

THE
INTERNATIONAL
WORKINGMEN'S
ASSOCIATION

ORIGINS — PARIS
LONDON — GENEVA — LAUSANNE — BRÜSSELS — BERNE — BASEL

NOTES AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

BY

E. E. FRIBOURG
ONE OF THE FOUNDERS

A Working Translation by Shawn P. Wilbur
Last revised April 8, 2025

Originally published in
PARIS, 1871

A CORVUS EDITION

2025

PREFACE.

Since today both governors and governed, philosophers and writers, talkers and curiosity seekers all discourse endlessly on the personnel, aim and acts of the *International*, it seemed to me that it could be useful for one of the founding members of that formidable revolutionary machine to speak and make known precisely:

What that association was in its beginnings;

Under the pressure of what internal and external events it gradually lost its character as a group for study to take that of a soldier in active politics;

Why the founders, so cordially united at the beginning of the work, are at this moment so divided on the course of action to follow;

How, finally, that association, born from a desire for universal pacification, using the weapons of truth and labor alone, is today an instrument of war in the hand of some blood-streaked maniacs.

And since the minister of foreign affairs, in his circular to the diplomatic agents, appeared to confuse, in a single condemnation, all the members of the *International*, and since, *doubtless through ignorance*, he makes the founders of the association jointly liable for some crimes committed in Paris by a handful of wretches, rejected by all the parties and all the social classes.

I must emphasize what is well known, that an honest mind could never conceive the thought of giving birth to a society “of war and hatred” and observe that the history of the *International* divides into two parts: the first period, which I will call Parisian, corresponds to the founding and the first two congresses, at Geneva in 1866, and Lausanne in 1867. During this time the association was *mutualist*, demanding of the collectivity only the guarantee of the execution of contracts that have been freely discussed, and freely consented to. We accept the entire responsibility for that first period.

But following some trials brought by the Empire, the moral direction inevitably escaped the hands of the French workers, passed to Belgium, and in that second period, which we will call Russo-German, the *International* became communist, which is to say authoritarian.

From then on it was easy to foresee the march of events; the invasion of all the world’s nuts into the heart of the *International*, the possibility of an association of all the shameful ambitions and, finally, the ephemeral advent of Babouvism. It is against every idea of complicity with that sect,

which we have always combated, that my friends and I protest, in our role as founding members of the International. While remaining deeply devoted to the emancipation of the proletariat, we have the right to cry out, recalling a phrase from Proudhon: We are innocent of all these vulgar Luperkalias!

In the course of this work, many names will come under my pen; often I will be forced to make known by some individual deeds, some political personage, either of Paris or of Versailles, but even on that terrain, whatever my intimate feelings might be, the truth will be safeguarded from the reach of passion.

Pursuing no individual aim, without systematic hatred, without bias for exoneration as well, I might commit some inaccuracy in the details; I challenge my bitterest enemies in advance to find a lie or a calumny. Striving to be fair, even to my friends, I will recount, but I will not discuss.

I will add that I have taken the greatest care to avoid reading all the so-called histories, revelations or mysteries of the *International* that abound at the moment. Wishing to remain true, I have only made appeal to the numerous documents that I possess on that subject, which I have grouped from day to day according to the events.

I would be too happy, if, in ending this account, I could be certain of having convinced some small number of readers that the *International* was the greatest attempt made since the origin of modern society to aid the proletariat *peacefully, legally* and *morally* win the place that belongs to it in the sun of civilization.

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION

I ORIGIN.

To each according to their works.

Among the number of attempts made in the last ten years to bring the peoples together on the terrain of human fraternity, and by order of date, it is appropriate to mention the huge festival given at London, in 1861, in the great Crystal Palace.

The idea of that solemnity, which gathered around five thousand choristers of the French choral societies, had been inspired by Mr. Delaporte by the two well-known lines by the poet Béranger:

Hearts are ready to agree
When the voices have fraternized.

That excursion in the domain of sentimentalism, without bearing all the fruits that its organized had hoped for it, was, however, quite fortunate.

The orpheonists, unwelcome and held in suspicion by the English workers on the day of their arrival, soon won the votes of their immense audience and, on the day of their departure, a sympathetic crowd followed them in procession all the way to the boats that would return them to their country.

Before separating all promised to keep safe the memory of the encounter, at the same time expressing the desire to repeat as often as possible such international agapes.

One step was made, the age-old enemies had repudiated their mutual mistrust, and musical harmony had made, for an instant, the hearts of the two nations vibrate in unison.

The universal exposition of 1862 would do more and better. The workers delegated by the different nations of the civilized world would encounter one another on the terrain of production and observation. Questions of workforces, of good fabrication, of apprenticeship, of the duration of the workday, of strikes even, and many others, should be raised; they were by the most intelligent of the French delegates. (1)

A quick survey revealed that the English worker, better paid while working fewer hours per day than the French worker, produced, however, at a lower rate, and that the businessmen of Great Britain should shortly be able to harm our foreign markets.

There remained, it is true, the question of the finished good, more finished among us than among our neighbors; but the solidity that they opposed to our flash was a sure guarantee that a day would come when they would be, to our detriment, the dominators of markets abroad.

The studious people who had become acquainted with the reports published through the efforts of the worker commission would recall what had struck all the Parisian delegates.

That apparent economic contradiction of a higher wage, leading to a lower cost, called for clarification; the English workers, when consulted, would attribute the results obtained to the existence of their *Trade Unions*, which, by putting them in a legal position to deal on an equal footing with the businessmen, permitted the establishment of lucrative rates for labor, while safeguarding the individual liberty of each worker, within the largest factors as well as the humblest workshop.

With a pride that was very natural in this case, the English workers offered to guide their colleagues from the continent in the study of the statutes of their societies, and considered it an honor to explain the details of their application. Some beginnings of cooperative societies (2) were also observed and commented on. However, while enjoying the praise of the French, the English producers did not see anything in these organizations but local acts, and declared themselves powerless to actively assist in the foundation of analogues societies in the rest of Europe.

The great banquet at the close of the exposition finished what the visit in the workshops had so well commenced; fraternal embraces were given there, they drank all around from the corporative cups; finally, toasts were raised to the future alliance among the workers of the world.

On their return to France, the Parisian delegates would busy themselves drafting some professional essays, noting carefully all that they had seen or thought they had seen, and what were, in their opinions, the reforms to introduce either in the laws or in the corporative customs, or in the methods of manufacture, in order to protect the workers from the drawbacks that they had been able to distinguish. These were the first *cahiers* of labor and the proletariat.

But at the moment of deciding what they wished to do next, the majority of the Parisian workers, oblivious to the danger always offered by a political protectorate, found it convenient to rely on the head of state for the task of improving their material and moral situation.

That complete abandonment of all political initiative, in exchange for an immediate social well-being, was clearly formulated in a series of little red

brochures, today nearly untraceable, written by some writers pledged to the Empire, co-signed by a large number of delegates. (3)

Some, less timid and more skeptical, but all also enemies of true liberty, would demand the reestablishment of the corporative barriers and the creation of special privileges for each of the branches of the national industry; finally, some rare exceptions would demand the pure and simple return to liberty, and particularly the repeal of the laws against the associations and coalitions, declaring themselves prepared, once armed with this precious lever, to return France to its ancient commercial and artistic superiority.

Among those of the delegates whose conclusions were without restriction in favor of the restitution of what we can properly call “some necessary liberties” was Tolain, then an engraver. (4)

Endowed with a great perspicacity, he had glimpsed as possible, in a very immanent future, that universal future alliance hoped for by the English. From his workshop, he set to himself to the task, to gather a small number of friends, inspire them with his faith, and all together to set out the first milestones of the work.

II

THE GROUP OF THE "SIXTY."

Already frequent correspondences were exchanged between London and Paris, when the Polish question came to captivate European politics once again; we were in 1863.

The agitation took the form of a petition, in the writing of which Tolain took an active part. This supplication in favor of an unfortunate nation was rapidly covered with signatures. Soon it was presented to the one who held in his power "the sword of France."

The popular demonstration was greeted with a refusal; we had forgotten that if the Imperial Constitution conceded the right to petition to the French, it was only through the Senate that it should exercise it.

Let us note in passing that this so-called lapse had been intended by the promoters of the petition: they had thought it preferable, they later admitted, to "address themselves to the master, not the servants." (5)

The elections of 1863 came, and with them a new delay in the formation of the association; the electoral success obtained by the Parisian opposition drove the political men mad; for them there was nothing left to do: the Empire had fallen. The illusion was such at that moment that Ledru-Rollin stated to Tolain, during the only interview he had with the ex-tribune, that Paris had just signified its retirement from the Empire, and that within six months the Republic would be proclaimed in France. The error of the grand exile was common to the whole French colony of Leicester Square, (6) and the insistence that Tolain began to demonstrate that the goal was still not so imminent, was for many in the remoteness that the conscript fathers of Jacobinism would always manifest for the International and its founders.

The meeting in support of Poland, held by the Londoners at Saint-James, in which Tolain took part with five co-delegates, among whom we see Cohadon, the manager of the Association of Masons, provided the Parisians with a new occasion to reforge their confidence in contact with their friends from the exposition.

In a few hours, Potters, one of the heads of the Trades Unions; Collet, journalist, French refugee; George Odger, an Englishman; Eugène Dupont, a Frenchman, and a number of different productive nations received the confidences of Tolain. The time was lacking to organize, but the idea was proposed, and already it would have been difficult to create obstacles to its blossoming.

Meanwhile, and as a result of selections, several seats were found vacant in the legislature; into the midst of the political competitions, which loomed from all sides, burst the manifesto of the sixty, launching through the popular world

the idea that a French Chamber would not be complete if it did not contain some worker deputies and that the candidates of the people who were about to be proposed should be elected *because they were workers*, and not *although they were workers*.

Proudhon, close to death, was moved by that appeal and dedicated to the development of the new idea his book: *On the Political Capacity of the Working Classes*.

We will not relate here the details of the struggle, written and spoken, that began with regard to that claim; we will only recall that Tolain, one of the signatories of the manifesto, although patronized and supported by the citizens Noël Parfait, Laurent Pichat and Delescluze, only obtained, during the election, 495 votes, in the fifth district of Paris.

It was a failure; but a fact pregnant with complications had been revealed: the workers affirmed from now on that they should be considered as something collective; they notified society that in the future it would be necessary to deal with them.

Quite fortunately for the republican idea, the socialist of *l'Extinction du paupérisme* never understood anything of the necessities of his era, and neither the wishes of the delegates, nor the manifesto, nor Proudhon's book, any more than the incidents of the electoral struggle, would make him repeal a repressive law or a decree restrictive of our liberties.

The electoral period having ended, Tolain and his friends again took up the work momentarily postponed; the clandestine electoral meetings, the committees of the arrondissements formed despite the imperial police, had led some young people into the arena; an invitation was made to them to join the group of the sixty, and several responded; among these neophytes of politics and socialism was found the author of this work. (7)

Toward the middle of September, the group had barely been formed when Tolain, Perrachon and A. Limousin (8) went to join their friends in England; the travel funds had been made by a weekly subscription fixed at 25 centimes per member belonging to the study project.

September 28, 1864, a historic date from now on, the public meeting organized in Saint-Martin's Hall gathered, officially this time, the worker-representatives of several European nations.

It laid the foundations for the great association. After a short chat, a committee was elected with a special mission to develop a constitution for the International, it was further decided that a labor congress would be held in 1865 until the time of this solemnity, the select committee would act as interim central council and sit in London.

The foundations were laid for the great association. (9) After a short causerie, a committee was elected with a special mission to elaborate some statutes for the International; it was further decided that a labor congress would be held in

1865; until the time of this solemnity, the committee chosen would act as a provisional central council with its seat in London. (10)

We would like to take the opportunity offered to us to say, in the clearest possible way, that no political personage, of any nation whatsoever, has taken, neither up close nor from afar, any part in the founding of the International.

A month and a half later, the post brought an envelop containing a little opusculé written in English. What passed the channel so modestly was the fundamental pact.

While a reliable friend made the translation, the group of internationalists appointed to the post of corresponding secretaries for Paris, Tolain, sculptor, Fribourg, decorative engraver, and Limousin, lace-maker.

As a consequence of these nominations, January 8, 1865, an office was opened, entirely financed by workers, at Rue des Gravilliers, 44; (11) the same day, the first two copies of the printed statutes were sent in envelopes, one to the prefect of police, the other to the minister of the interior, "so that you might not be ignorant."

The international association took possession of France.

III FUNDAMENTAL PACT.

While the fundamental pact had been distributed in France in more than twenty thousand copies, through the work of the Paris bureau, and while a great number of newspapers or pamphlets had frequently reproduced some extracts, we think it will be agreeable to the readers to place before their eyes this important document, each sentence of which has been consented to by the founders of the work and with the spirit of which the association remained steeped during the first three years of its existence.

We give this piece as it was completed by the Congress of Geneva, the changes made to the original composition only touching some points of writing and translation, and the little additions *a* and *b* that were introduced by the delegates only being the consecration fact that daily practice had proven to be indispensable.

The underlined passages are those that, in the minds of the founders, particularly gave the work a special character.

Preliminaries.

Considering:

That the emancipation of the laborers must be the work of the laborers themselves, that the "*efforts of the laborers to win their emancipation must not tend to constitute new privileges;*" but to establish the same rights and duties for all;

That the subjection of the laborer to capital is the source of all political, moral and material servitude;

That for this reason, "*the economic emancipation of the laborers is the great aim to which must every political movement must be subordinated;*" (12)

That all the efforts until now have been abortive, in the absence of solidarity among the workers of the various professions in each country, and of a fraternal union among the workers of the various regions.

That the emancipation of the workers "*is not a simply local or national problem;*" that, on the contrary, that problem interests all the civilized nations, its solution being necessarily subordinated to their theoretical and cooperation;

That the movement that has been accomplished among the workers of the most industrialized countries of Europe, by giving rise to new hopes, gives a solemn warning *not to fall back into old errors*, and advice to combine all the still isolated efforts;

For these reasons, the Congress of the international association declares that this association, together with all the societies or individuals that are members,

recognize as necessarily being the bases of their conduct towards all men, “*truth, justice, morals, without distinction of color, beliefs or nationality.*”

The Congress considered it a duty to demand the rights of man and citizen not only for the members of the association, but also for whoever fulfills duties.

“*No rights without duties, no duties without rights.*”

It is in that spirit that the Congress has adopted once and for all the following statutes of the *International Workingmen’s Association*:

ART. 1. — An association is established to procure a central point of communication and cooperation between the laborers of the different countries aspiring to the same aim; namely: mutual cooperation, progress and the complete emancipation of the working class.

ART. 2. — The name of that association will be: *International Workingmen’s Association*.

ART. 3. — The General Council will be composed of workers representing the different nations taking part in the International Association. *It will take within itself, according to the needs of the Association, the members of the bureau: such as president, general secretary, treasurer and individual secretaries for different countries.*

Every year, the assembled Congress will indicate the seat of the General Council, appoint its members and choose the place for the next meeting. “*At the time fixed by the Congress, and without any special convocation being necessary, the delegates will gather forthwith at the designated time and place.*” (13) If this is impossible, the General Council could change the place of the Congress without however changing its date.

ART. 4. — At each annual Congress, the General Council will make a public report of the labors of the year. In case of emergency, it may convene the Congress before the date fixed.

ART. 5. — The General Council will establish relations with the different worker associations, so that the workers of each country will be constantly informed of the movements of their class in the other countries. “*Let an enquiry regarding the social state be made simultaneously and in the same spirit; let the questions proposed by a society, the discussion of which is of a general interest, be examined by all,*” and, when a practical idea or an international difficulty will demand the action of the association, that association could act in a uniform manner. When it seems natural to it, the General Council will take the initiative with the propositions to submit to the local or national societies.

It will publish a bulletin in order to facilitate its communications with the sections.

ART. 6. — Since the success of the worker movement can only be assured in each country by the resultant force of the union and the association;

As, on the other hand, the utility of the General Council depends on its relations with the worker societies, whether national or local, the members of the *International Association* should make every effort, each in their own country, in order to gather in a national association the various existing workers’ societies.

“It is well understood, however, that the application of that article is subordinate to the individual laws that rule each nation; but, save for the legal obstacles,”(14) no local society is excused from corresponding directly with the General Council at London.

ART. 7. — Each member of the *International Association*, on changing countries, will receive the fraternal support of the members of the association. Through that support, he has a right: (a) to information relating to his profession in the locality where he has gone; (b) credit in the conditions determined by the rule of the section and under the guarantee of that same section.” (15)

ART. 8. — *Whoever adopts and defends the principles of the Association can be received as a member: “but under the responsibility of the section that receives him.”*

ART. 9. — *“Each section is sovereign in appointing its correspondents the General Council.”*

ART. 10. — Although united by a fraternal link of solidarity and cooperation, the workers’ societies will nonetheless continue to exist on the bases that are individual to them.

ART. 11. — Anything that is not foreseen by the statutes will be determined by the rules, which will be revisable at each congress.

Signed:

ODGER, CREMER, WHEELER,
English workers.

The annual dues were fixed at 1 fr. 25 per member.

IV GENERAL REGULATIONS

The regulations that follow, also adopted by the Congress, introduces on a regular basis the points of detail that, since the beginning, were applied at Paris, but only on a provisional basis.

ART. 1. — The General Council *is obliged* to execute the resolutions of the Congress.

A. In this aim it assembles all the documents that the central sections of the different countries send to it and those that it can procure by other means.

B. It is charged with organizing the Congress and of making its program known to all the sections through the intermediary of the central sections of the different countries.

ART. 2. — The General Council will publish, as much and as often as its means permit, a bulletin that will encompass everything that could interest the International Association, and must *concern itself above all with the supply and demand of labor in the different localities, the cooperative societies and the state of the laboring classes in all countries.*

ART. 3. — This bulletin, written in several languages, will be sent free of charge to the central sections, which will pass on a copy of it to each of their sections.

ART. 4. — In order to facilitate in the General Council *the execution of the duties that are imposed on them* in the articles above, every member of the association and of the member societies will contribute, each year, dues fixed at 10 centimes.

Those dues are destined to cover the various expenses of the General Council, like the pension of the general secretary, the costs of correspondence, of publications, of preparatory works for the Congress, etc., etc.

ART. 5. — Wherever circumstances permit it, the central offices of a group of a certain number of sections of the same language will be established. The members of these central offices, *elected and revocable at each moment by their respective sections*, must send their reports to the General Council once each month and more often if it is necessary.

ART. 6. — The administrative costs of these central offices will be supported by the sections that have established them.

ART. 7. — The central offices, no less than the General Council of the Association, *“are obliged to honor the credit that will be given to the members of the Association,”* but only so long as their notebooks will be stamped by the secretary of the section to which the member who demands the credit belongs.

ART. 8. — The central offices of the sections are “obliged” to admit all members of the Association to consult the bulletin of the General Council.

ART. 9. — Each section, numerous or not, has a right to send a delegate to the Congress; if the section is not in a position to send a delegate, it will join with neighboring sections in a group that will appoint a delegate for the whole group.

ART. 10. — The delegates will receive compensation from the section or group of sections that has appointed them.

ART. 11. — Each member of the International Association has the right to vote in the elections and is eligible.

ART. 12. Each section or group of sections that counts more than 500 members, has the right to send one delegate per 500 members above that original number.

ART. 13. — Each delegate has only one vote in the Congress.

ART. 14. — Each section is free to write its individual statutes and to regulate them in conformity with local circumstances and the laws of its country; *but they must in no sense be contrary to the statutes and general regulations.*

ART. 15. — The revision of the statutes and regulations can be made by each congress, at the demand of two delegates present.

For the General Council, seated at London:
President, Secretary General,
ODGER, shoemaker. ECCARIUS, tailor.

To the general statutes, and as objects of study proposed at the first congress, the following program was added:

- 1) Organization of the International Association, its aim, its means of action;
- 2) Worker societies, their past, present and future; unemployment, strikes, and the means of remedying them; primary and professional education;
- 3) The labor of women and children in the factories, from the moral and sanitary points of view;
- 4) Reduction of the hours of labor, aim, scope, moral consequences; the obligation of labor for all;
- 5) Association, its principle, its applications, cooperation distinguished from Association proper?
- 6) The relations of capital and labor; foreign competition; commercial treaties;
- 7) Direct and indirect taxation;
- 8) International institutions; mutual credit, paper money, weights, measures, currency and language;
- 9) The necessity of destroying the Russian influence in Europe by the application of the principle of the right of peoples to manage themselves, and the reconstruction of a Poland on democratic and social bases;
- 10) Permanent armies in their relations with production;
- 11) Religious ideas, their influence on the social, political and intellectual movement;
- 12) Establishment of a mutual aid society. — Moral and material support accorded to the orphans of the Association.

Such are, in their entirety, the fundamental bases of the Association. So it will be easy to convince oneself by a considered reading that the whole organization of the International was republican and federative; it left to each group its autonomy, only leaving the sovereign power to the Congress alone; the General Council was only a means of communication between the various sections, and

no order could emanate from the responsible functionaries to whom the Congress had confided the unique mission of executing its resolutions without even assessing them.

As for the application of universal suffrage, the International, being ahead of its time on this point as on so many others, had established it as follows:

Together, the members appointed the General Council, and that council chose its own bureau and functionaries, always revocable, which explains why the supreme president, of whom the enemies of the Association have spoken so much, never existed except in their servile imagination, incapable of understanding how such a vast organization could move, without being bowed under the yoke of a potentate. As for a secret pact, we affirm, without any fear of being contradicted by anyone, that there has never been a question of it among the founders of the work. It is, moreover, only common sense that a secret common to 20 people would soon cease to be a secret.

BEGINNINGS.

In the beautiful country of France, suspicion is a native plant, growing naturally near all new attempts, whose many branches envelop and too often stifle emerging personalities. For as long as nothing distinguishes them in the eyes of the crowd, and they only serve the construction of artificial renown, the newcomers of the revolutionary republican party, to which we have the painful honor of belonging, are flattered, supported, defended by the selfish and jealous mass, but if they aspire to leave the ranks of the stooges, in order to try to assert their individuality on a larger stage, immediately the comedy changes appearance: base and rampant slander attaches to them as to a prey, and will only abandon them after having soiled them or struck them down, unless by a vigorous effort the strugglers, breaking the embrace, rush with a bound to the summit of popularity.

Nothing could shield the founders of the International from that tribute, and they would pay it fully; at first, the most visible, and consequently the most attacked, was Tolain. The position of secretary of the worker commission of the universal exhibition, which he had occupied in 1862, his profession of faith as a candidate, published by the newspaper the *Opinion nationale*, were the points of departure for the attacks with the aid of which his former colleagues from the delegation strove to hinder his action. He was accused, first with murmurs, then in a loud voice, of being a secret agent of prince Napoleon, "he is of the Palais-Royal," it was frequently said, and that gained ground. The paternity of the red pamphlets of which we have spoken was attributed to him, and when it was demonstrated, items in hand, that these publications did not bear his signature, it was insinuated that he had not signed them, which was a tribute to his political skill, but that he had nonetheless inspired them.

The founding of the International furnished an occasion for the recrudescence of all these rumors, and Fribourg, whose active role during the elections of M. Pelletan and M. Pages, as well as his relations with the groups of the schools and of the faubourg Saint-Antoine had carried him forward, agreed to take part with the *internationals* of Paris only on the condition of being one of the correspondents; he wanted to see from up close if this organization with a republican appearance did not really hide an imperialist trap.

Tolain, directly warned by Fribourg of this frame of mind, agreed to let this last arrival in the group be designated as the title-holder of the bureau of correspondence for Paris.

Understanding was established at once among the correspondents, and it was necessary to take action.

From the beginning of the enterprise, money being lacking, the quarter of rent paid in advance had emptied the coffers of the founding group, which had

to resort to the helpful credit of M. E. Blot, in order to print 20,000 copies of the general statutes, and 7000 membership letters.

A small, broken cast-iron stove, brought by Tolain to the Rue les Gravilliers, a table of white oak, serving during the day as a workbench for Fribourg, in his trade as decorator, was transformed in the evening into a desk for correspondence, their second-hand stools, to which four miscellaneous seats were later added, such was, for more than a year, the furniture that adorned the little ground-floor room, facing north and enclosed, at the back of a courtyard, where putrid odors constantly condenses. It was in that little room, 4 meters long and 3 meters wide, that, we dare to say, the greatest social problems of our era were debated.

At London, the beginnings of the General Council were hardly more brilliant; and without the results of a group tea, with concert, speech and dance, which the English members gave to the London public, the work would perhaps have waited a long time to take root in England, for lack of money.

If we insist so much on the precarious state of the Association at its debut, it is because so many have harped about the *millions of the International*, that we think it is important to clarify what have always been the true pecuniary resources of that association, so that readers will be convinced that the strength so rapidly acquired by it was the product of the blunders of its adversaries, rather than the *immediate* means at its disposal.

The former colleagues of Tolain in the London delegation had not been alone in speaking of these so-called “plomplonnienne” (*sic*) intrigues of the worker candidate; the students [in] the brasserie and the *centurion* (16) workers of the faubourg Saint-Antoine had welcomed these gloomy remarks, then, according to the expression of Voltaire, they had further *wrapped them in gloom*.

A chill in relations between Tolain and M. Henri Lefort, who introduced him to Mr. Delescluze and his friends, all supported a system of probabilities unfavorable to Tolain.

Fribourg, having resolved to dispel this darkness, went to Mr. Lefort. In a few moments, he realized that his host was most unhappy to have been sidelined in the founding of the *International*, to which he would have been proud to attach his name. They agreed to take council of his wisdom in the future, and the quarrel seemed appeased.

Vain hope, this was only the prelude of the violent antagonism that would not cease to reign between the Parisian group, and the French branch of London, made up in large part of deportees mummified in their revolutionary methods, copied from the ancients, and their practice, to which they claimed all other attempts must be subordinated.

Mr. Lefort, in his interview with Fribourg, had assured that his adhesion as a member of the Association, by giving to the *International* an incontestable character of radical republicanism, would lead to composition all the groups of **pures** that Paris contains, and that 10,000 men from the cooperative societies

formed under the auspices of the *Crédit au Travail* would rush to join the newly born work. (17)

VI

PARIS AND LONDON.

Shortly after that incident, a letter from the Central Council arrived at the Rue des Gravilliers. In that letter, Tolain, Fribourg and Limousin were informed that, on the proposal of Mr. Lelubez, secretary for France, Mr. Henri Lefort had just been added to their number as *general correspondent of the Association for the French press*. In that role, he should be responsible for all negotiation and composition of articles to be disclosed to public by means of journalism.

Thanks to the General Council, the Paris bureau would have its chief, and that chief was a bourgeois, it was a poor man's *coup d'état*. Such a pretension aroused the indignation of the Parisian members, a protest was sent to London, and the correspondents addressed to Mr. Lefort a letter from which we extract the following passage:

“If we wanted to make a noise, a republican demonstration, we would take some other name than yours, a celebrated name; we would be broken, but we would fall to the applause of all.

“That was not our goal. We want to found an association that, through study, progressively brings about the emancipation of labor. On that terrain, whatever esteem we have for you, your notoriety only presents dangers without any advantage, and that is why we reject it.” (18)

If those were not the precise terms of that piece, we guarantee their exact sense.

