation of power in the hands of the General Council.

Citizen Marx said that the Congress decided yesterday (Saturday) to transfer the General Council from London to New York. He approved that decision. America is a country of working men. Every year hundreds of thousands of people go there, driven out of Europe or forced to go by privations. What a new and beneficial field of activity for the efforts of the International! The speaker hoped that this step would produce good results.

As for himself, he was giving up the title of member of the General Council, but—contrary to rumours—not the

title of member of the International. Quite the contrary. Having freed himself of the burden of administrative activity, he would devote himself with new energy to the task to which he had given 25 years of his life and to which he would devote himself to his very last breath: the emancipation of labour. (*Stormy applause.*)

A representative of Poland, a citizen with a very difficult name to pronounce ending in *ki* (*Wróblewski*), who was a general of the Commune, said that his fellow countrymen had to fight against three kinds of tyranny: political, spiritual and economic; but independently of this they were always to be found in the front ranks of the fighters.

Citizen *Engels* said a few general things, after which there was a speech by Citizen *Dupont*, apparently mainly for the purpose of making violent attacks on the well-known Russian socialist Mikhail Bakunin, a tireless patriot, a perfect likeness of Blanqui and the invariable victim of his own strivings. Having been imprisoned in all the prisons of Europe, twice condemned to death, once in Saxony and the other time in Austria, twice betrayed to the authorities and condemned to hard labour in Siberia, then having fled after fearful privations from Russian slavery along the Amur and via America to London, this sixty-year-old martyr had grown grey in exile and most certainly at any rate was above all suspicion of being a traitor and even a paid Russian spy.

But Citizen *Dupont* thinks otherwise of him. To the speaker Bakunin is no more than a worthless scoundrel who opposed the International and undermined its authority, wanted to concentrate authority in his own hands and persuade Spain to become a traitor. The speaker informed his listeners that on Saturday the indignant Congress had expelled the degenerate Mikhail Bakunin from the International and declared him unworthy of remaining a member of that association.

Citizen *Lafargue*, the representative of Portugal, chief editor of *La Emancipacion*, which is printed in Madrid, is Citizen Marx's son-in-law. He is of respectable appearance, his features are even noble. He laughs rather more often than necessary. Judging by his good-natured face tanned by the Andalusian sun, no one would suspect that he defends

those pernicious predatory theories which he dares to advance, slightly grinning, dispassionately, but with a majestic elegance and a merry grace.

He says that the International is banned in Portugal, so that it exists there only as a secret society, but despite this he is of the opinion that Portuguese tyranny is no worse than the Dutch. Holland has political freedom, freedom to write what one thinks, the right of association and assembly—that is true, of course, but what does that give? What does political freedom mean if it is not accompanied by moral freedom, the freedom of labour? The speaker seeks these two forms of freedom in vain in this country. When he is told that workers are forced to work sixteen hours a day here, he denies that freedom of labour exists in this country; in reality here there exists a fearful slavery, despite political freedom, which is powerless and, perhaps, even *strives* to be powerless.

Moral freedom, which allows us to think freely, without *social barriers*, is also not to be found in Holland. Hardly had the speaker arrived in The Hague when he happened, in the search for a room, to go to the house where Barbès had once lived. When he told the owner of the house that he (Lafargue) held the same views as Barbès, the man answered him that it would be better not to make a show of those ideas anywhere, otherwise all doors would be closed on him, at least those of respectable families. The speaker gave as another proof that one cannot think freely here the "fact" (perhaps he meant the "joke" (?) of the *Dagblad*) that girls were advised to leave their ear-rings at home because "scoundrels of the Paris Commune" had arrived in the country.

Citizen Lafargue then developed extreme socialist theories with a strange good-naturedness, which continually seemed to raise doubts about his seriousness. Spain, he said, is a very rich country. Its land is of inexhaustible fertility, but it remains in the hands of capital, and the poor feed on beans alone as long as they live. The Portuguese eat sardines, the cheapest and worst of food in their country, whereas the wine and other fruits of their land are sent abroad. When, on his arrival here, the speaker saw our rich meadows and our well-fed cows with their udders full of

milk, he thought he had found a country in which there was sufficient at least of milk, cheese and meat. He thought the workers here had milk, butter, cheese, meat and all the fruits of their fertile soil in abundance. But how great was his disappointment when he saw that the Dutch people's staple food was potatoes with vinegar and that they were deprived of all the tasty things, which are exported from the country under their very eyes.

In order to make "such" shameful conditions impossible, Citizen Lafargue suggests that private property be abolished. The dairy cattle and all that it produces, and also the land on which it grazes, must be declared the common property of all. Proprietors should be deprived of their estates, for the workers also, the speaker says, like meat. More than that. He wished that the capitalists who resisted these measures and who were foolish enough not to accept expropriation for the general (?) good (without compensation) should be driven out. This he would do with the help of the police who at present so cruelly persecute the members of the International, but will be immediately subordinated to it when power comes to the poor.

Citizen Lafargue was boisterously cheered. His speech, translated by *Cuno* and *Gerhard* respectively into German and Dutch was constantly interrupted by laughter and bursts of indignation on the part of the audience. The episode of the police in the service of the International expelling the owners of well-fed cows who offered resistance was found particularly amusing. We watched the reaction of two police inspectors who sat near us—they only smiled.

Citizen *Duval* (from Geneva) is of the violent democratic type. His tie is carelessly knotted, his appearance is untidy, he has an angry moustache, angry grey eyes, constantly frowning eye-brows. He briefly tells (in French) about the organisation of the Geneva Section, which he praises as a model of organisation. He insists on the necessity for strong organisation. The trade unions in a locality must be closely linked both with one another and with those of other localities. Thus the manufacturers' hopes to get workers "from other places" would be thwarted. For strikes a good "strike fund" must be set up, otherwise it would be mere child's

play. But a good strike fund is possible only where there is a strong organisation.

Citizen *Becker* (from Geneva), a nervous bearded person, and stout like *Sorge* (probably owing to poor food!), speaks German, violently attacking catholicism, which he divides into three groups: political catholicism, financial catholicism and genuine or church catholicism. He points out the means to get rid of them. He wants to put an end to church catholicism by abolishing the heavens!

Citizen *Van der Hout*, in a speech interrupted by thunderous applause, thanks the members of the General Council who have resigned for their eight years of tireless service in the interests of the great cause, the cause of the International. In particular he thanks Marx and, incidentally, praises the Communards who perished on the barricades to save humanity. The Dutch, says Citizen Van der Hout, seem calm and incapable of anything like the events which took place in Paris, but one day it may happen that they will become "roaring lions" if their patience is exhausted like that of their forefathers the Gueux, who for *eighty* years, the speaker says, fought continually for freedom and justice. He criticises the present States General and energetically denies that they represent the people of the Netherlands. He admits that among the members of our present government there are some who have a good attitude towards the workers, but that cannot be said of the majority. The speaker ends with a toast to the old and the new General Council, to all the members of the International and to the "heroes of the Commune".

Citizen *Gerhard* who, in his opening speech, said a few words in French, was probably reluctant to translate the whole of the speech made by his colleague Van der Hout. He preferred to close the meeting. The delegates, he said, were tired and worn out with all their worries over your interests. They had worked the whole week without interruption, so that often they did not even have time for meals. They were dreaming of a rest. Those present took the hint and dispersed. As we rose we saw the Spanish representatives, who had also come and were sitting calmly at a table smoking as if they had nothing to do with the meeting. The Poles kept them company. They looked well dressed

and at first glance one might have thought they belonged to quite a different variety of democrats than the Germans, French and Americans.

Suddenly a loud noise was heard and there was a great fuss. We saw Citizen Van der Hout standing in the middle of the hall (?) with a sheet of paper in his hand. He began to sing the first stanza of the Dutch translation of the *Marseillaise* and the members of the Amsterdam Section joined in. The singing was not bad, better than the text itself. Although Citizen Van der Hout waved his arms too much and in general made too many gestures, he was not out of tune. When the anthem was over we saw the members of the Congress dispersing. Marx and his companions shook hands with innumerable people. The close circle which had existed for a few days fell apart, the "great meeting" became a thing of the past and Dalrust became its old self again.

Standing in the street and observing the members of the International as they passed we could not help humming Seume's well-known verse:

"Where there's a song, sit in peace, the wicked don't sing", which has been mercilessly parodied into: "Where there's smoking, wait in peace, the wicked don't have cigars."

Published in *Algemeen Handelsblad* No. 12837, September 10,
1872

Translated from the Dutch

**NOTES
AND
INDEXES**

NOTES

- ¹ On the invitation of the Dutch Federal Council the majority of the delegates to the Hague Congress went to Amsterdam when the Congress was over to meet the local section of the International. The meeting took place in the Dalrust Hall, Amsterdam, on September 8. Speeches were made by Karl Marx, Friedrich Sorge, Paul Lafargue and other delegates. Marx delivered his speech in German and in French; it was published in the *Liberté* newspaper, issue No. 37, on September 15, 1872, and then reproduced in the Belgian, French and German press. The *Volksstaat* gave it with certain changes. Adolf Hepner wrote to Marx on September 26, 1872, that in the conditions prevalent in Germany mention of the necessity of a violent revolution would provide a pretext for a case against the newspaper (see p. 543 of this volume). In this book the most important readings differing from the *Volksstaat* are given in footnotes.

A correspondent's record of Marx's speech, which was published in the *Algemeen Handelsblad*, is given on pp. 634-42 of this volume.

Besides this meeting in the Dalrust, a meeting was held in Amsterdam on the same day by the minority at the Congress, who came out against its decisions. The account of this meeting has not been preserved, it is merely mentioned (see pp. 101-02, 243-44 of this volume). p. 33

- ² The *London Conference* of the International Working Men's Association was held from September 17 to 23, 1871.

The Conference was convened because it was impossible to call a regular congress on account of the attacks by the reactionaries and the persecution of the members of the International everywhere at a time when the International needed ideological cohesion and a strong organisation to fight the sectarian, anarchist and reformist elements alien to the proletariat.

A most important decision of the Conference was formulated in Resolution IX "Political Action of the Working Class", which

proclaimed the necessity to form an independent proletarian party in every country as an indispensable condition for the working class to conquer political power. p. 33

- ³ This is a reference to the Berlin meeting of the emperors of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia in September 1872, which was an attempt to restore the reactionary alliance of these states; among the questions discussed was that of joint struggle against the revolutionary movement. p. 34

- ⁴ The Hague Congress delegate *Maltman Barry* (1842-1909), an English journalist, a socialist, member of the International, the General Council (1872) and the British Federal Council (1871, 1873), supported Marx and Engels in their fight against the Bakuninists and the English reformist trade union leaders; when the International ceased to function, he continued to participate in the socialist movement in England, working simultaneously for the conservative *Standard* newspaper; in the nineties he supported the so-called "socialist wing" of the Conservatives.

In the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU, there are newspaper cuttings containing Barry's reports with the name of the newspaper written by Marx. In July 1873, these reports were published by their author with slight changes as a pamphlet entitled: *Report of the Fifth Annual General Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at The Hague, Holland, September 2-9, 1872*, London, [1873].

The text of the pamphlet provided the basis for the present publication. All the most important readings differing from the newspaper text are given in footnotes; judging by some of them, Marx must have taken part in editing the pamphlet. p. 36

- ⁵ In 1873 the bourgeois revolution (1868-74) in Spain reached its culminating point. On February 11, a republic was proclaimed and the bourgeois republicans came to power; their left wing included a strong democratic group headed by Pi-y-Margal, who proposed a programme of radical reforms.

Events proved that the political abstention preached by the Spanish Alliancists had become absurd, that the political action of the working class had become "an unavoidable necessity" (see Frederick Engels, *The Bakuninists at Work*, Moscow, 1976, pp. 10-11). At their meetings in Barcelona, Alcoy and other towns the workers demanded of their leaders to explain the stand they had to take in connection with the forthcoming elections to the Constituent Cortes. p. 36

- ⁶ See Note 2. p. 37

- ⁷ The *Philadelphia Congress*, convened by the separatist Prince Street Council on July 9 and 10, 1872, proclaimed in its resolutions the independence of the so-called Confederation of the International

from the General Council. The Congress represented sections consisting of petty-bourgeois and bourgeois elements. p. 43

- ⁸ This is a reference to the Congress of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party held at Mainz (Mayence) from September 7 to 11, 1872. It entirely approved the decisions of the Hague Congress. p. 64

- ⁹ The articles in the *Times* were unsigned and marked "From an occasional correspondent". In his reminiscences James Guillaume names Johann Georg Eccarius as the author (J. Guillaume, *L'Internationale. Documents et Souvenirs (1864-1878)*, Vol. II, Paris, 1907, p. 334). Engels also wrote that Eccarius worked for the *Times* (Engels to Sorge, May 3, 1873).

Johann Georg Eccarius (1818-1889), a prominent figure in the international and German working-class movement, a working-man publicist, was a tailor by profession; a member of the Communist League and one of the leaders of the German Workers' Educational Society in London, he was a member of the General Council of the First International from the time of its foundation; he was General Secretary of the Council from 1867 to May 16, 1871, and Corresponding Secretary for America from 1870 to 1872, and was delegated to all the congresses and conferences of the International; from 1871 in the struggle Marx waged against the English reformist trade union leaders he supported the latter and subsequently became a figure in the trade union movement.

For a number of years he wrote reports for the *Times* on the congresses of the International (Lausanne, Brussels, Basle), items and articles on problems of the International. His articles show a very accurate knowledge of the International's internal affairs. p. 68

- ¹⁰ The document referred to is *Fictitious Splits in the International* written between the middle of January and the beginning of March 1872 by Marx and Engels and approved at the meeting of March 5, 1872, as a private circular of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association (see *The General Council of the First International. 1871-1872. Minutes*, Moscow, pp. 119, 365-409*). It was printed as a pamphlet in French in May 1872: *Les prétendues Scissions dans l'Internationale. Circulaire privée du Conseil Général de L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*, Genève, 1872. p. 73

- ¹¹ The passages cited are from the letter of the Executive Committee of the General Council of August 8, 1872 "To Spanish Sections of the International Working Men's Association", written by Marx and Engels and published in *La Emancipación* No. 62, August 17 (see *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 446-49). p. 73

* Below referred to as *The General Council*.— Ed.

- ¹² On the *Philadelphia Congress* see Note 7.

The separatist Federal Council in North America was formed on December 18, 1871. It is known in literature as the Prince Street or the Spring Street Council, from the names of two New York streets at the intersection of which its premises were located, to distinguish it from the Provisional Federal Council uniting the proletarian sections, which was at 10 Ward Hotel, at the corner of the Broom and Forsyth streets.

On May 9-11, 1872, Victoria Woodhull's supporters held a meeting in the Apollo Hall to nominate her as candidate for the U.S. presidency, allegedly on behalf of the International. The whole of the Prince Street Council attended.

p. 76

- ¹³ See Note 3.

p. 79

- ¹⁴ This question is expounded in detail in the declaration of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association "Police Terrorism in Ireland" (see *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 149-50).

p. 79

- ¹⁵ This is apparently a reference to Karl Marx's speech at a sitting of the London Conference of the International on September 21, 1871: "On the Political Action of the Working Class."

p. 84

- ¹⁶ A big strike of building and engineering workers in Newcastle from May to October 1871 ended in a victory for the workers thanks to efficient support of the General Council (see *The General Council. 1870-1871*, pp. 252-54 et al. and *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 55 et seq.). Further Sorge mentions the strike of the Paris bronze-workers in February-March 1867, in which the strikers appealed directly to the General Council for help (see *The General Council. 1866-1868*, pp. 353-54, 355, 356, 99, 101 et seq.).

When he speaks about the strike of the New York Singer sewing-machine workers, Sorge apparently has in mind their appeal in the summer of 1872 to the General Council through the American Provisional Federal Council asking it to prevent the introduction of European workers (see *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 563-64).

p. 85

- ¹⁷ Apparently the reference is to the decisions of the Congress of the North American Federation of the International, which was held from July 6 to 8 in New York. The Congress set the task of freeing the workers from the influence of the bourgeois parties and rallying them "for joint independent action in their own interests". The Congress approved and confirmed all the General Council's decisions regarding the North American Federation, as also the decisions of the London Conference, thereby endorsing the policy of the General Council as a whole. In their resolution the Congress delegates unanimously declared: "We recognise the profound necessity of strong centralisation because without it we would

be powerless in the face of the constantly growing centralisation of the ruling classes." p. 85

¹⁸ The reference is to the letter "To Spanish Sections of the International Working Men's Association" (see Note 11). p. 96

¹⁹ It was at the Basle Congress, on the question of abolishing the right of inheritance, that the first open clash between the supporters of Marx's scientific socialism and the followers of Bakunin's anarchism occurred.

The question of the right of inheritance was placed on the agenda for the Basle Congress on the proposal of the Geneva Section "Alliance of Socialist Democracy. Central Section". The General Council studied this question and presented to the Congress a report written by Karl Marx (see *The General Council. 1868-1870*, pp. 128-33, 322-24), in which the main attention was devoted to criticising Bakunin's idealist conception, showing its reformist essence and opposing to it a positive exposition of the basic propositions of historical materialism and the Marxist theory of the proletarian revolution.

The General Council's report was read out by Eccarius at the Congress sitting of September 11, 1869. The debate showed that a considerable number of the delegates were not yet sufficiently advanced to understand the scientific argumentation developed in the Council's report. At the same sitting was read the report of the commission appointed by the Congress on the question of the right of inheritance (it included Dereure, Richard, Brismée, Guillaume, Bakunin, Heng, De Paepe, Liebknecht, Hess, J. Ph. Becker and Farça Pellicer), in which it was proposed that the Congress should declare that the abolition of the right of inheritance "is one of the indispensable conditions of labour".

In the voting on the General Council's report there were 19 votes for, 37 against, 6 abstentions and 13 delegates were absent; in the voting on the commission's report, 32 voted for, 23 against, 13 abstained and 7 were absent. As neither of the reports thus obtained an absolute majority, the Basle Congress did not adopt any decision on the question of the right of inheritance (see *The Basle Congress of the First International*, September 6-11, 1869, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1934, pp. 54-61 and 163). p. 97

²⁰ The reports in the *Volksstaat* were written by the Hague Congress delegates Adolf Henner, Frederick Engels and Fritz Milke. They were published without any signature. p. 103

²¹ Adolf Henner wrote articles I, III and IV of the report in the *Volksstaat*, which were published while he was in prison for taking part in the Hague Congress. p. 103

²² The article "Herr Bernstein, der 'Maggid'" was printed in issue No. 71 of the *Volksstaat* on September 4, 1872. It made fun of an

article in the Berlin *Volkszeitung*, whose author, Bernstein, cited all sorts of fictions about the International. p. 103

- ²³ Engels' authorship is confirmed by comparison with his article for the *Plebe* (see pp. 295-302 of this volume and with letters written by Hepner and Liebknecht (see pp. 530-31, 557). Engels' authorship was first established in 1964 (see the French translation of this article in *Etudes de Marxologie* No. 8, 1964) and confirmed by the reprint of this article in the language of the original in the collection *Friedrich Engels 1820-1970. Referate. Diskussionen. Dokumente*, Hanover, 1971, pp. 302-11.