The conflict worsened. From one side Mr. Lefort, thinking himself sure of the support of the General Council, threatened to break the Paris bureau. In the other camp, fearing that the personality of Mr. Lefort covered the meddling in the International of the Guernsey group, of which he was the commensal and friend, the Parisians resisted with passion.

The situation became difficult; at the same time, and as if the imperial police had been advised of these internal division, every day, at all hours, more or less clumsy agents came to call on Fribourg, addressing to him a thousand and one questions on the future of the work, the number of members, the real leaders of the movement. Many requested a watchword, a particular sign that allowed the internationals to be recognized by their fellow members.

All sorts of traps were set, and all were avoided. The firm will of the founders not to fall back into the *old errors* of secret *compagnonnage* made all the ruses fail, and wearied the most tenacious. Never did the International consent to take on a shadowy character as long as it could function in the light without concern.

In order to calm the dispute, the General Council appointed some investigators to become acquainted with the debate and present some conclusive reports; but Leluber, the close friend of Lefort, was chosen for that

mission. It was too much; despite the desire of the Parisian correspondents to remain impassive, immured in their rights as in a fortress, they lost patience, and the very day that Lelubez returned to London by the fast roads, Tolain and Fribourg, with 120 francs in their pockets for all their baggage, left from Boulogne, and the following day, March 1, disembarked at two in the afternoon at London Bridge.

The end of the day was used by them to rush, led by Eugène Dupont, in search of the members of the Central Council, and to win the sympathies of Jung, secretary for the Swiss. At eight o'clock at night, at the moment when Lelubez was going to make known his report, Tolain and Fribourg made their entry into the salon of the great Council.

The effect of that *coup de théâtre* was complete. Lelubez, visibly disconcerted, only dared read the end of the indictment that he had prepared, and the discussion au fond began immediately.

In the name of their right as an autonomous bureau, the Parisian correspondents would deny the General Council the power of meddling in their internal affairs; they would declare that, fathers of the Association, they would not tolerate anyone violating the federative pact freely consented to by all the members, and that as long as they had not committed any act contrary to the principles pronounced by the general statutes, they intended to be their own masters, and only come under the jurisdiction of their constituents for their roles as correspondents.

"Understand this idea well," they added in closing: "the General Council is only the heart of the Association, the Congress alone will be its head."

The English would sanction with their vote that interpretation of the provisional statutes. And Mr. Lefort was ripped from his functions before having functioned.

The same night, Tolain and Fribourg again took the boat, and on Wednesday evening they returned to Paris; their absence had lasted fifty hours.

They had won, they formally announced that they did not intend to throw France into the hazards of a combination of childish politics, destined fatally, according to them, to plunge the country into the convulsions of civil war, the clearest effect of which would be even scrape Paris of all socialist element, and delay by a century perhaps the liberation of the proletariat.

They had won, they had formally announced that they did not intend to hurl France into the hazards of a combination of infantile politics, inevitably destined, in their opinion, to plunge the country into the convulsions of a civil war, whose clearest effect would still be to skim Paris of every socialist element, and to delay by perhaps a century the emancipation of the proletariat.

They had won, after having proclaimed that if for them it was incontestable that a certain political form was necessary for the application of serious social reforms, it was equally true that every armed revolution that had no other aim

but to change the name of the despot or the number of the masters appeared to them a crime of *lèse-humanité*.

They had won, but regardless of the hatred of the whole Blanquist school and leaving behind them a long cortège of wounded self-esteem, little vanities strained, and bourgeois ambitions disappointed that, grouping themselves in a sheaf of hatreds, would only await an occasion to give themselves the pleasure of reprisals.

A first occasion was offered them at the London conferences.

VII FIRST PROGRESS.

The situation of the Parisian correspondents became better from the point of view of liberty of action, the impression that they had made at the General Council being for them a sure guarantor that from now on nothing would come to stymie their influence. In fact, from that time the central bureau never intervened in the nominations of the bureau correspondents, the tenure holders gave notice to the secretary of their nationality; the Central Council registered receipt of the notification, and that was all. At the same time that omnipotence imposed on them the obligation to do at least as well, all alone, as their adversaries would not fail to claim that they would have done under their protectorate.

The task was hard, but it was nevertheless accepted completely.

The individual memberships arrived frequently, nearly all the survivors of the republican associations dissolved by the Empire came to register *at the Gravilliers*. Some doctors, publicists, manufacturers, and members of the army lent their support to the work.

Many would agree to serve as links between Paris and the provinces and received the following verbal instructions:

Read the statutes before allowing anyone to join; recruit most particularly in the ranks of the republicans; stress the *socialist* character of the international, a foreign association whose establishment in France could not be official; use membership cards printed in English to demonstrate that the correspondents were only intermediaries established with the aim of facilitating the application of articles 5 and 7 of the general statutes.

Recommend to each newly constituted group to immediately cease to correspond with Paris, from which it would not have orders to receive, and to address itself to the General Council of London for all the information on internal organization.

In short, take advantage at every occasion of the silence of the Codes on this new fact and carefully gain ground.

Despite or perhaps even because of all these precautions, a great number of members hesitated to give their names, addresses and occupations; made mistrustful by experience, they sought an active incognito, willingly granted by the members of the Paris bureau.

Let us recognize however that a certain number of political notables did not recoil before formal adhesion to the statutes of the International. Among these artisans from the outset, we can cite Jules Simon, the author of *l'Ouvrière*, *l'Ecole*, and *Travail*; Henri Martin, the popular historian; Gustave Chaudey, the active collaborator of P. J. Proudhon, fallen victim of Raoul Rigault; Corbon,

former vice-president of the Constituent Assembly of 1848; Charles Beslay and many others that events would later distance from the founding group. (19)

The provinces also began to show signs of life, and Rouen, le Havre, Caen, Condé, Lille, Amiens, Lyon, liantes, Pocé, Lisieux, Roubaix, Saint-Étienne, Liancourt, and Libourne became centers of socialist propaganda, having their bureau of correspondence with the provisional council of the Association.

At the same moment, and through the intermediary of Fribourg, the International penetrated into Parisian freemasonry, where it recruited strong sympathies; finally Switzerland, Belgium and America announced the creation of openly socialist groups.

However, despite their appearance of success, the Parisian correspondents felt themselves isolated in Paris; the working masses escaped them, the group increased in size, but it was always only an individual group, a sort of Church, and instinctively they sensed that a prolonging of this state of things could only lead to a failure.

It was necessary to attempt a great effort. A list of the most influential workers of Paris was drawn up, some individual letters were sent, and each of them, thinking they only answered a personal invitation, came to take part in a clandestine meeting organized by Tolain and Fribourg. The trap was a success, and around a hundred and fifty citizens were taken in it. (20)

Without giving them time to recognize one another and taking advantage of the general silence, Fribourg, after apologizing for the summary process employed to bring about the gathering, expounded:

“The Parisian correspondents, manifestation of a particular group, do not claim the right to speak for the entire working class.

“Not wishing to usurp any legitimate influence, they came to ask this assembly, formed by design of representatives of the various Parisian industries, wishing to be advised on the means of appointing in each professional group a laborer whose mission would be to aid in the administration and direction of the Parisian movement.

“The correspondents thus checked each day by the true representatives of labor, no deviation from the spirit of the general statutes of the International could be feared.”

From the midst of the audience rose a worker in wallpaper, a former member of a society of professional resistance, who squarely, without detours or commentary, neatly posed the question of individual political tendencies **to** the founders of the International, ordering them to refute the accusations of “plomplonnien caesarism” that was so frequently formulated against the best known among them. He also demanded how, if they were not agents of the Empire, they hoped to succeed in founding, despite the law, an unauthorized association.

In the midst of attention that had become general, Tolain responded to Héligon on the question of individual tendencies, with a chronicle of his actions with Prince Napoléon, with whom he had never had anything but the natural relations of the secretary of the commission for the exhibition with the president of that institution; on the legal point, he repeated the theory of the foreign society against which the codes, not having foreseen it, had formulated nothing, and concluded on the necessity of taking advantage of that uncertainty while there was still time.

Fribourg, on his side, made known the intimate thought of the Parisian correspondents, on the political character of the Association. "In so far as it is a question of the membership, the *International* must recruit by preference from among the republicans; but the society, as constituted body, would abstain from any interference in the political affairs of France; it is a society for study, not a new Charbonnerie."

Then to wipe away any doubt about the sincerity of the declarations that had just been made, he added:

"The International will be the force of the workers' future; you must join, either to aid us in the accomplishment of our work if we are sincere, or to unmask us in time if we are dishonest."

The advanced hour did not permit a vote of the proposition, and the assembly separated, promising to make known the result of the general reflections of the workshops of Paris on this substantial business.

VIII

THE FIRST GREAT BUREAU

A few days later, the commission of the Gravilliers counted seventeen member added to the correspondents, which amounting to only twenty in all, the legal figure, the known members and officers of the Paris bureau, put at the service of the International the power of which they would have need.

Here is, from memory, the names and professions of the members of the first great bureau:

Tolain, carver; Fribourg, engraver; Ch. Limousin press-feeder: all three correspondents; Debock, typographer; Bourdon, engraver of arms; Héligon, wallpapers; Culetin, leather finisher; Parrachon, Camelinat, Guyard, line workers; Fournaise, optician; A Murât, mechanic; Varlin, bookbinder; Bellamy, pipefitter; Delorme, shoemaker; Mollin, gilder; G. Laplanche, coach-builder; Delahaye, locksmith, then later and following transfers: Chemalé, architect's assistance; Gauthier, jeweler; P. Malon, day laborer.

From that moment, the movement called cooperative received a new impulse and the presence of the internationals was felt everywhere. (21)

At Puteauz, Saint-Denis, Vanves, Montreuil, Vincennes, Grenelle, everywhere in Paris where a worker society was formed, the bureau delegated one of its members in order to make the general idea of a federation of groups prevail and in order to combat all the interference of a political protectorate.

The questions of strikes, raised so unfortunately in the same period by the Blanquist party, had no more avowed adversaries than the internationals. "Study first," they said, "see if the economic conditions of the country allow a revision of rates; then, after having been assured that you have truth and justice with you, examine if you are in a state to undertake the struggle and if you have the certainty of making your idea triumph, without which you will only produce aggravation of individual and public misery."

These counsels were sometimes heeded, and it is to the International that belongs the glory of having terminated every attempt at a building strike during the three years 1865, 66 and 67.

In an article published by the *Opinion nationale*, Mr. Ducuing had furnished the internationals an excellent means of forming some legal, but unauthorized societies; the form of civil society encourage by him was immediately popular among the workers, and the Gravilliers became the general rendezvous of all those who would attempt to found the societies known as cooperatives. Consumption, production, credit, solidarity, worker constructions, penny funds, and syndicates of mutual credit were for some years the questions debated each evening in that little workers' circle.

Every Thursday the Commission gathered to study the program of the first congress and examine of the correspondence, each day more voluminous, that was addressed to the Parisian bureau from all parts of Europe. (22) When the questions made to the correspondents necessitated a declaration of principles, they duly recorded it by inserting in the Parisian newspapers a little manifesto, which aided them powerfully in reaching the public, awakening them to the existence of the *International*.

Despite all these efforts, it was impossible to group in seven months more than five hundred direct members, but the correspondents had prepared a future of which they believed themselves the masters, and that would disabuse them so cruelly.

IX

RIVAL ATTEMPTS.

In order to counterattack the International from its first acts, some men belonging to the imperialist party attempted to found an association that, under the title of *Extinction du paupérisme: Invalides civils*, was to resolve cheaply the terrible problem of foresight for an unfortunate old age.

The spirit and aim of this new group was clearly defined by its statutes, from which we extract the two following articles:

ART. 2 . — This *Association* is constituted under the protection of the Emperor Napoléon III, from whom its founders have obtained support, and thanks to whom their initiative had been able to triumph over all obstacles.

Art. 3. — The members of the *Association* ask the emperor to choose, for intermediary of this protectorate with them, the duke of Persigny, the antecedents of the duke testifying to his sympathy for the social ideas whose triumph must insure the wellbeing of the masses by consolidating their alliance with the imperial dynasty.

Among the signatories of that piece, we note with curiosity the names of L. E. Boullanger, the mechanic with an iron hand, and J. Durand, the cutter of shoes, who have since figured among the members of the Paris Commune. A singular transformation, you will agree.

Between that association and the International, no agreement was possible; however, one of the agents of M. Hugelmann, M. Fanfernot, attempted to obtain, by intimidation, an offensive and defensive alliance: rejected on the political terrain, they asserted some sentimental reasons, suggesting to Fribourg that it would be unseemly to repudiate all solidarity with a group in which his father and elder brother appeared.

The necessity of not giving an immediate political color to the International Association made all the combinations run aground: the negotiators parted, furious and threatening; that was yet one more group of enemies.

The only direct result of those attempts was to lead the bureau of the Gravilliers to decide that no one could be a member of the International and a member of a society placed under any political protectorate.

We know the fate of the *Invalides civils*, and how the founders, at the price of their complete devotion to the Empire, were officially disavowed and forced to abandon the party.

Another group, led by M. Bazin, a typographic worker, came shortly after to seek a rostrum in the columns of the newspaper *le Pays*, edited by M. Grandguillot.

There, as in the relations of the delegates, the favorite theme was the appeal to the imperial power to achieve the desired aim. The editorial workers spoke in the name of the people and claimed to represent the dynastic tendencies; the International could not keep silent; with an eye to also affirming a workers' tendency, they turned to M. Peyrat, who offered them the hospitality of the *Avenir national*, under the supervision of M. Horn, the Hungarian known by all.

Some articles signed by the correspondents appeared for a week, then there was silence; the aim of the internationals was achieved: they could no longer be confused with the workers of the newspaper *Le Pays*.

The Gravilliers were not, moreover, on their trial run at journalism. Independent of a brochure on the elections of Paris, published in 1863 by Tolain, they had founded, under the title of *La Tribune ouvrière*, a weekly literary paper at five cents.

The Empire, frightened by the rapid success of that little sheet, seized the fourth issue and condemned the editor Ch. Limousin to a month of prison, which he served.

The grounds of the judgment state that the paper was suppressed for having spoken of social economy with regard to architecture and without being bonded.

Desiring to continue the written struggle, and this time with the avowed character of socialism, the International printed at Brussels *La Presse*, worker organ of the International Association; the police of the Empire prohibited its entry from the first issue. (23)

Then, while the International pushed the cooperative movement in the form of civil society, while M. Beluze recommended to the *Crédit au Travail* the form of a *société à gérance*, while M. Léon Say founded and administered the *Caisse des associations populaires de crédit, de production et de consommation*, limited liability company with variable capital, the Empire attempted to throw itself into the movement by the creation of the *Caisse des associations coopératives*, the seat of which was established at the Place Royale, and in the coffers of which the head of State deposited 500,000 francs.

All these attempts at emancipation by capital, and many others, ran aground on the ignorance and indifference of the mass of the people; only the International grew without interruption, and it is in the midst of that combination of circumstances that the London Conference opened.

THE LONDON CONFERENCE.

The Congress announced for 1865 not being able to take place, because of the small number of members and the pecuniary poverty of the General Council, an administrative conference was decided upon for the anniversary of the founding; in this manner, while furnishing the founders with an occasion to account for the results obtained, the public could not reproach the Association for having delayed the study of the problems raised by the proposed program of the future Congress.

On September 23, 1865, the correspondents of Paris, Tolain, Fribourg, and Ch. Limousin, to whom had been added Varlin as representative of the 500 Parisian members; César de Paepe, correspondent of Brussels; Dupleix, bookbinder, representative of the French section of Geneva; J. Becker, for the German sections of Switzerland; some delegates from the French branch of London, among them Vésinier and Lelubez; finally the representatives of the central bureau Odger, Grexner, Karl Marx, Eugène Dupont, Jung and a Polish captain whose name escapes us, gathered in one of the rooms at *Adelphi Terrace*, in London.

In order to yield to the invitation of the Council, the representatives of the different European groups had to impose heavy sacrifices of money on themselves, and without the precaution taken by the General Council to defray the costs of food and lodging during their stay in the capital of England, the conference would have been, by *force majeure*, terminated on the first day.

We will pass rapidly over the general labor of these meetings, in order only to linger on two points of debate raised by the program on the agenda.

At first the speakers were even held up by the very name of the Association. Indeed, what is a worker? By what certain sign can we discern who has a right to that title, from those who would usurp it? Should we admit all those who would claim that qualification?

At Paris, the question had been resolved. In the Thursday sessions, the Gravilliers had formally decided on the formal exclusion of what we commonly call the laborers of thought.

Despite their great good will, the Parisians had not been able to understand what must be understood by those words; if they meant liberal professions, and included the lawyers, poets, novelists, physicians, artists, and journalists, their opinion was that the presence of these gentlemen in the ranks of the International Workingmen's Association would contribute to stripping it of its character as a socialist worker society, and would finally draw them into political intrigues.

In their eyes, those alone were laborers who, having no other resources than their daily labor, could, from one day to another, be touched by misery, resulting

from involuntary unemployment or unexpected illness; outside of that category, there existed no sort of laborers with which association could be useful.

The English, less radical than their colleagues from Paris, wanted to be able to admit whoever desired admission; the Swiss and the Belgians demanded the same ease; they relied on the fact that in their respective countries the liberal professions, much more accessible than in France, were victims of all the fluctuations of business, as much, and often even more cruelly than the manual professions.

In order to safeguard the liberty of the groups and in order to prejudice nothing, it was decided by the Conference that each section be free, under its own responsibility, to give the word *worker* all the extension of which it seemed susceptible. For the same reasons, the admission of women was left to the judgment of each corresponding bureau.

On this point again, the French, more advanced in their labors, had decided, in a great majority: "The place of woman is at the domestic hearth, and not in the *Forum*; nature has made her nurse and housekeeper, let us not divert her from these social functions to cast her outside her path; to man, labor and the study of human problems; to woman, the cares of childhood and the embellishment of the home of the laborer." As a consequence, they had decided on her non-admission in the International, to the great scandal of the partisans of the so-called emancipation of women.

The question of honorary members was also resolved in the negative. The General Council then informed the Conference that a noble lord had offered to pay a subscription of 10 pounds sterling (250 francs) per year to be the backer of the Association. Breaking with all the British customs, the Council had rejected his proposition.

Nonetheless, these provisional measures, which were later recognized by the Geneva Congress, would have no retrospective effect: which explains why, despite these decisions, a certain number of women and non-worker members have been able to continue to take part in the Parisian International.

The second interesting point of the program, which would be the firebrand of discord of the Conference, the Polish question, came up on the agenda. The French and Swiss, in the name of their section, formally refused to let it be introduced in the questionnaire of the Congress; it seemed to them that this entirely political question could not reasonably figure in a purely socialist Congress, and in the committee meetings that were held during the day, in one of the rooms of a public house in Long-Acre, the Parisians and the Genevans had fought for the removal, but without success: two successive votes had condemned them to silence; the only concession that had been made to them consisted of the addition of the words "democratic and social" to the original formula.

At the public session in which that question was discussed, Vésinier was in attendance. Until that day he had spoken little, watching for the hour to act and serve the political projects of Leicester Square. Perceiving his disposition to speak, Duplex and J. Becker protested to the president, Odger, against the presence of this gentleman in the assembly. They informed him that Vésinier had been forced to leave Geneva, after some rather serious acts for which a challenge could be made against him presenting himself there from then on.

There being no time to establish that accusation in a very clear manner, the Council put off the examination of it until the next day, and the discussion began.

The Polish captain and the members of the Central Council, Karl Marx, Peter Fox, and Lelubez, made use, in favor of oppressed Poland, of all the arguments of politics and sentiment that the question entailed. The English applauded; the French and Swiss, linked by the morning's vote, abstained from speaking; they were proceeding to the final vote, when César de Paepe demanded to speak. He warmly pleaded the counterpart of that thesis. What did Poland want? He did not know; and even if he did know, for him, that question was a danger to the Association; it must be excluded. The assembly became hesitant.

Vésinier's turn to speak arrived. In a speech full of bile and hatred, he strove to demonstrate that by setting aside the Polish question polonaise they pleased the Empire, whose Russophile sentiments were on display at that time; and making himself the mouthpiece of the secret thoughts of the French branch of London, that all those who wanted to exclude the Polish question were only Bonapartist agents.

Lightly was less swift than the Parisian delegates, rising spontaneously, faces overwhelmed by anger and indignation. "You are a liar!" they cried in one voice. They would have taken action against the insulter; but the place where they were, the respect owed to the assembly, together with the feeling of pity and disgust that Vésinier inspired in all those who knew him, stayed their hands, which were ready to punish, and containing themselves with great difficulty, they sat down again in silence.

The rest of the session was without interest. The Polish question was upheld and the conference closed.

The next day, at Saint-Martin's Hall, a tea, followed by speeches and republican songs, and ending with a dance, furnished the Parisians an occasion to get to know the men of the Central Council better.

While Varlin and Limousin danced with the two young daughters of Karl Marx, he recounted to Tolain and Fribourg how he had vowed a deep hatred for P. J. Proudhon for his anti-communist opinions; how, in response to a work by that philosopher, *The Philosophy of Poverty*, he had triumphantly responded with his book, *Das Capital*, in the chapter on the *Poverty of Philosophy*. (24)

On the other hand, the Parisians learned that Lelubez had written to Lyon in order to put that section on its guard against the intrigues of Paris, which he

claimed were directed by some schemers; Dupleix, in his turn, made known the turpitudes of Vésinier, and obtained a promise of his exclusion from the Central Council.

You see, the discord was greater than ever between the Parisian party and the political group of London, which did hesitate before slander to attempt to insure its supremacy; what is more, it became obvious to the correspondents that the union of the socialist doctrines in the heart of the International would be difficult to establish; but far from seeing this as a reason for discouragement, the Parisians congratulating themselves more for having succeeded in provoking a debate.

XI

GENEVA CONGRESS, 1865-1866.

The year 1865-66 passed for the Association without great events for the International. The Thursday sessions of the Gravilliers, dedicated entirely to the study of the program, frequently brought in new faces, and in this way the number of members reached 1200; but let us note in passing that the first enrolled would refuse to pay the annual dues a second time, on the basis that some conferences were not a congress.

While the Parisian workers kept silent and studied, the European students gathered to speak at the [International Students'] Congress at Liège; there, Tridon, Protot, Humbert, Jaclard, Regnard, Germain Casse, Levraud, etc., etc., and others of the same value, made a spectacle of themselves to the universe, combating with passion some philosophical opinions contrary to their own. You will find below the declaration of the International on the same subject, and the reader will judge on which side the moderation and respect for beliefs was found.

On their return the congressites of Liège brought back an issue of the Belgian newspaper the *Espiègle*, in which Vésinier made a report on the London conference, further poisoning the debate and treating the Parisian delegates in the most abusive manner. Those, accused so directly, retaliated with a letter to Vésinier that pulled cries of rage from that hybrid being; counterattack, response, etc. The result of that spicy correspondence was a challenge to a duel addressed by Vésinier to the four insulted: provocation accepted, but deferred until the time of the Geneva Congress.

Vésinier, imprisoned for his *Mariage d'une Espagnole*, which he repudiated at that time, and which he claimed emanated from another pen than his own, could not come; that was fortunate for him, as the Parisian correspondents would have killed him like a dog. Later, in 1869, encountered in Paris by Fribourg, he claimed that the insulting epithets that peppered his article were the responsibility of Mr. Odillon Delimal, and that he strove to demonstrate that the original document had been rewritten by that writer, who had wanted to make the article more *Figariste*.

The month of August was dedicated to the preparation of the Parisian report, as well as seeking some means to use to sent a great number of delegates to Geneva. Money was always lacking, they scrounged a bit everywhere, (25) some members of the bureau covered the cost of their own journey, and somehow, eleven internationals left Paris. (26)

Toward the end of August, the Central Council, without consulting Paris, had committed the serious misconduct of summoning the French students to the congress of the laborers; that blunder would bear its fruits. In fact, hardly landed at Geneva, the Parisians found themselves facing Protot, Humbert,

Calavaz, Jeunesse, and a carpenter, Lalourcet, who, arriving the day before, had already said so much evil of the Parisian delegates, that the Genevans, taking these students for French police agents, wanted to deal out justice toward them. Thanks to Tolain and Fribourg these gentlemen were respected, which only made them more bitter. The next day, they attempted to gain entrance to the hall of the congress; while Humbert and Galavaz held Fribourg in the garden of the establishment, Protot succeeded in gaining the rostrum, and for a half hour strove to transform that socialist gathering into an anti-Bonapartist demonstration.

The impatient English imposed silence on them and the congress convened; the same day Tridon and Blanqui, having rejoined their acolyte, wrote to the *Confédéré de Fribourg* a letter of the Blanquist genre, denunciatory and lying. The following Thursday, a new attempt on their part, a new failure. And this time, without the active intervention of those that they insulted, Protot and his clique only made a leap from the convention hall into the waters of the lake.

These gentlemen disappeared; but the reader can judge if agreement was possible between the two groups. The Blanquists were avenged for their public affront by heaping the cruelest insults in their repertoire on the names of the cooperators.

After the verification of credentials, the presidency devolved to Jung, who speaking three languages — German, English and French — equally well, could best direct the debates. The French, English and Swiss papers were represented in great numbers at that formality. The delegates disclosed the resources of the Association; they appointed some commissions to examine the account and the reading of the filed reports took place.

It appeared from the report of the General Council that the International, although very popular and already enjoying a great moral credit, still only had very few real members, and the Congress should do a great deal for the future. As for the general ideas, the English saw the improvement of their lot only by a generalization of strikes supported in each country by the fund of the Association; it is on this point their attention was especially focused.

We will note that at this congress the Belgians were not represented, nor were the Germans properly speaking.

In their turn, the Parisians made their labors known. We can do no better than to publish that report, which the imperial administration banned from entry into France, the authors refusing energetically to insert “a phrase in honor of the emperor.” Without that absurd interdiction, the International, better known, could not have served as a refuge to the empty dreams that Paris always contains. The opinions of the Parisians, adopted not only by the correspondents of Lyon and Rouen, but also by the Swiss and the majority of the English, would become the basis of the Association.

We take the liberty of recommending to the serious attention of the reader, this brochure published in Brussels in 1866 by the French delegates.

REPORT OF THE FRENCH DELEGATES TO THE GENEVA CONGRESS.

PREFACE.

Since its foundation, the INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION has been subject to attack from many different sides. At base, we have reason to believe that the hostility, direct or roundabout, demonstrated against it has no other cause than our clearly and repeatedly stated unwillingness to accept tutelage by any personality, to passively follow any party. Buoyed by the sincerity of our opinions and the steadfastness of our acts, ready to assert ourselves everywhere and always in the same terms, we publish today the Report drafted at Paris, and read at Geneva by the Parisian delegates. That is, in our opinion, the best and only response that we can and would make to the strangely contradictory accusations that are expressed against us.

I PREAMBLE

Of all the phases that humanity has traversed thus far, there is not one, in our opinion, more important than that in which the people have entered during the last few years.

It has not had, thus far, a proper existence; in fact, in the most solemn acts of political and social life, even though it only seemed to act according to its own ideas, the Democracy crawls along behind its bosses, and we have recently seen it use all its energy to undertake the sorting of its masters, and *rashly fight for the choice of tyrants*.

What primarily distinguishes the present period from that which preceded it is that Labor asserts itself as the equal of the other forces, and wants to take its place in the moral and material world, by its initiative alone and apart from all the influences that it has, until recently, suffered and even sought.

How has it come to this point? What transformations has that idea suffered, before appearing in the light of day?

The Democracy has so far been continually defeated. From 89 to 1800, the bourgeoisie has made in its ranks, by strokes of decrees, saber or cannon, large gaps that the wars of the Empire have certainly not filled. The Restoration has never claimed the title of popular government. 1830 arrives! New failure. Under the July monarchy, each levy of shields ends with a catastrophe. Labor stirs again, with regard to parliamentary reform; February finds it on its feet, demanding, with great shouts, its emancipation. Determined to make any sacrifice, it offers to the Republic three months of misery; then, rightly or not, it thinks it perceives that it is being chloroformed, cajoled; it wants something other than speeches; obtaining nothing, it rises and affirms, five or six times, its sovereignty; finally, from shock to shock, from fall to fall, massacred by the

bourgeois republic, as it had been decimated by the monarchies, it falls, after fifty years of combats, in the most remarkable mystification... philanthropy!...

Still, however thick we believe the skull of the proletarian, some ideas penetrate there from time to time; however bogged down we believe him in the “cesspool of material interests,” he also has some concern for his dignity as a man, and believes himself, just like the others, something other than a machine. He reflects and seeks the causes of his defeats. There are the unlettered at work.

The wisest search history and discover that, for three centuries, the bourgeoisie has also found itself driven back each time that it has risen. Come 89, it presents itself and takes, almost without obstacles, its place in the State. Why not a hundred and fifty, a hundred or even fifty years earlier? To this question, history responds: It was not worthy!...

All of the nineteenth century was employed by it to gain, through study and labor, the ability that it lacked, and when 89 came it was, in talents, in science, in wealth, at least the equal of the aristocracy: that is the secret of its triumph.

That history is ours, cry the workers, and they decide, without shame, and without weakness, they are incapable.

Then, the agitation of the street, the secret societies, are followed by study and, and after fifteen years of persistent labor and laborious search, they come together and, attempting one final, common effort, they organize the *International Association*, to whose call we respond today.

After what has just been said, the aim of the *International Association* is clearly defined. To gather, to group, in order to make them more fruitful, all the individual efforts attempted so far in view of the emancipation of the proletariat by the proletariat itself; to create, or at least to develop, between the different nations, separated today by antagonistic interests, a moral link that, bringing them all into solidarity, centuples their strength, their force, their influence, and leads them, the ones by the others, toward the realization of that ideal justice, object of their demands and their wishes. In a word, the aim of the *International Association* is to bring, by scientific means — and peacefully, if possible — the proletariat to emancipation, to equality of right, no longer in theory, but in practice.

“Before legislating, administrating, building palaces and temples, and making war, Society works, plows, navigates, exchanges, exploits the land and the sea. Before crowning kings and instituting dynasties, the people found families, consecrate marriages, build cities, etc.” (P. J. Proudhon, *On the Political Capacity of the Working Classes*.) So it is with these different manifestations that we should concern ourselves first of all.

II CAPITAL AND LABOR.

All of the questions put on the agenda by the program link in a direct manner to the one bearing the number 6: Of the relations of capital and labor.

What is Labor? What is Capital?

Labor is the act by which man appropriates the forces of nature, and transforms the raw materials that it contains in its own substance. Such was, in its infancy, labor.

But humanity advances in a continuous march down the path of progress and, need expanding on account of the increasing perfection of the species, bread is no longer enough for it. To material enjoyments are joined the desire for moral or intellectual satisfactions, and labor becomes the act by which man creates one or more exchangeable and consumable services, destined to satisfy his material or moral needs.

Labor is still the act by which man manifests his bravery, his force, his morality; by labor, man dominates nature, acquires new knowledge and raises himself to the deification of himself, — if we can use such an expression here; for divinity is and has always only been the ideal of perfection toward which humanity invincibly tends by the complete development of its faculties.

What is capital?

It is the sum of services created and not consumed, destined by their creator either to facilitate a future production or to anticipate certain events such as sickness, old age, diminution or total loss of his forces.

Capital, finally, is accumulated labor!

Labor and capital are thus two identical terms, representing one single thing, but at various instants and from different points of view.

Their relations find themselves determined, defined by the identity of their nature: he travel not consumed today will be capital tomorrow: so the most perfect equality must preside over exchange.

In all the organic epochs, at all times, at each time that humanity, having consciousness of itself, has had a body of morals, of doctrine, without excepting the primitive period of Catholicism, — by the words of the Fathers of the Church, as by those of the philosophers, it has denied the legitimacy of interest — the majority, nearly the unanimity of the adherents of the *International Association* has followed that path.

However, precisely because of the tenacity with which it has maintained the opposite principle, it is necessary to reproduce here the arguments pronounced from both sides:

Capital — say the partisans of interest — is one of the most active agents of production; with the aid of capital, labor doubles, triples, even centuples its products; so it is just that the service rendered by the money-lender, a service that profits the laborer still more than the capitalist, although paid to the latter by labor, and from that point of view, interest seems to what is most just, most legitimate; to refuse it would be a denial of justice, a theft.

But — say the adversaries of interest — if capital is accumulated labor, labor today is worth that of yesterday, and the repayment of the labor lent by an equivalent labor is all that we could justly demand.

I deprive myself of my capital — responds the lender, — you profit from it, you the producer, and you will not pay me the interest!

You deprive yourself of your crowns, — retorts the laborer, — as every man who exchanges a product is deprived of it in order to obtain another of which is deprived in turn the one who cedes the service demanded by the first.

All that may be true, — objects a third, — when exchange is made from hand to hand; but if the labor of today is worth that of yesterday, we could not say as much for that of tomorrow; in supposing that there is nothing there by advance, credit, this credit, this advance must be paid for; so the interest is legitimate.

Error, profound error, — cry, in their turn, the adversaries of productivity, — that credit, that advance whose price you demand has been delivered to you for nothing by society. In fact, thanks to the tacit contract passed between all the members, thanks to the guarantee granted by all, thanks to money, incorruptible, representative symbol of the product, it had done you a service of which your fellow citizens all demand today the compensation; and, in the name of solidarity, of reciprocity between all, they summon you to have to fulfill the duties as you have enjoyed the rights; — to practice equal exchange — or they exclude you from the group.

To an act of war, to a claim that no formula of right, no legislation has thus far justified, they oppose a formal claim, based on justice and they say: If it is true that your present capital represents your exceeding of prior labor, our present labor is worth just as much as yours and we refuse to recognize that you have any right to the interest. Isn't it true that products exchange for products? Is your capital, in the form of coins or tools, anything but products, transformed but equivalent to ours? To whom do you owe that transformation? And when you present to us the impossibility in which we find ourselves of producing without capital, couldn't we ask you if you have created without the assistance of others, without a considerable amount of services left by previous generations, the products of which you demand, with the reimbursement, an interest?

Indeed, do we imagine the worker storing up his excess and preserving that same excess, his capital, in nature? What would the perishable products become if the exchange was not made immediately, thanks to the money that only has value by the guarantee of all; and, after having enjoyed the benefits of that guarantee, would the laborer, having become capitalist by a culpable premeditation, still find in the group dupes to pay him an income? No, the one who avoids the obligations of the contract commits a misdeed, a theft. It is up to society to reestablish the violated justice by banishing him, putting him in a state of blockade.

All that it is possible for us to recognize, — without however affirming its legitimacy, — is that, in the present state of commercial iniquity and industrial insolidarity, the capitalist takes from the borrower a premium in order to cover his chances of loss; but let them allow us to organize mutual credit, and the full repayment guaranteed, we will declare ourselves quits, after having accomplished it penny for penny.

Moreover, the consequences that carry off the productivity of capital, and the parasitism that it develops are so monstrous, that it would be impossible for us to hesitate. What! Can an individual have rendered enough service to society in 10, 20, 50, or even 100 years, to enable all the generations of his line to live in

idleness? No! no! Every law that violates equality “of right” is a false law. Now, can we suppose that equality is possible with the idea of rents; is it possible to dream of a society of rentiers, — living on what?

What we can affirm without utopia is a nation of laborers exchanging among themselves and practicing reciprocity and justice.

We cannot repeat it too often: we do not want to impose anything on anyone and we ask on this point reciprocity for ourselves; we respect all convictions; but it is impossible for us to accept that the liberty of others would be the negation of our own and that the collective force should be put at the disposition of certain theories rather than in the service of certain others. We protest against the prejudice reigning over the way in which services are exchanged, over the role and nature of capital and money. In the present state, all products suffer a first transformation; they are exchanged for money, which, in its turn, is transformed into products. This is a useless machinery in a number of cases; pay if you will the interest demanded, provided that we are allowed to exchange as it suits us, and to avoid that set of gears in which we always leave some shreds of our production.

We do not demand, for that patronage, subvention or privilege; and we would be permitted to find it strange, when it is a question of interest on capital, if we go on and on constantly with arguments like these: Pay for the service demanded, or do without it if you can.

But your so-called service is only one of the faces of the question. When the Bank, thanks to the monopoly that has been conceded to it, issues bills that only have value by common guarantee, and which represent the enormous sum of 950 million for a reserve of around 300 millions, perhaps we do ourselves a service, but we believe by rendering them another at least equivalent by accepting and guaranteeing its values. Now, your “doing without” amounts purely and simply to this: You are free, — not to issue fiduciary values, — but to pay the interest on those issued by the capitalists. Derision!

Such a theory seems monstrous to us and we pronounce the immorality of interest, the obligation of all to labor!

III

INSTRUCTION, EDUCATION, FAMILY.

To develop the moral and material faculties of the laborers, such is certainly the best, or rather the sole means of emancipation that the democracy can practice. Also, on this first point, the necessity of a good, serious, complete education, all the members have reached agreement: the necessity of simultaneously developing instruction and apprenticeship has also been recognized by all; on the means alone has arisen a dissent that much deeper as the solution of that question concerns the very basis of Society.

Who bears the duty of spreading instruction? What will be the means put to work in order to arrive at that so-desired end?

“The State, — Society, — say some, is especially interested in the material and intellectual development of its members. By instruction and education, man creates services in greater numbers and of an incontestably superior quality.”

“Society profits first of all from the benefits of education; from which quite naturally fall to it the responsibility for creating, developing, and **solder** education.”

Those who demand the intervention of the State go so far as to affirm obligation for the individual to submit to the program elaborated by that superior power, and, by an inexplicable **retour**, they refuse to accept the sanction, for there only appeared the **néant** of the system.

Others leave to the State the right to organize teaching and, they agree, in addition, to its right and duty to dissolve by a uniform education all the differences of opinion that create, beget individual liberty and that develop the familial life and education.

Thus, — in their opinion, — it is only by uniformity and education that it is possible to create a harmonic, viable society; dualism, contradiction, the clash of ideas seem to them so many causes of social misery and the antagonistic state of which the *International Association* pursues the abrogation. It is only, — they say, — by education, scientific, theoretical and practical instruction that we rely on arriving at our emancipation, and you refuse to yourself the sole means of acquiring it! What! In the name of individual initiative, in the name of liberty, you refuse to the State, which alone can make the necessary expenditures for the upkeep of the teachers, and for the creation of the schoolhouses, the right to organize education! But then immediately say that there is nothing more to do, and speak to us no more about emancipation by science. Your family, which makes for you the basis of society, we deny it; your liberty, your individual initiative are powerless; the State alone appears capable to us, we willingly confide our children to it and are disposed to grant it the necessary funds.

Thus, we see, accord on the necessity of a complete education: including the knowledge necessary to man in order to develop his intellectual and material faculties, simultaneous theoretical education; radically contrary opinions on the ways and means, as will be said.

The liberty of education — say the adversaries of free and obligatory instruction — alone can lead us to the end.

Here are the terms in which P. J. Proudhon expresses himself, on pages 218 and following, in his book, *General Idea of the Revolution*:

“A commune needs a teacher. It chooses one at its pleasure, young or old, a graduate of the Normal School or self-taught, with or without a diploma (but not without a prior guarantee of capacity, **dit** a fraction of the partisans of that opinion); the only essential thing is that the said teacher should suit the fathers of families, and that they should be free to entrust their children to them or not. In this, as in other matters, it is essential that the transaction proceeds from a free contract and is subject to competition: something that is impossible under a system of inequality, favoritism, and university monopoly, or that of a coalition between the Church and State.

Thus even with the present system of instruction, the university centralization in a democratic society is an attack upon paternal authority, and a confiscation of the rights of the teacher.

“Even with the present system of education, academic centralization in a democratic country, is an attack upon paternal authority and a confiscation of the rights of the teacher.

“Governmental centralization, in matters of public instruction, is impossible in the industrial regime, for the decisive reason that *instruction* is inseparable from *apprenticeship*, and *scientific* education is inseparable from *professional* education. So that the teacher, the professor, when he is not himself the foreman, is, above all, the man of the agricultural or industrial group, which employs him. As the child is the link between the parents, so the school becomes the link between the industrial groups and families; we reject that it should be separated from the workshop, and, under the pretext of perfecting things, should fall under the influence of an external power.

“To separate teaching from apprenticeship, as is done today, and, what is still more objectionable, to distinguish between professional education from the real, serious, daily, useful practice of the profession, is to reproduce in another form the separation of powers and the distinction of classes, the two most powerful instruments of governmental tyranny and the subordination of the workers

“Let the working class think of that!

“If the School of the Mines is anything other than the work in the mines, accompanied by the studies proper to the mining industry, the school will have for its object, to make, not miners, but chiefs of miners, aristocrats.

“If the school of Arts and crafts is anything but the practice of art or craft, its aim will not be to make artisans, but directors of artisans, aristocrats.

“If the School of Commerce is anything but the store, the bureau, the counting house, it will not be used to make traders, but captains of industry, aristocrats.

If the Naval School is anything but actual service on board ship, including even the service of the cabin boy, it will serve only as a means of distinguishing two classes, the class of sailors and that of officers.

“It is thus we see things go under our regime of political oppression and industrial anarchy. Our schools, when they are not establishments of luxury or pretexts for sinecures, are seminaries for the aristocracy. It was not for the people that the polytechnics, the normal schools, the [military] school at St. Cyr, the law schools, etc., etc., were founded; it was to support, strengthen, and increase the distinction between classes, in order to complete and make irrevocable the split between the working class and the upper class.

“In a real democracy, in which each should have close at hand both higher and lower education, this scholastic hierarchy could not be allowed. It is a contradiction of the principle of society. As soon as education is confused with apprenticeship; when it consists, for theory, in the classification of ideas and, for practice, in the execution of labors; when it becomes at once a matter of speculation, labor and housework, it can no longer depend upon the State; it is incompatible with government. Let there be a central bureau of education,

another of manufactures and arts, as there is now an Academy of Sciences and a Bureau des Longitudes. That can be done and we see no harm in it. But again, why is an authority needed for that? Why that intermediary between the student and the schoolroom, between the apprentice and the workshop, when it is not allowed between the workman and the employer.”

In the end, the theories propounded by those who advocate education by the State give us the fair measure of the goals they wish to achieve and fully justify our legitimate suspicions. Listen to one of the most fervent supporters of that institution.

“It is good that in our societies there has always been some physical work to accomplish, *the superior souls being the only one who could without peril abstain from talking part in it*, because they have enough fondness for thought keep themselves from the numbness and aberration that leisure leads to.... order would also have to suffer, either that labor diminishes, without souls being raised up, or that souls are raised up without labor diminishing....” Jean Reynaud.

You see here a society exclusively made up of *superior souls*.... living on practically nothing or, as is commonly said, *on love and fresh water*; unless one decides to bring from Africa or elsewhere some *inferior souls*!... From the theories of Jean Reynaud to the trafficking of the blacks, there is only one step. Have the philanthropists decided to take it? We would abstain from citing the opinion of this *thinker* if he had not been extolled to us in every way as one of the most zealous defenders of free and obligatory instruction, and then he was one of the called by Garnot to draw up the bill of 1848 to which one claims to call us back.

Instruction by the State is logically, necessarily a uniform program, with the goal of forming all intelligences according to a single type, a type that will necessarily be, by the very nature of the human mind, the negation of the social life, which is composed of struggles, contradictions, contrary affirmations; it will be immobility, atony, general atrophy, to the detriment of all.

That familial instruction that you repudiate is the only normal one, the only one that simultaneously brings with it the greatest development of liberty and dignity, of faculties and aptitudes; the only one that can really create men and, consequently, a society. Among the functions of the family, if there is one alone what would suffice to justify that natural institution, without which humanity without links, without consistency, seeks itself and perishes, lacking an ideal, it is certainly the education of the child. Without the family, the human species is no longer anything but a heap of beings, without determined functions, without reason, without law and without aim. Without the family, man, confounded in an immense community, is not for man anything but an enemy; without the family, has no other reason on earth to be; for without the family, women is no longer anything but a wandering being, condemned by her physical constitution to a premature exhaustion, to some incessant and powerless efforts, of which the clearest result for her organism, is a radical, complete transformation, which would be tantamount to the very negation of the species and the disappearance of the race.

The family finally is one of those natural institutions that are only proven by contradiction, and which imposes itself on humanity as the first condition, indispensable to the development of the being.

We can consider the number of four infants as the normal figure for each family; that two years separate each gestation seems to us one of the indispensable conditions of the vitality of the being; that the period of the education of the child lasts for the girl until the time when she is called to herself become the stock of another family, and for the boy until the age when he will himself be prepared to be a useful producer, that is for the first eighteen years, for the second fifteen or sixteen, an average of seventeen years: such are, in our opinion, the only normal conditions on which a real, viable and just society can be founded. Now, the mother of the family will thus find herself absorbed until the age of forty or forty-five. If it is at that age that she dreams of making herself industrial cog, we truly have not reason to object.

There remains, it is true, the widow and the single girl. We consider the first case as an accident to be covered by mutual insurance, for she is not exempted from raising her children, which makes her incapable to be a worker as understood by current industry; as for the second, we see there one of those abnormal facts against which we invoke the laws of nature, and that it is impossible for us to foresee and describe in a rational society founded on morals and justice.

This brings us back to the labor of women outside the family; some demand complete liberty on this point. If a woman believes herself fit to fulfill other functions that those we consider as natural, we will certainly refrain from imposing any constraint on her; but it is impossible for us to put the social forces at the service of institutions that we consider immoral, the practice of which has given rise among contemporary women to maladies unknown to our grandmother, and that we can justifiably consider as one of the most active causes of the degeneration of the race.

The facts revealed in recent times about the mortality of the children handed over to these *businesswomen of breeding* that we call by the name of child-minders, come on this point to confirm what we advance here about the functions of women. In the presence of such documents, what to say of the economic-philanthropic system that for fifty years sought to take hold of the direction of the working classes, and having nothing to do in order to react against such a state of thing comes to flatter us with regard to free and obligatory instruction?

That said, there only remains for us in this case to apply to women the principle of equality before labor: for equal service, equal product; that for a product equal to that of man, the woman receives a wage equal to that of man, that seems to us completely just; and while awaiting the transformation that we summon with all our wishes, we will not cease to clamor against the exploitation of which our mother, wives, daughters and sisters are the victims.

The family admitted, its dominant function being to perpetuate, to develop, from the intellectual point of view, as well as from the physical point of view, all the faculties of man, we see how education is done there and what are its results.

Nature has clearly indicated to what functions woman is destined; her constitution, her faculties, the sensitivity that characterizes here are, with the familial selfishness that is proper to her, the most powerful means of preservation that could have been granted to a human being. In fact, if the devotion to the public good, is preoccupation with collective interests are qualities in men, they are an aberration in women, of which science has long since noted the inevitable consequences for the child: *decline, rickets*, and finally helplessness.

The woman identifies with the being who owes her life, and education follows by her cares a march parallel to material development; it is without jolts, step by step, that the intelligence of the child develops; the organs, free of all constraint, function in a normal, regular manner and thus attain their highest degree of development. If, later, the introduction of a foreign influence is judged useful, it is limited, under the supervision and direction of the father, *according to his free choice*, to classifying the ideas received and coordinating the knowledge acquired. Will we obtain this result, with the nurseries and infant asylums, where a vain and powerless philanthropy coops up our children, in order to give them to society, without science, without conscience and without dignity? Whatever the devotion of the woman who accepts such a mission, whatever sacrifices it imposes, isn't the futility of her efforts the condemnation of the system of charitable institutions substituted for the family?

And later, when, the child growing, a greater education becomes necessary, you would abandon the only path that leads, by imperceptible and graduated transitions, to the free manifestation of his faculties? You would deliver him to an official teacher who, in order to facilitate the task, bends all his students under the weight of a method holds some back, and leaves others breathless; who, sometimes a bachelor, knows nothing of the family, nothing of the true conditions of a complex and difficult education? In the end, you will appoint (and pay with our money) this schoolmaster by a power that does not know these details; which rules and is obliged to rule, to rule instruction according to the general laws, inapplicable in a number of cases?

In the name of the liberty of conscience, in the name of individual initiative, in the name of the liberty of the mother let us rescue from the workshop, which demoralizes and kills her, that woman who dreams free, that woman that you only emancipate by making her a mongrel being, inevitably condemned, by the abuse of a labor for which she was not made, to an existence without joy and without aim. In the future society, asserting the equivalence of functions, let us give her back her dignity, which industrialism certainly does not respect, and that she could never recapture except in the family. To her the function of raising the child, of preparing for that free, male education that alone can make a man. And the family thus reconstituted, thanks to a radical reform of customs, to a more just division of the products of labor, will suffice, we believe, to make citizens outside the influence of the State and all regulation. And when the age come for the child when labor is imposed as relaxation from study, as a necessary function, the family will still be enough.

As to that last objection: “the father charged with a family will be unable to pay for the instruction of his children, and thus you condemn him to a state of inferiority against which are directed all our efforts,” we respond:

For instruction as for fire, unemployment, sickness and other risks, mutual insurance, “which must not be confused with begging, charity, assistance,” is destined to render the necessary education accessible to all.

So we cannot all free and obligatory instruction as the means of education, and we refuse to grant you the sanction demanded if it can allow the State to interfere with the family. A moral sanction is the only one we understand, and we are convinced that concern for their proper dignity will suffice to overcome the indifference of which you complain today, on the part of the interested parties themselves.

OPINION OF THE MINORITY.

(Bourdon, Varlin.)

Finding ourselves in agreement on the obligation to be educated in a society where we profit each day from the insights of other; recognizing the necessity of education being at once scientific and professional, we are radically divided on the means of spreading it: some maintain that this responsibility falls on the family; the others, that it must be borne by society.

The convictions being equally profound on both sides, we believe that we should indicate here the principles that we have taken for a guide in the study of this question. These principles can be summarized in two words: Justice, Liberty. Justice in social relations, equality of rights and duties, equality in the means of action put by society at the disposition of the individual, equality for the individuals in the burdens of society.

Individual liberty, the right for each and the power to employ their faculties, and to use them according to their will.

As long as the individuals could only arrange unequal means of action, the tasks that fall to them will be unequal, and justice will not exist.

As long as one constraint prevents the use of the self, liberty will not exist. That said, let us enter into the facts.

The complete incapacity of the human being, at their birth, requires in its favor an advance of services of which it will have to take account, when the development of its faculties will have put it, so to speak, in possession of itself, when it becomes a being capable of action.

With man in the state of nature, a comparatively small amount of services suffices for the child of:

That the mother directs his first step; that the father teaches him to hunt and gather the fruits with which he must nourish himself, and his education is complete. He can live freely and in conditions of complete equality with his fellows. The number of his brothers, even the loss of his parents would not be for him causes of inequality; the bit of demand for such an education is the guarantee that he will receive it from a strong being, whatever it might be. In the civilized state, it is something else: Man being created for enjoyments, that habit

has transformed into needs, in order to satisfy them, he must produce, produce a great deal; muscular strength no longer suffices, he must put intelligence to work.

From then on, education becomes complicated; to the physical development is added the intellectual and moral development.

The more the faculties of man will be developed, the more and better he will produce, the more he will be useful and the more he should be happy.

The less educated he will be, the less useful he will be and the more miserable, for inferiority is misery.

Now, the advance sum necessitated by an education capable of developing all the faculties of the child and to put him level with science and industry, being considerable, it is no longer a matter of indifference to ask who will furnish it.

It is just that this should be by those who must profit from it; but what is especially important is that all the children are assured of receiving it complete, so that none begin life in conditions of inferiority.

Some say that the responsibility for education falls on the family!

Can the family furnish equal means of education to all children? No. Depending on whether the family has more or less children, it will have more or less resources; and while the father of one could, without depriving himself, give them not only primary education, but also secondary and even higher education, the father responsible for many children will barely give them elementary instruction. The son of the first will become the manager of enterprises for which the children of the second will be the laborer.

Inequality for the children in the results, inequality of burdens for the families, and thus no justice.

To shield themselves from these shocking inequalities, the partisans of education by the family propose to found some cooperative insurance societies in order to provide, in equal parts, for the costs of education of their children, whatever their number. That idea is certainly very laudable, but is it capable of guaranteeing the education of all the children? No.

There will always be improvident fathers. Unconcerned for their dignity and of the interests of their children, they will not insure it; and, if education becomes too heavy a burden for them, they will neglect it.

Some quantity of children will still find themselves at risk of lacking education, or of only having due to the public or private charity that our opponents energetically reject, as it applies to men who have consciousness of their dignity. But if it is good to guarantee oneself against all protection, all charity, wouldn't it be better still to destroy them by leaving them no place any longer, no void to fill?

As for us, we do not accept that a single child should be deprived of instruction, that charity finds a single child to instruct.

Let society take education under its charge, and the inequalities cease, charity would disappear. Education becomes an equal right for all, paid for by all the citizens, no longer according to the number of their children, but according to their ability to contribute.

Incidentally, who will profit from the education of the child? Isn't it the entire society, rather than the family? Now, if it is society, let it be society that covers the costs.

But there is not there only a question of tasks and expenses; there is also, and especially, a question of direction, and it is to this that the partisans of education by the family cling most.

The fear of the absorption of the individual by the state, the terror of official education, makes them forget all the costs of education, all the social inequalities that inequality of instruction brings about.

Certainly, we can only agree with their criticisms of university education, only applaud the blows struck by them against the monopoly of education, for it is not to us that all that is addressed. We even make this declaration, that if we only had to choose between the monopoly of education in the hands of a despotic, absolute power, of the government of one man or a few men, and the liberty of education at the responsibility of the family, we would opt for liberty.

But when we demand that education be the responsibility of society, we mean a truly democratic society in which the direction of the education would be the will of all.

It will doubtless be objected that everyone will never have the same will and that the minority must be subject to the majority. That will occur even with mutual insurance. But we are allowed to hope that the habits of liberty will lead the citizens to make some reciprocal concessions, and that the programs of study will be formulated according to generally accepted ideas, excluding above all affirmations without proof and accepting only the sciences and reasonable things. In our mind, the central administration, having formulated a program of study including only the essential notions of universal utility, will leave to the communes the task adding what seems good and useful to them in relation to the places, manners and industries of the country, and to choose their instructors, to open and direct their schools.