An excerpt from Engels' article in the *Volksstaat* was printed in the *Internationale* No. 196, October 13, 1872. p. 105

- ²⁴ The reference is to Article 5, Section II of the Administrative Regulations which says: "The General Council has the right to admit or to refuse the affiliation of any new branch or group, subject to appeal to the next Congress.

"Nevertheless, wherever there exist Federal Councils or Committees, the General Council is bound to consult them before admitting or rejecting the affiliation of a new branch or society within their jurisdiction; without prejudice, however, to its right of provisional decision." (*The General Council, 1870-1871*, pp. 457-58). p. 106

- ²⁵ Apparently the reference is to Engels' article "The International in America" published in issue No. 57 of the *Volksstaat*, July 17, 1872. p. 107

- ²⁶ The Sonvillier Congress of the Jura Federation held on November 12, 1871, endorsed the "Circulaire à toutes les Fédérations de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs" ("Circular to All Federations of the International Working Men's Association") opposing to the resolutions of the London Conference of 1871 the anarchistic dogmas of political indifferentism and of complete autonomy for the sections and also containing slanderous attacks against the General Council. In the Sonvillier circular the Bakuninists suggested that all Federations should demand the immediate convocation of a congress to revise the General Rules of the International and censure the General Council. p. 113

- ²⁷ The *Separate Alliance (Sonderbund)*—Engels ironically gives this name to the anarchists and their allies by analogy with the separate union of reactionary Catholic cantons in Switzerland in the 1840s. p. 116

- ²⁸ In connection with Adolf Hepner's arrest the editors of the *Volksstaat* requested "two other delegates to the Congress" to send an article on the Congress (see p. 105 of this volume). In issue No. 78 of the *Volksstaat*, September 28, two articles on the Congress were published, one written by Engels and the other, date-lined Berlin, sent

in by the German Social-Democrat printing worker Fritz Milke, who had participated in the Congress with a mandate from a Berlin Section of the International. p. 116

- ²⁹ James Guillaume knowingly distorts the facts. Marx's criticism was not directed against Eccarius but was in defence of Maltman Barry and concerned the English trade union leaders who were not present at the Congress, and not the British Federation. p. 130
- ³⁰ See *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 364-66. p. 131
- ³¹ This article by Marx, which appeared in the Vienna progressive daily *Neue Freie Presse*, was a direct answer to the slanderous attacks by the Bakuninists, who had tried in issue No. 14 of the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*, August 1, 1872, to explain the ideological struggle in the International by the "dictatorial" strivings of the German Communists. Unlike the articles sent from The Hague to the *Neue Freie Presse* by the Austrian delegate Heinrich Oberwinder (Heim), which were marked "own correspondence" ("*orig. korr.*") and signed "g", the article by Marx and also his second article on the Hague Congress in the same newspaper (see pp. 156-59 of this volume) were marked "from our special correspondence" and carried no signature.
- Until now the whole series of articles from The Hague published in the *Neue Freie Presse* was ascribed, on the basis of Wilhelm Liebknecht's testimony (see pp. 574-75 of this volume) and also that of the historian M. Nettelau, to Oberwinder, who, being a professional journalist, did not write only for the working-class and socialist press. As Engels noted, Oberwinder's co-operation with bourgeois newspapers "occurred with the knowledge and approval of the party and in its direct interests" (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 33, S. 584).
- Besides these articles, the section "Press-bureau Telegrams" also carried fairly detailed telegrams on the Congress proceedings. p. 139
- ³² This refers to the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (see Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Moscow, 1976, pp. 477-519). p. 140
- ³³ This was the first national organisation of the German workers, founded on May 23, 1863, at the Congress of German workers' societies in Leipzig; it was strongly influenced by Ferdinand Lassalle. p. 140
- ³⁴ It was at Eisenach on August 7-9, 1869, that the all-German Congress of Social-Democrats of Germany, Austria and Switzerland, took place. It was attended by 263 delegates representing over 150,000 workers. Here it was that the independent revolutionary party of the German proletariat was founded under the name of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party. The Congress adopted a pro-

gramme including the basic principles of the Rules of the First International and based on Marxist Principles. The Social-Democratic Workers' Party was declared a branch of the International. As Prussian laws prohibited in the country any society which entered into relations with other organisations, especially foreign ones, the Congress adopted the decision on the individual adherence of party members to the International. p. 140

- ³⁵ This is a reference to the decision of the First (Nottingham) Congress of the British Federation of the International (July 21-22, 1872) on the establishment of an independent workers' party built up on the principles of the International. p. 141
- ³⁶ This is a reference to the materials of the commission set up by the Versailles National Assembly to enquire into the causes of the Paris Commune—*Enquête parlementaire sur l'insurrection du 18 mars 1871*, Vols. I-III, Versailles, 1872. The publication included reports by the commission, statements by witnesses, minutes of the Central Committee of the National Guard, the Federal Council of the International, the Republican Union of the Rights of Paris, documents of the Committee of Public Safety, the Central Committees of 20 districts and other organisations. Despite the tendentious selection of the materials, this is a valuable collection of sources on the history of the Commune. p. 143
- ³⁷ *Karel Sabina* (1813-1877) was a Czechoslovak public and political figure, a man of letters, one of the organisers of the secret revolutionary-democratic society, the chief task of whose members was to fight Habsburg absolutism. Sabina was an active participant in the 1848 events, voicing the interests of the revolutionary sections of the petty bourgeoisie. For his part in the Prague uprising of 1848 he was condemned to death in 1849 by an Austrian court, the sentence being commuted to eighteen years' imprisonment in a fortress. He was released under an amnesty in 1857. Recruited by the Austrian police as a paid informer in 1859, he was exposed in 1872 and exiled from Czechoslovakia by decision of a tribunal of Czech patriots. p. 144
- ³⁸ The *Nechayev trial* was a trial of student youths accused of secret revolutionary activity. It took place in St. Petersburg in July and August 1871. A detailed survey of the materials in the case was prepared by Nikolai Utin for the Hague Congress (see *The Hague Congress of the First International. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 370-72, 396-456, 567-610).
During the trial it emerged that Bakunin and Nechayev had been sending in envelopes proclamations and conspiratorial letters to persons known and unknown. p. 144
- ³⁹ The proclamation referred to is the pamphlet: A. Richard et G. Blanc, *L'Empire et la France nouvelle. Appel du peuple et de la jeunesse à la conscience française*, Brussels, 1872, p. 144

- ⁴⁰ Quoted from memory from J. G. Fichte: "Politische Fragmente aus den Jahren 1807, und 1813" in the book: *J. G. Fichtes Sämmtliche Werke*, Band VII, Berlin, 1846, S. 573. p. 145
- ⁴¹ Quoted from memory the text of the declaration of the Paris Sections (see *The Hague Congress of the First International. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 233-36). p. 157
- ⁴² The account for the *Volkswille* newspaper was written on the basis of correspondents' reports in the *Neue Freie Presse*. p. 160
- ⁴³ This article was printed as a leader in the *Volkswille*. It apparently came from the pen of the Austrian Social-Democrat Heinrich Scheu, one of the newspaper's editors, delegated to the Hague Congress by the Esslingen Section. p. 170
- ⁴⁴ *Raimond Wilmart* (pseudonym *Wilmot*)—a French revolutionary who took part in the Paris Commune, was delegated to the Hague Congress (1872) by the Bordeaux Sections; in 1873 he emigrated to Buenos Ayres, where he worked to spread the principles of the International. p. 174
- ⁴⁵ In October 1872, a group of Blanquists, former members of the General Council including Arnaud, Cournet, Ranvier and Vaillant, who had left the Congress in protest against the transfer of the General Council to New York, put out the pamphlet *The International and Revolution* (written by Vaillant). It was essentially their programme of action; they announced that they had broken with the International, accusing it of "flight from the revolution". The pamphlet showed that the grounds for the Blanquists' break with the International were differences of views concerning the tactics of the proletarian movement which were due to inadequate understanding of historical materialism. This document clearly illustrated the Blanquists' voluntarism, their ignoring the real conditions of the struggle and their tendency to putschism.
- But the years spent in the International and participation in the Paris Commune had their effect on the Blanquists. Their pamphlet testified to the fact that in the economic part of their programme they had given up the petty-bourgeois ideas of Proudhonism and declared themselves supporters of socialist measures coinciding in many respects with those outlined in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*.
- In 1874, in an article dealing with the programme of the Blanquist émigrés, Engels stressed the turn the Blanquists had made towards proletarian socialism (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 18, S. 528-35).
- Marx was informed by Eugène Dupont on November 6, 1872, that Ranvier's signature had been placed on the pamphlet without his knowledge. p. 177

⁴⁶ This account was published in the *Tagwacht*, press organ of the German sections of the International, over the signature of Joh. Ph. Becker, delegate of the Romance Federal Council and a number of Swiss sections.

A prominent figure in the international and German working-class movement, *Johann Philipp Becker* (1809-1886), was a brush-maker by profession; a veteran of the 1848-49 revolution, he played an outstanding role in spreading the ideas of the International. From 1866 to 1871 inclusive he was the publisher of the International's monthly *Vorbote*; he was a friend and associate of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. p. 190

⁴⁷ The question of creating a universal language was raised at the Geneva Congress of the International in 1866 by James Guillaume. His report was noted by the Congress but not discussed. p. 193

⁴⁸ The reference is apparently to Borkheim's article "Der Verfasser der 'Russischen Briefe' an die 'Drei Parteigenossen'" published on April 30, 1870, in the *Volksstaat* (in connection with the publication in the same newspaper of Bakunin's "Briefe über die revolutionäre Bewegung in Russland") and to the anonymous article "More about Bakunin" which appeared in the *Tagwacht* Nos. 40, 41, 42 and 43 of October 5, 12, 19 and 26, 1872. p. 195

⁴⁹ *Discours prononcés au Congrès de la Paix et de la Liberté à Berne (1868) par M. M. Mroczkowski (Ostroga) et Bakounine, Genève, 1869.* }

The *League of Peace and Freedom* was a bourgeois pacifist organisation founded in 1867 by petty-bourgeois and bourgeois republicans and liberals. Victor Hugo, Mikhail Bakunin and Giuseppe Garibaldi took an active part in organising it. p. 196

⁵⁰ Bakounine, M. *L'Empire knoutogermanique et la révolution sociale*, Genève, 1871. p. 197

⁵¹ Joh. Ph. Becker's account contains an inaccuracy: Sauva was delegated only by Sections No. 29 and No. 42; Section No. 12, founded by Victoria Woodhull, was represented by William West. p. 201

⁵² On May 12, 1872, a referendum rejected the project for a constitution which proposed the introduction of a unified army, school and legislation for the whole of the Swiss Confederation. Centralist and federalist tendencies were revealed within the Swiss sections of the International during the struggle over this referendum. p. 207

⁵³ The author probably has in mind his book: J. F. Becker, *Ein Wort über die Fragen der Zeit, seinen Mitbürgern zum Geschenk*, Bellevue, 1841. p. 210

- ⁵⁴ Here the account is inaccurate: at the Congress of the Romance Federation in April 1870 a split took place caused by the initiative of the Bakuninists in forming an independent federation which took the name of the Jura Federation in September 1871.

Bakunin (together with Zhukovski, Perron and Sutherland) were expelled from the Romance Federation on August 13, 1870.
p. 214

- ⁵⁵ The report was published in the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* without any signature; the author, James Guillaume, a Swiss school teacher, an active member of the International and one of Bakunin's closest accomplices, was delegated to the Hague Congress by the Jura Bakuninist sections; he wrote about the Hague Congress also in the book *L'Internationale, Documents et Souvenirs (1864-1878)*, Paris, 1907, Vol. II, pp. 319, 356.

Adolf Hepner wrote a detailed criticism of Guillaume's report on the Congress in the *Volksstaat* (see pp. 124-38 of this volume).
p. 219

- ⁵⁶ See Note 29. p. 224

- ⁵⁷ On April 2, 1869, one of the most numerous meetings in Geneva (attended by some five thousand persons), called on the initiative of the Romance Federal Council, resolutely protested against the slander of the International by the bourgeois press and the industrialists; the protest was published in the *Vorbote* No. 4 for 1869.
p. 229

- ⁵⁸ See Note 16. p. 230

- ⁵⁹ The author apparently has in mind Engels' letters to Carlo Cafiero, who gave them to Guillaume. The *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* No. 6, May 10, 1872, carried the statement that the editors had in their possession letters written by Engels in the autumn of 1871 "to his Italian friends".
p. 233

- ⁶⁰ The author has in mind Paul Lafargue's open letter to the Jura Federation published in the *Égalité* on June 1, 1872. p. 233

- ⁶¹ September 15, 1872, was the day fixed for the congress of the anarchists, followers of Bakunin, at St. Imier (Switzerland).

At this congress, the delegates, one of whom was Bakunin, rejected the decisions of the Hague Congress declaring that they did not recognise the General Council and contracting a Pact of Friendship, Solidarity and Mutual Defence for the struggle against the federations and sections which had adopted the positions of the Hague Congress. The St. Imier congress called on the Federations of the International Working Men's Association to adhere to this Pact, thus declaring an open split in the International.

p. 244

- ⁶² The account of the Belgian delegate Pierre Fluse is published from a photocopy of the manuscript.
Part of the report (see pp. 256-61 of this volume) was published in the *Internationale* No. 191, September 29, 1872 (reprinted from the *Mirabeau*).
Pierre Fluse (1841-1909), a Belgian Proudhonist, a weaver by profession, a member of the International, a delegate to the Brussels Congress (1868) and the London Conference (1871), represented at the Hague Congress of the International (1872) one of the biggest federations of the International in Belgium, the centre of which was Verviers. p. 245
- ⁶³ This list, unlike the official printed one, gives the actual names of two French delegates, Potel (pseudonym Lucain) and Faillet (pseudonym Dumont). p. 246
- ⁶⁴ Apparently a slip of the pen. Bakunin's article referred to—"Organisation of the International"—was published in the anarchistic annual *Almanach du Peuple pour 1872*. p. 258
- ⁶⁵ Victor Dave's article "L'Autorité ou la Révolution" was published in issue No. 177 of the *Liberté*, November 13, 1870, unsigned. p. 260
- ⁶⁶ Engels' article "Imperative Mandates at the Hague Congress" was published without his signature in *La Emancipación*. In publishing it the editors tried to make it look like an article written in Spain. p. 280
- ⁶⁷ The editors of *La Emancipación* set themselves the task immediately after the ending of the Hague Congress to make known its decisions to the Spanish workers, to refute the disinformation and slander spread by the Bakuninist press, above all by the *Barcelona Federación*. After Paul Lafargue's account *La Emancipación* printed "Report of the General Council to the Hague Congress" and Engels' article "Imperative Mandates at the Hague Congress".
Paul Lafargue (1842-1911), a prominent figure in the international and French working-class movement, an outstanding propagandist of Marxism, a member of the General Council of the International, Corresponding Secretary for Spain (1866-69), took part in forming sections of the International in France (1869-70), Spain and Portugal (1871-72); he was a delegate to the Hague Congress, one of the founders of the Workers' Party of France, a follower and associate of Marx and Engels. p. 286
- ⁶⁸ After Engels' articles appeared in the *Plebe*, Enrico Bignami, the editor of the newspaper, wrote to Engels on October 17, 1872; "As you see, from the *Plebe*, I published your correspondent's reports, which aroused great interest. Costa speaks of them in *Favilla*, others in other newspapers." p. 295

⁶⁹ Engels here quotes the article "Correspondence from Turin", which was published in *Favilla* No. 184, September 3, 1872. p. 300

⁷⁰ This report by Friedrich Adolph Sorge, delegate of the North American Federation, on the work of the American delegation at the Hague Congress was read out by him at a sitting of the North American Federal Council on September 28, 1872. On September 30, the New York *World* newspaper carried a variant of the report specially composed for the press. The present text is published according to a facsimile of the German manuscript kept in the Wisconsin University library, Madison (USA).

Friedrich Adolph Sorge (1828-1906), a prominent figure in the international and American working-class and socialist movement, a veteran of the 1848 revolution, emigrated to the USA in 1852; he was an active member of the International, the organiser of American sections, Secretary of the Federal Council, a delegate to the Hague Congress, a member of the General Council in New York and its General Secretary (1872-74), an active propagandist of Marxism and a friend and associate of Marx and Engels.

p. 303

⁷¹ On December 4, 1871, Carlo Terzaghi asked Engels for financial aid for the *Proletario* newspaper, of which he was the publisher. The rough draft of a reply composed by Engels about January 9 has been preserved. But before this letter was posted, Engels learned from information published in the review "Working-Class Movement" of the *Gazzettino Rosa* No. 360, December 28, 1871, that the Emancipation of the Proletariat society in Turin had decided to give its support to the Sonvillier Circular (see Note 26) and that Terzaghi backed the demand of the Jura Federation for the immediate convocation of a congress. As a result Engels wrote another letter on January 14-15, retaining only the first two paragraphs of the first with slight corrections. The remainder of the text was written partly between lines of the first which had been struck out and partly on a fresh sheet.

p. 324

⁷² The Congress of the Belgian Federation of the International Working Men's Association, held on December 24-25, 1871, in Brussels, having discussed the Sonvillier Circular (see Note 26), did not support the Swiss anarchists' demand for the immediate convocation of a General Congress of the International but at the same time instructed the Belgian Federal Council to draw up a project of new Rules for the Association. A brief account of the Congress was published in the *Internationale* No. 155, December 31, 1871, under the title: "Belgian Workers' Congress".

p. 326

⁷³ This letter of Engels is in reply to Paul Lafargue's letter of January 7, 1872. Lafargue had informed Engels that the Romance Committee's reply to the Sonvillier Circular (see Note 26) had been published in *La Emancipación* and that the Spanish Federal Coun-

cil, after rejecting the Bakuninists' proposal to convene an extraordinary congress, had supported the Belgian Federation's decision to examine all disputed questions, including that of revising the General Rules, at the regular Congress. p. 327

⁷⁴ The Circular adopted by the Bakuninists at the Sonvillier Congress (see Note 26). p. 328

⁷⁵ The *Saxon Congress* of Social-Democrats was held at Chemnitz on January 6-7, 1872, and was attended by 120 delegates representing more than 50 local organisations. Among the delegates were August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht. The attitude to be adopted to the Sonvillier Circular (see Note 26) was discussed at a closed sitting. The Congress unanimously supported the General Council and approved the resolutions of the 1871 London Conference. Wilhelm Liebknecht wrote to Engels on January 10, 1872: "The meeting was splendid.... At a private meeting of the delegates it was unanimously decided to support you in the struggle against the Bakuninists, and I was instructed to inform you of this...." On January 23, 1872, Marx informed the General Council about the decisions of the Congress. See *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 85-86. p. 329

⁷⁶ See Note 72. p. 329

⁷⁷ The letter was written on the basis of information received from Vitale Regis. In the latter half of February 1872, Regis (under the pseudonym of Etienne P  chard) spent ten days in Milan and Turin on instructions from the General Council to find out the actual state of affairs in the sections of the International to conduct the struggle against anarchism and to spread the ideas of the International.