What is more, that education by society will find an excellent corrective in the liberty of education, in the natural right that the individual has to teach what they know, and learn what they don't know. A right of which we are presently deprived, and that we are all resolved to demand with all our energy.

This right of education would not only allow some teachers to offer courses concurrently with the public schools, either for general studies or more often for specialized studies; but still, by leaving to each the ability to establish courses or conferences critical on the points found incomplete or flawed in the teaching, would permit the presentation of the objection to the students and the public who would judge. This would force the public educators to hold themselves to the level of science and to the improvements of teaching methods in order to leave the least possible grip for criticism.

It seems to us that in this manner the parents would have as large a part as desirable in the direction of the education; and the children would be assured of all receiving an education as complete as necessary.

But in order for all to be assured of receiving that instruction, there must be an obligation! Should it be real or simply moral? If the obligation is real, it is said, you strike at the liberty of the child and the authority of the father.

As for the liberty of the child, we respond: in order to be free, it must have the enjoyment of all its faculties to be able to suffice for its own existence; now, the child is not free, and to become free, has need precisely of education.

In terms of paternal authority, a father does not have a right to refuse education to his child. Now, society having the duty of safeguarding the interests of its members, in the name of the interest of the child when its father leaves it in ignorance, it should take it and instruct it.

We conclude then for education by society, under the direction of the parents and compulsory for all children; but we also demand, whatever happens, the freedom of education. (28)

IV

COOPERATION DISTINGUISHED FROM ASSOCIATION.

Are cooperation and association two synonymous terms, designating a single idea, a single mode of grouping; or are they, on the contrary, the expression of two ideas having a common form, but radically different in their aim, their means, and their results?

First, what do we mean by association? What signification are we authorized to give it, according to the tendencies of those who have advocated, practiced, and even sometimes attempted to impose it?

Association, in the opinion of its founders themselves, should dissolve all interests, annihilate differences, create absolute equality; now what law should preside over this fusion of wills? Is it free contract? Doubtless not; for all the reformers — Cabot, R. Owen, Fourier, Louis Blanc, etc., like Lycurgus—start from the basis that society is everything, that it alone has rights, and that the individual only has duties; the good of the collectivity the supreme aim, they could not recoil before any means; the satisfactions offered or rather promised to the part are a concession made graciously by the whole and not a distribution based on tacit or real conventions, since there are no longer contracting individualities, but instead a superior, absorbing unity.

The different associations that have been established have begun according to these laws, they have begun by organizing the whole, only to later recruit some members, some associates to which they promise an equal share while demand of them an unequal labor; they owed all and received part. The famous formula, *from each according to his faculties, to each according to his needs*, offers, in a striking form, the contradiction of the principle. The State (for where the individual does not exist, there must be a higher authority that thinks, directs and acts in the name of all), the State being sole judge, first demands of the unity all that it can really produce, and offers it what it believes necessary to its needs.— Live there if you can, a moral and free being who feels an increasing dignity developing in you because of your responsibility, you in whom the State,

directing power of the association, has not yet curbed all movements, and destroyed all initiative.

Cooperation is a form of association; so we could, at first glance, deny the necessity of a new expression to designate this particular mode. But if cooperation is one of the forms of association, it is distinct from it, so distinct that it is impossible to confound them, and that the end and the means of action offer such differences to observation that a new word becomes necessary.

While the association covers the individuals, who, ceasing to be persons, become unities; cooperation, on the contrary, groups men in order to glorify the strength and initiative of each, "The fundamental idea is thus", said P. J. Proudhon, "that of a contract by which several individuals agree to organize among themselves, in a certain measure and for a determined time, either production, circulation or exchange: consequently, they bind themselves to one another and guarantee mutually, reciprocally a certain quantity of products, services, advantages, duties, etc., which they are in a position to obtain and to give to each, recognizing that they are perfectly independent, whether for their production, or for their consumption.

"The contract therefore is essentially synallagmatic: it imposes no obligations upon the contracting parties, except those that result from their reciprocal promise; it is not subject to any external authority; it alone forms the law between the parties; it only awaits their initiative for its execution."

So that the quantity of services, products, liberty and well being is for each as much more considerable as the contracting cooperators are more numerous; and, in that sense, it is true to say that the tendency of the cooperative principle, "mutuality, federation," is universality. Now, we could not say as much for association, which, beyond certain limits, and even more so [when] universalized, leads inevitably to a governmental communism, where a high personification of the community is responsible for making, according to son good pleasure and without any responsibility, the regulation of labor, the distribution of the products.

The tendency of society is to the realization of right, and, consequently, to unity. How does cooperation realize that ideal?... By free contract, by the affirmation of right, each individual acquires a quantity of enjoyments and well-being superior to what they could hope for from an isolated labor. Right is one; and if its manifestations are numerous, infinitely variable, they are the same for all. Now, what is right? It is the power, the ability that each has to enjoy the economic forces. The unity of rights, the unity of tendencies, the unity of desires are thus found realized by cooperation, and renders impossible the usurpation of the majority, the crushing or absorption of the minority.

In association, as it has been revealed to us thus far, the contract is, for a more or less considerable party, without compensation; it is also uncertain, since the division promised, already insufficient, is not even guaranteed. Association, finally, is the subordination individual to the group.

On the contrary, what makes up the essence of cooperation is that, thanks to free contract, the individuals are not only obliged synallagmatically and commutatively toward one another, but they also acquire by the pact,

considerable quantity of rights and liberty without having to fear any infringement on their free initiative, which finds itself, on the contrary, increased by the quantity of efforts provided by each.

In summary, without occupying yourself with determining what was the value of the word Cooperation at the moment of its appearance in France, nor with the sense that we attached to it then, we say: That to a new phase of the social movement must correspond a new word. Cooperation, generally accepted today, appears to us to render our idea; we will clarify its sense for us.

To this day *Association*, as it has been understood and practiced, has meant: Submission of the individual to the collectivity leading almost unerringly to the destruction of liberty and individual initiative; — *Cooperation* means: Contract freely consented to, with a unique aim, determined and defined in advance. In *Association*, the general interest was the higher principle before which the individual bows; in *Cooperation*, it is the collectivity that is organized, in view of furnishing the individual all the means of increasing their liberty of action, to develop their individual initiative.

Finally, Association appeared to aim to unite person and not thing; on the contrary, Cooperation seems to us to indicate the union of things, and not of persons.

V

UNEMPLOYMENT, STRIKES.

Unemployment, strikes! Two words to which we commonly attach a very different sense, which, however, produces on general production and circulation exactly the same result.

In the first case, one party of the laborers is put out to pasture by the pure and simple will of the capitalists; production being halted, there results, by virtue of what we pompously call *liberty, law of supply and demand*, an increase of products; for if the laborer only receives on account of the quantity of their products, it is not the same for the capitalist who, by the suspension of labor, creates an artificial rarity with the aid of which he imposes his prices on the consumer, and thus collects an often considerable profit, to the detriment of total consumption.

In the second case, pressed by the necessity of a greater remuneration, the laborers suspend their labors, in order to obtain for their services a higher wage, or a diminution in the duration of labor. It becomes very evident then that, since the producers are at the same time consumers, the cessation of labor makes a void in the purse of the laborer, immediately and inevitably causes a restriction in his consumption, and leads, as a consequence, unemployment in the other industries. That is one of the manifestations of that economic solidarity that links all the industries.

The result, as we see, is the same as in the first case; there is a vicious circle there from which it is important for the workers to escape as soon as possible.

Let us seek what the causes of these perturbations can be. They result, in our opinion, from the anarchy that reigns today in the relations of capital and labor. In fact, capital, gathered by different means, more or less respectable, in a very limited number of hands, monopolizes, at will, labor. Sure of being able to wait, thanks to the preference granted to the **capital écu**, it imposes its conditions; in order to avoid suffering the oscillations caused, in the sales price, by the abundance of products, it ceases its demands, dismisses a part of the laborers, and gives those it keeps this terrible alternative: of leaving the workshop and dying of hunger for lack of work, or of wearing themselves out by an excessive and badly paid labor, leading to a slow death, by fatigue and exhaustion.

It is thus that in a mass of industries, where the normal workday is presently ten hours, certain industrialists demand thirty, fourteen or even fifteen, in the moments of urgency, in order keep in demand a certain number of workers, and thus to force them (pressed as they are by hunger) to come make a disastrous competition on those who are occupied.

Let us recognize however that, in the present organization, unemployment can have other causes. Either by passion or routine: there are industries overburdened with arms; the products exceeding the normal consumption, it becomes necessary to suspend labor. Now, one of the effects of the division of labor and especially of the specialization of various parts of each trade, is to make it impossible for the laborer to pass immediately from one industry to another. There results, in certain cases, some disturbances whose repercussions make themselves felt in the professions most foreign to those affected.

The strikes have the same original cause as the unemployment. They ordinarily break out, either when, the price of all products increasing, wages remain the same (and consequently, proportionately, diminishes), or when the price of products remaining the same, wages diminish, following what we could call the strike of the capitalists.

In sum, strike against strike, unemployment against unemployment, war between bosses and workers, between laborers and capitalists, to the detriment of all.

Capital is as necessary to production as labor; the causes of the struggle are all in their present relations, which it is indispensable to transform.

To establish exchange on the basis of reciprocity.

To reform professional education in the direction of a polytechnic for apprenticeship.

To establish some exact, complete statistics so as to avoid the blockage in certain professions, which inevitably leads to the lowering of products and consequently of wages, and the scarcity of arms in certain others, which causes increase in the price of the products in a much greater proportion than that obtained by the workforce. Such are, in our opinion, the means of remedying that state of things of which we complain, and which leads, in certain cases, to some crises that it is impossible to avert in the present state of relations between the producer-consumer and the non-producing consumer.

It is in order to arrive at the realization of that order of ideas, that the International Association has been founded.

VI

TAXATION

You set apart for the Lord all that opens the womb of the mother, all the first-born of your livestock, and you consecrate to the Lord all the first-born males that you have.... And you purchase with money all the first-born of your children.

(Exodus, chapter XIII, v. 12 and 13.)

The original idea of taxation is that of a redemption; all of antiquity understood it in this way. According to the law of Moses, the entire universe being the property of Jehovah, his representatives withdraw a royalty on all that the earth produces and even on human life; it is thus that the first-born had to be redeemed by an offering: it is thus the sign of servitude. The tribute to which the vanquished was subject is the general form that taxation takes, from the origins until our own times; we understand that there was not then, and there is still not today, another law, another balance than the will of the victor. Toward the end of the Middle Ages, it was still affirmed in the form of redemption and became sign and means of emancipation, but it was not slow to take again its first character, and it would require nothing less than a revolution to transform its idea and meaning. The famous decree of the *Marc d'argent* made this principle pass into facts: of the conquest of liberty by contribution to the public expenses. Today it is still, if not a sign, at least a means of creating social inferiority; in fact, it is enough to study the different modes of division of the tax to insure that it is progressive in the sense of poverty and that it is not even proportional in the sense of wealth: the laborer alone pays, since he alone produces. Now, in the mid-nineteenth century, there are still authors who claim that labor is a punishment, result of an original sin, who make taxation an aggravation of that punishment; the most unworthy being the proletarians, it seems natural to make their taxation serve to draw out their servitude.

Thus, the army, the courts, the police, the schools, the hospitals, hospices, houses of refuge and correction, asylums, nurseries and other charitable institutions, religion itself are first paid and maintained by the proletarian, then directed against him; so that the proletariat works not only for the caste that devours it (that of the capitalists), but also for the one that scourges and stultifies it.

However, the general sentiment protests against such a flagrant iniquity; the laborer rebels against that state of things, he first asks for, then imposes, a radical reform of the system. The tax should only be the share paid by each in order to settle the general expenses is thus an exchange between the taxpayers and that abstraction that we call the State. It follows that the members of the collectivity are alone judges competent for the services of which they have need, and also the price that suits them to put on it.

These principles are generally recognized, but the practice is far from being in agreement with the theory. If we must believe Mr. de Parieu, "the social order

would be inverted and the peoples are not slow to perish of their own excesses, without a series of restrictive, repressive or preventive measures, among which it is appropriate to place taxation,” and he adds that “the artifices that steal from the majority of the citizens the exact figure of the taxes that they pay does not cease for long to be licit and to hold, as it were, a beneficial anesthesia....” That would be the affirmation of our incompetence, and we would have thought ourselves authorized, by universal suffrage, to consider ourselves adults.

Taxation assumes all forms. In order to wrest from the people the products of their labor, all means are good. The infinite variety of taxes require us to silently pass over a great number of them, however we will divide them into two great categories: direct taxes and indirect taxes. Among the direct taxes, there are two of them against which the democracy must protest with all its strength: service, and conscription, justly called *tax of blood*; we can affirm that, in the present state, they are both the most persecutory and the most unequally divided; in fact, they bear directly no longer on the **excédant**, but also on the gross product and on the producer himself; then, the use that they make of the resources that they procure suffices and beyond in order to dismiss them without further examination.

The taxes on doors and window, as well as those on consumption, the excise duties, among others, are so many measures directed against the health and life of the people; we could say as much of nearly all of them; those that seem most odious to the people are not always the most dangerous to them.

But to undertake today a radical reform of taxation and propose a new organization, seems impossible to us; for if the solution of all the other questions posed by the program must bring about the emancipation of labor, it is not the same for the question of taxation, which can only find practical solution after that emancipation is accomplished.

So we limit ourselves, for the moment, to indicate that taxation must be as direct as possible, in order that the portion pertaining to each, clearly determined, allows them to feel the burden that they support, and so that the just division of it may be easily verified.

VII

THE PERMANENT ARMIES CONSIDERED IN THEIR RELATIONS WITH PRODUCTION.

War, when there remains on this means of affirming right, is a public service, all without exception are compelled to it; thus demands right, liberty, equality and justice

On that question, the examination of the facts is fully sufficient to motivate the condemnation of the institution. In fact, remove from labor several tens of millions of men, it is doubtless harmful to production.

Employ these same men to destroy each other and to plunder the products of the peaceful laborers, it is doubly harmful, triply harmful to production. And I it was necessary to hold to the study of the direct relations of the armies with that

same production, there would have to be joined to the facts pronounced above the statistics of the unproductive expenses necessitated by the upkeep of the soldiers, and all will be said. But to instruct the people, to make them ethical, is to stimulate labor and increase the sum of collective well-being, and it is from that point of view that it is especially suitable to envision the permanent armies. The *International Association* only has to subscribe to the protestations that we have at all times to make the people understand, in order to proclaim the condemnation of the system.

Let us note first that no army is possible without discipline, that this discipline is the negation of liberty and, consequently, of the morality of the soldier. Passive obedience is, they say, a necessity; so be it; let us see the results of it, and for that let us turn back to the heroic times, in order to avoid the burning terrain of current events:

Caesar has just crossed the Rubicon; he is about to invade his homeland; one of his lieutenants addresses to him, to the applause of all the soldiers, the following words:

“By your eagles ten times favorable to our arms, by your triumphs over so many enemies, I swear it, if you want the chest of a brother, the throat of a father, the entrails of a wife full with a living fruit, to be struck with my sword, speak, my trembling hand will obey. Strip the Gods, burn the temples, destroy in the fires of the camp their statues in tatters: what must be done? I am ready, on the banks of the Tiber, opposite Rome, do you want me to mark the place of your camp? Whatever they are, the walls that you condemn will crumble under the battering ram that my hand will wield. Order: what city must soon be a ruin? Be it Rome, it will perish!” (Lucan, *Pharsalia*.)

To speak of production! It is indeed a question of that when the life and honor of the citizens run the risk at all times of being thus *respected*, protected by those that we pompously call the defenders of the Homeland!...

The defenders of the Homeland! But the homeland needs defenders only when it is threatened; and, since in the end it is there that we must return, to make stagnate for several years the most vigorous part of the laborers in the barracks, it is certainly to hinder production in the present and in the future. For, what services are to be awaited from a being bastardized by the system: accustomed to an idle and aimless life, dragging after it demoralization and debauchery, permanent cause of physical degeneration. Living without proper will, what to make of it, we ask, if not a parasite in the society where it will return.

Let us not forget, finally, that when “the *Public Order* means *liberty, right, and homeland*, it could not be better defended than by the people armed.” (Benjamin Constant.) And that, “if we want to be free, we must be our own police and army. To give ourselves guardians, is to give ourselves masters.”

VIII

FREE EXCHANGE. —COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

The *International Association* could not remain indifferent to that grave question of exchange, which can so profoundly effect the interests of labor.

For ten years, protectionists and free traders have fought a battle that appeared interminable, in which the adversaries repeat *ad nauseam* the same arguments.

We do not want to discuss here the good faith of either; but when, in an economic question, a matter of science, we debate for entire years, without finding a solution, we believe that the question is badly posed. There is some uncertainty there.

Looking at it, we see very quickly, in fact, that the protectionists and free traders are guided by individual interests much more than by the general interest, envisioned from the point of view of justice.

Both, depending on whether they are farmers, merchants, manufacturers, capitalists; according to the interest of the moment and the transformations of industry or agriculture, never really defend the interests of labor, but instead the interests of the proprietor, the capitalist, and the shopkeeper.

Whatever is said about it today by the partisans of protection, who present it as a system of guarantees—insuring labor to the worker, the national market to the manufacturer—we have the right to affirm this: protection was only a guarantee for the proprietor, the industrialist and the trafficker; it was even for the most part a monopoly.

In fact, during the period that began in 1815 and ended in the latest commercial treaties, we have seen established little by little high finance and large-scale industry: it could not be otherwise. On the one hand, absolute master of the domestic market by the effect of tariffs that insure him the sale of his products at an increased price, the capitalist, the industrialist demanded, on the other hand, the rigorous application of the law on coalitions, and found himself, by virtue of the competition among the workers, sole master of regulation of the rate of wages. De plus, the introduction of the machine progressively brought the division of labor; no doubt, it was the normal, regular development of industrial progress; but applied without counterweight, without a just division of the profits and without professional instruction, the division of labor could only aggravate the already precarious situation of the worker. In many industries, the work no longer demands the united efforts of the intelligence and muscles; a mechanical labor is sufficient. At the expense of public hygiene and morals, women and children were enlisted in fabrication and manufacture; and the agricultural worker, drawn into the movement by the attraction exerted on him from afar by the big cities, could, despite his inexperience, increase the number of industrial workers.

Soon the equilibrium is ruptured; the depopulation of the countryside brings about a continuous increase [in the price] of agricultural products, while, by the excess of competition, wages remain stationary in industry.

It is this double evil that they want to remedy by putting free trade into practice, and by the abolition of the sliding scale. For some time, we have been able to deceive ourselves about the results of these measures; we can hardly be mistaken today. If there is an advantage in the new system, it is certainly not for Labor, but only for Capital. — Through the Bank of France, it is absolute master of the discount. — Decried, by anonymity, proprietor of the canals, the railroads, the transatlantic lines, it is absolute master of transportation and circulation. — By the lure of large dividends, the big financial companies have organized for ten years the *drainage* of popular capital, and today they have direction of it, regulating its use without responsibility or sufficient supervision. — Credit, circulation, exchange, machines, all the economic forces have been monopolized by them; the social tools are in their hands. — Sovereign over the market, they can, at their discretion, distort the law of supply and demand with their speculations, by artificially creating the abundance or rarity of products.

What proves the error of the system is that the balance of commerce can settle in favor of one nation without the laborer finding any real advantage there. Once the wages are paid, all the profits remain to capital;—capital has no homeland. So that the profits produced by the labor of the French workers can go in large part to increase the *Goods* of the capitalists of England.

Each day the progress of industry allow the worker to produce more in the same space of time, but as he does not share in the profits, we could see this phenomenon occur: the balance of trade settles to the advantage of France, the yield of the tariffs, of the direct and indirect taxes increasing, at the same times as unemployment will strike more frequently and more cruelly among our industrial populations. So we can foresee in certain cases a result that seems contradictory at first; the population of wage-workers producing more, laboring less, consequently receiving a lower wage, and, by speculation, the capitalist and the industrialist, all-powerful in the market, realizing more substantial profits.

What is serious in the situation that is made for us is that labor enjoys here the role of a little school-fellow of the King. When capital commits an error, a fault, it is labor that receives the lash. In the state of industrial antagonism and economic insolidarity in which we live, it is on labor that the financial and industrial crises weigh most heavily.

Let the ironmaster of Champagne or the Vosges, let the spinner of Rouen be protectionists. Let the ship-owner of Marseille or the winemaker of Bordeaux be free traders. That is their affair. In this they hardly consult anything but their interests. But we who seek justice, we who want the equality of rights and duties, we who believe that a freely consented contract must connect in solidarity the citizens who compose a natural group — commune, province, or nation — what interest do we have in seeing either protection or free trade triumph?

What we want is the freedom to organize equal exchange among producers, service for service, labor for labor, credit for credit. In all commercial speculation, one of the two contracting parties has lost what the other has gained, it is the state of war. It is up to us to organize peace in industry by the gradual suppression of the random chances of commerce, by cooperation, which,

based on reciprocity and justice, can only allow, between the contracting parties, a mutual exchange of equivalent services.

IX

OF RELIGIOUS IDEAS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE MORAL ET SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PEOPLES.

[The Association, counting within its ranks members of all the religions and some indifferent on religious matters, could not dogmatize; so it was content to proclaim its desire not to interfere on that terrain. Here is the text of that resolution:]

It is impossible to make on this question anything but a declaration of principles.

Religion is one of the manifestations of the human conscience, respectable like all the others, as long as it remains in internal, individual, private thing; we consider religious idea and all *à priori* ideas as not being able to be the subject of useful discussion; each which think, on this point, what they judge appropriate, on the condition of not making “their God” interfere in social relations, and of practicing justice and morals.

X

OF THE RECONSTITUTION OF POLAND.

[More fortunate at Geneva than at London, the Parisians were able to set aside the question of Poland by the following considerations:]

Partisans of liberty, we proclaim our protest against all despotisms, to condemn and energetically reprove the organization and social tendencies of the Russian despotism, as leading unflinching to the most overwhelming communism; but, delegates to an economic congress, we believe we have nothing to say about the political reconstitution of Poland.

APPENDIX.

Gathered in congress on the soil of the old Swiss republic, we have said there, about the economic program put on the agenda, without anger and without weakness, all that we had to say, and nothing but what we wanted to say. It is the frank and complete expression of the economic and social principles that animate and direct us.

The publication that we make today proves, whatever has been said of it, that we do not recoil before responsibility for our acts; for we seek only justice.

It is now up to our fellow citizens, to public opinion to decide. (29)

After hearing the reading of the Parisian report, the Lyonnais delegates declared that they renounced speech; as a consequence, they withdrew from the bureau the manuscripts that they deposited there, referring themselves completely to the conclusions of the delegates from Paris.

The delegate from Rouen having made the same declaration, it was decreed that the report of the Parisian delegates would take the name of *French Report of the Delegates to the Congress of Geneva*; following these decisions, they have signed the present:

BOURDON, — CAMELINAT, — CHEMALÉ , — CULTIN, — FRIBOURG, — GUIARD , — MALON , — MURAT, — PERRACHON, — TOLAIN, — VARLIN, *delegates of Paris*, — BAUDY, — RICHARD, — SCHETTEL, — SECRETAN, *delegates of Lyon*, — AUBRY, *delegate of Rouen*.

These official signatures represented the formal membership, not only of the Parisian, Lyonese and Rouenese Commissions, but also of all the Thursday groups of the Gravilliers.

The Swiss, by their oft-repeated applaus, were associated with the line of conduct traced by Paris; only the English and some Germans who were present adopted that report only with certain reservations that we will make known in the following chapter.

XIII

RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENEVA CONGRESS.

We have said that the English had made certain reservations on one point of the Parisian memorandum. Indeed, eager to justify their reputation as practical men, the English only considered the International as an organizing power from which the strike movement could receive great help.

They even made the delegates understand that the adhesion of the English workers' societies depended on this condition. Consequently, they asked the Congress for a declaration limiting the hours of work, and claimed the support of the Association to achieve this goal.

Invoking a recent decree of the United States, in which the legal duration of the day was fixed at eight hours, they implored their co-associates to oppose a systematic refusal to their employers, when the latter, under the pretext of urgent orders, asked them to do overtime or night work, even though they offered to pay it above the ordinary rate.

While acknowledging with the English that it was deeply regrettable to see certain employers, distorting the law of supply and demand, speculating on the so-called conditions of orders, force their workers to work more than the hygienists prescribe, while a good number of available arms create artificial competition and a so-called abundance of offers whose clearest result is always the lowering of wages, Varlin, Tolain, Chemalé, Camélinat and Fribourg opposed the consideration of the English proposal; according to them, it was enough to declare "in principle, that a serious labor of eight hours per day should be considered sufficient to provide the person who performs it with the means to support his existence; that it was appropriate to leave young children in school as late as possible, and that night labor, contrary to human nature, should only be an exception in a normal society.

"But, in the name of the liberty of contracts and contractors, the International Assembly had no business intervening in the particular relationships between employers and workers other than by giving advice if it was asked to do so." (30)

As a corollary to these declarations and to indicate what they thought had to be done, the Parisians recalled that they had tabled the following project:

"Among all the members who adhere to the statutes of the society, there is formed under this title: International Workers' Association, a universal cooperative society with variable capital and equal monthly contributions.

"This society will have as its object the investment of all its members, both in their reciprocal countries and in the various countries of Europe where corresponding offices will be established, — it will also provide mutual credit to those members who have temporarily moved away from their usual center.

“It will open stores wherever it can, in which the associates will put into practice the exchange of goods or services, for services or goods of an equivalent value, without any other levy than the registration fees of said services or goods.

“It will open international counters where the products of the associates’ industry will be sold to the public.

“Finally, it will sponsor, if possible, the cooperative associations which it considers to realize the idea of justice and solidarity between all their members.”

In order to achieve this result, the means of action of the Association were to be:

The establishment in each locality of Europe of corresponding offices;

A monthly contribution intended to cover the general expenses of correspondence;

A publication, also monthly, of a bulletin of the society;

The organization of international professional education;

Partial emigrations and immigrations of the members of the Association.

The strict observation of the principle of reciprocity.

The Congress ratified these proposals to the extent that they were practical, that is to say, the study of all the points indicated.

Although all the members of the Congress agreed not to perpetuate the functions, neither in one place, nor on certain heads, nevertheless, given the impossibility of making the central seat in Paris and the temporary difficulty of establishing it in Brussels, the English were still charged with composing a general council for one year, from which were to be excluded in particular, and, at the express request of the French delegates, the named Lelubez and Vésinier, convicted of slander against the Parisian office.

This exclusion, pronounced on Saturday at ten o'clock in the evening, closed the work of the Congress.

The next day, a great celebration offered by the Genevan members, with a procession of workers' societies, a walk on the lake, a symphony, a banquet and speeches, ended the session of the first Workers' Congress. (31)

XIV

PARIS WORKS 1866-67.

The return to France was without incident for the French: they returned empty-handed; but the English who passed through Paris found themselves stripped by the imperial police of all the papers they were carrying. It took the all-powerful intervention of the English ambassador Lord Cowley to have these documents returned <several months later> to their owners; and even then they were only returned to them because they were English subjects. It was necessary to think about organizing the office in Paris definitively. In a few days, the following regulations, prepared for a long time, were adopted by the Commission.