Regis reported on his journey on March 1, 1872, in the form of a letter to Engels. He informed Engels, among other things of Terzaghi's expulsion from the Turin Section of the International, called *L'Emancipazione del Proletario*, and of his suspected connections with the police. On the basis of this information Engels broke with Terzaghi and established contact with the new Secretary of the Section, Cesare Bert.

L'Emancipazione del Proletario, a society, formed in January 1872 by the proletarian elements which had withdrawn from the Workers' Federation in Turin, applied for admission to the International as a section on January 19. Engels reported on the section's contributions at a meeting of the General Council on January 23, 1872 (see *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 86, 394).

In the original the letter was addressed by mistake to Carlo Bert instead of Cesare Bert.

p. 330

⁷⁸ Here the author apparently has in mind the article "Pourquoi les ouvriers voteront *Non* le 12 Mai" ("Why the Workers Will Vote *No* on May 12") which was published without any signature in *L'  gali-*

te Nos. 9 and 10, May 7, 1872. For a general assessment of the struggle for a revision of the Swiss Constitution see Engels' letter to J. Ph. Becker of June 14, 1872 (pp. 342-43 of this book).

p. 334

⁷⁹ Apparently Becker has in mind his work *Neue Stunden der Andacht* (New Hours of Prayer), Geneva, 1875, on which he worked with interruptions from 1857 to 1875. It was a work of militant materialism and atheism, a biting political pamphlet. A lawsuit was instituted against it in 1875-76. The tribunal classified it among the books to be banned from circulation.

p. 335

⁸⁰ The Congress of the Belgian Federation, which took place in Brussels on May 19-20, 1872, examined the project of the Rules drawn up by the Belgian Federal Council on instructions from the Congress of the Federation held on December 24-25, 1871 (see Note 72). According to this project drawn up by Eugène Hins, a Council member and follower of Bakunin, it was practically proposed to abolish the General Council. After a stormy debate the Congress decided to have the project discussed in the sections and after that to take the final decision at an extraordinary Congress of the Federation in July 1872.

p. 336

⁸¹ This refers to the Nechayev trial (see Note 38).

p. 338

⁸² Engels means the list, which Liebknecht sent him in his letter of June 4, 1872, of German Social-Democrats, members of the International, who were to maintain contact with the General Council during the imprisonment of Bebel and Liebknecht.

p. 338

⁸³ See Note 59.

p. 339

⁸⁴ See Note 80.

p. 340

⁸⁵ *La Emancipación*, Nos. 52 and 53, June 8 and 15, 1872, contained the article "Belgian Project of the General Rules" sharply criticising the project of the Rules proposed by the Belgian Federal Council (see Notes 72 and 80).

p. 340

⁸⁶ Engels has in mind the article "Voting of May 12" in the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* No. 6, May 10, 1872 (see Notes 52 and 78).

p. 341

⁸⁷ See Note 59.

p. 342

⁸⁸ Apparently the author has in mind the "Declaration of the General Council Concerning the Universal Federalist Council" printed in *La Emancipación*, issue No. 52, June 8, 1872.

The *Universal Federalist Council* was set up in early 1872 out of former members of the French Section of 1871 and various bourgeois

- and petty-bourgeois organisations. Their attacks were directed mainly against the London Conference resolutions on the political action of the working class and on the struggle against sectarianism. The intrigues of this self-styled organisation were exposed in the General Council's declaration of May 20, 1872 (see *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 202-04). p. 344
- ⁸⁹ Despite the lack of evidence, Wilhelm Liebknecht, who had been arrested on December 17, 1870, on a charge of "preparatory actions for high treason", was condemned at the Leipzig trial, which took place from March 11 to 26, 1872, to two years' imprisonment in the fortress of Hubertusburg on the outskirts of Leipzig. p. 347
- ⁹⁰ This is apparently one of the variants of Article 6, Section II of the Administrative Regulations discussed by the General Council on July 2, 1872. p. 351
- ⁹¹ The enclosure in Sorge's letter to Marx of June 7 was the report of the American Provisional Federal Council for May 1872. p. 352
- ⁹² The bourgeois democrat Paul Lindau, publisher of the Berlin journal *Gegenwart*, wrote to Marx on May 8, 1872, asking him to collaborate in his journal; in particular he wished Marx to write an article on the International. His request was not granted. p. 355
- ⁹³ In accordance with Liebknecht's proposal, the following statement was published in the *Volksstaat* on August 7, 1872: "The mandate must read: The members of the International resident here nominated at their meeting today Citizen (name) their representative at the Congress of the International Working Men's Association convened at The Hague for September 2, 1872." p. 356
- ⁹⁴ On June 24, 1872, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels wrote the preface to the German edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, which was published in July in Leipzig. In it they stressed the significance of the experience of the Paris Commune, which had proved the necessity for the working class to break up the old state machine. p. 356
- ⁹⁵ *Fictitious Splits in the International* was published in the *Radical* (Paris) Nos. 175, 176, 177, 179, June 23, 24, 25, 27, 1872. The Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU has not a complete set of the newspaper for 1872. p. 356
- ⁹⁶ The reference is to the article "The Bourgeoisie and the International in the United States" published in *La Emancipación* No. 54,

June 22, 1872. It unmasked the attempts made by the bourgeois reformers Victoria Woodhull and Tennessee Claflin to use the organisation of the International in the USA in their own interests. The article was written on the basis of material sent to Engels by Paul Lafargue. p. 360

⁹⁷ Bakunin's letter to the editors of the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* was printed in issues Nos. 10-11, June 15, 1872, and then in the pamphlet *Réponse de quelques internationaux, membres de la Fédération jurassienne, à la Circulaire privée du conseil général de Londres*. p. 361

⁹⁸ The congress referred to is the extraordinary Congress of the Belgian Federation, which was held in Brussels on July 14, 1872; it rejected by a majority of votes the proposal tabled by Eugène Hins to abolish the General Council, but supported the demand for a revision of the General Rules. The congress also discussed the question of Belgium's representation at the Hague Congress. p. 362

⁹⁹ The reference is apparently to the "Plan of the Principles of a Regional Swiss Federation" published in *L'Égalité* No. 12, June 13, 1872. p. 366

¹⁰⁰ Marx and Engels took a holiday at Ramsgate between July 9 and 15, 1872. p. 366

¹⁰¹ See Note 12. p. 369

¹⁰² The full text of Articles 1 and 2 of the Administrative Regulations reads: "1. Every member of the International Working Men's Association has the right to vote at elections for, and is eligible as, a delegate to the General Congress.
"2. Every branch, whatever the number of its members, may send a delegate to the Congress." (*The General Council, 1870-1871*, p. 455). p. 370

¹⁰³ See Note 88. p. 373

¹⁰⁴ This is the Circular written by Lafargue on behalf of the New Madrid Federation *A los internacional de la región española* ("To the Members of the International in Spain") on June 27, 1872, and which appeared in the form of leaflets as well as in the form of an article in the International's press. p. 373

¹⁰⁵ This is a reference to the *New Madrid Federation* formed on July 8, 1872, by members of the editorial board of *La Emancipación*. Paul Lafargue took an active part in organising the New Madrid Federation and in its work. After the Spanish Federal Council refused to admit it, the New Madrid Federation applied to the General Council, which recognised it on August 15, 1872, as a Federation of the International. The New Madrid Federation

resolutely opposed the spread of anarchist influence in Spain, conducted propaganda of the ideas of scientific socialism and fought to establish an independent proletarian party in Spain. p. 374

¹⁰⁶ A quotation from the obituary "Father Meuron" in the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* No. 7, May 15, 1872. p. 375

¹⁰⁷ The reference is to Part One of Engels' work *The Housing Question*, published in the *Volksstaat*, issues Nos. 51, 52 and 53, June 26 and 29, and July 3, 1872, under the title "How Proudhon Solves the Housing Question". This article was a direct reply to an anonymous article entitled "The Housing Question" reprinted in the *Volksstaat* from the Austrian workers' paper *Volkswille*.

Later it became known that the author of the article was the Proudhonist Arthur Mülberger. p. 380

¹⁰⁸ This is a reference to the book *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. Erster Band. Buch I. Der Produktionsprozess des Kapitals. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Hamburg, 1872*. The first section of this edition had been published in July 1872.

Apparently in this letter Ludwig Kugelmann speaks about the more detailed table of contents. p. 383

¹⁰⁹ This letter was written by Engels in reply to a letter from the Working Men's Association in Florence dated June 27, 1872, asking what the flag of the International was. p. 383

¹¹⁰ Enclosed in the letter was a cutting from the *Nottingham Guardian* with a small item entitled

"ANTICIPATED COLLAPSE
OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY":

"It is expected among the members of the organization known as the International that that Society will pass through a serious crisis at the approaching meeting at the Hague. English working men find that it has done so little towards helping them in their struggles against employers, and that the latter are obtaining at the present time so many articles from the Continent for use in the building trade, that it is useless to maintain the federation. A motion will therefore be proposed to disintegrate the Society. The General Council, and those who support its ambitious designs, will of course oppose the motion, but the General Council has been so much divided against itself that it can hardly except to stand. In any circumstance, it is expected that the English element will withdraw from the organization." p. 394

¹¹¹ The Workers' Association in Pest organised a demonstration of solidarity with the Paris Commune on June 11, 1871. Because of this the Government dissolved the association and its leaders, together with representatives of the Austrian workers' movement

who had come from Vienna, were arrested on a charge of high treason. The trial, which took place from April 23 to 29, 1872, provoked indignation even among the bourgeois opposition. The courage shown by Farkas and the other accused in defending their socialist views before the tribunal aroused considerable interest in the International. Fearing that a condemnation would provoke further unrest among the workers the tribunal acquitted the accused.
p. 397

- ¹¹² The resolution mentioned is "Political Action of the Working Class" tabled by Vaillant at the fifth sitting of the London Conference of the International (September 20, 1871) expressing the common stand of Marx, Engels and their supporters in the General Council.
As can be seen from the following letter, Jung here has in mind the text of this resolution revised for inclusion in the General Rules of the International (see *The General Council, 1871-1872*, pp. 262-63). The resolution originally proposed by the General Council on July 23, 1872, as Article 8 was included in the General Rules as Article 7a by the Hague Congress.
p. 401
- ¹¹³ The Council's resolution to convene the Congress at The Hague was quoted in issue No. 13 of the *International Herald*, June 29, 1872, in the report of the General Council's meeting on June 18, 1872.
p. 402
- ¹¹⁴ Receipt of the letter from Portugal was reported by Engels at a meeting of the Sub-Committee of the General Council on July 5, 1872 (see *The General Council, 1871-1872*, p. 306).
p. 402
- ¹¹⁵ The circular mentioned is that of the New Madrid Federation which was published in issue No. 11 of *La Emancipación*, July 27, 1872.
p. 405
- ¹¹⁶ On August 25 and 26 and September 2, José Mesa sent Engels all the official documents of the Alliance he had as well as his official statement on the Alliance to the Congress. These documents, which were placed at the disposal of the Commission of Enquiry into the Alliance, were afterwards used by Marx and Engels for their work on the pamphlet *The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association*. A detailed list of these documents drawn up by Engels is given in *The Hague Congress of the First International. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 684-87.
p. 406
- ¹¹⁷ This document, approved on a motion by Marx at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the General Council on July 27, 1872, was printed in issue No. 14 of the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*, August 1, 1872.
p. 407
- ¹¹⁸ William West's mandate to the Hague Congress issued by Section No. 12 was not recognised. On his return to America, West wrote

- an article on the Congress in issue No. 16 of *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly*, March 22, 1873. p. 408
- ¹¹⁹ This was the First (Nottingham) Congress of the British Federation of the International (July 21-22, 1872).
A report on the Congress was carried by issue No. 62 of the *Volksstaat*, August 3, 1872. p. 412
- ¹²⁰ The draft of the address "The General Council to All Members of the International Working Men's Association" was drawn up by Engels on instructions from the Executive Committee of the General Council. At the meeting of the General Council on August 6 the draft gave rise to a lively discussion during which a number of the Council's members opposed the publication of the address before the affair of the Alliance was investigated. Although it was approved by the majority, the address was not published and remained in manuscript (see *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 439-45). p. 414
- ¹²¹ Engels has in mind the documentary data which he received from Spain confirming the existence of a secret Alliance; these documents provided the basis for the draft of the General Council's address to all members of the International Working Men's Association (see Note 120). By the beginning of August 1872, Engels had received from Spain, besides Lafargue's letters and articles exposing the Alliance, a copy of Bakunin's letter of April 5, 1872, to Mora, which was later published in *The Alliance of Socialist Democracy and the International Working Men's Association* (see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 637-39), the Rules of the secret Alliance in Spain and the circular of the Madrid Section of the Alliance dated June 2, 1872, which contained a proposal to dissolve the Alliance groups. p. 414
- ¹²² During the discussion of the project drawn up by the Belgian Federal Council at Verviers on July 21, 1872, members of the German Section spoke in favour of supporting the General Council, for which the Belgian Federal Council expelled the Section from the Federation. On advice from Cuno, who was at the time conducting propaganda among the German Sections, the Verviers Section asked the General Council to investigate the conflict (see *The General Council. 1871-1872*, p. 316). p. 414
- ¹²³ See Note 120. p. 415
- ¹²⁴ See Note 88. p. 416
- ¹²⁵ See Note 98. p. 417
- ¹²⁶ Engels has in mind the work on the revision of the General Rules and the Administrative Regulations which was being done in the

General Council and the Executive Committee in connection with preparations for the Hague Congress. The leading role in preparing the new project of the Rules was played by Marx and Engels, around whom the majority of the General Council members united, supported by the revolutionary elements in the localities. As a result of the discussion, which lasted from June 25 to the end of August 1872, a new project of the Rules and the Regulations was adopted. The document, which has been preserved in Karl Marx's archives, is the text of the official edition of the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of 1871 in French (*Statuts Généraux et Règlements Administratifs de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Edition officielle, révisée par le Conseil Général, Londres, 1871*) in which all the corrections adopted by the General Council in June-August 1872 were inserted by Lafargue. The larger ones being pasted in place of the cuttings in the printed text. All this work was done by Lafargue in accordance with another extant copy of the 1871 edition roughly corrected by Marx himself, who inserted separate more precise formulations.

It was intended to submit the General Rules and the Regulations in this state for approval by the Hague Congress (September 1872). However, Marx and his associates confined themselves to referring to the Congress only separate, more important points: Article 8 (under number 7a) was included in the General Rules and the articles on strengthening discipline and centralism in the organisations of the International (Articles 2 and 6, Section II) in the Administrative Regulations. p. 418

127 The Congress of the North American Federation took place from July 6 to 8, 1872, in New York. p. 419

128 See Note 7. p. 419

129 The reference is to the resolution "Designations of National Councils, etc.

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

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

"3. Consequently, no branches, sections, or groups will henceforth be allowed to designate themselves by sectarian names as Positives, Mutualists, Collectivists, Communists, etc., or to form separatist bodies under the name of *sections of propaganda*, etc.,

pretending to accomplish special missions, distinct from the common purposes of the Association.

"4. Resolutions 1 and 2 do not, however, apply to affiliated *Trade's Unions*." p. 432

- ¹³⁰ The mass anti-war meeting in New York on November 19, 1870, was organised by sections of the International, trade unions, free-thinkers' societies and other democratic organisations. It was attended by about 2,000 persons and adopted an address condemning the continuation of the war against the French Republic and the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, and containing a call to the US government to use its influence to render assistance to republican France.

Accounts of this meeting were published in the *Volksstaat* Nos. 99 and 103, December 10 and 24, 1870, and in the *Vorbote* No. 1, January 2, 1871. p. 432

- ¹³¹ The *Union de las tres clases de vapor* was one of the first trade unions in Catalonia; it united the weavers, spinners and day-workers of the textile mills. The union was a collective member of the International.

Francisco Mora was not able to attend the Hague Congress. p. 435

- ¹³² The address of the Portuguese Resistance societies has not been preserved in the documents of the Hague Congress.

At the twelfth sitting of the Congress, on September 7, 1872, Lafargue tabled a motion to organise international trade unions. p. 435

- ¹³³ The document referred to is the resolution of the Rimini Conference.

This conference of the Italian anarchist groups was held from August 4 to 6, 1872. In a special resolution adopted on August 6, the conference called on the sections of the International to send delegates not to the regular Congress at The Hague, but to a separatist congress of the Bakuninists which it was intended to convene on September 2 at Neuchâtel. This splitting proposal got no support from a single section of the International, including even the Bakuninist organisations. On receiving the resolutions of the Rimini Conference, Engels wrote an address to the Italian sections on behalf of the General Council, exposing this manoeuvre of the Bakuninists (see *The General Council. 1871-1872*, pp. 451-452); part of it was published in the *Plebe* No. 95, August 28, 1872. p. 437

- ¹³⁴ A small group of Serbian and Bulgarian students in Zurich under the immediate influence of the anarchists had formed a group of the Alliance under the name of Slavenskij Zaves. On October 24, 1871, Marx reported at a sitting of the General Council that he had received a letter from the section in Zurich. In reply to Marx's request for information, Utin pointed out that the Bakuninists

were trying to organise a Slav section to counter the Russian Section of the International. On the General Council's refusal to recognise the group, the latter joined the Jura Federation (the section's programme had been written by Bakunin); the group fell apart in the summer of 1873. p. 442

- 135 The Programme of the Socialist-Revolutionary Polish Society in Zurich which is referred to here was written by Bakunin and published on July 27, 1872 as an appendix to issue No. 13 of the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne*. The Polish social-democratic association, formed under the influence of the anarchists, at first adopted Bakunin's programme but soon rejected it under the influence of the Polish socialist Tokarzewicz. p. 443
- 136 Karl Hirsch's article "Fictitious Social Theories and Real Political Aims of Mr. Bakunin", published in the *Volksstaat* newspaper in August and September 1872, played a significant role in preparing the German Social-Democrats' attack on Bakunin at the Hague Congress and was a contribution of the Eisenach party to the struggle of Marxism against the anarchistic sectarians. p. 450
- 137 Engels' letter to E. Glaser de Willebrord has been preserved in the form of a copy made by Zhukovsky of a long excerpt quoted by Glaser de Willebrord in a letter to Brismée on August 21, 1872. It was published in a lithographic biography of Bakunin written by the Austrian historian Max Nettlau (M. Nettlau, *Eine Biographie*, V. III. K. 57, S. 613-15). p. 455
- 138 See Note 133. p. 455
- 139 See Note 131. p. 456
- 140 Mottershead was elected Corresponding Secretary of the General Council for Denmark, but actually his function was fulfilled from spring 1872 by Engels, Mottershead being very neglectful of his obligations.
A summary of this letter by Louis Pio made by Engels in German is preserved in the Central Party Archives. p. 457
- 141 The *Workers' Association* established in 1860 by the bourgeois liberal K. W. Rimestad after the type of the Schulze-Delitzsch organisation in Germany subsisted until 1879, confining itself to educational activity among the workers. p. 457
- 142 This was an article published in the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* No. 10-11, June 15, 1872, in reply to the private Circular of the General Council *Fictitious Splits in the International* (see Note 10). p. 458
- 143 The book referred to is Engels' *Condition of the Working Class in England*, published by Otto Wigand in 1845 (reprinted in 1848). p. 466

- 144 Paul Lafargue travelled to The Hague and lived there in a hotel with papers in the name of José Mesa: he took part in the Congress under his own name. p. 477
- 145 In a secret circular dated July 7, 1872, the Spanish Federal Council influenced by Bakuninists proposed that all sections should elect to the Hague Congress a single delegation according to a common list and should give the council the right to dispose of the money set apart by the local organisations for the delegates' journey and to draw up a single imperative mandate. As a result of the Federal Council's activity the Spanish Federation sent to The Hague as its delegates four Bakuninists (Morago, Marselau, Alerini and Farga Pellicer) with an imperative mandate drawn up in the Bakunist spirit (see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 325-29). p. 478
- 146 The reference is to the Sonvillier Circular (see Note 26). p. 479
- 147 In the address to the Spanish sections of August 8, 1872 (see Note 11) the Executive Committee of the General Council called on the Spanish sections to elucidate the fact of the existence and activity of a secret Bakunist society—the Alliance, in Spain. p. 479
- 148 On receiving the address dated August 8, 1872 (see Note 11), the New Madrid Federation took the decision on August 22 to give the General Council all the information and documents it had concerning the secret Alliance.
José Mesa's memorandum on the Alliance mentioned here has not been preserved in the materials of the Hague Congress. p. 480
- 149 With the letter were enclosed four August 1872 issues of *La Emancipación*. "Proyecto de Organización Social de las secciones de la Asociación Internacional de los Trabajadores" began to be printed in *La Emancipación* on August 3, 1872, and Francisco Mora's open letter of August 17, 1872, to Tomas Morago was published on August 24, 1872. p. 481
- 150 Paul Lafargue's mandate from the New Madrid Federation has not been preserved in the materials of the Hague Congress. p. 481
- 151 The reference is to the reports of Jules Guesde in *La Liberté* Nos. 32 and 34, August 11 and 25, 1872. p. 482
- 152 Karl Marx's mandate from the Leipzig Section was submitted to the commission but has not been preserved in the materials of the Congress (see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 296, 332). p. 484
- 153 With this letter Utin sent the first part of the manuscript of his extensive report on the activity of the Bakunist Alliance in

Switzerland and its connections with the Nechayev affair (see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 366-96), as well as a copy of a confidential letter of the League of Peace and Freedom dated September 22, 1868. p. 485

- ¹⁵⁴ Besides the reports of Johann Georg Eccarius, (see pp. 68-102) of September 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9, the *Times* also published telegrams from its own correspondent, apparently Lewis Wingfield. p. 494
- ¹⁵⁵ The mandate of the Carouge Section to the Hague Congress was submitted by the Communist and Blanquist Antoine Arnaud. p. 498
- ¹⁵⁶ In 1868 as a result of assertions that Pierre Vésinier had calumniated French members of the International, the Brussels Congress instructed the Brussels Section to demand of Vésinier proof of his accusations and to expel him from the Association if it turned out to be inadequate.
On October 26, 1868, the Brussels Section decided to expel Vésinier from the International.
Pierre Vésinier (1826-1902) was a French petty-bourgeois publicist, an anti-Bonapartist, and an emigrant. He was dismissed from the General Council in 1866 for calumniating it, and expelled from the International in 1868. He was a member of the Paris Commune and after its suppression he emigrated to Britain; as secretary of the French Section of 1871 he published the newspaper *Fédération*, was a member of the Universal Federalist Council, and attacked Marx and the General Council of the International. p. 498
- ¹⁵⁷ At a sitting of the Sub-Committee of the General Council on July 19, 1872, Engels was instructed to prepare for the forthcoming Congress at The Hague the financial accounts for the period since September 1871. He read out his accounts at a sitting of the Congress on September 7, 1872, and they were unanimously approved (see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 96-98). p. 503
- ¹⁵⁸ The reference is to the Report of the General Council to the Congress, which Marx was instructed to draw up at a sitting of the Sub-Committee on July 19, 1872. p. 514
- ¹⁵⁹ A polemic concerning the role of Bakunin developed in the newspaper *Morning Advertiser* in August 1853. The occasion for it was an anonymous article which appeared on August 19 under the title: "Europe.—One Man" with the sub-title "From a Russian living in London". Its author was Golovin. On August 23 a letter to the editor was printed, signed F. M. (the initials of Francis Marx, a supporter of David Urquhart) under the title: "The Russian Agent Bakunin". In this letter Bakunin was accused of having connections with the tsarist government. On August 24 the newspaper published a refutation of the "F. M." article signed by Golovin, Herzen and

- the Polish émigré Worcell, which also contained an attack on a "certain German gazette", meaning the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of 1848-49. In this connection Karl Marx was obliged to write an open letter to the editor of the *Morning Advertiser* on August 30, 1853, replying to the calumnious accusation against a Russian revolutionary (see *Morning Advertiser*, September 2, 1853). p. 518
- ¹⁶⁰ This is an allusion to the resignation of Johann Georg Eccarius from the post of Secretary of the General Council in May 1871. p. 526
- ¹⁶¹ Adolf Hepner figured on the list of delegates to the Hague Congress as delegate of Section No. 8 of New York, from which he had a mandate. This circumstance could have guarded him against prosecution by the Saxonian police, but he did not manage to evade arrest (see pp. 534, 538 of this volume). p. 527
- ¹⁶² *La Emancipación* No. 65, September 14, 1872, carried Paul Lafargue's report on the Hague Congress (see pp. 286-94 of this volume) and a number of items on the Alliance. p. 535
- ¹⁶³ The correspondent's report "Meeting in Amsterdam" (reprinted from *La Liberté*) was published in *La Emancipación* No. 66, September 21, 1872. p. 537
- ¹⁶⁴ The reference is to the censure passed by the reformist majority of the British Federal Council against Karl Marx on September 12, 1872, for accusing the trade union leaders of corruption. Many sections of the British Federation, including those of the Manchester district, protested against this decision. p. 538
- ¹⁶⁵ *Confidential Information* was written by Karl Marx on March 28, 1870, and intended for the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party. It exposed the schemes and intrigues of the Bakuninists in the International (see Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 16, S. 409-20). Excerpts from it were read out at the court proceedings during the Leipzig trial in March 1872. p. 540
- ¹⁶⁶ The *Liberté* No. 37, September 15, 1872, carried a number of most important documents of the Hague Congress: the nominal list of delegates, the greeting to all fighters for the emancipation of labour, the motion tabled by Vaillant, Arnaud and others to include the question of the political action of the working class in the agenda of the Congress; the declaration of the Paris sections, the motion tabled by Sorge and Becker on the immediate opening of the debate on Articles 2 and 6 of the General Rules, the motion by Lafargue, Sorge and others to organise international trade unions, the statement of the minority, the report of the commission of inquiry into the Alliance with the statement by Roch Spingard (see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 330-33; 133-84; 233-36; 186-87; 197; 199-200: 481-83). p. 541

- ¹⁶⁷ Issue No. 24 of the *International Herald*, September 14, 1872, carried a communication of the editor, William Harrison Riley, of the forthcoming publication in one of the following issues of the reports of Raimond Wilmart and John Hales; the editors also promised to print in the same issue "wholesome criticisms on the conduct of several members of the General Council". The intervention of the Manchester and other sections resulted in the appearance of an editorial note in the *International Herald* No. 25, September 21 (see p. 176 of this volume). p. 542
- ¹⁶⁸ On July 5, 1848, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* received from Paris two communications which falsely affirmed that the French writer George Sand had in her possession documents proving Bakunin's connections with the Russian government. On August 3, 1848, the paper carried a refutation by George Sand herself, which completely exhausted the incident. p. 543
- ¹⁶⁹ The text of the report written by Engels as delegate of the German Section No. 6 of New York is not at present in the possession of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. p. 550
- ¹⁷⁰ See Note 61. p. 554
- ¹⁷¹ The work in question is the series of articles by J. G. Eccarius "Working Time", published in the *Internationale*, Nos. 191-194, September 8, 15, 22 and 29, 1872. The Spanish translation made by Mesa was published in *La Emancipación* Nos. 65-68 and 70, September 14, 21 and 28, and October 5 and 19, 1872. p. 554
- ¹⁷² See Note 107. p. 554
- ¹⁷³ Engels' articles on the war were published in the *Pall Mall Gazette* for 1870 and 1871. p. 557
- ¹⁷⁴ See Note 144. p. 562
- ¹⁷⁵ This was a protest letter written by the Spanish delegates to the Congress and published in *La Liberté* No. 40, October 6, 1872. p. 563
- ¹⁷⁶ The correspondence from Manchester, December 21, printed in the *Neue Freie Presse* No. 2905, September 25, 1872 and marked "From our own Correspondent" originated from reformist elements of the British Federation hostile to the General Council of the International. p. 567
- ¹⁷⁷ The reference is to a letter from William West to Marx, dated December 8, 1871, on the conflict between Sections Nos. 1 and 12 and a letter from Johann Georg Eccarius to Marx dated December 20, on the necessity to expel Section No. 12. Both these letters figure in the list of documents of Karl Marx under the heading "United States" (see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, p. 670). p. 567

- 178 See Note 8. p. 569
- 179 In his letter written on behalf of the British Federal Council on October 21, 1872, and published in the *Internationale* No. 198, October 27, 1872, Hales spoke in favour of establishing direct contacts between the British and Belgian Federations, by-passing the General Council, which was in fact stating support for the struggle of the Bakuninists against Marxism. p. 577
- 180 What is meant here is Bakunin's proclamation "To the Russian, Polish, and All Slav Friends", published as a supplement to the *Kolokol* No. 122-23, February 15, 1862. p. 579
- 181 *M. Bakunin, The People's Cause. Romanov, Pugachev or Pestel?*, London, 1862. p. 579
- 182 This was the first edition of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, which appeared in Geneva in 1869. In Bakunin's translation there were a number of inaccuracies which distorted the meaning of the document. p. 580
- 183 This is a quotation from Bakunin's pamphlet *To the Officers of the Russian Army*, Geneva, January 1870. p. 580
- 184 Nikolai Utin sent the translation of *The Revolutionary Catechism* on September 2, 1872, addressed to the Swiss delegate to the Hague Congress Théodore Duval. p. 580
- 185 Utin draws Marx's attention to the anonymous article "More About Bakunin" in the *Tagwacht* newspaper, Nos. 40-43, October 5, 12, 19 and 26, 1872 (see Note 48). p. 581
- 186 The protest against Bakunin's expulsion from the International was written on October 4 and published in issue No. 4 of *La Liberté*, October 13, 1872, signed by a group of Russian émigrés in Switzerland: N. Ogaryov, V. Zaitzev, V. Ozerov, A. Ross (N. Sazhin), V. Golstein, Z. Ralli, A. Elsnitz, V. Smirnov. p. 581
- 187 What is meant is the money given to Herzen in 1858 by the Russian landowner P. A. Bakhmetiev for propaganda (the Bakhmetiev fund). In 1869 under pressure from Bakunin and Ogaryov Herzen agreed to divide the fund into two parts, one of which was given by Ogaryov to Nechayev. In 1870, after Herzen's death Nechayev also received the other half of the fund from Ogaryov. p. 581
- 188 Nikolai Utin here refers to Herzen's *Past and Thoughts*, chapters: "The Germans in Emigration" and "The Young Emigrants". p. 581
- 189 Ogaryov's verses "The Student" were printed in leaflets form in 1869 in Geneva and were used by Nechayev as a sort of authority from Ogaryov. p. 581

- ¹⁹⁰ During the republican uprising in Lyons in September 1870, Bakunin tried to seize the leadership of the movement. On September 28, 1870, the Bakuninists attempted to capture the town hall but failed completely. p. 582
- ¹⁹¹ Nechayev was arrested on August 14, 1872, in Zurich and extradited to the tsarist government by the Swiss authorities in autumn of the same year; he was thrown into the Alexeevsky ravelin, where he died in 1882. p. 582
- ¹⁹² Engels here has in mind the announcement in the *Plebe*, No. 112, October 26, 1872, of the forthcoming publication of a separate pamphlet containing the account of the Hague Congress and the General Rules with the changes introduced by the Congress. Big-nami was unable to publish this pamphlet. p. 586
- ¹⁹³ The reference is to the *Circle of Social Sciences* founded in London by the refugees of the Commune on January 20, 1872. It united several groups of French refugees on the basis of recognition of the "principles of the Commune". Besides discussing general questions concerning the French refugees and studying social problems, the Circle endeavoured to establish and maintain permanent relations with the revolutionaries of other countries. The members of the International Ranvier, Lissagaray, Hubert, Lechenne and others were active members of the Circle. On their proposal Marx was unanimously admitted to the Circle on February 3, 1872 and took part in its activities up to the autumn of 1872. p. 588
- ¹⁹⁴ In issue No. 49 of the *Tagwacht* newspaper, December 7, 1872, was an article on the factionary struggle which had developed in the Workers' Association of the Zurich canton. p. 595
- ¹⁹⁵ The reference is to the account given by J. H. Staube of the general meeting of the Glarus Cantonal Workers' Society on December 1, 1872, published in issue No. 49 of the *Tagwacht*, December 7, 1872. p. 595
- ¹⁹⁶ The reference is to the protest against the Hague Congress decisions made by a group of Bakunin's supporters. p. 602
- ¹⁹⁷ This letter, like a number of others, was written with account of the possibilities of perulustration by the tsarist police. p. 605
- ¹⁹⁸ Mikhail Bakunin's open letter containing his resignation from public life appeared in the *Journal de Genève* on September 25, 1873, and in the *Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne* on October 12, 1873. p. 606
- ¹⁹⁹ This is a reference to a journey Engels made with his father to Italy during which they spent about 10 days in Milan in May 1841. p. 610

- ²⁰⁰ On being deported from Italy to the Austrian frontier on March 29, 1872, Cuno made a short stay in Geneva and Chemnitz and then, as we see from the extant letters written by Engels to him, he was resident in Düsseldorf in April 1872 and in May moved to Belgium, first to Seraing (in May 1872) and then to Liège, in June 1872, where he remained until August 1872, that is, almost until the Congress. The fact that Cuno was planning to go to Spain is testified by the following passage from Engels' letter to him dated April 22-23, 1872: "In the event something coming of the place in Spain which Becker has in mind for you, let me know immediately so that I can give you recommendations for our people there. The place will probably be in Catalonia, the only industrial province in Spain, and you could be very useful there" (see Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 33, S. 448). It has not been established whether Cuno did in fact spend any time in Spain between March and August 1872. This may be an error of memory. p. 610
- ²⁰¹ Theodor Friedrich Cuno's reminiscences of meetings with Karl Marx and Frederick Engels and of his participation in the European and American working-class movement are preserved in the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU. They were written on the Institute's request. Appended to the manuscript are earlier reminiscences written in the 1880s under the title "Reminiscences from the Field of Agitation". Appended are also many documents, letters, leaflets, newspaper cuttings, reports, materials from various organisations and so on; a number of letters and newspaper cuttings are pasted into the text. The manuscript of 1933 (without the appendices) consists of 85 pages; the text is written in black ink on one side of white ruled paper; there are separate corrections in red pencil. p. 613
- ²⁰² The Commission to investigate the Alliance sat for three days — September 5, 6 and 7, 1872. Its members were excused from attending the sittings of the Congress, as result of which Cuno had a wrong impression of the work of the other delegates, which, according to the testimony of the participants themselves, was very intense. p. 622
- ²⁰³ See Note 190. p. 622
- ²⁰⁴ The manuscript of *An Agitator's Reminiscences* was written by Theodor Cuno in 1883 and reviewed by him in 1933, as is shown by corrections in black pencil.
The manuscript consists of 48 pages numbered in 1883 and 1933, written in purple ink on one side of white ruled paper with broad margins on the inside marked off with a double (red and blue) line. p. 626
- ²⁰⁵ The whole episode with Nechayev's letter (addressed to Nikolai Lyubavin, not to Nikolai Utin) is given inaccurately (see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 342-43, 363-65). p. 631

- ²⁰⁶ A prominent figure in the French working-class movement, one of the organisers of the International in France, the well-known Communist Benoît Malon was a left Proudhonist whom his petty-bourgeois revolutionism inclined to closeness with the Bakuninists. After the fall of the Commune, Malon supported the struggle of the anarchists in Switzerland against the General Council and Marx. The accusations levelled against him at the Hague Congress called forth protests from some delegates who had known him by his former work. On Engels' suggestion the question of Malon's expulsion was not put to the vote (see *The Hague Congress. Minutes and Documents*, pp. 106, 173). p. 631
- ²⁰⁷ The *Democratic Association* or *Democratic Union* (Democratische Vereeniging) was founded on November 9, 1871, as a result of the movement for the extension of electoral rights in Holland (autumn 1871). The discussions during which it was decided to establish this political organisation took place in Amsterdam in the *Vooruitgang* (Progress) Club. p. 634

NAME INDEX

A

- Abeele, van den* (born in 1847)—
38, 41, 48, 49, 72, 79, 127, 145,
159, 168, 222, 224, 242, 248,
261, 267, 279, 308, 312, 317-18,
521, 544-45, 615
- Adoratsky, V. V.* (1878-1945)—
613]
- Aleksandrov, Vasily Maximovich*
(c. 1849-c. 1906)—442
- Alerini, Charles* (born in 1842)—
41, 95, 96, 108, 122, 146, 160,
161, 201, 223, 238, 242, 246,
262, 264, 266, 268, 271, 274-
275, 279, 293, 296, 309, 310,
317-18, 480, 508, 511, 599, 615,
629
- Alexander II* (1818-1881)—Rus-
sian emperor (1855-81)—579
- Almeida y Santos, José*—288
- Alves, Daniel*—288
- Andrieu, Jules*—453
- Applegarth, Robert* (1833-1925)—
420, 426
- Arnaud, Antoine* (1831-1885)—
64, 81, 125, 183, 188, 201,
206, 220, 221, 233, 246, 251,
254, 271, 352, 560, 594, 616
- Arnould, Victor*—244, 468, 473,
487
- Artus, Jean-Louis*—438, 441, 447,
485
- Aspro*—288
- Auguste, Dantel*—549
- Authero*—404