International Workingmen's Association.

REGULATIONS OF THE PARIS OFFICE.

Admissions.

ARTICLE 1, — To be admitted, one must prove one's status as a worker.

ART. 2. — Any admission is final after three months, if the member has not received notice to the contrary from the Commission.

ART. 3. — In the event of non-admission, all sums paid by the member will be reimbursed in full.

ART. 4. — When registering, each new member pays 50 centimes of admission fee and receives a member's book.

Contributions.

ART. 5. — The contribution is set at 10 centimes per week.

ART. 6. The member must pay his contribution each week into the hands of a collector. In the event of non-payment for two weeks, the collector may claim the sums due from him. Two months of delay may result in removal from the membership.

Information.

ART. 7. — Members must provide all information relating to labor statistics.

ART. 8. — A book will be kept at the correspondence office making known the conditions under which members could deliver their products to members of the International Association, in parallel with the selling prices to the public.

ART. 9. — All information transmitted to the office may always be consulted without payment by members of the society.

Credit.

ART. 10. — When a member, going to work outside his usual center, wishes to be credited, he will make a request to the Commission, which will determine the amount of the credit, in view of the resources of the fund and the guarantees

offered by the member; the office will endorse his book for the amount of credit guaranteed by the Commission.

ART. 11. — Credit will be absolutely refused to any member whose contribution is not up to date.

ART. 12. — The member may, for three months, enjoy his credit in all corresponding offices, up to the amount guaranteed at his departure;

The sums received by him will be entered in his book by the correspondents of the paying offices.

ART. 13. — Reimbursement must begin three months after the opening of the credit and be fully made within three months thereafter unless there are major impediments, the value of which will be assessed by the Crediting Commission.

ART. 14. — In the event of non-reimbursement without valid reasons, the member will be excluded and reported by means of the Bulletin, which will publish the reasons for the exclusion.

Administration.

ART. 15. — The Commission responsible for administration is composed of fifteen members appointed by list ballot by direct suffrage of the members; the term of office will extend from one Congress to another.

ART. 16. — The Commission chooses from among its members and under its responsibility three correspondents, a cashier and an archiving secretary;

The correspondents can only execute the decisions of the Commission.

The cashier keeps the general accounts;

The archiving secretary is responsible for classifying the documents referred to, indicated by the Commission.

ART. 17. — Each day, one of the members of the Commission must be in the office for two hours, from eight o'clock to ten o'clock in the evening on weekdays, and from one o'clock to three o'clock on Sundays, to receive and provide information.

Exclusions.

ART. 18. — Any false or incomplete declaration relating to names, ages, domiciles or professions shall automatically result in exclusion; members of a society whose principles are in opposition to those issued in the fundamental pact of the International Association, and also those who are in the case provided for by art. 14, shall also be excluded.

Any member who resigns or is excluded shall be entitled to reimbursement of the sums paid by him during the year, after deduction of general expenses, which shall be recorded in the annual inventory.

Delegations.

Only the following may be elected as delegates:

1. Manual workers in the strict sense;
2. Employees employed in industry, commerce, or private civil administration.

When it came to applying art. 16 of this regulation, the outgoing correspondents expressed the desire not to be re-elected to these functions; but

in the face of the attacks and the intrigues of the Blanquist party, which claimed and had it printed that the Congress had disavowed the Parisians, the members of the Gravilliers kept Tolain, Fribourg and Varlin in office; Héligon, who for several months had been acting as treasurer-cashier, became so regularly; Chemalé was called to the post of secretary general, and Bourdon was put in charge of the archives of the Society.

However, the Parisian newspapers had spoken of the Geneva Congress, and, with their usual assurance, had pronounced on its strength, its tendencies, as well as on the number of its members, all things of which they were profoundly ignorant moreover.

Some, the *Presse* among others, had denounced the Society to the justice of the Empire; some had been sympathetic to these attempts at emancipation: *Liberté*, through the pen of Mr. Hector Pessard, had anticipated the future importance of the International, and concluded that it was necessary to take this powerful news into account: "It is," he said, "a warning given solemnly to the world by men from all countries, by citizens tired of sterile struggles, fatal consequences of an organization that is collapsing."

But one point on which they all agreed was to confuse the collective memberships of English workers' societies with the actual memberships, and to reward the Association with millions of members, when it had barely a few thousand.

The Parisian correspondents took care not to correct such errors. Knowing that one only groups around the powerful, they let it be said and continued their work.

They returned to study: the examination of the possibility of establishing exchange counters detained the Parisian Commission for a long time; then, when it was well established that the realization of such a project was only possible after the International really counted its members in millions, they were concerned with mutual credit applied to the emancipation of the proletariat.

On this subject, here was the plan that the International (French section) proposed to execute: to ask each of its members for a weekly contribution of 0 fr. 10 c., and to use these funds to put an entire professional group in possession of its tools of labor, and to support it during the whole time that the competition of the capitalists would make labor rare or unprofitable; then, when this group was strong enough to live on its own, proceed in the same way with respect to another group, then a third, and so on, until, in each profession, a production group having been formed, one could consider opening shops selling at cost price, making this foundation coincide with the creation of a paper of exchange taking precedence over metallic currency in the shops of the Association.

This system, put into practice throughout Europe, was to peacefully bring about the solution of the social problem, as production-consumption.

Vocational education also had its turn. The Parisians were very keen to see it transformed. To this end, they dreamed of sending the child on his tour of Europe as soon as the first year of apprenticeship was over, by combining in advance his stations on each important point, so that he could return at the end of five or six years, knowing all the manufacturing processes used in his trade, having a sufficient tincture of the principal languages spoken in Europe, as well as of the manners and customs of the peoples among whom he would have lived, and that, made more benevolent towards each, he could make himself, at the same time as a complete worker, a true citizen. By this means, the internationals hoped to realize their moral league against war; how, indeed, could one have asked this child become a man, to march into combat against those who had welcomed and protected his childhood, and in whose ranks he was certain to meet a workmate, or a member of his adoptive family?

The attached questionnaire was given to members with a request to fill it out and send it to the Gravilliers, to begin the major social survey that would logically precede this attempt.

Feeling vaguely the possibility of a trial hanging over their heads and eager to leave something viable behind, the Gravilliers drew up the statutes of a large mutual insurance company to cover themselves against particular risks.

Here is a brief summary of the economy of this institution:

At the birth of a child, the insured was to receive a certain sum, then the education was guaranteed to the newborn until the age of apprenticeship, at which time the Society was to provide him with the means to acquire his professional tools; finally, the death of the head of the family would have given rise to financial assistance, either to his widow or to his beneficiaries, and proportionally to the number and age of the heirs.

Great latitude was left to members, who could insure themselves against all foreseen risks or only for one of them.

Needless to say that, thanks to the liberty enjoyed under the imperial regime, these various projects could not be put into execution, and they remained a closed letter for the greater number of members of the International. We relate them here only to make our story complete.

M
Profession.
Age.
Domicile.
Lieu de naissance.

**ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE
 DES TRAVAILLEURS**

BUREAU DE PARIS.
N° D'INSCRIPTION : | DATE :

Renseignements à fournir :

		ADULTES.		ENFANTS.		Observations particulières.	
		Hommes.	Femmes.	Garçons.	Filles.		
Combien d'ouvriers dans la profession.							
Salaire.	Le plus haut.....						
	Le plus bas.....						
	La moyenne.....						
Travail.	Depuis quel âge..						
	La durée journalière.....						
	Aux pièces.....						
	A la journée.....						
	De jour.....						
	De nuit.....						
	Insalubre ou non.						
	Dangereux.....						
Nature du danger.							
Causes du danger.							
Chômage.	Y a-t-il chômage..						
	L'époque.....						
	La durée.....						
	La cause.....						
Apprentissage.	Depuis quel âge..						
	Quelle durée....						
	Quelles conditions..						
Quels sont les débouchés les plus importants.							
Quel degré moyen d'instruction.							
Sur quels points plus particulièrement.							
Y a-t-il des obstacles légaux s'opposant au développement de la profession.							
Quels sont-ils.							
		Secours mutuels.	Crédit.	Épargnes	Consommation.	Production.	Observations générales.
Sociétés professionnelles formées de	Patrons seuls.						Nota. — Écrire les observations générales au dos de cette page.
	Ouvriers seuls						
	Les deux réunis.....						
	Approuvées par décret.						
Membres honoraires...							

THE STRIKES

While the internationals were actively concerned with social questions, their enemies the Blanquists were denouncing them everywhere and, by all means, — avowable or shameful, it mattered little, — were trying to stop this movement whose direction escaped them.

Their clamor became so great, the attacks so direct that it was necessary to listen to them. A jury composed partly of pure politicians, partly of socialists, was proposed to settle the dispute and pronounce in the last resort on which side was right and justice. (32)

The so-called Renaissance trial, in which all the Blanquists were implicated, delayed by several months all attempts at rapprochement between the two enemy schools and contributed to poisoning hatreds.

In accordance with party traditions, Blanqui's sectarians, triumphing over these prosecutions and the resulting condemnation, accused the Gravilliers of having denounced them to the police in order to stifle their revelations.

All these struggles had a fatal side for the Association; from this period onwards, one can observe an unfortunate tendency to allow itself to discuss with the authoritarian party, which, until then, the International had carefully kept at a distance.

More immediately interesting events came to divert attention from these concerns. All of Paris remembers the strike of the Paris bronze workers (February 1867), and the reason that led to its declaration. It will be remembered that several heads of large bronze establishments, frightened by the development of the Workers' Society of Mutual Credit founded in this profession, wanted to remove their personnel from this influence, and suddenly gave their workers the alternative of breaking with this organization or ceasing to work in their workshops.

The struggle so dreaded by the founders of the International had begun, but it was the bosses who had provoked it, and the workers, strong in their rights and jealous of their dignity, accepted the challenge. Responding to an act of war with an act of war, the Bronze Credit Society decreed the blacklisting of any house from which a worker was dismissed because he was a member of the Credit.

A curious spectacle then occurred: almost all the bronze workers who were not yet registered with the Society came to join it; (33) the bosses closed their workshops, (34) but at the same time all the professional societies contributed money to support the nascent strike; support subscriptions were organized, and in *authorized* public meetings held in the Gélín Hall, in Ménilmontant, and attended by 4 to 500 listeners, all the incidents of the conflict were reported.

In the face of this display of activity, the employers agreed to listen to words of appeasement. However, these negotiations dragged on and the mutual credit funds were rapidly disappearing. The International, of which almost all the members of the bronze bureau were members, resolved to strike the decisive blow. At its invitation, the bronze workers delegated three of their members to London, (35) to whom were added as *ciceroni* two of the founders of the International. (36)

The aim of this trip was to solicit from the English workers' societies a support more moral than material, and to increase by distance the results obtained. This program, skillfully conceived, succeeded in every way; the English received the delegates in their steering committees, promised much, but gave little.

However, a few thousand franc notes arrived from London in the middle of one of the meetings at Ménilmontant, which the dissident employers were attending. The effect was immense; this letter, bringing favorable news and real money, threw the coalition of bosses into disarray; worried about the future, they withdrew their ultimatum and the workshops reopened.

The bronze workers, masters of the situation, did not take advantage of their leverage to demand an increase in labor prices, and returned in full all the funds that had been lent to them by the workers' societies. (37)

This is, we believe, the only example of repayment offered by the history of strikes. (38)

The public, eternally in love with the marvelous, always believed that the English shipment had amounted to several hundred thousand francs and the International let it be said. (39)

Emboldened by the success of the bronze strike, the tailors of Parisian fashion declared themselves on strike (March 1867); but here the International, which had no member on the steering committee, abstained from intervening. (40) Moreover, the strikers, all workers in the capital's department stores, already well paid, refused to take care, first of all, of improving the very precarious situation of the garment workers, and the International could not be sympathetic to them: the strike failed due to lack of material resources and moral support.

Around the same time, a terrible incident occurred: the workers of Roubaix, in a fit of furious madness, broke machines, set fire to workshops, mistreated innocent people; a cry of deserved reprobation rose from the ranks of the bourgeoisie; the workers fell silent, terrified; their conscience forbade them to applaud, but they lacked the energy to blame.

Only the internationals, risking their nascent popularity, dared to raise their voices to vigorously reprove and, in a public letter addressed to the Roubaix strikers, they expressed themselves thus:

International Workers' Association

PARIS OFFICE.

Regrettable disturbances, accompanied by even more regrettable violence, have broken out among the spinners and weavers of Roubaix.

The causes are:

1. The introduction of machines imposing on weavers an increase in labor, without an increase in wages, and at the same time eliminating a large number of workers;
2. The establishment of a regulation imposing measures detrimental to dignity and fines of flagrant illegitimacy;
3. Finally, the intervention of the gendarmerie in these details of private interests and in a case where it perhaps had to watch over public safety, but not to protect by its presence the claims of individuals.

The strike provoked by these causes has had as its consequence the sad events of which public opinion has been informed. In this situation, the International Association believes it must speak out and call the attention of the workers of all countries by making the following declarations:

The use of machinery in industry raises an economic problem whose immediate solution is imperative. We, the workers, recognize in principle the right of the workers to a proportional increase when, by new equipment, a more considerable production is imposed on them.

In France, a country of universal suffrage and equality, the worker is still a citizen when he has crossed the threshold of the workshop or factory. The regulations imposed on the spinners of Roubaix are made for serfs and not for free men; they undermine not only the dignity, but also the existence of the worker, since the amount of the fines can eliminate and exceed the rate of the wage.

In such a debate, when no violence had been committed, and the strike began with the abandonment of the workshops, the intervention of the gendarmerie could only irritate the workers who believed they saw pressure and a threat there.

Workers of Roubaix,

Whatever your just grievances, nothing can justify the acts of destruction of which you are guilty. — Consider that the machine, an instrument of work, must be sacred to you; consider that such violence compromises your cause and that of all workers. — Consider that you have just provided weapons to the adversaries of freedom and to the slanderers of the people.

The strike continues, new arrests have been made, we remind all members of the International Workingmen's Association that there are brothers in Roubaix at this moment who are suffering. That if among them men who have been misguided for a moment have been guilty of violence that we condemn, there is solidarity between them and us of interests and misery; at the heart of the debate, there are also just grievances that the manufacturers must make disappear.

Finally, there are families without heads: let each of us come and give them our material and moral support.

For the Parisian Commission,
H. TOLAIN, FRIBOURG, VARLIN, correspondents.

The Parisian workers applauded this language and the Association won by this courageous act a considerable moral influence. (41)

Rumors of war floated in the air, and while the sovereign masters of France and Prussia looked at each other with animosity, the advanced English, French and German groups exchanged friendly protests in favor of maintaining peace. (42) One of these German appeals to Paris crossed the border and the Gravilliers published the following response on 28 April:

Workers of Berlin,

We have received with joy your peaceful greeting: like you, we want only peace and freedom.

As citizens, no doubt, we love the mother country; but when the spirit of the past tries to perpetuate prejudices, when the worshipers of force want to reawaken national hatreds, workers, we will never forget that the work which makes us all united, can only develop through peace and freedom.

It is not a question of deciding by arms the nationality of a piece of territory, but of uniting our efforts to make equity reign there.

Do we not have to fight enough causes of misery, suffering, enough undeserved misfortunes, without going, with our own hands, to destroy and devastate, leaving the field fallow, the machine inert.

Victors, vanquished, we will be no less victims.

Labor is the duty and the right; it is the law of modern man.

War between peoples can only be considered as a civil war, a retreat of civilization.

Workers of Germany or France, we do not have too much of all our strength and all our energies to organize ourselves for labor and exchange.

We want peace and liberty.

Peace! to produce, to exchange together.

Liberty! to establish between us ever closer, more peaceful relations; for, as we know each other better, we esteem each other more.

Brothers of Berlin! brothers of Germany!

It is in the name of universal solidarity, invoked by the International Association, that we exchange with you the peaceful greeting, which will cement once again the indissoluble alliance of the workers!

For the Parisian Commission:
the correspondents,
TOLAIN, FRIBOURG, VARLIN.

This piece was translated into all languages and reproduced by almost all foreign newspapers. Shortly after, the Paris group launched the following manifesto against all war.

International Disarmament League.

The primary cause of War is the army.

Considering:

That the axiom: *Si vis pacem, para bellum* (If you want Peace, prepare for War), has so far received the most complete denial from events;

That standing armies, far from being a guarantee of security for each nation, have, on the contrary, become, as a result of the warlike overexcitement that they develop in the regimented man, an occasion for conflict, a continual challenge to neighboring nations;

That this system of armament tends to make the idea of *force* prevail over the idea of *right*;

That from a political point of view, armed Peace, false in its principle, disastrous in its results, has the immediate consequence of determining among all peoples an excessive armament;

That, on the one hand, such an order of facts cannot continue without bringing about the ruin of the peoples, and that, on the other hand, these efforts having cost the nations too much for them to be declared useless, conquest becomes the ideal of each army;

That from an economic point of view, man violently torn from social life, from the habits of labor, delivered without reserve to the cult of force, returns with difficulty to his first state;

That thus, not only does this system stop production in the present, but also hinders it in the future;

Considering, furthermore, that if, in the present state of Europe, these are circumstances where justice, liberty, dignity and national independence can find no sanction except by arms, the national militias would offer in the event of aggression, by the mass uprising and spontaneous enthusiasm of citizens, more guarantees for the security of the peoples than professional militarism, which consumes the resources of the nation in pure loss;

The undersigned declare:

To energetically condemn the present system of armament which, by making war a profession, makes war inevitable;

To protest against permanent armies and to demand, as a transitional means, the organization of national militias, the most effective means of destroying forever the preponderance of brutal force over the intellectual and moral power of the peoples.

GENERAL DISARMAMENT; ORGANIZATION OF THE MILITIAS: such is the motto inscribed on our flag.

Initiative committee:

France: Ch. Beslay, owner; E. Fribourg, engraver-decorator; E. Chemalé, designer; H. Tolain, chaser; P. Gautier, jeweler-employee; G. Laplanche, saddler-coachmaker.

Germany: Schily, lawyer; Hugo Rothschild, merchant.

England: Cowell Stepney.

Belgium: Louis Debock, typographer. Hungary: Pompéry; Karoly Draskulcs.
Denmark: L. Petersen, furrier.

Russia: Reinfeld, cabinetmaker. Sweden: Wollin, tailor.

Switzerland: Antoine Müller, Zurich.

Subscriptions and membership lists are provisionally received, 54 rue Lafayette, at Mr. Hugo Rothschild's.

The minimum single payment is set at 10 centimes.

All sums received will be devoted exclusively to the propaganda of the League.

The membership lists will be published, as well as the statement of receipts and expenditures.

Encouraged by the relative success of the working class, the bourgeoisie also wanted to have its International, and the *League of Peace and Freedom* was founded in Geneva, under the patronage of the great exiles and with a clearly avowed political aim. We shall soon see what influence this league had on the future of the International.

XVI
LAUSANNE CONGRESS, 1867.

The month of September had arrived, and fifty delegates had responded to the call of the International; that was about ten fewer than in Geneva, and the public being even more completely lacking, it seemed that the International must perish and fade away in the void.

The progress accomplished was presented; Murat, one of the delegates from Paris, made it known that the Parisian section had only 600 members and that it owed 466 francs. As we can see, the millions were still not very abundant in the social fund.

Germany, England, Italy also gave few material results. (43) The discussion began on the following program:

1. What are the practical means of making the International Association a common center of action for the working class in the struggle it supports against capital?

2. How can the working classes use for their emancipation the credit they give to the bourgeoisie and the government? — Credit and popular banks. — Currency. — Paper money. — Mutual insurance. — Workers' societies.

3. Cannot the efforts attempted today by associations for the emancipation of the fourth estate (working class) result in the creation of a fifth estate whose situation would be even more miserable? — Mutuality or reciprocity considered as the basis of social relations. — Equivalence of functions. — Solidarity. — Workers' society.

4. Labor and capital. — Unemployment. — Machines and their effects. — Reduction of working hours. — Division of labor. — Transformation and extinction of wage labor. — Distribution of products.

5. Social functions. — Role of men and women in society. — Education of children. — Comprehensive education. — Freedom of education. — Phonography.

6. Definition and role of the State. — Public services, transport and traffic. — Collective and individual interests. — The State considered as guardian of contracts. — Right to punish.

7. Is not the deprivation of political freedoms an obstacle to the social emancipation of workers, and one of the main causes of social disturbances (unemployment)? — What are the means to hasten the restoration of political freedoms? Would it not be the demand by all workers for the unlimited right of assembly and unlimited freedom of the press?

8. Addresses to the Peace Congress in Geneva.

9. Discussion on the seat of the General Council and on the location of the next congress.

As was noted at the Geneva Congress, in the absence of the Germans and Belgians, no clearly communist aspirations had been revealed among the delegates.

In Lausanne, it was to be otherwise, and the two schools were to measure themselves for the first time on the ground of property.

Without going into long details on the work of this congress, we will make known the resolutions that were adopted there.

FIRST QUESTION: *Rapporteur*: Eccarius.

1. The sections must not only lend their support to any idea of progress in public life, but also take the initiative for the creation of institutions of production or of any other nature that present a direct utility for the working class. The central committees must support them in their attempts.

2. If the General Council cannot publish a bulletin, it will make a written communication each quarter to the central office of each country, which will be responsible for having it reproduced by the newspapers of the country, and, above all, by the newspapers of the section.

3. The central contribution for the year will be 0 fr. 10 for all members of the International Association or affiliated societies. It will be payable quarterly.

4. The delegates of the branches and sections who have not paid their central contribution will not be able to take part in the Congress.

SECOND QUESTION: *French Rapporteur*: Charles Longuet. — *Belgian Rapporteur*: César de Paëpe.

The Congress urgently invites the members of the International in the different countries to use their influence to induce the craft societies to apply their funds to the cooperation of production, as the best means of using, for the purpose of the emancipation of the working classes, the credit that they now give to the middle class and to the government.

Those of these societies which do not think it proper to devote their funds to the formation of cooperative establishments for their own account, should use these funds to facilitate the establishment of productive cooperation in general and make their efforts to establish a system of national credit proportional to the means of those who would claim its aid, independent of metallic values, and to establish a system of cooperative banks.

THIRD QUESTION: *French Rapporteur*: Chemalé. *Belgian Rapporteur*: César de Paëpe.

This question, concerning which César de Paëpe wished to make the idea of *the entry of the soil into the collective property of society; the abolition of inheritance to certain degrees*, gives rise to a long and brilliant discussion, in which delegates from all nations take part; the assembly witnesses a real struggle between communism and freedom of property. The Germans, the English and the Flemish are absolute partisans of collective possession, both of the land and of the instruments of labor; the French and the Italians, on the contrary, support individual property and refuse completely to give in on this point. They recognize the right of pre-emption granted to the community in the event of non-occupation of the instruments of labor, land, mines, etc.; but as long as the individual personally uses his tools he must remain the owner.

Apart from individual property, the French delegates see only a fatal march towards authoritarian and absolute communism; consequently, they propose to the assembly to remove this sentence from the report. This proposal is adopted, the question remaining reserved for the next congress.

The following resolutions were then submitted and adopted by the assembly:

1. The Congress believes that the efforts attempted today by workers' associations, if they were generalized in the present form, would tend to constitute a fourth class, with below it a fifth class even more miserable; the supposed danger of the creation of a fifth estate, brought about by the current efforts of workers' associations, will vanish as the development of modern industry makes production on a small scale impossible.

Modern production on a large scale fuses individual efforts and makes cooperative work a necessity for all.

2. That to obviate this danger it is necessary for the proletariat to understand that social transformation can only definitively be brought about by means acting on the whole of society and conforming to reciprocity and justice.

3. The Congress nevertheless believes that all efforts by workers' associations should be encouraged, except to eliminate as much as possible from these associations the right to levy capital on labor, that is to say, to introduce the idea of mutuality and federation.

FOURTH QUESTION: *Geneva rapporteur*: F. Quinet.

The Congress renewed the declaration made the previous year by the Geneva Congress.

The Congress declares that in the current state of industry which is war, mutual aid must be given to defend wages, but that it believes it is its duty to declare that there is a higher goal to be achieved, which is the abolition of wage labor. It recommends the study of economic means based on justice and reciprocity.

FIFTH QUESTION: *French rapporteur*: Chemalé. *Swiss rapporteur*: Cuendet-Kuntz. *Belgian majority*: César de Paëpe. *Belgian minority*: Hins.

The first three reports all concluding in the sense of the French memorandum of Geneva, and the last one re-editing the opinions of the minority of the same report, the Congress adopted:

1. Professional and productive scientific education, and the study of a comprehensive education program;
2. Organization of the workshop school;
3. Considering that the phrase free education is nonsense, since the tax levied on citizens pays for it; but that education is indispensable and that no father has the right to deprive his child of it.

The Congress grants the State only the right to substitute itself for the father when the latter is unable to fulfill his duty.

In any case, all religious education must be excluded from the program.

SIXTH QUESTION: French Rapporteur: Vasseur.

1. The State is or should be only the strict executor of the laws voted and recognized by the citizens;

2. The efforts of nations must tend to make the State the owner of the means of transport and circulation, in order to destroy the powerful monopoly of the large companies, which, by subjecting the working classes to their arbitrary laws, attack both the dignity of man and individual liberty. By this means we will succeed in giving satisfaction to both the collective interest and the individual interest;

3. We express the wish that the guilty man be judged by citizens appointed by universal suffrage; that the citizen judges know the guilty person thoroughly, and that they have to seek the principal causes that led the man to the crime or to the error.

We also ask that no guilty person be judged outside his country, so that one can examine, as we have just said, the principal causes which could have diverted him from his duties; because society as a whole is too often the only guilty party. Lack of education leads to poverty; poverty leads to stupefaction; Brutality leads to crime; crime to penal servitude, and penal servitude to degradation which is worse than death.

SEVENTH QUESTION: Geneva rapporteur: Perron.

In order to put an end to the ambiguities, the Congress declared:

Considering that the deprivation of political liberties is an obstacle to the social education of the people and the emancipation of the proletariat:

1. The social emancipation of the worker is inseparable from his political emancipation;

2- The establishment of political freedoms is a first measure of absolute necessity.

To a request for membership in the future peace congress submitted by Dupleix and Pierron of Geneva, the Lausanne Congress responds:

Considering that war weighs mainly on the working class, in that it not only deprives it of means of existence, but also forces it to shed its blood in conflicts on which it has not decided;

That armed peace paralyzes the productive forces and intimidates labor by placing it under the threat of war;

That peace, the first condition of general well-being, must in turn be consolidated by a new order of things that will no longer know classes in society, one of which is exploited by the other,

Decides:

The Congress fully and sincerely adheres to the League of Peace, which will be constituted on September 9 in Geneva, will support it energetically in all that it can undertake to achieve the abolition of standing armies and the maintenance of peace, with the aim of arriving as quickly as possible at the emancipation of the working class and its liberation from the power and influence of capital, as well as at the formation of a confederation of free states throughout Europe. (44)

Then after having thus committed itself to the line, the International formulated the following reservation:

Considering that the war has as its first and principal cause pauperism and the lack of economic equilibrium; that, in order to eliminate war, it is not enough for us to disband the armies, but to modify the social organization in the direction of an ever more equitable distribution of production.