B

- Babeuf, Gracchus* (real name *Fran-
çois Noel*)—189
- Bachmann, Moritz*—629
- Bachruch, Henri*—492-93
- Baer, C.*—504
- Bakhmetyev, Pavel Alexandrovich*
(born in 1828)—581
- Bakunin, Mikhail Alexandrovich*
(*Bakounine, Michael*) (1814-
1876)—39, 40, 55, 65, 66, 73,
75, 81, 86, 100, 113-15, 121-23,
132, 141-44, 146-47, 159-61,
168-69, 176, 195-98, 202, 204-
05, 207, 209, 211, 215, 238-40,
242, 258, 273-74, 293-94, 299,
301, 305, 317-18, 325, 327-
28, 332, 335, 337-38, 342-43,
352-53, 356, 359-61, 373, 375,
398, 413-17, 423-24, 435-38,
440, 442-45, 447-48, 455, 459-
62, 464, 471-72, 478, 480-81,
485, 508, 517-18, 520, 529, 538,
540, 543, 549-51, 572, 579-84,
597-600, 602, 605-06, 611, 615,
618-19, 621-23, 626-32, 638
- Bakunina, Antonina Ksaveryevna*
(maiden name *Kvyatkovskaya*)
(c. 1840-1887)—444, 622
- Baranov, Vladimir Ottomarovich*—
353
- Barbès, Armand*—639
- Barnekow, Arthur*—501-02
- Barry, Maltman* (1842-1909)—
36-67, 72, 75, 125, 129, 220-21,

- 246, 262, 309, 487-88, 511-12,
525, 546, 616
- Barton, Robert Fyodorovich*—609-
13, 621
- Bartorelli, Ugo*—383-84
- Bastiat, Frédéric* (1801-1850)—
357
- Bebel, August* (1840-1913)—51-52,
123, 323, 454, 485, 494-97,
602-05, 610, 612
- Becker, Bernhard* (1826-1891)—
146, 160, 222, 246, 293, 411,
413, 434, 503, 616, 627
- Becker, Johann Philipp* (1809-
1886)—101, 146, 149, 153-54,
160, 162, 165-66, 190-218, 243,
246, 311, 313, 319, 329, 331-36,
341-42, 359, 364, 365, 397-98,
415-18, 429, 437, 472, 493,
498, 556, 569-70, 595, 609,
616, 627, 641
- Beecher, Henry Ward*—619
- Beghelli, Giuseppe* (1847-1877)—
283
- Belley*—453
- Bernard*—584
- Bert, Cesare*—330-31
- Bertrand, F.*—98, 112, 154, 166,
176, 271-72, 291, 315, 550, 564
- Beust, Friedrich* (1809-1886)—51-
52
- Biedermann, Karl* (1812-1901)—
103, 119-22, 574
- Bignami, Enrico* (1846-1921)—
295, 586
- Bismark, Otto, Prince* (1815-
1898)—51-52, 55, 87-108, 497,
616
- Blanc, Gaspard*—81, 144, 194,
582, 631
- Blanc, Louis* (1811-1882)—630
- Blanqui, Auguste* (1805-1881)—
95, 111, 155, 157, 201, 375,
525, 638
- Boehmers*—543, 571-72
- Bolte, Friedrich*—98, 112, 154,
166, 176, 271-72, 291, 315,
380-82, 430-31, 564-66
- Bonapart, Louis*—see *Napoleon III*
- Boon, Martin James*—532, 542
- Borkheim, Sigismund Ludwig*
(1826-1885)—195, 334-35, 338,
348, 421, 556-57
- Boruitau, Karl* (died in 1873)—
356
- Bousquet, Abel*—132, 238, 243,
274, 317
- Boussé*—569
- Bracke, Wilhelm* (1842-1880)—
356, 413-14, 421
- Bragulat*—563
- Brismée, Désiré* (1823-1888)—48,
57, 77, 79, 89, 99, 130, 146-47,
149, 159-60, 162, 168, 174, 222,
225, 242, 244, 246, 252, 254-55,
269, 279, 311-12, 317-18, 349,
385, 387, 426, 482, 486-89, 500,
505-07, 517, 521-22, 615
- Brix, Harold* (1841-1881)—501
- Bückler, Johann*—195
- Bürkli, Karl* (1823-1901)—437
- Burns, Mary Ellen (Pumps)* (born
about 1860)—333, 357, 610
- Burns, Lydia (Lizzy, Lizzie)* (1827-
1878)—343, 348, 467, 480, 533
- Butler, Ben*—627

C

- Cabet, Etienne* (1788-1856)—194
- Cafiero, Carlo* (1846-1892)—107-
08, 129, 283, 290, 300-01,
339, 618
- Calewaert, Louis*—385, 487
- Calleja, Inocente*—264
- Capestro, Federico*—see *Cuno,*
Theodor Friedrich
- Carl, Conrad* (died in 1890)—98,
112, 154, 166, 176, 271-72, 291,
315, 564
- Chanzy*—561
- Chatelet*—574, 601
- Chaumette, Pierre Gaspard* (1763-
1794)—189
- Chernyshevsky N. G.*—581
- Claflin, Tennessee* (1845-1923)—45-
46, 75, 87, 381, 618
- Clark*—393
- Cluseret, Gustav Paul* (1823-
1900)—148
- Coenen, Philippe*—222, 242, 246,
261, 279, 318, 615

Coleman, Patrick John—467, 490
Collet, Charles Dobson (died in 1898)—551, 552
Combault, Amédée Benjamin (born c. 1838-died not earlier than 1884)—447
Considérant, Victor (1808-1893)—194
Costa, Andrea (1851-1910)—479
Coullery, Pierre (1819-1903)—220
Cournet, Frédéric (1839-1885)—64, 72, 126, 146, 150, 160, 188, 206, 220-21, 234, 246, 251, 254, 271, 352, 391-93, 498-99, 502, 560, 594, 616
Cuno, Paulina—614
Cuno, Theodor Friedrich (pseudonym *Caestro Frederico*) (1846-1934)—54-55, 64, 80, 91, 132, 146, 149, 155, 160, 222, 225, 226, 236, 239-40, 246, 252, 268, 274, 312, 327-29, 332, 335, 339-40, 357-61, 398-400, 414-16, 484, 530, 537-39, 551, 564-65, 567, 576-77, 587, 598-601, 609-33, 640
Cyrille, Victor—40, 246, 282, 615

D

Dagobert—368-73, 433-34
Danielson, Nikolai Frantzevich (pseudonym *Nikolai-on*) (1844-1918)—337-38, 420, 448-49, 459, 464-65, 596-98, 602, 605-06
Danton, Georges Jacques (1759-1794)—548
Dave, Victor (1845-1922)—82, 97, 150, 162, 223, 241, 242, 244, 246, 252, 254-55, 260-62, 278-79, 309, 317-18, 452, 591-92, 615
David, Edouard—98, 112, 272, 291, 315, 565
Davisson, A.—439
Davoust—372
Delecluze, Charles (1809-1871)—493
Delmar, John—625
De Morgan, John—343, 490

Demuth, Hélène (Lenchen) (Nim, Nimmy) (1823-1890)—504
Dentraygues, Emile (pseudonym *Swarm*) (born c. 1837)—221, 238, 248, 273, 578, 616
De Paepe, César (1841-1890)—336-37, 359, 385, 426, 469-70, 486, 497, 575-76
Dereure, Simon (1838-1900)—38, 40, 42, 65, 96-98, 112, 121, 129, 146, 150, 154, 160, 166, 176, 246, 251-52, 261-63, 266, 291, 293, 308-09, 312, 315-16, 369, 371, 378, 382, 401, 417, 420, 432, 456, 530, 556, 565-66, 588, 617
Dettle, B.—566
De Wolfers, Alfred—373
Dickmann—543
Dietzgen, Josef (1828-1888)—80, 222, 246, 411, 484, 457-58, 616
Dilke, Charles Wentworth (1843-1911)—41, 111
Dmitrieva—see *Tomanovskaya, Elizaveta Lukinichna*
Dubois, Ulisse—220
Dufaure, Jules Armand Stantslas (1798-1881)—142, 249
Dumas, Jean—569-70
Dumont—see *Faillet, Eugène Louis*
Dupont, Eugène (c. 1831-1881)—48, 72, 77, 81-82, 97, 99-101, 111, 221, 224, 238, 246, 252, 273, 294, 297, 302, 308, 312, 314, 316, 319, 365, 387, 393-94, 420, 426, 439, 446, 468, 482, 507, 511-12, 514-15, 519, 528, 539, 578, 590, 616, 629, 631, 638
Durand, Gustav Paul Emile (b. 1835)—194, 324
Duval, Théodore—101, 246, 273, 316, 319, 437, 485, 500-01, 584, 616, 640

E

Eberhardt—222, 242, 246, 279, 318, 486-88, 615
Eccarius, Johann Georg (1818-1889)—39, 68-102, 129, 223-

- 24, 246, 261, 303, 308, 311,
335, 419, 505, 526, 530, 532,
538, 567, 587, 617, 629
- Eichhoff, Wilhelm Karl* (1833-
1895)—376, 427
- Elliott, John*—46, 381
- Elsnitz, Aleksandr Leontyevich*
(1849-1907)—582
- Elzingre, Louis*—220
- Ely, Richard Theodor* (1854-
1943)—612
- Endly*—453
- Engels, Friedrich* (1820-1895)—
40, 42, 56, 59-60, 65, 88, 95-96,
105-16, 131, 140, 146, 154, 160,
166, 176, 222, 233, 236-38,
243-44, 247, 262, 264-65, 271,
273, 276, 280-85, 289, 292,
295-303, 307-08, 314-17, 318,
321, 323-36, 338-43, 347-48,
352-61, 365-68, 373-74, 380,
383-91, 393-95, 398-400, 402-
06, 414-18, 422-27, 431-33, 435,
439-40, 444, 449-51, 454-57,
466-69, 473-87, 490-92, 499,
501-05, 513-14, 521, 524-43,
545, 549-57, 559-64, 567-68,
570-72, 574-77, 585-90, 593-94,
601, 602-24, 627-32, 638
- Erisman, Fyodor Fyodorovich*
(1842-1915)—441
- F
- Fäh, C.*—570
- Faillet, Eugène Louis* (pseudonym
Dumont) (1840-1912)—94, 221,
247, 578, 616
- Fanelli, Giuseppe* (1826-1877)—
481
- Farkas, Karoly (Carl)* (1843-
1907)—247, 293, 397-98, 523,
617
- Favre, Jules* (1809-1880)—51, 78,
142, 150, 162
- Fazy*—334-35
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb* (1762-
1814)—144
- Fink, Wilhelm* (1833-1890)—333,
422, 466-67, 568-69
- Fluse, Pierre* (1841-1909)—222,
242, 243-79, 293, 309, 318, 482,
487, 615
- Fontana*—404
- Fornaccieri*—98, 112, 176, 272,
291, 315
- Fourier, Charles* (1772-1837)—
194
- Frankel, Leo* (1844-1896)—38, 42,
99, 146, 160, 220-21, 247, 252,
261, 302, 303, 308, 312, 316,
335, 418, 447, 471, 549, 555,
572, 590, 616, 628
- Frey, Joseph Heinrich*—570
- Friburg*—194
- Friedländer, Hugo*—146, 160,
247, 574, 617
- G
- Garibaldi, Giuseppe* (1807-1882)—
446
- Gaveau*—572
- Geib, August* (1842-1879)—339,
356, 411-12, 450
- Geleff, Paul Johansen* (1842-
1921)—501
- Gerhard, Hendrtek* (c. 1829-
1886)—38, 48, 69, 71, 77, 101,
127-28, 145, 149, 162, 223,
242, 247, 261, 267, 279, 308,
311, 318, 391-92, 452, 514,
556, 615, 635, 640-41
- Gilkens*—223, 615
- Ginsburg, Lev Savelyevich* (1851-
1918)—509, 532
- Giskra, Karl* (1820-1879)—141
- Gladstone, William Ewart* (1809-
1898)—41, 52, 75, 112, 130,
224, 302
- Glaser de Willebrord*—468, 482
- Glaser de Willebrord, E.*—361-62,
385-87, 425-27, 450-51, 455-56,
468-69, 472-73, 482, 486-87,
513-14
- Gögg, Maria* (born in 1826)—376
- Goldenberg, Lazar Borisovitch*
(1846-1916)—582
- Golovin, Ivan Gavrilovitch* (1816-
1886)—518-19
- Gompers, Samuel* (1850-1924)—
625

Gouppy—394
Grant—626
Greulich, Hermann (1842-1925)—
 365, 430, 437, 447, 595-96
Grosselin, Jacques (1835-1892)—
 336
Grundmann, P.—504
Guillaume, James (1844-1916)—
 39, 46, 55, 57, 64-65, 81, 83,
 85, 90, 93, 97, 100, 102, 113-14,
 123, 131-37, 146, 148-49, 153,
 156-57, 159-60, 162, 165, 167-
 69, 175-76, 201, 207, 214, 219-
 44, 247, 253-54, 262, 264, 267,
 269, 273, 275-76, 279, 283, 286,
 293-94, 299, 301, 311, 313,
 314, 316-18, 325, 505, 507,
 510-11, 517-18, 520-21, 529,
 538, 550, 565, 572-73, 591,
 597-600, 606, 615, 621, 623,
 629, 631-32
Gutsmann, Bruno—596
Guyetas (Guétat)—437

H

Hales, John (born in 1839)—72,
 146, 160, 223, 247, 303, 309-10,
 393-95, 408-09, 427, 504, 511,
 530, 532, 538, 542, 546, 550,
 577, 587, 617
Harcourt, W. E.—146, 247, 568,
 570-71, 617
Hartung—569, 595
Hasenclever, Wilhelm (1837-
 1889)—360, 399
Hasselmann, Wilhelm (b. 1844)—
 399
Hawe, Lindray—453
Hébert, Jacques René (1757-
 1794)—189
Heddeghem—see *Van-Heddeghem*
Hedwig—447
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich
 (1770-1831)—604
Heim, Ludwig—see *Oberwinder,*
Heinrich
Heinzen, Karl (1809-1880)—453
Heitbrink, H.—504
Heller, Hugo—427

Hepner, Adolf (1846-1923)—48,
 90, 92, 103-05, 119-38, 146,
 149, 156-57, 160, 162, 167-68,
 175, 222, 232, 247, 254, 261,
 267, 273, 293, 311-12, 315,
 355-58, 360, 388, 408, 414, 421,
 434, 449-50, 454, 457, 466-67,
 484-85, 496-97, 513, 520, 526-
 27, 530-31, 534, 538, 540-41,
 543-44, 551, 554-56, 569, 571-
 72, 591-92, 617
Herman, Alfred (1843-1890)—82,
 134, 153, 159, 165, 168, 174,
 222, 227, 242, 247, 252, 261,
 266, 270, 279, 318, 339, 350,
 359-60, 400, 469, 487, 548,
 615
Herostratus—443
Herzen, Alexander Ivanovich
 (1812-1870)—141, 518, 581
Hins, Eugen (1839-1923)—326,
 336, 349-50, 352, 359, 362,
 385, 398-99, 425, 486, 500,
Hins, Maria—352, 359
Hirsch, Karl (1841-1900)—355-
 56, 450, 484
Holstein, Vladimir Augustovich
 (1849-1916)—582
Horace (Quintus Horatius Flac-
cus) (65-8 B. C.)—337, 634
Horner, F. (1831-1886)—441
Hout, van der (born in 1843)—48,
 63, 90-91, 149, 154-55, 159,
 162, 166, 168, 223, 242, 248,
 254-55, 261, 267, 311, 317,
 318-19, 615, 635, 641-42
Huart—487
Huber, Johann—145
Hubert—380
Hugo, Victor (1802-1885)—561

I

Iglesias (1850-1925)—536
Imandt, Carl—558
Imandt, Peter—557-58
Imandt, Robert—558
Ivanov, Ivan Ivanovich (died in
 1869)—583

J

- Jaclard, Charles Victor* (1843-1903)—375
Jarrow, F. J.—532
Johannard, Jules (1843-1882)—62, 64, 80, 97-98, 146, 148, 156, 160, 220, 221, 247, 255, 275, 316, 365, 396, 441, 510-15, 517, 524-25, 616, 629
Jones—303, 439, 528, 530, 542, 547
Jørgensen, Alfred—502
Jozewicz, Ferdinand—302-03
Jung, Hermann (1830-1901)—126, 335, 340, 363-65, 368-73, 377, 387, 401-02, 407, 420, 426, 433-34, 437-39, 469-70, 497, 503-04, 510-15, 524-25, 530
Jung, Sarrah (died in 1890)—272-73, 434, 512, 515

K

- Kavanagh, Samuel*—98, 112, 154, 166, 176, 271-72, 291, 315
Kleist, Carl Wilhelm—458
Kleist, Carl—458-59
Krupp, Alfred (1812-1887)—136
Kugelmann, Ludwig (1828-1902)—48, 146, 160, 222, 247, 354, 366, 383, 395, 408, 413, 421-22, 434, 483-84, 617
Kuhlmann, Ludwig—504
Kwasniewski, Gustav (1833-1902)—484

L

- Lachâtre, Maurice* (1814-1900)—354, 436, 562
Lafargue, Laura (1845-1911)—63, 150, 397, 423, 435, 447, 477, 505, 526, 554, 567, 577, 601, 612, 632-33, 635
Lafargue, Paul (1842-1911)—39, 40, 58, 66, 82-83, 98, 101, 112, 123, 146, 153-54, 160, 165-66, 174, 200, 222, 227, 233, 247, 252, 262-65, 269, 272, 286-95, 309, 312, 316, 319, 323, 327,

- 361, 373-76, 389-91, 396-97, 415, 423-25, 434-36, 447, 456, 473-74, 476-77, 481, 483, 508, 516-17, 526, 535-37, 539, 550, 552-53, 562, 567, 577, 588, 591, 601, 605, 612, 617, 628, 631-33, 635, 638-40
Landeck, Bernard (born in 1832)—360, 549, 572
Langlois—194
Lanza (1815-1882)—52
Lassale, Ferdinand (1825-1864)—140, 357, 399, 485, 627
Laurel, Carl Malcom Ferdinand—98, 112, 154, 166, 176, 271-72, 291, 315
Laveau—561
Lavrov, Pyotr Lavrovich (1823-1900)—500, 505-10, 516-23, 531-32
Leblanc, Albert (born in 1844)—582
Léger—373
Leite, Santos—288
Le Moussu, Benjamin—48, 60, 149, 162, 222, 225, 247, 251, 261, 267, 303, 311, 314, 352, 373, 380-82, 430, 453, 456-57, 515, 549, 567, 617, 629
Lessner—492
Lessner, Friedrich (1825-1910)—60, 64, 72, 222, 247, 293, 352, 394, 418, 492, 532, 568, 571, 617
Levashova (or *Levasheva*, née *Zitnovieva*), *Olga Stepanovna*—446, 471
Levièle—98, 112, 154, 166, 176, 271-72, 291, 315, 565
Lieberse, Bruno (1836-1905)—451-54, 482, 488, 493, 503, 591-92, 594
Liebknecht, Natalia (1835-1909)—348, 454, 494, 526-27, 593
Liebknecht, Wilhelm (1826-1900)—51-52, 123, 323-24, 326, 329, 331-33, 336, 338, 347-48, 355-58, 387-88, 454, 466, 478, 485, 494-97, 526-27, 544, 574-75, 593, 610
Lindau, Paul (1839-1919)—355

Lissagaray, Prosper Olivier (1838-1901)—155, 507
Liwenenthal, Jean (also *Liewenthal, Loewenthal*)—596
Lochner, Georg (b. c. 1824)—352
Longuet, Charles (1839-1903)—49, 57, 60, 64, 66, 79, 81-82, 94, 150, 156, 162, 167, 175, 220-21, 233, 247, 252, 254, 269, 303, 312, 315, 316, 351, 396, 436, 447, 515, 517-18, 549, 559, 566-67, 571, 575, 612, 616, 632
Lopatin, German Alexandrovich (1845-1918)—337, 462, 464
Lorenzo, Anselmo (1841-1914)—344, 347, 389, 393, 536, 563
Low, Harriet (1832-1897)—471, 504
Loyola, Ignaty (1491-1556)—198
Luba, Raimundo—288
Lucaïn—see *Potel, Frédéric*
Ludwig, Gustav—146, 160, 410-11, 449, 484, 589
Luginbühl—446
Lullier, Ernst [*Charles* (1838-1891)]—561
Lyubavin N. N. (1845-1918)—353, 449, 459-63, 596-98, 602

M

MacDonnell—467, 480, 490, 533
MacDonnell, I. Patric (c. 1845-1906)—38, 47-48, 60, 72, 111, 149, 162, 242, 247, 261, 267, 302, 308, 311, 343, 352, 467, 480, 490-91, 499, 505, 532-33, 556, 617
Mack, David—55, 91, 155
Malatesta, Errico (1854-1932)—618
Malon, Benoit (1841-1893)—81, 113, 132, 207, 238, 243, 252, 275, 293, 299, 317-18, 375, 447, 517, 631
Marat, Jean Paul (1743-1793)—189
Marchand, Louis—132, 238, 243, 274, 317
Margueritte, Edouard Louis Ma-

rie (pseudonym *Henri Tes-*
sier)—188, 206
Marselau, Nicola Alonso—41, 48, 62, 65, 107, 123, 149, 162, 201, 223-25, 238, 242, 248, 262, 266-67, 273, 274, 279, 293, 311, 317-18, 481, 508, 511, 588, 600, 615, 628
Martin, Constant (1839-1906)—188, 206, 503, 594
Marx, Eleanor (Tussy) (1855-1898)—440-48, 471-72, 504-05, 583, 585, 612, 624, 632
Marx (Longuet), Jenny (1844-1883)—354, 434, 436, 454, 458, 571, 575, 612, 632
Marx, Jenny (1814-1881) (née *von Westphalen*)—63, 150, 397, 401, 505-06, 513, 526, 558-59, 566, 594, 613, 621, 632, 635
Marx, Karl (1818-1883)—33-35, 41-44, 46, 49, 54-56, 58-60, 62, 65-67, 72, 75, 77, 79, 87-88, 90, 93, 95-97, 101-02, 104, 111, 123, 130, 139-46, 148, 150, 154, 156-62, 166, 175, 197, 222-25, 227, 230, 233-38, 243, 247, 251, 261-66, 270-73, 275, 289, 294, 297, 302-03, 306, 308-310, 312, 314-16, 319, 321, 323, 329, 335, 336-37, 348, 351, 353-57, 361, 365-68, 375-76, 380-81, 383, 387-89, 391, 395-97, 401-02, 407-08, 410-13, 415, 418-22, 425-27, 434-36, 440, 442, 444, 448-49, 451-54, 457-66, 468-69, 472-73, 477, 482-84, 487-89, 493-96, 500-01, 504-05, 511, 513, 517-19, 521-529, 533-38, 541, 543-59, 564-68, 570-86, 589-91, 593-602, 605, 609-24, 627-33, 635-38, 641-642
Mayall—354
Mazzini—283, 330
McCarthy—490-91
McNeil, George E.—546-47
Meissner, Otto Karl (1819-1902)—354, 383, 411-12
Mesa y Leompert, José (1840-1904)—264, 274-75, 390, 405-06, 424,

- 480-81, 483, 508, 535-36, 552-54, 559-60, 562-63
Mess—434
Meyer, Fritz—504
Meyer, Hermann (1821-1875)—380, 566
Meyer, Siegfried (c. 1840-1872)—421
Mie, Louis—561
Milke, Fritz—116-19, 146, 160, 222, 248, 273, 293, 484, 617
Milner, George—467, 532
Mirabeau, Honoré Gabriel (1749-1791)—195
Moltke, Karl Helmut Bernhard (1800-1891)—50, 557
Monterossi (pseudonym *Charles Rodenback*)—451-52, 514
Moor, Samuel (c. 1830-1912)—543
Mora, Francisco (1842-1924)—264, 305, 423-24, 435, 456, 478, 480-81, 536, 563
Moraes, Anselmo de—403
Morago-Gonzales, Tomás—40, 41, 58, 85, 94, 107, 123, 130, 146-147, 149, 153-54, 160, 162, 165-66, 201, 223, 238, 239, 242, 247, 262, 266, 269, 273, 279, 293, 296, 312, 317, 327, 373, 375, 403, 404, 423, 480-81, 508, 511, 517, 573, 588, 599-600, 615, 628
Morgan—see *De Morgan, John*
Morley, Samuel (1809-1886)—41, 75, 111
Mottershead, Thomas G. (c. 1825-1884)—41, 47, 72, 75, 99, 129, 146, 160, 223, 230, 248, 310, 505, 511-12, 532, 538, 587, 617
Mülberger, Arthur (1847-1907)—554, 603
Murat, André Pierre (1833-1893)—194
- N
- Napoleon III* (*Louis Napoleon Bonaparte*) (1808-1873), French emperor (1852-70)—49, 143, 151, 163
Nechayev, Sergei Gennadyevich (1847-1882)—144, 324, 338, 353, 442-44, 447, 462, 509-10, 581-83, 631
Negreskul, Mikhail Fyodorovich (c. 1843-1871)—338, 460
Nobre-França, José—288, 402-05, 425, 473-76
Norbier—373
- O
- Oberwinder, Heinrich* (1846-1914)—90, 145-56, 162, 165, 247, 293, 574, 617
Obolenskaya, Zoya Sergeyeвна (born in 1829)—444
Ogarev, Nikolai Platonovich (1813-1877)—581
Oldrini, A.—594-95
Ollivier, Emile (1825-1913)—49, 151, 163
Ommen—434
Orpin, G.—463
Ozerov, Vladimir A. (1838-c. 1915)—582
- P
- Pagés, Victor* (born c. 1850)—264, 536
Pauvert, van der—476
Pécharde, Etienne—see *Regis, Vitale*
Pellicer Farga, Rafael (1840-1890)—41, 107, 123, 146, 160, 201, 223, 238, 242, 247, 262, 266, 273-74, 296, 317-18, 508, 511, 563, 588, 600, 615
Pereira, José—288
Perret, Henri—363-65, 386, 498, 585
Perron, Charles Eugène (1837-1919)—131, 460
Petersen—493
Pfänder, Karl (1818-1876)—352, 420-21
Pico—513
Pihl, S. T. (1840-1881)—126, 146, 160, 248, 502, 617
Pillon—97

- Pindy, Jean Louis* (1840-1917)—387
Pio, Louis (1841-1894)—126, 457, 501
Pius IX (1792-1878)—Pope of Rome (1846-78)—52
Podolinsky, Sergei Andreyevich (1850-1891)—500, 505-10, 516-23, 531-32
Polyakov, Nikolai Petrovich (c. 1841-1905)—353, 449, 460-62
Potel, Frédéric (pseudonym *Lucain*) (died in December 1872)—55, 129, 149, 221, 225, 237, 239, 248, 268, 279-74, 276, 293, 312, 538, 550, 578, 599, 616, 621, 630, 632
Proudhon, Pierre Joseph (1809-1865)—93, 141, 158, 168, 194, 233, 256, 259, 261, 548, 553, 555
Prudhomme (born c. 1843)—375
Pyat, Félix (1810-1889)—142-43
- R
- Ralli-Arbore, Zamfrij K.* (born in 1849)—582
Ranvier, Gabriel (1828-1879)—39, 42, 48, 62, 64-65, 77-79, 81, 90-91, 93, 98, 146, 149-50, 188, 206, 220, 224, 227, 234-35, 248-49, 251, 261, 265, 267, 271, 308, 311, 315, 352, 453, 457, 514, 555, 560, 585, 586, 588, 594, 616, 629
Regis, Vitale (pseudonym *Etienne Péchard*)—269, 278, 330, 339, 448-49
Rémy, Theodor—366, 437-39
Richard, Albert (1846-1925)—81, 144, 194, 438, 582, 631
Ritchards, Arthur—493
Rigault, Raoul (1846-1871)—493-94
Riley, William Harrison (1835-1907)—176
Ris—634
Rittinghausen, Moritz (1814-1890)—248, 355-56, 411, 458, 468, 617
Roach, John—38, 47, 64, 72, 77, 125, 129, 146, 160, 223, 225, 248, 261, 308, 505, 556, 617
Robert, Emile—487
Robert, Eugène—468, 473
Robespierre, Maximilien (1758-1794)—189
Robin, Paul (born in 1837)—375
Rochat, Charles (born in 1844)—469, 548-49
Rodenback, Charles—see *Monte-rossi*
Romanet—373
Rossel, Louis (1844-1871)—493
Rossety (or *Rossetti*), *Biagio* (Blaise)—437
Royer—453
Rüder—117, 120, 531, 534, 572
- S
- Sabina, Karel* (1813-1877)—144
Sabor, A. (1841-1907)—367
Sacaze, François (1808-1884)—142
Sagasta, Praxedes Mateo (1825-1903)—52
Saint Clair—98, 112, 154, 166, 176, 271-72, 291, 315, 565
Sand, George (real name *Dupin, Aurore*) (1804-1876)—543
Sauerborn—399
Sauron, Maurice—463
Sauwa, Arsène—39-42, 46, 55, 61, 65, 74-75, 96, 148, 161, 174, 204, 223-24, 242, 248, 262-63, 266-67, 269, 271, 279, 283, 308-12, 315, 318-19, 433, 511, 565, 617
Scheu (1845-1926)—80, 146, 149, 160-73, 222, 248, 484, 589, 617, 627
Schily, Victor (1810-1875)—492-93, 556
Schlebach, Pierre—360, 415
Schneider, Josef—360
Schönfeld, Engelbert—504
Schramm (1813-1882)—54-55, 64, 80, 91, 155, 226, 252, 465, 611, 629-30
Schulze-Delitzsch, Hermann (1808-1883)—194, 357

- Schumacher* (b. 1844)—222, 248, 411, 459, 617
Schweitzer (1833-1875)—92, 124, 133, 137-38, 232, 360, 416
Schwitzguëbel (1844-1895)—65, 66, 101-02, 113-14, 123, 133, 146, 160, 201, 207, 223, 238-39, 242, 248, 262, 273, 279, 283, 293, 299, 309, 317-18, 325, 340, 378, 407, 417, 507, 512, 539, 573, 598-600, 615, 632
Seiffert, Rudolph (1826-1886)—527, 530, 534
Serraillier, Auguste (born in 1840)—57, 60-61, 66, 72, 88, 95, 98-99, 111, 127, 220, 221, 248, 269, 271, 273, 289, 297, 302, 314-16, 352, 365, 447, 487, 512, 514-15, 519, 539, 549, 555, 562, 566-67, 578, 586, 588, 590, 616, 629, 631
Serraillier, Eugenie—515
Setti—97, 154, 166, 175
Seume, Johann Gottfried (1763-1810)—642
Sexton, George—47, 49, 60, 64, 72, 78, 90, 129, 146, 150, 160, 162, 221, 248, 312, 505, 532, 617
Shcherbakov—471
Sigel, Franz (1824-1902)—616
Silva, José da—288
Silva, Rebello da—404
Simon, Jules (1814-1896)—118
Smirnov, Valerian Nikolayevich (1848-1900)—582
Smith—360
Smith—394
Solomon—492
Sorge, Friedrich Adolf—40, 42, 45-46, 48, 65, 66, 75-77, 80, 85, 90, 94, 96, 98, 101-02, 121, 129, 136, 146, 149, 153, 160, 162, 165, 169, 174, 224, 229-30, 234-35, 243, 249, 253, 255, 262-63, 267, 271, 273, 293-94, 303-19, 352-53, 372, 378-80, 382, 396, 401, 417, 419, 431-32, 455-56, 470, 478, 492-93, 511, 514, 517, 525-26, 528-30, 533, 537-40 545, 550-51, 564-68, 570, 575-77, 585-88, 590-91, 593-94, 598, 601, 605-06, 617, 622, 624-26, 635-36, 641
Sorge Georg Wilhelm—396
Soriano, Trinidad—373, 481
Speyer, Hugo—503-04
Speyer, Karl (b. 1845)—98, 112, 154, 166, 176, 291, 315, 418-20, 564-65
Splingard, Roch—24, 130, 132, 149, 222, 225, 236, 241, 242, 248, 368, 275-76, 279, 283, 312, 317-18, 426, 468, 487, 517, 560, 597, 600, 615, 621, 630, 632
Steens, Eugène (1825-1898)—486
Stempkowski—509, 522, 584
Stepney, William Frederick Co-well (1820-1872)—368, 555
Stieber (1818-1882)—52, 422
Stumpf, Paul (c. 1827-1913)—367-68
Svada—502
Swarm—see *Dentraygues, Emile*

T

- Taylor*—373
Tedeschy, J. M.—423
Terzaghi, B. (1845)—300, 324-25, 330-31, 342
Testini, Vincenzo (pseud. *Paolo*)—622
Thiele—569
Thiers (1797-1877)—52, 87, 103, 108, 118, 158, 616
Tibaldi, Paolo (1825-1901)—505
Tilton, Elizabeth—619
Tilton, Theodor—618-19
Tinayre—471
Tolain, Henri Louis (1828-1897)—194, 324, 386
Tomanovskaya, Elizaveta Luki-nichna (pseudonym *Dmitrieva*) (1851-c. 1910)—447
Tomás (1850-1903)—409-10
Townend, Th. S.—534
Trochu (1815-1896)—78, 150, 162
Truelove (1809-1899)—503, 551

Tugin, E.—589
Turski (1847-1926)—442

U

Uhr, Ignatz—398
Urquart, David (1805-1877)—551
Utin, Boris Isaakovich (1832-1872)—441
Utin, Evgeny Isaakovich (1843-1894)—441
Utin, Nikolai Isaakovich (1845-1883)—334-35, 365, 440-48, 459, 464, 471-72, 485, 500-01, 504, 579-86, 597, 606, 631
Utina, Natalia Iyeronimovna (née Corcini)—441

V

Vacquerie—561
Vaillant, Edouard (1840-1915)—39, 61, 64, 81, 90-92, 125-26, 129, 137, 144, 146, 150, 156, 160, 167, 175, 177-89, 201, 206, 220-21, 232, 234, 248, 251, 254, 262-63, 270-71, 309, 315, 335, 351-52, 401, 418, 447, 449, 466, 494-97, 504, 507, 510-11, 517, 520, 527, 549, 558-61, 585, 588, 594, 616
Van Alphen—635
Van-Heddeghem (Walter)—55, 149, 221, 225, 236, 248, 268, 275, 312, 317, 560-61, 588, 616, 621, 630
Van Suetendael—348-51, 388-89, 488-89
Varlin, Louis Eugène (1839-1871)—269, 375, 498
Verrycken, Laurent (1835-1892)—385, 468, 486
Vésinier (1826-1902)—194, 360, 386, 498
Vespillier—46, 311
Visscher—522
Vichard—55, 130, 149, 221, 225, 236, 248, 268, 312, 512, 514-515, 578, 616, 621, 630
Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro) (70-19 B. C.)—579

Vogeláar—468
Vogel von Falckenstein (1797-1885)—50
Vogt, August (c. 1830-c. 1883)—335, 545
Voltaire, Francois Marie Arouet de (1694-1778)—228, 269

W

Walter—see *Van-Heddeghem*
Ward, Osborn (1831-1902)—98, 112, 176, 272, 291, 315, 553
Washington, George (1732-1799)—195
Wegmann, Adolph (born c. 1852)—541-43
Weiler, Adam—492
Werth—355
Wertheim, Gustav—367
West, William—43-46, 48, 75-77, 87, 108, 121, 125, 135, 146, 148, 149, 160, 161, 174, 224, 266-67, 290, 296, 309-12, 381, 408-09, 419, 421, 512-38, 546, 564, 568, 577, 618-19
Westphalen, Ferdinand Otto Wilhelm Henning von (1799-1876)—150
Wigand, Hugo (1822-1873)—356, 466
William I (1797-1888)—king of Prussia (1861-88), German emperor (1871-88)—50
Willigen, P. van der—547-48
Wilmart, Raymond (pseudonym Wilmot)—61, 81, 174-76, 221, 248, 261, 310, 396-97, 487, 538, 550, 559-62, 616
Wilmot—see *Wilmart, Raymond*
Wingfield, Lewis Strange (1842-1891)—493-94
Wolfers—see *De Wolfers*
Woodhull, Victoria (1838-1927)—43, 45, 75-76, 87, 122, 146, 150, 201, 266-67, 311, 381, 416-17, 618
Wróblewski, Walery (1836-1908)—72, 111, 150, 222, 238, 248, 273, 289, 294, 297, 302, 319, 566, 616, 631-32, 638

Würtz, K.—502

Wuttke, Johann Karl Heinrich
(1818-1876)—338, 347, 574

Y

York, Theodor (1830-1875)—411

Z

Zhokhov, Alexander Fyodorovich
(1840-1872)—441

Zhukovsky (Joukowski), Nikolai
Ivanovich (1833-1895)—41, 125,
146, 148, 160, 161, 224, 238-39,
265, 273-74, 309-10, 317, 511,
522, 531, 597

INDEX OF LITERARY AND MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

Allah—Supreme Being of the
Mohammedans.—205

Cinderella—a fairy-tale heroine,
image of an ill-treated, hard-
working girl.—191

Don Quixote—title character in
Cervantes' novel.—51, 423

Hans Breitmann—main character
in Ch. Lipand's humoristic
Ballads by Hans Breit-
mann, who spoke a mixture
of English and German.—
635

Job—an Old Testament patriarch
figure; image of a man who
suffers with patience and hu-

mility, for which he is reward-
ed by God.—426

Mary (Bib.)—mother of Jesus.—
191

Mohammed—semi legendary found-
er of the Moslem religion.—
205

Nemesis (Gr. Relig.)—Goddess of
retributive justice.—261

Rinaldo Rinaldini—robber, title
character in a novel by the
German writer Christian
August Vulpius.—195

Stiggins—personification of hy-
pocrisy in Charles Dickens'
Pickwick Papers.—45

INDEX OF PERIODICALS

Algemeen Handelsblad (*General Trade Newspaper*)—newspaper founded in Amsterdam in 1831 under the title *Nieuwe Amsterdamsche Courant*.—635, 642