The workers' congress subordinates its adhesion to the Peace Congress to the acceptance by the latter of the declaration stated above.

NINTH QUESTION:

The obstacle that had been opposed to the fixing of the General Council in Paris continuing to exist, the General Council sitting in London was maintained in function. Tolain, de Paëpe and Guillaume, from Locle (Switzerland), were delegated to officially bring to Geneva the conditions of the alliance.

How, one will ask, was the International able, forgetting its principle, not only to adhere, but also to enter officially into relations with a political society? It is because, in the face of the incessant attacks of which it was the object, the delegates believed it necessary to give "pledges" to the republican party.

This was a first mistake; it was to be fruitful.

XVII

AFTERMATH OF THE LAUSANNE CONGRESS, 1867

The Geneva Congress of 1867 (Peace and Liberty) brought together representatives of the two associations; in one of the sessions, Gustave Chaudey, armed with the declaration of the Lausanne Congress on political liberties, proposed from the podium a pact that was accepted: the workers would help the bourgeoisie to regain political liberties, in return the bourgeoisie would cooperate in the economic emancipation of the proletariat.

Combining these declarations with the facts that all or almost all of the Republican exiles and the deputies of the left had joined the League of Peace and Liberty, one could believe that the fusion of the classes had taken place.

We remember how this congress ended and how, without the contingent provided by the International, the members of the League found themselves violently expelled from Geneva territory. (45)

The direct result of the convention in Geneva led the International to take part in the demonstration of November 2, 1867 at the tomb of Manin (Montmartre cemetery), then in that of the 4th of the same month, the object of which was to protest against the reoccupation of Rome by imperial troops. (46)

At the meeting given by the militant democracy there were internationals and politicians, but of deputies from Paris, not a shadow was seen; most of these gentlemen were on vacation. Furious at this abandonment of public affairs, the internationals drafted in the form of an ultimatum a sort of address to the deputies of the Seine, summoning them to resign in order to enable the Parisian voters to speak out energetically against the Roman question.

Several deputations went to the homes of the recipients; one of them, after having waited from four thirty to eight o'clock in the evening in front of the door of the splendid hotel of M. Jules Favre, finally obtained an audience.

The object of the visit having been explained, M. Jules Favre, while protesting against the imperative form given to the communication, was nevertheless kind enough to make the following two responses, which we recommend to the meditation of the admirers of M. the Minister of Foreign Affairs of September 4.

On the resignation requested in principle, he was of the opinion with his interlocutors "that in the presence of the act of the sovereign, the dignity of the deputies would require that they resign collectively from their mandate; but that, knowing that a certain number of his colleagues did not share this manner of judging the facts, he did not believe he had the right to individually give his resignation, so as not to appear, by a public act, to cast blame on the conduct of those of his colleagues who would not imitate him."

Pressed, also, to make known whether the proletariat could hope to be guided in the struggle by the liberal bourgeoisie the day it rose up in arms for the

Republic, M. Jules Favre, despite the decision of the Geneva Congress (Peace and Liberty), replied: "It is you, gentlemen workers, who alone have made the Empire; it is up to you to overthrow it alone."

Two days later, a small note appeared in a newspaper in Le Havre announcing that M. Jules Favre had received, on November 4, delegates, among whom he had recognized several agents provocateurs. Immediately summoned, in writing signed by all his visitors to name these so-called agents, the leader of the left, in a letter written entirely in his own hand, which the author of this work carefully preserves, protested that he was completely unaware of the article in the newspaper in Le Havre, and that he was even unaware of its existence.

From this period dates the decided antagonism that separated the International from the parliamentary left, and it is to M. Jules Favre that goes back in part the responsibility for having forced this great organization to seek elsewhere its point of support.

This also explains the ardor of the electoral struggle in Paris in 1869, and why M. Favre had to undergo the affront of a second round of voting from which he emerged victorious only thanks to the support provided to him by the governmental votes of the Empire.

The agents provocateurs and the crossroads orators, as the "illustrious master in the art of speaking" called them, had remembered November 1867.

XVIII

TRIALS AND DEVIATIONS

The membership in the League of Peace and Liberty, the demonstrations of November 2 and 4 had drawn the attention of the imperial police to the actions of the Paris office; at the end of December, searches were carried out at the headquarters of the Association, rue des Gravilliers, and at the homes of Chemalé, Tolain, Héligon and others.

We will not recount the trials of the International, let us limit ourselves to recalling that the imperial prosecutor was obliged to confess:

The defendants who appear before you are hard-working, honest, intelligent workers. No conviction has struck them, no stain tarnishes their morality, and I do not have, gentlemen, in order to justify the prejudice directed against them, to utter any word that could harm their honor...

Furthermore, the judgment's consideration is worded as follows:

Whereas the associates linked together by the very purpose of the association have contributed to its realization; as this purpose was the improvement of the workers' conditions through cooperation, production and credit....

Declares the association dissolved;

Sentences all the accused to a fine of 100 francs, sets the duration of the imprisonment at thirty days.

The first commission (47) thus struck appealed the judgment and stood aside, while a second elected commission reopened the Gravilliers. This second steering group (48) into which the members were forced to include a fairly large number of liberal communists, believed it necessary to accentuate the political tendency of the Parisian workers. Also, the new prosecutions were not long in coming, and as a result, while the first defense had only contained *mutualist* socialist affirmations, the second was the occasion for a profession of republican faith and a communist declaration.

As we can see, the original plan of being very republican individually, but only socialist collectively, had been profoundly modified as a result of the necessity in which the International believed itself more and more to "give pledges" to the Jacobin politicians.

The detention struck the second group, and brought into daily contact the pseudo-communists of the International, the Blanquists of the Renaissance affair and General Cluseret.

What happened, we can easily guess, deprived of their liberty and consecrated "politicians" by their condemnation, the prisoners lent an ear to the suggestions of the authoritarian party, which, gangrening the minds of the workers, ensured itself more auxiliaries.

The International Association was definitively suppressed in Paris as a study body. A liquidation commission was charged with settling the debts of the Paris office, which from then on ceased to exist.

Into whose hands was the dominant influence going to pass? Who would now be willing to stand up to the authoritarian communist appetites that were already revealing themselves on all sides? What group would be able to oppose a sufficiently strong dam to the invasion of the flood, a terrible billow on the social horizon? No one knew, and the Parisian founders of the International felt with pain their work slipping from their hands.

The law on public meetings had just been voted in (June 1868); on the other hand, the professional workers delegated to the Universal Exhibition of 1867 had, since that time, held weekly meetings in the passage Raoult; (49) thus the Gravilliers were offered an opportunity to regain all or part of the liberal influence that they had exercised in Paris. It was a hope. The internationals who had remained free clung to it in desperation.

The role of women in society was the problem under discussion in the Wauxhall hall (July 1868). Heligon took advantage of this to read an extract from the Geneva Memoir; after this reading, which was very warmly applauded, Heligon informed the assembly that such were the opinions of the International. This declaration having produced a very great effect, the prisoners of Sainte-Pélagie were moved by it, and at the instigation of their brothers in captivity, addressed a letter of protest to the president of the popular assembly. This document recalled that the International was not a body of doctrines, but only a society of studies, and that, on the question of women mainly, there were two groups which demanded not to be confused.

The separation was complete; in order to make it more complete and to clearly separate what needed to be isolated, Fribourg, taking advantage of this incident, endeavored to demonstrate that those who want to make women an industrial agent are only shameful communists. In response to this direct attack, Lefrançais, who was not and has not, as far as we know, ever been a member of the International, stepped out of the ranks, declared himself a Babouvist, and the debate began across all the issues, between the founding International and more or less concealed communism. Until 1869, the incessant struggle between the parties had such an animosity that the presence at the civil wedding of Germain Casse of a guest, a member of the International, was enough to cause a scandal on the part of the Blanquists, and that in public meetings the appearance on the platform of Belleville or Montmartre of an internationalist speaker had the privilege of exciting storms. (50) During the public meetings of the Wauxhall, Mr. Horn announced that at the instigation of Mme. Marie Goëg, an international association of women had just been created in Geneva. The communists, happy with this unexpected reinforcement, applauded this

creation. The internationals, remaining faithful to their principles, spoke out vigorously against this foundation.

XIX

BRUSSELS CONGRESS, 1868.

Since the International was now unable to regularly delegate associates to its congresses, the internationals took action with the professional societies and obtained promises of fairly numerous direct delegations. To facilitate nominations, the barriers of association were lowered, and these delegates of 1868 did not need to be members of the International in order to take part in the work of the Brussels Congress. It was enough that they were members of a workers' society or that they were part of a socialist group. This was yet another deviation from the spirit of the fundamental pact, but it was necessary; without this expedient France would not have been represented at this third meeting, which was to have such a disastrous result for the International. (51)

At the Brussels Congress, among the hundred delegates present, (52) the communists were in the vast majority: nothing could resist them, neither property nor liberty. Carried away by success, they forgot themselves to the point of forbidding the liberal minority represented by France to speak.

To the request of Tolain to read a protest from the minority, President Dupont responded by submitting the question to the assembly, which by a large majority refused to allow the minority's declaration to be read. (53)

Applause was not lacking at this majority move. Among those in the audience who expressed their satisfaction in an unequivocal manner, it was easy to notice Blanqui and Tridon, who, having never failed to attend any of the sessions of the Congress, were very happy to see the International finally led away from its path.

Godin-Lemaire, the founder of the Familistère, Rochefort, recently exiled, had also attended the sessions of the Congress, of which we reproduce the main resolution.

Fourth question of the program: on landed property, arable land and forests, mines and coal mines, canals and railways, etc.

I. With regard to coal mines and railways:

Considering that these great instruments of labor are fixed to the ground and occupy a notable part of the ground, which is the domain provided free of charge to humanity;

Considering that these instruments of labor are of such proportion and importance that they require, under penalty of constituting a dangerous monopoly, the intervention of the whole of society with respect to those who exploit them;

Considering that these great instruments of labor necessarily require the application of machines and collective force;

Considering that the machines of collective force, which exist today for the sole advantage of the capitalist, must in the future benefit only the worker, and

that for this it is necessary that any industry where these two economic forces are indispensable be exercised by groups freed from wage labor;

The Congress proposes: 1. that the coal quarries and other mines, as well as the railways, in a normal society, belong to *the social community represented by the State*, but by the State regenerated and subject itself to the law of justice; 2. that the quarries, coal mines, railways be granted by the society, not to companies of capitalists as today, but to workers' companies, and this by means of a double contract: one giving the investiture to the workers' company and guaranteeing to the society the scientific and rational exploitation of the concession, the services as close as possible to the cost price, the right to verify the accounts of the Company, and consequently the impossibility of the reconstitution of the monopoly; the other, guaranteeing the mutual rights of each member of the workers' association with respect to his colleagues.

II. With respect to agricultural property:

Considering that the needs of production and the application of agronomic knowledge require large-scale and collective cultivation, require the introduction of machinery and the organization of collective force in agriculture, and that moreover economic development itself tends to bring back large-scale cultivation;

Considering that from then on agricultural labor and the ownership of arable land must be treated on the same footing as mining work and ownership of the land;

Considering, moreover, that the productive fund of the soil is the raw material of all products, the original source of all wealth, without itself being the product of the labor of any individual;

The Congress believes that economic development will make the entry of arable land into collective ownership a social necessity, and that land will be granted to agricultural companies as mines are to mining companies, railways to workers' companies, and this with conditions of guarantees for society and for farmers, similar to those necessary for mines and railways.

III. With regard to canals, roads, telegraph lines:

Considering that these communication routes require overall management and maintenance that cannot be abandoned to individuals, as some economists demand, under penalty of monopoly;

The Congress believes that the communication routes must remain the collective property of society.

IV. With regard to forests:

Considering that abandoning forests to individuals would lead to the destruction of these forests, while this destruction on certain points of the territory would harm the conservation of sources and, consequently, the good qualities of the land, as well as public hygiene and the life of citizens;

The Congress believes that the forests must remain the social community.

By the favorable vote of the assembly, collective ownership was resolved in principle.

Not wishing to maintain itself on the paths of liberty on any side, the Brussels assembly, having received from the League of Peace and Liberty an invitation to come and take part in the work of the Congress of Berne 1868, made the curious response that we will read:

Resolved:

1. That the delegates of the International Association who will go to Berne bring to the assembly, in the name of the International, the different resolutions taken at the Congresses of Geneva, Lausanne and Brussels; but that all discussions, all resolutions taken engage only their personal responsibility;

2. That the delegates of the International believe that the League of Peace has no reason to exist in the presence of the work of the International, and invite this society to dissolve itself and its members to be received in one or other section of the International. (54)

It was Albert Richard, a typographer and one of the founders of the Lyon International, who, as a member of both congresses, took it upon himself to notify Berne of the Brussels Declaration.

This circumstance inevitably brings us back to the League of Peace and Freedom, and especially to the Congress of Berne, from which the Russo-German International emerged fully armed.

BERNE CONGRESS (PEACE AND FREEDOM), 1868.

While the International was entering more and more into the Jacobin path, by a singular return, the League of Peace and Freedom was making laudable efforts to give a beginning of satisfaction to liberal socialist ideas. (55) Within this society was agitated, in the state of a powerful minority, the nihilist party, (56) man and woman, who recognized Bakunin as high priest, and whose alliance with the authoritarian French bourgeoisie threatened the existence of the association.

Here too a rupture was inevitable, and if the League were to perish in the struggle, it was necessary that one of the two parties succeed in excluding the other. As always and everywhere, the authoritarians began the battle.

Emboldened by the success of the Brussels communists and very probably styled by Blanqui; Bakunin, Outine, Wirouboff, E. Reclus, Jaclard, Richard wanted to impose on the League a resolution on the social question in which the words *equalization of classes and individuals* appeared.

But they were up against a strong opponent.

A very lively discussion began; we reproduce the three main passages:

Bakunin wants a clear resolution; he wants the equalization of individuals and classes to be indicated; apart from that, there are no more ideas of justice, and peace will not be founded. The worker must no longer be duped by speeches. He must be told what he should want, if he does not know it himself. No more of this civilization based on enslavement. I am a collectivist and not a communist, and if I demand the abolition of inheritance, it is to arrive quickly at social equalization. If you have other means, give them; otherwise we will have the right to suppose that you are only calling the workers to give them new chains.

Albert Richard came to support the Bakunin project, in his name, and in the name of the workers he claimed to represent.

Society is distorted, it must be reformed. Is it politics that will achieve this? No; the current system is a result, not a cause. If those who complain would get along together, we would reform; but the word of the day is, as a social bond, domesticity and, as a human idea, self-love. Two classes have formed in society; leaving aside the priests and public officials, who are parasites completely outside of society; examining the principle of heredity and recognizing it as the principle of all evil, we must conclude that the economic system is the cause of despotism and war, which is used as a diversion when the cry of misery is too ardent. The remedy is in the collective ownership of the land; in a political system that ceases to place restrictions on the development of the popular idea; it is necessary to establish a democratic and egalitarian tax, and to throw down a challenge to the adversaries of this idea. Moreover, let those who possess be

reassured, they will lose nothing, on the contrary, and then if they did lose, they would lose even less than those of 1793 and 1794.

These speeches already said enough; however, here comes Jaclard, Tridon's *intimate*, the living link between Blanquism and nihilism. Seeing him heading towards the tribune, those present guess that there is something of the hyena in this man; he speaks, and his voice, at first quite soft, becomes sibilant and acrid; he becomes animated, and hatred comes out of every pore:

JACLART. — *“I am not here to support a new proposition. I could ask you if it would not be appropriate to substitute the word fusion for the word federation, I could ask you many other things; but why should I expose myself to the reproach of dividing, why should I bring down the illusions of some of the groups who place their hope in the members of the League and who expect that at a given moment they will offer the very interesting and above all very original spectacle of throwing the obstacle of their plumpness in the path of armed conflict?”*

No, I am asking to reconcile and I will ask the partisans of the individual and of the federation why they have rejected the equalization of classes and individuals. Their system is false and I will ask them if they have confidence in the idea they are putting forward; I know that their system is to improve, to preserve, not to destroy. But in this circumstance they resemble an individual who, after having escaped from a long slavery, would forget to take with him his weapons, his tools of work, his wife and his children.

I will say to them: By acting in this way, *you will fall back into Orleanism, and, duping the working classes, you will succeed in establishing a new despotism.*

You speak of federation and republic, and you think you have done a lot in establishing them. However, if I examine Switzerland, *I see misery and rickets there; therefore the proletariat is compatible with the federation and the republic. You need a philosophical basis in order to found, and if you want to make a social revolution you must be an atheist, otherwise you will collapse. When in 89 Robespierre and the other leaders of the Revolution said that a religion was necessary for the people, it was only a compromise, and in 1848 being religious was ridiculous.*

If you are not atheists, *you must logically be despots, and instead of being a league of emancipation you will be a holy alliance against the revolution.*

You want to preserve, but we have already preserved too much, and *the barracks that guard Paris are the same ones that you left standing in February and which were used by the troops to shed the blood of the people in June.*

Rather than preserve anything of this old social organization, *I would perhaps be led to ask for the invasion of the barbarians.*

I know that this is not the widespread opinion in *the guild of the lawyers*; but seeing that it was so difficult to understand each other, *we have counted our friends and our enemies and we are satisfied in judging the moral value of each.*

So we separate ourselves from you and we tell you: You will have wanted war, and it will be the last; yes, *the last war will be waged and it will be terrible: it will rise up against everything that exists, against this bourgeoisie which has nothing in its head or in its heart and which no longer stands.*

My conclusion is that we must finish with all of them, and it is only on their smoking ruins that the definitive republic will sit, and it is on the ruins covered, not with their blood — they have long since not had any in their veins — but with their accumulated detritus, that we will plant the flag of the social revolution."

The highlighted passages are those that we wrote down while the speaker was speaking. We therefore guarantee their authenticity. The parts of the sentences that connect the textual quotations are present in our memory, and we deliberately soften their terms.

The distance at which we write imposes on us the obligation to say nothing of which we are not absolutely sure.

MM. Charles Lemonnier, Jules Barni, G. Chaudey for the bourgeoisie, Fribourg in the name of the workers, rose up against such doctrines of which they disapproved and which they declared themselves ready to combat wherever they encounter them.

After some virulent replies from both sides, the communist proposal was rejected by 80 votes to 30.

Bakunin, quite angry, left the deliberation room of the League with his followers, and the next day the collective resignation of the dissident group was filed on the desk of the Congress. (57) Once freed from their actions, the collectivist-equalizers founded the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, whose program is as follows:

Program of the International Alliance of the Socialist Democracy.

1. The *Alliance* declares itself atheist; it wants the abolition of cults, the substitution of science for faith and of human justice for divine justice.

2. It wants above all the political, economic and social equalization of classes and individuals of both sexes, beginning with the abolition of the right of inheritance, so that in the future enjoyment will be equal to the production of each, and that, in accordance with the decision taken by the last Workers' Congress in Brussels, land, the instruments of labor, like all other capital, becoming the collective property of the whole of society, can only be used by the workers, that is to say by agricultural and industrial associations.

3. It wants for all children of both sexes, from their birth to life, equality of means of development, that is to say of maintenance, education and instruction at all levels of science, industry and the arts, convinced that this equality, at first only economic and social, will have as its result to bring more and more a greater natural equality of individuals, making disappear all the artificial inequalities, historical products of a social organization as false as it is iniquitous.

4. Enemy of all despotism, recognizing no other political form than the republican form, and absolutely rejecting any reactionary alliance, it also rejects any political action that would not have as its immediate and direct goal the triumph of the cause of the workers against Capital.

5. It recognizes that all the political and authoritarian States currently existing, reducing themselves more and more to the simple administrative

functions of public services in their respective countries, will have to disappear in the universal union of free Associations, both agricultural and industrial.

6. Since the social question can only find its definitive and real solution on the basis of the international or universal solidarity of the workers of all countries, the Alliance rejects any policy based on so-called patriotism and on the rivalry of nations.

7. It desires the Universal Association of all Local Associations through Liberty.

REGULATIONS:

1. The *International Alliance of the Socialist Democracy* constitutes itself as a branch of the *International Workingmen's Association*, of which it accepts all the general statutes.

2. The *Founding Members* of the *Alliance* provisionally organize a *Central Bureau* in Geneva.

3. The founding members belonging to the same country constitute the *National Bureau* of that country.

4. The National Bureaus have the mission of establishing, in all localities, *local groups* of the *Alliance of the Socialist Democracy*, which, through their respective National Bureaus, will ask the Central Bureau of the *Alliance* for their admission into the *International Workingmen's Association*.

5. All local groups will form their Bureaus according to the custom adopted by the Local Sections of the *International Workingmen's Association*.

6. All Members of the *Alliance* undertake to pay a contribution of ten centimes per month, half of which will be retained for its own needs by each national group, and the other half will be paid into the Central Bureau's fund for its general needs.

In countries where this figure is considered too high, the National Bureaus, in concert with the Central Bureau, may reduce it.

7. At the annual Workers' Congress, *the Delegation of the Alliance of the Socialist Democracy*, as a branch of the *International Workingmen's Association*, will hold its public sessions in a separate location.

The members of the Geneva initiating group:

J.-Philippe Becker. M. Bakunin. Th. Remy. Antoine Lindegger. Louis Nidegger. Valérien Mroczkowsky. Jean Zagorsky. Phil. Zoeller. A. Ardin. Ch. Perron. J. Gay. J. Friess. Fr. Rochat. Nicolas Joukowski. M. Elpidine. Zamperini. E. Becker. Louis Weiss. Per- ret. Marauda. Édouard Crosset. A. Blanchard. A. Matis. C.Raymond. Ms. Alexeieff. Mrs. Bakunin. Ms. Suzette Croset. — Ms. Rosalie Sanguinède. Ms. Désirée Gay. Ms. Jenny Guinet. Antoine Dunaud. J. Maulet. Guerry. Jacques Courtois. John Potot. André Bel. Fr. Boffety. Guyot. Ch. Postleb. Ch. Ditrax. J. Croset. J. Sanguinède. G. Jaclard. L. Coulin. Fr. Gay. Blaise Rossety. Jos. Marilly. C. Brech- such. L. Monachon. Fr. Mermollod. Donat father. L.J. Cheneval. J. Bedeau. L.H. Fornachon. Piniere. Ch. Grange. Jacques Laplace. S. Pellaton. W.Rau. Gottlob Walter. Adolphe Hæberling. Perrié. Adolphe Catalan. Marc Hériquier. Louis Allement. A. Pellegrin-Druart. Louis de Coppet. Louis Dupraz. Guillimaux. Joseph

Baquet. Fr. Pisteur. Ch. Ruchet. Placide Margarittaz. Paul Garbani. Étienne Borret. J.J. Scopini. Fr. Crochet. Jean Jost. Léopold Wucher. G. Fillietaz. L. Fulliquet. Ami Gandillon. V. Alexeieff. François Chevallier.

At the head of the 85 signatures of members of both sexes shine like the symbol of the work the names of Becker, a German, and Bakunin the Russian.

Four or five Frenchmen appear in this list, and we find there Perron and Catalan, from Geneva, who, delegates of the International in Brussels, contributed powerfully to the adoption of the collectivist resolutions.

It was this International, much more than its elder, that the world would henceforth have to fight.

All the newspapers, both French and foreign, rose up against the results of the Brussels Congress, but paid little attention to the dissidents of Berne. They exaggerated the power of the International and made it the mistress of the world.

Then the following phenomenon occurred: The working people, taking literally the sharp assertions of journalism, became accustomed to seeing in this association the great modern justice-bringer.

Finding the names of influential members in all the demonstrations, whether social or political, they imagined that it was they who ordered them.

Lulled by fanciful stories about the organization of the Association, about the numerous traveling representatives that a supposed occult committee sent out on Europe to recruit proselytes, the worker wanted to recognize in every man who spoke out loud an envoy of the International.

Dazzled by the fictitious millions that all the ignorant and malicious accusers were dangling before their eyes, the people believed in inexhaustible coffers.

The International!... The schemers of all ranks, the foolers of all levels used this magic word to subject to their domination the calm people who spoke reason, and the International became a real force, because it had been made the prototype of the danger for sovereigns and a refuge for the oppressed.

At the very moment when the phenomenon we have just indicated was occurring, terrible strikes broke out: Basel, Geneva, Seraing were troubled and bloodied as a result of the conflicts between workers and employers. The International intervened actively, through writings and subscriptions. The idea of a federation intended to increase tenfold the power of the societies of mutual credit, issued in Lausanne, is seriously studied in Paris; (58) because the International was still a force, but had no more cohesion, and rival groups were rallying under this flag. A new organization was necessary to make the projects of the authoritarians succeed; however, getting started was quite difficult. So, in Basel, the delegates from Paris still represented a series of different schools: Malon was a communist; Mollin, a positivist; Chemalé, a mutualist; Tartaret, a liberalist, etc., etc.

In several of the strikes of this period, as we have said, we find the hand of the International; but in many others, Aubin, Ricamarie, it is in vain that we

attribute the initiative to it. It remained completely foreign to them, because, to intervene, money was needed; and money is often promised, but very rarely granted.

XXI

BASEL, 1869.

Events are moving quickly. The Basel Congress, the most truly numerous of all, brings together Russians, Austrians, Germans from the North, others from the South; Liebnecht, the member of the Prussian parliament; Rittinghausen; Louis Lindegger of Austria, publicist; Spaniards, Italians, English, Swiss, Belgians and a few French. (59) The question of collective property is discussed again; but this time from the point of view no longer relative, but absolute.

In the Thursday session, the Commission submits to the assembly the resolution that it wishes to see accepted by the Congress:

RESOLUTION

1. Landed property is abolished; the soil belongs to the collectivity; it is inalienable;

2. The cultivating farmers will pay to the State the rent that they paid to the proprietors; this rent will serve as interest and will be used to pay for public services, such as education, insurance, etc.;

3. As a transitional measure, it is agreed that small landowners who work their land through their own work will be able to remain owners of this land for their entire life without paying rent; upon their death, the land tax on their land will be increased in proportion to the rent on other lands of the same value and will therefore be transformed into land rent. From then on, land tax will be abolished for these lands, as it already is for those that pay rent;

4. Leases will be for life for individual farmers; they will be for a term of for agricultural associations (a term higher than the average for life);

5. Leases will nevertheless be terminable by individuals or by agricultural associations for specific reasons of particular utility;

6. Leases will be personal; subletting is prohibited;

7. The land is valued at the beginning and end of each lease. If, at the end of the lease, there is a capital gain, the society reimburses it; if there is a capital loss, the society can reimburse itself on the movable objects that the occupant or the association has left;

8. In order to encourage association in agriculture, agricultural associations will have preference for renting the land. After the associations, this preference will still exist for the children of the deceased occupant who would have worked with their father;

9. In order to simplify the question of land, its administration will be entrusted in each commune to the communal council, appointed by all the adult inhabitants of the commune. This council will provide in particular for the gathering of plots and the delimitation of possessions, so as to stop the leveling. The communes may even constitute only one agricultural association, if such is the will of the inhabitants;

10. The State, in concert with the agricultural commissions appointed by the farmers, will take care of the major works of reforestation, clearing, drainage, and irrigation; it will come to an agreement with the rural works companies that could be formed to carry out these overall works.