Die Arbeiter-Union (*Workers' Union*)—German newspaper published in New York; from June to October 1868 it appeared weekly as the organ of the National Workers' Union, and from May 1869 daily as the organ of the National Workers' Association of the USA. It carried documents of the International, material on the workers' movement in Europe and the USA, and extracts from the first volume of Marx's *Capital*.—431-32

The Bee-Hive Newspaper—English trade union weekly published in London from 1861 to 1876 under the following titles: *The Bee-Hive*, *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, *The Penny Bee-Hive*; it was strongly influenced by the bourgeois radicals and reformists. In November 1864 it was proclaimed the organ of the International. It carried official documents of the International Working Men's Association and reports on the meetings of the General

Council. Marx protested against its distortion and abridgment of the documents of the International. From 1869 it virtually became a bourgeois newspaper. In April 1870, on Marx's proposal, the General Council broke off all ties with it.—530

Braunschweiger Volksfreund (*Brunswick People's Friend*)—German workers' newspaper, published in Brunswick from 1871 to 1878.—411, 434

Bulletin de la Fédération jurassienne de l'Association internationale des travailleurs—newspaper of the Swiss anarchists, published in French and edited by James Guillaume; it appeared from 1872 to 1878, at first as a fortnightly and from July 1873 as a weekly.—124-25, 128-29, 132-33, 137, 144, 244, 280, 316, 365-66, 375, 378, 406, 442-43, 447, 479, 555-56, 560, 563, 572-73, 576-77, 600, 631

La Commune (*Obshchina*)—the title of the first issue of a newspaper edited by Sergei Nechayev and V. Serebrennikov which appeared in London in September 1870; the second issue, in 1871, was destroyed

- by the publishers themselves.—581
- El Condenado (The Outcast)*—Spanish anarchist weekly published by Tomás Morago in Madrid from 1872 to 1874.—391, 553-54
- Le Corsaire*—French republican bourgeois daily published in Paris from 1871.—456, 528-29
- Dagblad van Zuidholland en's Gravenhage (Daily Newspaper of Southern Holland and The Hague) (The Hague)*—38, 54, 63, 64, 90-91, 104, 254, 392, 452, 639
- The Daily News*—English liberal newspaper of the industrial bourgeoisie published in London from 1846 to 1930.—504, 533, 551
- Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*—German newspaper published in Leipzig from 1843 to 1879; until the summer of 1848 it was conservative, later on liberal.—103-04, 119, 574
- Deutsche Zeitung*—Austrian anti-Semitic daily founded in Vienna in 1871.—171
- L'Écho du Parlement (Belgium)*—386
- L'Égalité*—Swiss weekly of the Romance Federation of the International published in French in Geneva from December 1868 to December 1872. In November 1869-January 1870, Bakunin, Perron, Robin and other members of its editorial board tried to use it for attacks on the International's General Council. In January 1870 the Romance Federal Council succeeded in changing its editorial board and expelling the Bakuninists from it, after which the newspaper supported the line of the General Council.—143, 324, 283, 334, 352, 365, 373, 380, 418, 584-85
- Elberfelder Zeitung*—German daily published in Elberfeld from 1834 to 1904. In the 1860s it was the organ of the liberal bourgeoisie.—355
- La Emancipación*—Spanish workers' weekly, organ of the Madrid Section of the International; published in Madrid from 1871 to 1873; from September 1871 to April 1872 it was the organ of the Spanish Federal Council opposed to anarchist influence in Spain. In 1872-73 it carried the *Manifiesto of the Communist Party*, some sections from *The Poverty of Philosophy* and from the first volume of *Capital*, and a series of articles by Engels.—73, 285, 286, 294, 326, 352, 360, 391, 405, 415, 418, 424-25, 435-36, 481, 508, 535-36, 550, 553, 563, 577, 587, 597, 638
- L'Étoile belge (Belgian Star)*—newspaper published in Brussels from 1850 onwards.—549
- La Favilla (The Spark)*—Italian newspaper published in Mantua from 1866 to 1894; in 1871-72 it appeared daily; at first it voiced bourgeois-democratic views, and in the first half of the 1870 it was influenced by the anarchists.—300
- La Federación*—Spanish workers' weekly, organ of the Barcelona Federation, published in Barcelona from 1869 to 1873; it was influenced by the Bakuninists.—284, 373, 374, 390, 406, 508, 554
- Ficcanaso (Slyboots)*—Italian republican satirical daily, organ of the Left-wing Mazzinists, published in Turin from 1868 to 1872.—283
- Le Figaro*—French reactionary newspaper published in Paris from 1854 onwards; it had con-

- nections with the government of the Second Empire.—528
- Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt*—German petty-bourgeois and democratic daily published in Frankfurt am Main from 1856 (under this title from 1866) to 1943.—450
- Gazzetta di Torino*.—445
- Gazzettino Rosa*—Italian daily published in Milan from 1867 to 1873; in 1871-72 it supported the Paris Commune, and published the documents of the International Working Men's Association; from 1872 it was influenced by the Bakuninists.—324
- Die Gegenwart*—journal published in Berlin from 1872 to 1931.—355
- Golden Age*—newspaper published in New York from 1871 to 1875.—618
- Hermann. Deutsches Wochenblatt aus London*—weekly newspaper, organ of the German petty-bourgeois democrats, published in German in London from 1859 onwards.—541
- Het vrije Volk* (Free People)—Bakunist newspaper published in Antwerp from August 1872 onwards.—591
- L'Indépendance belge*—liberal political and literary daily published in Brussels from 1831 to 1940.—120, 122, 426, 548
- L'Internationale*—Belgian weekly, organ of the Belgian sections of the International, published in Brussels with close participation of De Paepe from 1869 to 1873. In 1873 it took an anarchist stand.—124, 388, 455, 482, 506, 548-49, 553, 576-77
- The International Herald*—English weekly published in London from March 1872 to October 1873; from May 1872 to May 1873 it was the official organ of the British Federal Council of the International; it published reports on the General Council's and the British Council's meetings, documents of the International Working Men's Association and articles by Marx and Engels. At the end of 1872 and beginning of 1873 the newspaper played a big part in the struggle against the reformists, who had split off from the British Federal Council. From June 1873, following the departure of its publisher and editor William Riley from the labour movement, Marx and Engels stopped contributing to it and the materials of the British Federation of the International ceased to be published in it.—174-76, 365, 402, 404, 530, 542, 587
- Jornal de Comercio* (Lisbon).—405
- Journal de Genève national, politique et littéraire*—conservative newspaper published since 1826.—445, 606
- Kasseler Tageblatt*—Kassel daily paper.—121, 123-24
- Kolokol* (The Bell)—Russian revolutionary-democratic newspaper published in Russian from 1857 till 1867 by Alexander Herzen and Nikolai Ogarev in the Free Russian Press Publishing house founded by Herzen, and in French (*La Cloche*) in 1868 and 1869 with supplements in Russian; up to 1865 it was published in London, later in Geneva.—141
- Kölnische Zeitung*—German daily published in Cologne from 1802 onwards; organ of the big Rhenish bourgeoisie and the national-liberal party; in the

- 1870s it was Bismarck's mouth-piece.—119, 339
- Landbote*—Rural Messenger.—595
- Leipziger Tageblatt und Anzeiger*—German daily published from 1807 onwards; in the 1870s and 1880s it was the organ of the big bourgeoisie.—466
- Leipziger Zeitung*—see *Leipziger Tageblatt und Anzeiger*.
- La Liberté*—Belgian democratic newspaper published in Brussels from 1865 to 1873; in 1872 and 1873 it was a weekly; in 1867 it became one of the organs of the International Working Men's Association in Belgium.—35, 242, 244, 251, 260, 391, 455, 473, 482, 541, 543, 548, 563, 581, 588
- The Manchester Guardian*—English bourgeois newspaper founded in 1821 as the Free Traders' organ; in the mid-nineteenth century it became the liberal party's organ.—534, 542
- Il Martello (The Hammer)*—Italian newspaper of the Milan Section of the International, published in February and March 1872; influenced by Cuno, who was one of its editors, it published a number of articles against the Bakuninists.—610
- Le Mirabeau*—Belgian weekly published in Verviers from 1868 to 1874; organ of the Belgian sections of the International.—553
- The Morning Advertiser*—English radical bourgeois daily published in London from 1794 to 1934.—518
- Neue Freie Presse*—Austrian liberal newspaper published in Vienna from 1864 to 1939.—139, 145, 156, 159, 567
- Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Organ der Demokratie*—militant daily organ of the revolutionary proletarian democrats during the 1848-49 revolution in Germany; it was published in Cologne from June 1, 1848, to May 19, 1849; its editorial board included Marx (editor-in-chief) and Engels (editor).—543
- Neuer Social-Demokrat*—German newspaper published in Berlin thrice a week from 1871 to 1876, organ of the Lassallean General Association of German Workers; its trend fully reflected the Lassalleans' policy of adaptation to the Bismarck regime and flirtation with the ruling classes of Germany, the opportunism and nationalism of the Lassallean leaders. From its sectarian positions the newspaper systematically attacked the Marxist leadership of the International and the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party; it supported the Bakuninists and representatives of other anti-proletarian tendencies hostile towards the General Council.—118-19, 399, 485
- The New York Herald*—American daily, organ of the Republican Party, published in New York from 1835 to 1924.—381, 419-20
- The New York World*—American daily, organ of the Democratic Party, published in New York from 1860 to 1931.—421, 564
- Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*—German conservative daily published in Berlin from 1861 to 1918; in the 1860s-1880s it was the Bismarck government's official organ.—52, 118-19
- Nottinghamshire Guardian*—English newspaper published from 1846 onwards.—394
- O Pensamento Social (Social Thought)*—Portuguese socialist

- weekly, organ of sections of the International, appearing in Lisbon from February 1872 to April 1873; it published the International's documents and articles by Marx and Engels.—403-04, 424, 476
- La Plebe (The People)*—Italian newspaper published in Lodi from 1868 to 1875 and in Milan from 1875 to 1883; its editor was E. Bignami; it voiced bourgeois-democratic views till the early 1870s, when it became a socialist newspaper; in 1872 and 1873 it was an organ of sections of the International and supported the General Council against the anarchists; it published documents of the International and articles by Engels.—300, 302, 586
- Publications of the "People's Judgment" Society (Izdaniya Obshchestva "Narodnoi Raspravi")*, Moscow, St. Petersburg—actually both issues were published in Geneva (No. 1, summer of 1869, and No. 2, winter of 1870); they were edited by Mikhail Bakunin and Sergei Nechayev. The newspaper opposed *The People's Cause* (Narodnoye Dyelo), which supported the line of the General Council of the First International.—579-80
- Le Radical*—French bourgeois republican newspaper published in Paris in 1871 and 1872.—356
- Le Rappel*—French Left republican daily founded by Victor Hugo and A. Rauchefort in 1869 and appearing till 1928; it sharply criticised the Second Empire and supported the Paris Commune.—451, 591
- La Révolution Sociale*—weekly published in French in Geneva from October 1871 to January 1872; in November 1871 it became the official organ of the anarchist Jura Federation.—325, 328
- Semaphore*.—361
- Le Socialiste*—weekly, organ of the French sections of the International, published in French in New York from October 1871 to May 1873; it supported the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements in the North American Federation of the International; after the Hague Congress it broke with the International.—565, 566
- Socialisten*—Danish workers' newspaper published in Copenhagen from July 1871 to May 1874; from April 1872 onwards it appeared daily.—126, 501
- Le Soir*—French bourgeois republican daily published in Paris from 1867 onwards.—528
- Standaard (The Hague)*.—38
- The Standard*—English conservative daily founded in London in 1827.—36, 38, 40, 42, 59, 67
- Die Tagwacht*—Swiss Social-Democratic newspaper published in German in Zurich from 1869 to 1880; from 1869 to 1873 it was the organ of the International's German sections in Switzerland and subsequently of the Swiss Workers' Union and of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland.—190, 193, 195, 197, 199-200, 218, 326, 365, 429, 447-48, 581, 595-96
- Le Temps*—French conservative daily, organ of the big bourgeoisie, published in Paris from 1861 to 1943; it stood in opposition to the Second Empire and was against the war with Prussia; after the fall of the Empire it supported the Government of National Defence.—392

- The Times*—The biggest English conservative daily published in London from 1785 onwards.—68, 88, 93, 102, 493, 551
- De Toekomst* (The Future)—Dutch workers' newspaper which appeared in The Hague in 1870 and 1871 thrice weekly; it carried documents and other materials of the International.—451
- Union* (New York).—618
- Der Volksstaat*—central organ of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Eisenachers) published in Leipzig from October 2, 1869, to September 29, 1876 (twice weekly and from July 1873 thrice weekly). It expressed the views of the revolutionary trend in the German workers' movement and was constantly persecuted by the government and the police. Its editorial board was continually changing due to arrests of its editors; its general leadership was effected by Wilhelm Liebknecht; it was considerably influenced by August Bebel, who was at the head of the *Volksstaat's* publishing house. It regularly carried articles by Marx and Engels; attaching great importance to this publication Marx and Engels closely followed its work, criticising its errors and rectifying its line; as a result it was one of the best workers' newspapers in the 1870s.—34-35, 103, 105-07, 116, 119-24, 133-34, 138, 195, 217, 222, 322, 323, 328, 360, 383, 387, 412, 432, 450, 458, 485, 520, 530, 541, 543, 555, 557, 569, 572, 575, 577, 585, 592, 594, 604
- Volkswille*—Austrian workers' newspaper published in Vienna from January 1870 to June 1874.—160, 163, 169, 173, 380
- Volks-Zeitung*—German daily, organ of the oppositional liberal bourgeoisie, published in Berlin from 1853 onwards.—119
- Der Vorbote*—monthly organ of the International's German sections in Switzerland published in German in Geneva from 1866 to 1871; its responsible editor was Johann Philipp Becker. On the whole the journal pursued the policy of Marx and the General Council and regularly carried documents of the International and information on the work of its sections in various countries.—365, 432
- Vryheid or Vrijheid (Freedom)* (The Hague).—451-52, 591
- De Werker*—Dutch newspaper published in Flemish in Antwerp from 1868 onwards; between 1868 and 1871 weekly organ of the Flemish Section of the International carrying its documents; subsequently daily organ of the Flemish and then of the Belgian Socialist Workers' Party (till 1914).—545
- De Werkman*—Dutch workers' weekly published in Amsterdam from 1868 to 1874; in 1869 it became the organ of the International's Amsterdam Section.—452, 594
- Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly*—American newspaper published by the bourgeois feminists V. Woodhull and T. Claflin in New York from 1870 to 1876.—408, 618
- World*—see *The New York World*.

INDEX OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES AND ADDRESSES

A

Ala—623

Alcala de Henares—483

Alemtejo—404, 405

Alsace—50

America—see *United States of America*

Amsterdam—33, 57, 66, 101, 148, 159, 162, 169, 243, 247, 248, 279, 294, 316, 319, 391, 452, 519, 522, 525, 529, 537, 547, 591, 618, 624, 634

— *Dalrust Hall*—101, 634, 635, 642

— *Hoogesluis*—634

— *Warmoesstraat*—634

Amur, R.—638

Antwerp—38, 48, 79, 246, 261, 385, 468, 482, 544, 578, 591

Appenzel—595

Atlantic Ocean—61, 102, 183, 234

Australia—53, 72, 105, 108, 146, 152, 160, 165, 222, 247, 288, 295, 307, 312, 571, 671

Austria—51-52, 96, 105, 108, 122, 140-41, 146, 152, 154, 158, 164, 166, 168, 170, 172, 183, 209, 247, 252, 288, 295, 307, 609, 617, 638

B

Baden—616

Baltimore—382

Barcelona—62, 123, 271, 314, 406, 480, 536, 563, 574, 610, 629

Basle—53, 97, 142, 228, 246, 305, 329, 332, 407, 429, 438, 556, 569

— *Münzgasse*—570

Bavaria, land—617

Bayonne—559

Belgium—72, 82, 105, 108, 146, 152, 158, 160, 164-65, 168, 171, 174, 209, 227-28, 242, 246-48, 252, 270, 288, 295, 307, 308, 329, 340, 348-51, 358, 399, 425, 435, 452, 469, 488, 489, 516, 531, 538, 591, 610, 615, 631

Berlin—34-35, 53, 85, 116-17, 140, 146, 160, 248, 329, 336, 355, 376, 427, 460, 466, 484, 531, 532, 555, 617, 637

Berne—446, 485, 500

Béziers—238, 274

Biel—207

Bielefeld—503

Billeret—207

Bohemia—72, 146, 160, 247, 617

Bologna—327, 342

Bonn—632

Bordeaux—238, 274, 375, 396, 487, 559-62

Borinage—468, 548

Boston—625

Bötzingen—207

Bremen—568

- Breslau* (Wrocław)—247, 355,
 466, 484, 617
Brest—49, 151, 163
Brooklyn—382, 618, 619, 625,
 626
Brunswick—50, 146, 160, 246,
 411, 413, 421, 434, 503, 616
Brussels—43, 57, 60, 62, 77, 79,
 89, 142, 149, 162, 175, 222, 242,
 244, 246, 271, 277, 291, 314,
 336, 344, 345, 349-51, 361,
 385, 388, 389, 398, 417, 425-27,
 438, 450, 455, 467, 469, 472,
 482, 486-89, 498, 500, 509, 521,
 523, 531, 532, 538, 548, 550,
 575, 576, 578
 — *L'Kent*—351, 389, 576
 — *la Pepiniere*—387
Buenos Aires—53, 152, 165, 312,
 559
- C
- Caen*—79
Calais—487
Carouge—125, 220, 246, 498
Castille—266
Catalonia—153, 165, 435, 456
Celle—247, 484, 617
Charleroi—248, 615
Chaux-de-Fonds—see *La Chaux-de-Fonds*
Chemnitz (Karl-Marx-Stadt)—
 146, 160, 355, 398, 484
Chicago—41, 53, 72, 75, 79, 152,
 164, 176, 220, 246, 382, 419,
 421, 546, 616
China—71
Cologne—355, 357, 411, 458
Copenhagen—126, 220, 248, 450,
 457, 501, 616, 617
 — *Gl. Kongevej*—502
 — *Ravnsberggade*—501
Corgémont—207
Cork—79
Cortebert—207
Courtelary—207
Crimmitschau—355, 484
- D
- Darmstadt*—355, 449
 — *Waldstrasse*—449
- Denmark*—53, 72, 80, 105, 108,
 126, 146, 152, 160, 164, 222,
 227, 246, 248, 288, 295, 307,
 312, 539, 616, 617
Dieppe—509
Dresden—140, 246, 355, 484, 616
Dublin—79, 248, 533, 617
Dundee—557
 — *Broughty Ferry*—557
Düsseldorf—239, 246, 340, 484,
 610, 617, 626
- E
- Edinburgh*—558
Eisenach—140, 412
Elton (USA, Louisiana)—609, 613
Emilia—416-17
England—see *Great Britain*
Eszlingen—146, 160, 248, 484,
 617
Europe—35, 49-53, 60, 69, 72,
 75, 88, 89, 101, 152, 155, 164,
 166, 171, 172, 183, 194, 226,
 235, 238, 271, 273, 303, 312,
 317, 382, 427, 433, 460, 465,
 564, 576, 594, 614, 624, 627,
 632, 637
- F
- Ferrara*—332, 342, 455, 587
Florence—383
France—49-51, 56, 58, 60, 72,
 73, 80, 84, 96, 105, 108, 111,
 126, 137, 141, 144, 146, 151,
 152, 154, 158, 160, 163, 164,
 166, 183, 185-87, 194, 202, 209,
 220, 222, 227, 237-39, 245, 248,
 252, 269, 273, 274, 288, 295,
 301, 302, 304, 307, 329, 332,
 334, 453, 493-97, 506, 510, 539,
 549, 566, 582, 585, 587, 588,
 610, 622, 627, 628, 632
Frankfurt-am-Main—367, 484,
 578
 — *Bibergasse*—367
- G
- Geneva*—41, 73, 80, 84, 87, 101,
 146, 148, 149, 153, 160-62, 165,
 175, 196, 207, 214, 222, 246,