In response to this resolution and before starting a game that was lost in advance, Tolain read the following conclusions:

Considering that the community cannot have rights that infringe on the natural rights of the individuals who compose it;

That, consequently, collective rights can only be guaranteed rights that assure everyone the free exercise of their faculties;

That these rights are inherent in man himself and that they are equal for all;

That, under penalty of delivering everything to an arbitrary regulation, having as its starting point either an abstract idea taken from outside of man and superior to Humanity, or a feeling that is not capable of regulating and determining social relations in a legal manner, it must be recognized that man has the right to appropriate the whole of his product;

That, in addition to the tools properly speaking, industrial or agricultural, credit or land is necessary for the craftsman or the farmer to become a producer-exchanger and sovereign master of the products of his labor, while he has contributed to all social charges;

That the existing of certain industries that require the reunion of several individuals does not change anything in the fact of possession, or free and individual property;

The Congress declares that, to achieve the emancipation of workers, it is necessary to transform leases, rents, farm rents, in a word all rental contracts, into sales contracts;

That then property being continually in circulation ceases to be abusive by this very fact;

That, consequently, in agriculture as in industry, workers will group together as and when they deem it appropriate, under the guarantee of a freely negotiated contract, safeguarding the liberty of individuals and groups.

For his part, Langlois presented these conclusions:

With regard to landed property, the Congress makes the following declarations:

1. Land, as it is not a product of human industry, belongs indistinctly to all, and, in right, it has never ceased to belong to them;

2. The parts of this common domain, of this common and inalienable property, could only be granted to a few under certain conditions;

3. These conditions, which, history is there to demonstrate, have often been modified, will be again, and they must be in each nation as soon as they have been recognized as contrary to justice and the general interest.

Bakunin, after having fought individual property, asked the deputies to adopt the voting formula below:

I vote for the collectivity of the soil in particular, and in general of all social wealth, in the sense of social liquidation.

By social liquidation I mean the expropriation, by right, of all current proprietors, by the abolition of the political and legal State, which is the sanction and the only guarantee of current property and of all that is called legal right; and expropriation, in fact, everywhere and as much as it will be possible and as quickly as it will be possible, by the very force of events and things.

As for the subsequent organization, considering that all productive work is necessarily collective work, and that the work that is improperly called individual is still work produced by the community of past and present generations, Bakunin concluded with the solidarity of the communes, proposed by the majority of the Commission, all the more willingly since this solidarity implies the organization of society from the bottom up, while the project of the minority speaks to us of the State.

“I am,” he added, “a resolute antagonist of the State and of all bourgeois policy of the State.

“I demand the destruction of all states, national and territorial, and, on their ruins, the foundation of the international workers’ state.”

Langlois, Longuet, Chemalé, Tolain, Murat, Tartaret, Mollin struggle, dispute every word, yield only step by step; but despite their heroic and brilliant resistance, the closure of the discussion is pronounced; a vote follows and gives as result: fifty-four votes for collective property; four against; thirteen abstentions and four absences. Russo-German collectivism wins, and the Congress declares that society has the right to bring the land and the instruments of work into collective property! (60)

In vain the French, especially the Parisians, invoked reason, nature, logic, history, science, they only succeeded in attracting the following response: “Science!” cried Brismée, from Brussels. “If science is in contradiction with our revolutionary aspirations, so much the worse for science; it is up to science to yield to our principles, but our principles must not bend to anything.”

Frantic cheers greet this joke and, all restraints having been broken, a senseless rearrangement of the map of Europe is indicated, the abolition of inheritance (61) is demanded and almost obtained. What it lacks in votes is so little, that it is obvious to all that Karl Marx, the German communist, Bakunin, the *Russian barbarian* — as he likes to call himself — and Blanqui, the frenzied authoritarian, form the omnipotent triumvirate.

The International of the French founders was dead, very dead; the only question for the Parisians could be to save mutualist socialism from this general shipwreck. (62)

1870.

Strikes, more strikes and more strikes; no more studies, or anything like them. Under Varlin's leadership, the organization of this state of struggle grew every day; the Internationals abroad, masters of the field, supported the movement, founded violent newspapers; an epidemic of unrest raged in France and paralyzed production.

However, as we have already said, not all strikes can be attributed to the International. To cite only two famous examples, that of the clerks in novelties (63) and that of Le Creuzot were carried out under the influence of causes absolutely foreign to the Association. In the Le Creuzot affair, if we come across the name of Malon, it is as a correspondent for *La Marseillaise*, and his presence in the conflict is largely counterbalanced by that of Jean Laroque, editor of *Le Parlement*, the newspaper of Grégory Ganesco. As for Assy, very embarrassed by his role, he was constantly floating from one to another of his advisers, and had never been part of the International.

Let us add that it is quite wrong to attribute the origin of this strike to a question of either salary or benefit. The motive for this outcry is entirely contained in a question of celibacy, and it was only after the agitation had started that the questions of mutual aid societies and benefit arose.

In Paris, the federation known as the Corderie is gaining importance; (64) but, there again, people are only grouping together to better count themselves, and of all these members of the International, very few are those who have read its general statutes. The hubbub is reaching its peak. In the workshops, people are recruited and join the International as they offer and accept a glass of wine; to cap it all, the hallucinated Empire orders a third trial against the Association, which it wants to implicate in the famous plot. (65)

We strongly advise the rare thinkers of our time to read the debates of this affair carefully; they will be struck to see that it was so easy to include and bring together in the same prosecution men who are so absolutely strangers to each other.

A certain number do not even belong to the International.

For those who were part of it, this is the extent to which they agreed on social questions. In his improvised defense, Heligon said: "My friend Malon knows that in the entire International Association, communism has not found a more bitter adversary than me;" and Malon, for his part, replied: "I am proud of my communist opinions, but the International cannot be in solidarity with them."

Combault, in his defense, also said: "Here is Murat, my friend, whom I greatly esteem and who has some esteem for me, I like to believe, well! we are in disagreement; he is a mutualist, I am a collectivist."

By uniting its enemies on common ground, the Empire facilitated the means for them to concert their action and unite against it. September having arrived, the judgment rendered on July 8 against the accused could not be executed.

It is known that the International, as a constituted body, took little part in the movement; nor is it found very active in the defense of Paris. Completely misled by the declamations of Blanquists, Pyatists and other *ejusdem farinae*, the last-minute Internationals kept their courage and their powder for the Prussians of the interior. Under the pretext of strengthening the Republic and hastening the advent of socialism, they shook one and seriously compromised the future of the other.

Then came the Commune. Here our task ends. Before pronouncing on the share of responsibility that falls on the International for the crimes committed in Paris, it is appropriate to await the result of the thousands of judgments that the courts martial will render. However, personally, we firmly believe that the despoiling decrees, the arbitrary arrests, the shooting of hostages, and the systematic burning of the capital, are the works of the Russo-German party, and that none of the members of the International who had to play a role in this association, during the years 65, 66 and 67, consented to countersign such crimes.

The example of Messrs. Charles Beslay and Theisz (66) is a favorable indication of our opinion. And, to make it easy for each reader to verify this assertion, we place before their eyes the table of all the members of the Commune and of the Central Committee of the National Guard. The names of those who notoriously belonged to the International before the Brussels Congress are designated by an asterisk; the names written in italics are those of the avowed enemies of the Internationals. As for the others, they were either simply indifferent or came very late to the International.

Membres de la Commune.

Allix.	* Dereure.	<i>Oudet.</i>
* Amouroux.	Descamps.	Parisel.
Andrieu.	Durand.	Philippe.
Arnaud.	A. Dupont.	Pillot.
Arnold.	C. Dupont.	* Pindy.
A. Arnould.	<i>Eudes.</i>	Pottier.
Assi.	<i>Ferré.</i>	<i>Protot.</i>
* Avrial.	Fortuné.	Puget,
Babick.	* Frankel.	<i>F. Pyat.</i>
Bergeret.	Gambon.	<i>Ranvier.</i>
* Beslay.	Ch. Gérardin.	Rastoul.
Billioray.	* E. Gérardin.	<i>Regère.</i>
Blanchet.	H. Geresme.	<i>R. Rigault.</i>
Brunel.	Grousset.	Vallès.
* Chalain.	* Johannard.	* Varlin.
Champy.	Jourde.	Verdure.
Chardon.	* Langevin.	Vermorel.
* Clémence.	Ledroit.	* Vésinier.
* E. Clément.	<i>Lefrançais.</i>	Viard.
J. B. Clément.	Lonclas.	* Serrailier.
V. Clément.	* Longuet.	Sicard.
Cluseret.	* Malon.	* Theisz.
Courbet.	Martelet.	<i>Tridon.</i>
<i>Cournet.</i>	Meillet.	Trinquet.
<i>Lelescluze.</i>	<i>Miot.</i>	Urbain.
* Demay.	Mortier.	* Vaillant.
	Ostyn.	

Comité central de la garde nationale.

* Avoine fils.	Castroni.	Jourde.
Arnaud.	Chouteau.	Lisbonne.
G. Arnold.	C. Dupont.	Lavalette.
Assi.	Ferrat.	Lullier.
Audignoux.	Fortuné.	Maljournal.
Bouit.	Fabre.	Moreau.
Bergeret.	Fougeret.	Mortier.
Babick.	Goudier.	Prudhomme.
Boursier.	Gouhier.	Rousseau.
Blanchet.	Geresme.	Ranvier.
Baron.	Grollard.	Viard.
Billioray.	Josselin.	* Varlin **.

XXIII

CONCLUSION

Fulfilling our promise, we have recounted the story of the International in all sincerity, without omitting anything important, without bringing to it the passion of the party man.

Now it is up to the reader to decide whether the cold-blooded violence and the theoretical eccentricities are the work of the workers, or whether they are not rather the work of the political bourgeois, whose vanity and laziness have corrupted their education. (67)

Let us compare the exalted adherents of the Congresses of the International with those of the League of Peace and Freedom; let us look for the past and present actions of both, and let us judge in which camp the progressive revolutionaries were agitating and in which camp the retrograde revolutionaries were swarming; where the men of the future, where the men of the past.

In inviting our readers to engage in this study, we do not in any way presume to make the public return to the account of the International. No, the siege is made; and we know that nothing prevails in France against fashionable phrases. It is so convenient today to justify all deviations or to explain all difficulties by these words: "It is the International!" that we would be ungracious in undertaking to deprive the most spiritual nation on earth of this convenient explanation. (68) But let the bourgeoisie reflect well, the publication of this work is a serious warning given to it by a convinced republican socialist. If it persists in its old errors, if it still resorts to the regime of repression to ensure its future, its fortune and its life are in danger; the present International, simplistic communist authoritarian, by that very fact popular, made stronger by a blind persecution, will shatter it like glass, not only in France, but also in the whole of Europe.

On the contrary, if, through a frankly republican organization, the bourgeoisie contributes to providing France with institutions based on the alliance of order and liberty, through work and study, the proletariat, better educated, becoming more conscious of its duties than jealous of its rights, will peacefully and smoothly climb the path that must lead it to its true emancipation. The bourgeoisie will disappear, but through the successive elevation of the working class and not through the lowering of the middle classes. And who, in this case, would regret such a result!

Freemasonry, Carbonarism, Marianne, the International are daughters of slavery. All were born in despotic times and among oppressed peoples.

Ensure liberty of association, and by removing the cause, you remove the effect.

The remedy is simple, will we dare to apply it?

END

NOTES

1. This affair of the worker delegations had awakened the apprehension of the prefect of police. Mr. Boitelle refused to let the workers appoint some professional delegates. "I would rather, he said, "see the law against the associations abolished than to see this journey carried out." Finally, forced to yield before the formally expressed will of the head of state, he gave Tolain the necessary authorizations, but reassured him that if he was the master nothing of the sort would take place in France.

2. The Equitable Pioneers of Rochdale.

3. If at that time the Empire, duly noting the wishes of the majority of the professional groups, had made law according to the direction indicated, we would have moved back in a single leap to 1750.

4. Whatever can be said of Tolain and his manner of living, we can attest *de visu*, that Tolain, a worker in bronze, only left the vice at the time of the transformation of the *Courrier français*, and that after the departure of Vermorel, he retired to the stores of Mr. Chavagnat, where he worked a modest job, when the events September 4, 1870 broke upon the scene.

Among those who today mock him so humorously, we believe that very few would be capable of so nobly enduring the poverty endured for so many long years by the worker deputy of Paris.

5. Expressions of Bibal in one of the electoral gatherings in the passage of Saint-Sébastien (worker candidacies).

6. The French exiles gathered very frequently in *Percy Street*, at the home of a restaurateur-landlord, named Jacques. It was in that establishment that that they proceeded to the reorganization of France, to the preparation of the famous lists of nominations of republican functionaries. That is also where the members of the *Revolutionary Commune* of Paris came to measure themselves in discussion against the *Rights of Man* and other whimsical sects.

Some groups of revolutionary women were formed there; one of them had for president *the citoyenne Lorgnes*.

The foundations were also laid for a masonic schism.

We see that the idea of establishing the Revolutionary Commune in France does not date from 1871. It was always the ideal of the émigrés, and especially of the Jacobins.

7. During the electoral campaign of December 1863 and June 1864, Fribourg had known at Garnier Pages, Rue Saint-Roch, 45, a sizable number of restless students and some of the Blanquist workers, whom the candidates of the committee of the Thirteen did not disdain making use of, even while scorning them.

Acquaintance made, we met again in the faubourg Saint-Antoine, and when the *Rive Gauche* was founded, Fribourg was admitted into the little inner circles of the Latin Quarter. This explains how strangers to the world of labor, such as Longuet, Emile Richard, Emile Maison, Robert-Luzarchè, Jules Ducrocq, Nauzet and Pierre Denis, were from the first hour adherents of the International, which they would defend throughout the great debates.

8. Soon after the founding, the poor health of Mr. A. Limousin force him to be replaced by his son, Charles Limousin.

9. The biggest deal of the era, said the lawyer Camille Bocquet as early as 1865.

10. It was because of the impossibility of establishing a central bureau at Paris that the founders would abandon the task of proposing the business to the English, which made Bibal speak the phrase so often repeated since: "it is a child born in the workshops of Paris and nursed in London."

11. It was with great difficulty that these titular figures could stop the local of the Rue des Gravilliers; the question of the *Denier à Dieu* was especially fraught with practical difficulties.

12. Reading this passage, Tolain could not suppress joyful movement: "Finally," he said to his colleagues, "it can no longer be said that is we alone who absolutely desire that the political question not pass above all else."

13. Rousseau's theory of the right of the sovereign. (*Social Contract.*)

14. This article was made specifically for France.

15. At his departure the member received a sum of money sufficient to reach his destination. When he arrived, the bureau of that locality facilitated his search for work, installation in a workshop, and from that moment the new arrival become part of the local section.

The destination bureau then gave notice of the inscription to the dispatching bureau, that it credited with the sum advanced to the traveler, it becoming a debtor to his new bureau.

The balance was adjusted at the end of the fiscal year, at least as the need of money does not oblige the creditor make a demand on the receiving bureau.

In this manner the new member could pay in proportion of his daily wage, and if he disappeared while remaining insolvable, the original creditor group became responsible with regard to the creditor bureau by solidarity.

16. *Centurion* and *dizainier* were the titles by which the Blanquist workers ranked themselves, to make themselves, and others, believe that France only awaited their order to enlist in their cause.

17. "I have ten thousand men in Paris who move at my word and who will rally to you if I tell them so, but I will do so only if you accept me in the Paris bureau."

So said Mr. Lefort. "If you speak the truth," answered the correspondents, "you are just a traitor to the Republic, for if we had ten thousand men devoted to our cause, the Empire would be overthrown within twenty-four hours; but as we do not have them, any more than you do, we must set ourselves to study and wait without uselessly waving a political flag."

18. Mr. Henri Lefort had been condemned under the Empire for involvement in a secret society. What's more, at the moment of the conflict he had just been made the publisher, in Paris, of the bust of Victor Hugo. This was more than enough to put all the bloodhounds of the prefecture of police hot on his heels.

19. Some people have cast doubt on the truth of these gentlemen's membership, and we will respond: M. Jules Simon received, in February 1865, at his home and from Fribourg, the card bearing the number 606; he paid a subscription of ten francs. Later, at the time of the Geneva Congress, M. Jules Simon paid the sum of twenty francs to facilitate the sending of the Parisian delegates.

For the others, we need only cite the following articles:

Siècle, October 14, 1865.

"It is with deep emotion that we read the account of what has just happened in London.

"We have a presentiment that something great has just begun in the world, and that the Long-Acre hall will be famous in history. The elevation of sentiment, the breadth of vision, and the lofty moral, economic, and political thought that presided over the choice of questions comprising the program... will capture with common sympathy all friends of progress, justice and liberty in Europe.

"We knew well that this deathly cold that spreads across the surface of our societies had not reached the depths nor frozen the popular soul, and that the sources of life had not been extinguished...

"Our ears were no longer accustomed to such words; they made us tremble to the depths of our hearts."

"Henri Martin."

Siècle, February 4, 1865.

"The wind is blowing more and more towards congresses; we must rejoice in these efforts to foster the intellectual communion of all friends of progress in Europe...

"We begin with moral and intellectual federation and end with political federation...

"So I wonder what the international congresses of European proletarians will think, these 'illustrious old men' of whom Monsignor Dupanloup speaks, 'who compose the senate of the human spirit.' Will they, seeing 'the rising tides of democracy, dig their graves and, before dying, commend to the crucified Jesus not only their souls, but their homeland and their children?' I don't know, but what I am certain of is that all far-sighted and generous people will applaud the

thought of this meeting in a congress of several hundred men, representing the elite of workers from all the countries of Europe... Significant progress has been made since our agitations for social reform some twenty years ago. At that time, apart from a small group, the general tendency of socialist workers was to consider the State as their visible welfare and to expect from it the redemption of the lower classes. Now a new generation declares that "the emancipation of the workers must be the work of the workers themselves."

"A. CORBON."

20. As the guests entered the workshop on Rue Pierre-Levée, where the meeting was being held, Fribourg engaged them in a general conversation.

This means of squelching any requests for explanations was quite successful as long as the number of arrivals did not exceed twenty, but from that moment on, calls could be heard from all sides; everyone wanted to speak.

The moment was difficult to pass through. To secure a hasty retreat, Tolain positioned himself in front of the entrance, and while Fribourg explained that under the law governing meetings of more than twenty members, only he, as the signatory of the invitation letters, and the owner of the premises could be prosecuted, the remaining guests took their places, stunned, within the assembly.

21. The freethought movement was bound to find followers in the International. Thus, the following piece, the work of Mr. Aristide Rey, a student, enjoyed some success there.

International Association of Freethinkers.

ACT AS YOU THINK SOCIETY.

I

Whereas only he is an honest man who aligns his actions with his principles;

II

As good cannot exist apart from truth and that there is no truth except that given by Science;

As it is important to separate progressive and scientific morality from outdated dogmas that reason condemns and sentiment must disapprove of;

As conscience rejects religious doctrines that guide man by fear and the most base motives;

As these doctrines have divided men by distorting morality and corrupting the notion of law;

III

As the communion of ideas between man and woman alone can found a family;

As giving a child a faith and a knowledge that are negative of each other is to oppose the heart to reason, to corrupt judgment, to paralyze the will, and to prepare skepticism;

As surrendering one's money, one's children, and one's person to the defenders of the past, through indifference or weakness, is to betray the cause of the new society and delay its triumph;

IV

As many men proclaim these truths, but, failing to firmly assure themselves of their convictions and to make them the inviolable rule of their conduct, they constantly give the lie to their words through their actions;

As this contradiction results in the degradation of character and public demoralization;

As a community of action, giving everyone example, support, and strength, can alone make easy the struggle of a rational life against habit and prejudice;

The undersigned consider it their duty to break with doctrines they reject in principle; they declare their commitment to never receive any sacrament of any religion:

*No priest at birth,
No priest at marriage.
No priest at death.*

We constitute under this title: "Act as you think" society, an association whose law is Science, its condition is Solidarity, and its purpose is Justice.

The following document was attached to this declaration:

This is my testament:

My last wish is not to be buried according to the rites of any religion, and I grant the power to represent me before my family to prevent the desecration of my body.

This 18...

22. Up to 40 letters arrived a day; some of them were so lively that Fribourg burned them as soon as he had read them and without waiting for the Commission to meet. The unfortunate people who wrote them were either mad or rogues.

23. Meanwhile, the first issue of another small newspaper, *La Fourmi*, was breaking the rules and, thanks to a fortunate choice of pseudonyms, reaching Paris. But whether guessed or denounced, the internationals were unofficially advised to abandon the idea of having a newspaper of their own.

Faced with the government's ill will, the newspaper's administrators requested and obtained an audience with M. de Saint-Paul, then chief of staff at the interior ministry. The imperial official informed them that neither *La Presse Ouvrière*, nor any other workers' newspaper would cross the border, not for what it contained at first, but for what it might say later.

"So, sir," said one of the interested parties, "you are shooting us in advance for a crime you suppose we might one day intend to commit?"

"That's absolutely it," replied M. de Saint-Paul, dismissing the visitors.

One can easily imagine the anger and indignation of the internationals; but the curious thing about the incident is that of these five gentlemen: Tolain, Bourdon, Fribourg, Varlin and Clémence, it was the latter two who distinguished themselves by their exaltation against the despotism of power, and this attack on freedom of the press. Despite these intimidations, Fribourg and Chemalé launched, in July 1868,

Le Fédéraliste.

A 32-page review, large octavo.¹ — Offices: 16, rue Hautefeuille, Paris. Subscription: France, 5 francs per year. Foreign, postage extra.

PROGRAM.

Cogito, ergo sum.

I think, therefore I am.

When, on June 20, 1889, the Third Estate, sitting in the Tennis Court, professed the solemn oath that made it equal to the other two estates, it conquered sovereignty, affirmed its capacity and, by this energetic claim, proved that it was aware of its Power, its Right, and its *Idea*.

From that day dates its emancipation; from that day also a revolution was made, and the division of the Third Estate into two categories (Bourgeoisie and Plebs) was consummated.

Like the bourgeoisie then, the people today believe themselves to have attained political and social capacity; *they demand to make a proof of it*. Abandoning the fraternitary and communitary sentimentality of another era, rejecting the always disappointing palliatives of philanthropy, convinced that empiricism has had its day and that society must rest on a series of immutable laws, of which Justice is both the summit and the base, it is from study, from science that the Proletariat now demands the solution to the problems on which its emancipation depends.

Delegations, workers' candidacies, congresses, international, national or professional associations are all cries of appeal pushed by a generation anxious to finally make known and realize, *without ever seeking the support of any authority*, what it believes to be justice and truth.

To wait any longer to take part in the discussion, to entrust the defense of our interests and our rights to a PATRICIATE, would seem to us a failure, a step backward, almost an apostasy; it would be to confess our unworthiness, to deny our fathers, and to fall back to the rank of *clients* or *freedmen*.

If, in 48, the bourgeoisie, arguing our inability and empowered by our powerlessness to define our aspirations, could reject us, relegate us to our political inferiority, and keep us, as it were, outside the law, would it be the same today?

We cannot believe it.

¹ 1. This Review, initially monthly, is destined to become bimonthly, then weekly, as soon as the number of subscribers allows.

The People, in attaining self-awareness, conceived their ideal and formulated their program.

Opposing to the universal antagonism of persons, social interests and conditions, mutually supportive yet distinct interests; to granted constitutions, contracts, freely discussed and freely consented to; to hierarchical subordination, civil, political, and social equality, they conclude in favor of the equivalence of functions, the reciprocity of services and respect.

Finally, they believe that the social pact, an essentially synallagmatic and commutative contract, guardian of the liberty and dignity of the citizens, is contained in embryo in the mutualist or federative idea.

It is to help spread these principles and the consequences they entail that we have resolved to found a publication entitled *Le Fédéraliste*.

Who are we? What does it matter? Strangers to all cliques, willing to accept the support of all men of good faith, as well as to reject all *influence*, it is not a name, but a principle that we inscribe on our flag:

FEDERATION

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC.

FEDERATION

AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL.

24. This was the only time Karl Marx appeared at an international meeting; he never attended a congress, and he was never president of the General Council.

Eccarius, on the other hand, was always part of the Central Council's delegations to all workers' societies and congresses, and was for a long time the General Secretary of the International.

Eccarius is a German, having lived in London for over ten years.

25. Appeals had been addressed to Parisians by the Paris office:

To the Members of the International Working Men's Association.

"Gentlemen,

"As the date fixed for the meeting in Brussels of a Workers' Congress approaches, the correspondents in Paris, members of the Council sitting in London, believe it their duty to draw your attention to this letter, intended to clearly define the nature of the Congress.

"This meeting, the first of its kind, but, we hope, the first of a long series, must have as its objective to bring the workers of the different countries of Europe together to achieve the goal set by the Association: the total emancipation of the workers without distinction of race, creed, or nationality, that is, the solution to the modern problem: the abolition of the proletariat and of slavery, whatever its form.

"But why, one might ask, have workers been called upon to undertake this immense labor, when on all sides eminent, educated, and devoted men are striving to seek the remedy you are asking for?... Why?

"Because it is time for the worker to do it himself, no longer through guardians who, however devoted they may be, do not suffer from the illness and are ignorant of its poignant pains, and because, finally, as we have said, the man of our time is of age and wants to be emancipated.

“Then, it must be said, we believe that by doing so we are effectively supporting the efforts of these same men, for they have never been able to know the truth about this gigantic cancer that is devouring humanity; they have never had complete information about our suffering, and we want, in this solemn meeting, to spread our gaping wounds openly, courageously rejecting the emollients of all kinds that are applied to us, and even if they should recoil in fear at the sight of the extent of the evil, to show it to them in all its hideousness.

“When everyone has thus become aware of the danger, everyone will be called upon to present their remedy, for the Association calls upon all men of the future. Socialists, communists, phalansterians, positivists and democrats, all of you who believe you possess the remedy for our ills, we will not say to you: Come! It is your conscience that will cry it out to you, for no one has the right to concentrate on themselves, when they can save their fellows.

SUMMARY AND INVITATION

to the Societies of Mutual Aid, Mutual Credit, Production, Consumption and Savings.

In summary, the reader can see that the International Association proposes to open a major investigation into the social state of the working classes; that it does not prejudge the decisions of the next Congress, that it in no way claims any leadership, that it intends to respect the liberty of the group of associates, and that it limits itself to asking each and every one for insights on this great subject of the emancipation of the workers. Rightly or wrongly, there currently exists in Europe a current of reformist-socialist ideas; this current, like all its analogues, has given rise to many theories, many projects which, left undiscussed, perhaps perpetuate many errors, but perhaps also contain useful truths. It is to this elaboration that we call all devoted hearts, all those who believe that the very collapse of all the projects, matured in our weak minds, would bring about immense progress in humanity; for, let us not forget, there are two ways to advance: the first and most fruitful, by spreading the truth, and a second, no less useful, by destroying ignorance and the illusions engendered by suffering and misery.