- 265, 292, 325, 328, 331, 333,
339-42, 355, 362-66, 397, 415,
428, 429, 437, 438, 440, 442,
445, 446, 448, 458, 460, 464,
471, 472, 492, 549, 569, 579,
582, 585, 595-97, 616, 640
— *Temple Unique*—335, 584-
86
- Germany*—48-50, 56, 61, 72,
79-80, 84, 92-93, 96, 98, 105,
108, 118, 124, 129, 133-34, 137,
144-45, 151-52, 158, 160, 164,
168, 171, 183, 209, 221-22, 227,
245, 251-52, 273, 295, 304,
307, 323, 326, 328, 329, 332-35,
357-60, 363-66, 399, 408, 410,
412, 418, 454, 459, 484, 495,
538, 539, 541, 543, 557, 566,
585, 603, 610, 611, 616, 627
- Gestemünde*—434
- Ghent*—248, 261, 308, 385, 531
- Giessen*—98
- Girgenti (Agrigento)*—300, 327
- Glarus*—595
- Gosport*—570
- Grandval*—207
- Great Britain*—34, 36, 52, 68, 78-
79, 84, 105-06, 129, 141, 143,
146, 152, 160, 164, 183, 209,
256, 265, 288, 295, 304, 307,
329, 332, 360, 395, 486, 542,
575, 605, 616, 627, 631, 637
- Grenchen*—207
- Hague, The*—33, 36, 37, 41, 48,
53, 59, 64, 68, 70, 72-75, 77-78,
82, 88, 91, 94, 101, 103-05, 108,
116, 118, 124-26, 128, 130,
133, 139-40, 145, 147-48, 155-
56, 160, 170, 177, 181, 188,
190, 219, 222, 226-27, 234, 235,
239-41, 243, 246, 249, 251, 255,
256, 263, 285, 286, 287, 288,
290, 295, 298, 299, 300, 301-03,
305, 307, 352, 362, 363, 366-68,
377-78, 380-84, 387, 395, 399,
407, 408, 409, 411, 413, 415,
417-20, 422, 426, 429-31, 434,
436-38, 444, 445, 448, 450, 451,
453, 454, 456-59, 465, 466, 469-
73, 476-83, 486-89, 491-94, 496,
498, 499, 500, 503-14, 516,
518, 519, 522-24, 526, 528-31,,
533-35, 539, 543, 546-48, 556.,
558, 563, 568, 569, 576, 577.,
587, 588, 592, 595, 602-04, 610.,
611, 614, 615, 617, 618, 622.,
624, 626, 629, 635, 636, 639
- *Belle-vue, hotel*—465
— *Concordia Hall*—68, 69,
145, 148, 219, 451, 453, 483,
487, 493, 510, 514, 524, 626
— *Fagelstraat*—477
— *Jacob-Catsstraat*—454, 483,
493, 503
— *Lange Lombard Straat*—38,
68-70, 145, 148, 219, 453, 483,
493, 510, 514, 524, 626
— *du Lion d'or, hotel*—514
— *National, café*—77, 86, 89-90
— *Pico, hotel*—77, 86, 89-90,
145, 513, 532
— *Rijnspoor, st.*—453
— *Schuyvers Jaal*—86
— *Spuit*—145
— *Tuinenberg*—145
— *deux Villes, hotel*—500
- Hamburg*—50, 140, 333, 411, 412,
450, 484
- Hanover*—50, 146, 160, 247, 288,
354, 366, 383, 395, 408, 413,
421, 434, 483, 617
- Heidelberg*—146, 160, 410, 460,
589
— *Plöschstrasse*—449
- Herford*—504
- Hoboken*—201, 248, 352, 378,
380, 381, 396, 420, 430, 537,
545, 550, 564, 575, 586, 587,
590, 593, 605, 606, 617, 625,
626
— *Gastle Garden*—625
— *Garden Street*—380, 381, 430
- Holland*—see *Netherlands*
- Hubertusburg*—347, 348, 356, 387,
478, 485, 526, 527, 574, 602
- Hungary*—51, 72, 105, 108, 222,
247, 288, 295, 307, 397, 523,
617, 628
- I
- Imola*—478
- India*—513

Innsbruck—610
Interlaken—471, 472, 485
 — *Bönningen, Chalet Lac*—471
Ireland—53, 72, 79, 105, 108,
 288, 295, 307, 312, 395
Italy—53, 73, 80, 110, 113, 114,
 141, 146, 160, 195, 209, 256,
 290, 301, 304, 328, 334, 339,
 342, 358, 365, 416, 455, 478,
 481, 538, 541, 549, 550, 586,
 597, 609, 618, 620-23, 627,
 628, 631

J

Jemappes—426
Joliet—421
Jura—73, 85, 102, 114, 158, 168,
 171, 207-09, 244, 279, 286,
 290, 342, 343, 507, 603

K

Kievskaya gubernia—532
Königsberg (Kaliningrad)—146,
 160, 484

L

La-Chaux-de-Fonds—74-75, 125,
 126, 207, 208, 220, 224, 232,
 248, 262, 309, 335, 510, 616
La-Mancha—423
La Plata—560
Lausanne—207, 596
Leipzig—52, 121, 129, 140, 146,
 161, 247, 323, 326, 331, 332,
 338, 355, 356, 358, 376, 413,
 414, 422, 427, 449, 454, 466,
 484, 494-97, 526, 530, 532, 534,
 538, 540, 543, 551, 554, 568,
 571, 572, 574, 591, 592, 594,
 610, 617
 — *Hohe Strasse*—422
Leiria—403
Le Locle—207, 335
Ltège—82, 339, 357, 398, 399,
 414, 548, 610
 — *Pelican*—400
Lille—558
Lisbon—222, 227, 287, 391, 402,
 423, 425, 435, 473, 481

Liverpool—343, 376, 394, 421,
 435, 546, 625
 — *Temperance Hotel, Chris-
 tian, St. Islington*—546
Locarno—418, 460, 464
Locle—See *Le Locle*
Lodi—587
London—37-40, 57-67, 72, 77, 80,
 84, 85, 88, 96, 99, 102, 103,
 111, 112, 121, 125, 130, 136,
 139-43, 149, 150, 154, 157, 162,
 167, 175, 183, 188, 202, 206,
 220, 222-23, 229, 230, 233, 234,
 247-49, 271, 291, 292, 295, 297,
 301-03, 307, 314, 323, 324, 326,
 327, 329-34, 336-43, 347, 348,
 351-59, 361-63, 366-68, 370-73,
 376-78, 380-85, 387-89, 391,
 393, 395, 398, 401, 402, 405,
 407-12, 414, 415, 418, 420-25,
 427, 430, 431, 433-35, 437, 439,
 440, 448-51, 454, 457-59, 465-
 73, 477, 478, 480, 482, 483,
 486-88, 490-94, 497-501, 503-
 05, 509, 510, 512, 514, 516,
 518, 519, 522, 524, 528-35, 537,
 540-48, 550, 551, 554, 556-60,
 562, 564, 568, 570, 571, 574,
 576, 578, 579, 581, 584, 586,
 589, 591, 593, 594, 596, 598,
 602, 605, 606, 612, 616, 617,
 622, 624, 637, 638
 — *Bath Cottage, Eton Place,
 Bath Road, Cranford, Houn-
 slow*—480
 — *Belle-vue Road, Wandsworth
 Common*—547
 — *Bethnal Green*—72, 248, 617
 — *Bishops Gate Street*—504
 — *Bolsover Street, Portland
 Road*—467
 — *British Museum*—624
 — *Charles Street, Clerkenwell*—
 340, 401
 — *Chestford Street*—549
 — *Charlotte Street, Bedford
 Square*—595
 — *Charlotte Street, Fitzroy*—
 457
 — *Fitzroy Street, Fitzroy Square*
 —492

- *Gremford Street, Portman Square*—487
 — *High Holborn*—324, 497, 498
 — *Huckney Road*—72, 247, 617
 — *Islip Street, Kentish Town*—498
 — *John Street, Clerkenwell*—556
 — *Juverness*—438
 — *Leighton Grove, Kentish Town*—351, 497
 — *Malden Road, Kentish Town*—351
 — *Mark Lane*—556
 — *Marylebone*—499
 — *Modena Villas, Maitland Park, Haverstock-hill*—53, 340, 401, 465, 533, 544
 — *Northumberland Street, Strand, Western Central*—534
 — *Park Street, Gloucester Gate, Regent's Park*—36
 — *Queens Road, Gosport Hants*—568
 — *Rathbone Place, Oxford Street*—354, 407
 — *Regent's Park Road, Primrose Hill*—333, 343, 355-57, 449, 450, 454, 470, 482, 484, 486, 530, 532, 540, 550, 554, 568, 571, 574, 576, 586, 593, 610
 — *St. Martin's hall, Long-acre*—101
 — *St. Paul's Cathedral*—624
 — *South Audley Street*—368
 — *Southboro Terrace, Carlton Grove, Packham*—343, 467, 490, 499, 532
 — *Sunny Bank, Hensy Lane*—551
 — *Tower*—624
Longemalle—416
Lorraine, province—50
Lötzen—50
Louisiana—609, 613
Lucerne—246, 595
Lugano—555, 622
Lyons—49, 151, 163, 582, 585, 622
- M
- Madrid*—35, 153, 165, 175, 227, 323, 327, 352, 361, 373, 374, 376, 379, 389, 405, 435, 480, 483, 508, 535, 552, 554, 559, 562, 588, 638
 — *San Pedro*—535
Magdeburg—484
Manchester—303, 393, 394, 396, 439, 528, 530, 541, 543, 550, 567
 — *Mashell Street*—543
 — *Moreton Street, Strangeways*—541, 543
 — *Mount Street, Strangeways*—394
 — *Rosamond Street*—397
 — *Sanderson Street, Miles Platting*—439, 528
Mantua—300
Marseilles—49, 148, 151, 161, 163, 310
Marylebone—see *London*
Mayence (Mainz)—64, 247, 267, 355, 367, 411, 526, 534, 569, 617
Mecklenburg—50
Milan—54, 55, 80, 155, 327, 332, 342, 416, 455, 465, 587, 609-11, 629, 630
 — *Gnocchi, café*—623
Montreux—551
Morteau—589
Moscow—582, 613
Moutier—207
Munich—140, 144, 146, 160, 193, 248, 442, 484, 610, 617
Münster—207
- N
- Naples*—339, 342, 416
Netherlands—34, 53, 63, 69-72, 105, 108, 124, 128, 148, 152, 158, 164, 168, 171, 204, 209, 244, 246-49, 255, 261, 279, 288, 295, 302, 307, 312, 342, 352, 354, 362, 367, 384, 392, 407, 422, 430, 435, 465, 477, 503, 513, 591, 626, 636, 639, 641

- Neuchâtel*—81, 108, 121, 129, 207, 247, 248, 305, 446, 454, 455, 478, 481, 507
Neumünster—366, 430, 595
Newcastle-upon-Tyne—85, 230
Newfoundland, isl.—625
New York—35, 40, 42, 45, 48, 60-63, 65, 66, 74, 75, 77, 80, 88-90, 101, 106, 107, 111, 112, 121, 122, 130, 146, 149, 154, 162, 166, 169, 176, 184, 185, 202, 229, 234, 235, 246-48, 263, 271, 289-91, 297, 298, 302, 307, 310, 314, 315, 352, 368, 378, 382, 389, 408, 418, 420, 430, 433, 511, 522, 524, 527, 529, 533, 537, 552, 557, 568, 571, 575, 577, 584, 585, 587, 590, 591, 601, 615, 617, 618, 620, 622, 625, 629, 632, 635, 637
 — *Apollo Hall*—369
 — *Broad Street*—409
 — *Broom Street Hotel*—625
 — *Forsyth Street*—369
 — *Grand Street*—368
 — *Prince Street*—310, 380
 — *South Fifth Avenue*—418
 — *Spring Street*—76, 369, 420
 — *Ward Hotel*—89, 369, 372, 381
New Jersey—430
New Zealand—53, 152, 165, 312
Norderney—422, 434
Normandy—79, 81
Nottingham—393, 394
Nürnberg—355
- O
- Oldenburg*—50
Oxford—427
 — *James Street*—427
 — *Rose Villas*—427
- P
- Palma*—374
Paris—49, 52, 77, 78, 103, 136, 143, 146, 149, 157, 158, 159-63, 178, 187, 229, 230, 246-49, 373, 389, 395, 427, 436, 456, 492, 493, 495, 500, 509, 528, 556, 561, 585, 586, 588, 615, 616, 636, 637, 641
 — *Bastille*—479
Paterson—201, 248, 598, 601, 617, 626
 — *Market Street*—601
Pest (Pesth)—capital of Hungary, left-bank part of modern Budapest—51, 52, 247, 397, 398, 523
 — *Theresienstadt, Rákos Graben Gasse*—398
Petersburg—see *St. Petersburg*
Philadelphia—380, 382, 419, 566
Pittsburgh—380, 566
Poland—105, 108, 295, 307, 566, 638
Pomerania—50
Porrentruy—207
Porto—403, 476
Portugal—53, 105, 108, 152, 164, 165, 174, 272, 288, 295, 307, 312, 423, 424, 435, 436, 477, 481, 535, 550, 616
Prussia—50, 152, 164, 178, 246-48, 288, 616
- Q
- Quaregnon*—548
Queenstown—529
- R
- Ramsgate*—366
Ravenna—300
Regensburg—484
Reims—487
Renan—207
Rhine, R.—465, 632
Rhine Province—246, 248, 288, 387, 458, 633
Rimini—107, 121, 129, 283, 284, 290, 300, 445, 455, 456, 478, 482
Rio Grande—615
Romagna—417
Rome—300, 427, 482, 605
Rorschach—595

Rotterdam—392, 453, 513
Rouen—49, 151, 163, 246, 615
Russia—52, 132, 144, 337, 353,
 425, 471, 500, 509, 531, 566,
 581, 609, 611, 616, 622, 638

S

Sadowa—55
St. Imier—206, 207, 335, 509,
 554, 588, 601
St. Louis—382, 566
St. Petersburg (Leningrad)—337,
 353, 420, 448, 459, 461, 462,
 464, 532, 579, 582, 596, 598,
 602, 605, 609
 — *Nevisky Prospekt*—462
San-Francisco—248, 378, 382,
 511, 616
Saragossa—176, 265, 344, 345,
 393
Sardinia, isl.—623
Saxony—246, 288, 348, 616
Scheveningen—145, 426, 434, 500,
 611
Schleswig-Holstein, land—50
Scotland—53, 85
Sedan—50, 93, 108, 137
Seixal—403
Setubal—403
Seville—224, 374
Siberia—141, 579, 581, 638
Stegburg—411, 457
Solingen—248, 458, 459, 617
 — *Goldstrasse*—458
Sonceboz—207
Sonvillier—207, 377, 428, 478
Southampton—421
Spain—39, 40, 52, 72-74, 95, 96,
 105, 110, 113, 114, 117, 123,
 141, 146, 149, 152, 160, 162,
 164, 183, 195, 209, 223, 242,
 248, 253, 264-66, 272, 275, 276,
 281, 284, 285, 288, 291, 293,
 294, 304, 307, 323, 334, 342,
 358, 361, 373, 390, 406, 414,
 416, 417, 435, 436, 456, 474,
 477, 480, 511, 535, 536, 541,
 549, 550, 552, 553, 577, 583,
 597, 610, 620, 625, 627, 628,
 631, 638, 639

Stuttgart—140, 146, 155, 166,
 239, 246, 274, 484, 497, 617,
 626
Switzerland—52, 72, 78, 84, 93,
 96, 100, 105, 108, 110, 112,
 114, 128, 141, 143, 145-46, 158,
 160, 168, 171, 175, 176, 201,
 204, 208-10, 229, 235, 244, 246-
 48, 273, 276, 279, 288, 291,
 295, 299, 307, 316, 326, 332,
 334, 335, 337, 341, 362, 363,
 374, 377, 386, 407, 417, 418,
 428, 429, 440, 446, 464, 478,
 479, 522, 541, 549, 550, 557,
 585, 602, 609, 615-17, 622, 631

T

Tarn, dept.—463
Tejo—403
Thun—440, 446
Toulouse—146, 160, 472, 482,
 487
Trieste—610
Tuscany—417
Tübingen—144
Turin—324, 327, 330, 332, 339,
 342, 364, 427, 455, 587

U

United States of America—34, 35,
 39, 43, 46, 53, 72, 74, 76, 80,
 84, 85, 96, 97, 105, 121, 143,
 147, 148, 152, 160, 161, 165,
 174, 183, 186, 220, 222, 223,
 229, 234, 246-48, 252, 256, 263,
 266, 272, 273, 279, 288, 289,
 295, 306, 307, 311, 352, 369-71,
 381, 408, 412, 416, 417, 430,
 431, 455, 456, 480, 507, 524,
 526, 527, 541, 576, 584, 589,
 612-15, 622, 625, 627, 631,
 632, 637, 638
Utrecht—391

V

Valencia—73, 82, 85, 94, 96, 101,
 153, 165, 285, 343, 344, 406,
 409, 563

- Venice*—609
Verona—335, 609, 610, 623
Versailles—189, 254
Verviers—359, 360, 398, 399, 407,
 414, 415, 425, 500
 — *Rue de Pont*—360
Vesdre, R.—245, 246, 385, 615
Vevey—207
Vienna—51, 144, 146, 160, 172,
 312, 627, 637
Victoria (Australia)—247, 617
- W
- Werdau*—484
Wermsdorf—526
- West Indies*—53, 152, 164
Westphalia, land—387
Wilhelmshöhe—50
Württemberg—246, 248, 288, 617
- Y
- Yorkshire*—490
- Z
- Zug*—246
Zurich—207, 222, 247, 362, 365,
 428-30, 437, 438, 440-43, 447,
 459, 471, 498, 500, 509, 522,
 567, 596, 597, 617
 — *Limmat Quai*—439

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 all your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.