Thus then, to any citizen who believes, as we do, in the usefulness of this study, we definitively ask that they contribute their contribution to our work, that they study our questionnaire; and if they cannot attend the Congress, that they send us a memorandum intended to enlighten the delegates present. This word “delegates,” which is found under our pen, serves us usefully as a transition to also appeal to societies, whether of mutual aid, mutual credit, production, or consumption. From these societies, grappling with practical difficulties, we also ask for membership as a group, because we cannot repeat it enough: the point that dominates all others is the *investigation*, and this investigation, to be properly conducted, must not be limited to individual members, but also to group members, who, by sending delegates to the *European Congress of Labor*, will provide a contingent of hitherto unappreciated value.

To insist further would seem to us to be an insult to the good spirit of the worker. We believe we have said enough for this time on this subject; we have

nothing left, in closing this brochure, but to repeat that, if the cause of obscurantism has St. Peter's Pence, we must find the Pence of Progress that will serve to ignite the spark that generates the humanitarian and social center.

26. The sum allocated to each delegate by the Paris office was one hundred and twenty francs, from which they had to deduct the cost of the third-class round-trip ticket. With the remainder, they lived and entertained themselves in Geneva for eight days.

27. The English delegate, Mr. *Dupont*, announced that a group of people from Paris had demanded the right to take part in the deliberations of the Congress; he proposed that this group appoint a delegate to participate in the discussion.

This proposal, supported by the French, was rejected by the Germans and the English.

An uproar broke out, and a fight ensued in the part of the room reserved for the public.

M. *Dupleix*, in charge of organizing the Congress, declared that "these individuals had come with the clear intention of causing a scandal; as he must ensure that the discussions are not disturbed, he invited the members of the Association present at the session to ensure that *their delegates* were respected and to expel the troublemakers.

Mr. Dupont's proposal, which was put to a vote, was rejected, and calm was restored only with great difficulty.

(*Annales du Travail.*)

September 1866.

Letter to the Editor of the Confédéré de Fribourg.

Dear Editor,

In your September 9 issue, you inserted a letter from several individuals (some of whom are not even members of the International Association), containing an accusation of violence to which they were allegedly subjected, and in which they claim that this violence was directed against them at the instigation of Mr. Dupleix, president of the Geneva section, and the Parisian delegates. They further claim to have been insulted by the same people.

It is important to reestablish the facts: and first of all, regarding the accusation of insults, we declare that it is only thanks to the repeated affirmations of the French delegates that these gentlemen have been assured that they were not taken for informers and treated as such; as for the violence of which they complain, it would most certainly have occurred without the effective intervention of the members of the French delegation, as well as other members of the Congress.

That said, we must, Mr. Editor, acknowledge, as befits our dignity, the insults and accusations these gentlemen felt it necessary to direct against the members present at the Congress.

We utterly deny these trivial allegations, and we call upon their authors to produce the evidence they claim to possess.

As for knowing who we are and what we want, we ask those who are truly devoted to the truth to consult, for their enlightenment, the minutes of the Congress, as well as the reports published by various newspapers, notably the *Avenir de Genève*, *Nation Suisse*, etc.

Please accept, Mr. Editor, our greetings.

FOR THE WORKERS' CONGRESS:

H. JUNG, President of the Congress.

JOH.-PH. BECKER, Vice-President.

A. BOURDON, Secretary.

GEO. ODGER, President of the London Central Committee.

R. CREMER, Honorary General Secretary of the London Central Council.

J. CARD, Secretary of Congress.

28. We would be entitled to ask the fanatics of the Deputies of the imperial left, what are the significant differences that they could indicate between the opinions of the communist Varlin and those expressed in so many speeches, on compulsory education, by M. J. Simon, Picard, etc., etc.

29. As we have said, this Memoir was unable to enter France. Here is the letter written on this subject, dated March 9, 1867, to Minister of State Rouher, acting Minister of the Interior.

M. Minister,

The undersigned, delegates of the International Workingmen's Association, express their profound astonishment at the action taken by your Administration against the Memoir read by them in Geneva. Determined to accept responsibility for their actions, they attempted to publish their Memoir in France, and the refusal they experienced from the Parisian printers alone decided them to have it published abroad. They attributed this refusal by the Parisian publishers to the fear inspired in each of them by the laws governing the press; they believed that, if the Memoir came from abroad, no obstacle would be placed in the way of the publication of their ideas; It seemed useful to them from all points of view that light be shed on opinions, and that these ideas, shared, whatever one might say, by a large number of citizens, could be controlled by public opinion. Strong in their conscience, they awaited the discussion with the calm of convinced men.

The border is closed to them; before drawing any conclusions, they thought it useful, M. Minister, to bring this fact to your attention, and await your final decision on this subject.

Signed:

The Members of the French delegation.

The next day, the minister's response, addressed to the headquarters, rue des Gravilliers, invited Bourdon, one of the signatories, to come to his office, where the reasons for the ban would be explained to him.

The delegate appeared there; the Memoir was on the desk, and a few paragraphs were annotated; he was invited to modify or delete them. Discussion began on the substance of the ideas expressed. The Minister did not dispute the right to issue this or that doctrine; all his *observations* concerned the given form; he asked that certain expressions be softened; that certain facts be presented less crudely. On the response that the Memoir was read in this way in Geneva, that moreover it is the expression of the thought of the Congress on the said questions, that it would be difficult to repeat the same ideas without falling back into the same phrases, the Minister said that then he saw himself forced to maintain the ban. However, he added, if you included some thanks to *the Emperor, who has done so much for the working classes*, he would see. Bourdon simply replied that the International Association did not engage in politics, that flattering or denigrating a particular person or political party was not within its remit, that it studied the substance of the questions, published the results of its research, and left each group to apply them according to the nature of its needs and means of action.

The ban was maintained: in France one could not read what was printed and sold freely in Brussels.

30. It is the same illusion as that of Messrs. Fribourg and Tolain, and other delegates of the Parisian workers at the Geneva Congress. The workers at the Geneva Congress are, as we know, in favor of free credit: this is their favorite formula. "You would abolish debts, then," we said to one of them one day, "if you were the masters of France?" — "No; but we would abolish the law on usury." The response was subtle; it was liberal. M. Fribourg wanted to show us by this that he placed above all discussion respect for private agreements, respect for the freedom of transactions, and his response does him credit.

Léon SAY, *Débats*, April 26, 1867

31. It was on the occasion of this trip on the lake that the flag of the International made its first appearance. This flag was that of the Geneva section, red, it bore in white letters:

*No rights without duties,
No duties without rights.*

The boat *Chablais* was decked out with the flags of all nations; that of the International was hoisted on the mainmast, to the sound of a symphony and when it appeared, dazzling and fluttering, above all the others, an immense cry of stupor resounded on the quay:

"It is the Red Republic," said the Genevan bourgeois.

32. Two days before the time set for the meeting of this jury, Fribourg, meeting Blanquist workers, expressed his sorrow at seeing work so scarce.

"That's all the better," replied Meunier and Genton, two centurions, "the more misery there is, the happier we will be. We would like the worker to stop finding a way to earn his bread, then hunger would do, perhaps, what reasoning has not yet been able to do."

"You cooperators," they added, "you strive to alleviate the suffering of the worker, and that is why we detest you. Because if, by some impossible chance, you succeeded in making the worker happy, the revolution would never happen, and we want the revolution above all."

33. In a spontaneous burst, each workshop presented the following declaration to the boss:

"We, the undersigned, declare that we have the honor of being part of the *Société du Crédit Mutuel des travailleurs du bronze*, which aims to guarantee each worker a remuneration more in keeping with the needs of life, and protest in advance against any society tending to lower the conscience and dignity of man."

February 23.

34.

ASSOCIATION OF BRONZE MANUFACTURERS

to ensure the independence and liberty of labor

February 24, 1867.

Sir and dear colleague,

Uncertainties having arisen in the minds of several manufacturers on the conduct to be held towards the workers, your Commission believes it must recall again the principle of your decisions. You have resolved:

"All the workshops will be closed on Monday, the 25th of this month;

"The reopening will only take place as long as the workers have declared that the ban no longer weighs on any of our establishments."

This rule is fundamental.

As an exception, you wanted those workers who do not approve of the strike to be able to return to work on Tuesday morning, by renewing with the bosses the *formal and honorary declaration* of not supporting the strike either by contribution or in any other way.

This return to work itself should be considered *only temporary*, because if the ban were not lifted everywhere in an absolute manner, and this, within a short period of time, it would be necessary to proceed with a new closure, so that by virtue of the solidarity which binds us, no house is more favored than the others."

For the Administrative Commission:

The President, T. BARBEDIENNE.

The Secretary, G. SERVENT.

35. Camelinat, Arsène Kin, Valdun.

36. Tolain, Fribourg.

37. The police prefect called the delegates of the bronze and congratulated them on the dignity and firmness of their conduct.

38. To each Workers' Society that provided funds to the bronze workers, the members of the Credit Office issued a receipt with a stub. After the strike had subsided, the reimbursements of the funds advanced were made in the order of registration.

39. The following memory is linked to the bronze workers' trip to London, which we cannot pass over in silence:

On March 1, 1867, a former captain, François-Antoine-Clovis Hémont, who had been banned in December, died in London. Félix Pyat had been invited to the burial of this republican; but apologizing for the uncertainty of the weather, fatigue, and the frequency of these ceremonies, he had formally declined the invitation. On the morning of the 10th, he was informed that Parisian workers were passing through London and that they would attend the captain's burial; he immediately changed his mind, despite the pouring rain, went to the cemetery and delivered a warm speech on the half-open grave, the peroration of which, addressing itself directly to the delegates of the bronze workers and the International, invited these workers to understand the mission reserved for them; and, after an allusion to the Congress of Geneva, ended thus:

“Fellow citizens, compatriots, Gessler's hat crowns the edifice. I will rest in peace on foreign soil, if, with Rousseau's book, you have brought back to France the arrow of William Tell.”

All to the cry of Long live the Republic.

While the small group of political friends repeated with the speaker, Long live the Republic, the delegates from Paris consulted each other with their eyes, and the same reflection imposed itself on their minds: “If citizen Pyat believes so firmly in the virtue of the dagger, why does he not go there himself?”

40. In 1865, during the London Tailors' Strike, the Paris office having published an invitation to French workers not to accept the offers of the English master tailors, the Paris tailors believed in reciprocity anyway, and this was the cause of their disappointment.

41. This influence was increased by the following publication:

International Workers' Association.

(Paris Office.)

Two successive strikes have broken out among the coal miners of Fuveau (Bouches-du-Rhône).

It is not a question of a wage increase; here again, it is a question of a regulation not discussed, which the Company wants to impose.

A first time, a change in the hours of night labor had led to the strike. Although this change reduced the time of rest, the miners had been obliged to submit to it.

A new article added to these regulations, by further aggravating their already so painful situation, caused a second cessation of work.

400 miners have been on strike for three weeks. In this painful crisis, the surroundings of Fuveau have given the example of the greatest calm, and thus proved that they were aware of their duties and their rights as men and citizens.

Consequently,

Given the paragraph of the constitutive pact:

“The Association considers it a duty to claim, not only for its members the rights of man and citizen, but also for anyone who fulfills his duties.”

The Paris Office brings the fact to the attention of the Offices of the Association, with the confidence that the material and moral support of the members of the said Association is henceforth acquired by the miners of Fuveau.

April 21, 1867.

For the Parisian Commission, correspondents:
VARLIN, TOLAIN, FRIBOURG.

42.

June 17, 1866.

Europe currently offers, to the astonished eyes of the populations, a grandiose spectacle, well designed to deeply move the true friends of humanity.

The democracy is rising, rising.... rising and growing without ceasing; never was a sovereign more pampered by his friends than the people are at this moment by their most bitter enemies. Those who loathe them the most are the first to choose their colors and wear their cockade; it is only by displaying their flag that an opinion can attract the attention and captivate the masses. Will they know how to take advantage of their advantages?... Go, go, people! May you, in the midst of all these flatterers, show yourself, by your perspicacity, worthy of the place that history prepares for you in the annals of humanity!

The democracy is neither French nor English; it is no more Austrian than Prussian, Italian than German; the Russians and the Swedes are part of it, as are the Americans and the Spaniards; in a word, the democracy is universal, and it is this universality that is the guarantee of its success. It affirms its solidarity and summons all nations to the Workers' Congress, where will be studied together all the questions raised by the development of financial feudalism and the intensity of the misery to which it is reduced, while addressing to it every day, with protestations of devotion, the basest flatteries.

It is with the aim of preparing the solution of these questions that this formidable investigation has been opened, the sections of which, today isolated, separated, with no other link than this feeling of solidarity which unites the most diverse peoples, are ardently studying the program of their emancipation.

It is from these points, imperceptible to anyone who does not know their existence and position, that the new idea will emerge, the announcement of which will make the world shudder!...

But what! Everything disappears. An intense and nauseating fog envelops the earth and seems to foretell complete destruction for humanity.

What is it?... It is.... It is.... Ah! Rise up, peoples! It is war!... The horizon lights up, and it is the cannon that vomits death and projects its sinister gleams into the darkness; the earth trembles, and it is the shock of men succeeding the shock of ideas; the gunfire resounds, and a million human machines, industrious and peaceful, bent formerly under the weight of a devouring and poorly paid work, will rush one upon the other to execute the decree of fatality!

Oh! May these soldiers, who were yesterday still citizens, and companions in our labors and our studies, feel awakening in them those feelings of equality, dignity, solidarity that were the basis of our relations; may they, while there is still time, remember the motto inscribed on the flag of the International Association: *Labor! Solidarity! Justice!*

And the workers, escaping, for this time again, from the domination of the aristocracies interested in the struggles between peoples, will finally address in this Workers' Congress, on which all their hopes are currently based, these serious questions that war, with its hideous practices, is powerless to resolve.

Certified as a true copy:

For the Parisian members:

Varlin, bookbinder; Bourdon, engraver;
Bony, mechanic; Héligon, wallpaper
printer; Floquet, house painter; Tolain,
engraver; Fribourg, one of the Parisian
correspondents.

(Courrier français, June 17, 1866).

43. See the official reports and minutes. Chaux-de-Fonds, printing house of the *Voix de l'Avenir*, 1867.

44. Garibaldi, going to Geneva, in order to preside over the Peace Congress, was to pass through Lausanne; on the day of his arrival, Tanari of Boulogne, and Stampa of Milan asked the Congress to appoint a deputation charged with going to invite the general to come and attend the sessions of the Congress.

A short discussion took place on this proposal and the Congress decided that, while they pay homage and justice to the character of the general, as well as to his perfect honorability, it is not up to a meeting of workers to make such a move with a citizen, however illustrious he may be; that if the general, who is president of several workers' societies in Italy, had thought it appropriate to come and sit at the Congress, he would have been received with all the sympathy to which he is entitled; but that since he had not thought so, it would be an act of misplaced deference to address such an invitation to him.

The Italian delegates having withdrawn their proposal, the Congress proceeded to the next order of the day.

45. The two Geneva sections, French and German, and a large part of the delegates from Lausanne were present in full force in the hall of the Electoral Palace, at the time of the double vote to which the League of Peace and Freedom owed not perishing under the violence of the Fazystes, and above all to avoid the ridicule that always attaches to major aborted enterprises.

46. After Mentana, a banquet was offered by the students of the left bank to the Garibaldian Combatz, who had been *amazed* by a shotgun ball. It was on this occasion that Fribourg met Raoult Rigault, who immediately told him about his electric machine for killing *reactionaries*. His plan at that time had two phases: in the first moment of a taking up of arms, the conspirators were to go immediately to the homes of those to be killed, and under any pretext having entered the home of the said reactionary, it was to be done on the spot.

“The Steering Committee,” he said, “had noted for this purpose with the greatest care and kept up to date all the addresses and information necessary for the success of this first operation. The first part of the rest would always be highly blamed by the senior leaders, *to calm and silence the onlookers* (sic).”

Those whose arrest had been recognized as necessary were to be taken to one of the forts or to one of the barracks of Paris, then once the courtyard was full, a formidable electric battery was to rid the revolution of all the traitors, and like that, Rigault said laughing, *there would be no bloodshed and how quickly it would go!* (sic)

A prank that Rigault liked to tell about, would make known the principles of justice displayed by this sad character.

One evening, being with a political friend from the Latin Quarter, Rigault noticed a cat on a pile of garbage. Seizing it and taking it home with the intention of eating it was a moment's work; but killing it without revolutionary devices was repugnant to him. So what did our dilettante do? He baptized the cat, named it Badinguet, instructed the animal's trial; after having charged it with all the crimes imaginable, requested the death penalty, and his friend, endowed by him with the qualification of delegate for practical justice, carried out the sentence.

“But,” said one of the listeners, “in this affair I see clearly an animal arrested for no reason other than your good pleasure, I see clearly that without very clear proof you concluded that it must be Badinguet, and that after having thus gravely insulted it, you cruelly put it to death; so the policeman, the slanderer and the executioner were well represented, but the accused I do not know that you heard his defense and that you provided him with a lawyer. And this looks to me like a political assassination with a legal sham.”

— “What!” Rigault continued, “lawyers, a defense, oh yes! is that in our principles? We are authoritarians, and if we are so angry with Badinguet, it is not because he is a despot, but because we are not the masters.”

During his stay at Sainte-Pélagie, Rigault and Ferré spent entire days petitioning against all the other prisoners and constantly having them appear before the Commune. It was in Rigault's room that this tribunal sat, whose grotesque decisions already indicated what was to be expected of these men.

Sometimes Rigault's door would close on a secret meeting which would be announced in the courtyards and corridors of the prison:

"Citizens of the Commune, in session."

It was undoubtedly from this tiny organization that the entire police prefecture of the Commune emerged.

47. Félix-Eugène Chemalé, aged 39, architect; Henri-Louis Tolain, aged 39, chiseler; Jean-Pierre Héligon, aged 34, wallpaper printer; Rémy-Zéphirin Camélinat, aged 37, bronze fitter; André-Pierre Murat, aged 35, mechanic; Joseph-Étienne Perrachon, aged 39, bronze fitter; Joseph Fournaise, aged 40, precision instrument worker; Pierre-Michel Gauthier, aged 41, jeweler; Onéxime-Irénée Dauthier, aged 30, saddler; Jean-Victor Bellamy, aged 35, turner-tap maker; François-Eugène Gérardin, aged 40, house painter; Jean-Pierre Bastien, 45, corset maker; Victor-François Guyard, 36, bronze fitter; Pierre-Louis Delahaye, 48, mechanic, and Jean Delorme, 36, shoemaker.

48. MM. Bourbon, engraver; Varlin, bookbinder; Malon, dyer; Gombault, jeweler; Mollin, gilder; Landrin, engraver; Humbert, crystal cutter; Granjon, brush maker; Charbonneau, carpenter of carved furniture.

49. M. Jules Simon was kind enough to make himself heard at these meetings. The discussion on the role of women in society provided the author of the *Ouvrier de 7 ans* with the opportunity to affirm his socialist principles and to say that, in his opinion, “women have the right to work, and that he forms the most sincere wishes for free and compulsory education.”

(Tenth General Assembly, Sunday, October 13, 1867).

As we have already noted, the difference in principles, if there are any, between Messrs. Jules Simon and Varlin are not the most apparent.

50. The three pieces that we are publishing here will establish our assertion very clearly:

No. 1 — A few words of explanation for a personal act.

I begin first of all by asking the people to whom these few lines are given to forgive me for the annoyance that I am going to cause them by diverting them

from serious occupations to make them take an interest, even if only for a moment, in my very small personality.

No one is more inclined than I to accuse as ridiculous any gentleman who believes that the whole world has its eyes on him and that by explaining his actions he is fulfilling a priesthood.

If, breaking the silence today, I am prepared to equal the proud man I have just mocked, do not blame me, but rather a sect of "political mites" who would be quite inclined to take note of a longer silence, to declare me convinced of all the foolish accusations that they have been willing to unload on my back.

Now, between being a scoundrel and ridiculous, my choice cannot be long, and asking to speak of a completely personal act, I say to the malicious people of all ages and social positions:

My resignation as a member of the Paris office of the International Workingmen's Association has served as a pretext for you to repeat against me all the platitudes of your repertoire, absolutely as my entry into this same group had made them blossom on your lips; were you going to look for the natural motives for my resignation? no! not so young; according to the master's clever method, you have forged and peddled them without worrying otherwise about their plausibility, or their character. If you had opened your eyes, you would necessarily have been led to note that my relations with the members of the Paris office had remained the same after as before my resignation, and that, as time passed, the coldness inherent in any divorce had given way to relations of good fellowship; but that was not your business, it was too down to earth, and then it would not have bothered anyone and one could have believed that you were going downhill by going a month without hearing yourself slander someone.

However, since on the one hand it would not be convenient for me to leave your nonsense unanswered any longer, and on the other hand, each time you have been required to provide proof of what you accuse one of us of, you have always failed to keep your appointment, although each time you had the power to designate part of the jury, I will make up for your voluntary absence by notifying you that it results from a *declaration signed on August 3, 1868 by fourteen members of the Paris office and in particular by all the delegates to the Geneva Congress in 1866*, that: the reasons that led to my resignation are entirely in the domain of private life; that these reasons were appreciated differently by a part of the commission which even considered them insufficient; that nevertheless, not wishing at any price to raise dissensions that would have delighted our political enemies, and without judging the substance of the question otherwise, it was preferable for me to resign as a member of the office.

But, said those who took the trouble to answer, if it is as simple as that, say it out loud, because it makes a bad impression; to those I will say, that I myself had asked that silence be kept on these reasons until the day when it would be possible for me to make them known without inconvenience to anyone.

I can say today that one of the greatest arguments presented to persuade me to resign, was that, as a merchant and manufacturer, my business position was very tense, that it could happen that it would end in a catastrophe that would not fail to be attributed to misconduct, and that if proceedings were brought against

the Association, it should not be in the position of providing, willingly or unwillingly, the elements of an indictment on the community, for the personal act of a member of the office and for objects completely outside the sphere of action of the society.

The reasons given seemed to me too respectable and too logical for me not to go there; but at the same time any wise man will understand that I could not trumpet that I was in a difficult situation, because that would have been to infallibly bring about the catastrophe that I most wanted to avoid.

I therefore resigned from my functions, but nevertheless remained a member of the Association, because it was perfectly understood that if I had not been one of the official representatives of the group, the commission would never have thought of raising any of the questions to which I had just answered.

Thus are reduced to nothing these accusations of any collusion with the French administration, as well as those relating to poor management of the Association's funds, management which, to say in passing, was not within my functions following the definitive formation of the office on my return from Geneva.

I would never have thought of publishing all these details if quite recently a *monsieur* Levraud had not thought it necessary to publicly use this resignation as a weapon against me and make it the basis of an infamous slander.

Although I had the right to be indulgent for the state of intoxication in which this *biped* found himself, I nevertheless sent him two of our mutual friends, whose honorable character he had proclaimed many times (Longuet, Marchand), to obtain from him a retraction, a confirmation by proof or finally a reparation by arms.

It happened what always happens with such men, that is that he refused to give me satisfaction by asking for four days to provide *material* proofs of what he had put forward, namely that I had lost the right to present myself among honorable people. — This delay was granted to him, but it was August 3, and today September 10, nothing having happened because nothing could happen, and this gentleman not having retracted his words, I have the right to conclude, and I conclude, that the insulter, suitably styled and sufficiently heated, had lied knowingly, without respect for the mutual friend who had personally invited us to his table.

Now one does not argue with such beings, one challenges them, and this is one of the purposes of this publication, I *challenge* them to bring against me any kind of infamous proof of any kind.

Does this mean that I believe myself to be perfect and that in my life it would not be easy to point out faults? Not at all! I do not believe in perfection and I think that one is a man only on the condition of being an assembly of strength and weakness, I ask only of the citizen not to erect vices into virtues and to make every effort so that his faults harm only himself, his strength is at the service of all.

In closing I must also admit that I am keen to rid my friends of the trouble they take on every occasion to explain my conduct. My conduct defends itself, while it is known: I have never refused to open up to a friend; but I declare that

henceforth, well convinced of the futility of the efforts made or to be made to open the eyes of our voluntary “myopic” (that was the name given at the time to the Blanquists), having acquired proof that they only slander for the love of the art, without worrying otherwise about the results, I cease the profession of dupe that I have practiced for four years, wanting in good faith to bring back people that I believed to be misguided.

Let them think what they want, I care little; when they have *authentic* proof, because I believe them capable of fabricating false ones, let them judge me, let them put me on their funeral lists and let them consider me dead in advance, I will laugh at it; but I refuse them any explanation, any compromise, I reject them, because, as an interested party, they did not blush to descend to the hateful lie, and they lacked the courage necessary to face the arbitral decision of those who admitted them to the honor of providing proof of their words.

E. E. FRIBOURG,
E n g r a v e r -

decorator.

N. B. As I finish these lines, it has just again become a question of my resignation among the delegates to the Brussels Congress gathered in committee, and I learn that, there again, citizen Tolain made the formal declaration that the reasons that had made me leave the Paris office in no way affected my character and that they were all private matters.

No. 2. *Nain jaune.*

April 1869.

Doctor Sebille was succeeded by M. Fribourg, a member, it must be remembered, of this *International Society* that has made a certain noise and of which M. Tolain is one of the principal initiators. We have, we believe, the honor of counting M. Fribourg among our systematic adversaries. This cannot prevent us from declaring that between the previous speakers and him, there is an immense difference. M. Fribourg has read, remembered, compared. He has arrived at that disdain for politics which is the indispensable element in the triumph of social ideas. And yet, he had barely begun to speak when hostile whispers ran through the ranks of the two or three hundred people who seemed to dominate the currents of the assembly, and many gaps occurred. We do not wish to echo the calumnies that we heard circulating around us on the account of the speaker and his friends of the *International Society*; but, if they have reached the ears of M. Fribourg, they will have taught him to understand the cruelty, the injustice and the stupidity of these imputations launched from who knows where, at certain moments, against men whose influence is justified, imputations which result in having, for example, cleverly styled cretins maintain that Auguste Blanqui, a great soul and a great heart, spent thirty years of his life in prison for the pleasure of being pleasing to all the police prefects who inherited from M. Gisquet.

G. HUGELMANN.

November 8, 1869.

My dear Fribourg,

Are you resentful? I am as devilishly so! The other day, I found myself, in the company of Perruchon and Guyard, near the man named Vésinier whom you know as well as I do; very happy to have this opportunity to have before my eyes the proofs of my *infamy*, I treated him from top to bottom, according to his merits. He swore, of course, that he had the said proofs; he gave his address to the *Rappel*.

Tolain consulted puts himself at the disposal of his friends; I await a response from Varlin, and if I have not written to you the next day, it is because I have absolutely lacked time.

In any case, do you consider it necessary to cooperate in the preparation of a report that will allow us to silence the venomous beast that, according to recent information, continues its exhortations against us? Please reply as soon as possible.

Yours,

CH. LIMOUSIN.

51. The *International Workingmen's Association* opened its third Congress on Sunday, September 6, in the Salle du Cirque in Brussels. The programme of its deliberations included the following eight questions:

1. Mutual credit among workers;
2. The effects of machines on the wages and situation of workers;
3. Integral education, including the study and apprenticeship of trades;
4. Land ownership (arable land and forests, mines and coal mines, canals, railways, etc.);
5. Strikes, federation between resistance societies, and the creation of an arbitration council for possible strikes;
6. Reduction of working hours in workshops (question formulated by the English and American sections);
7. What should be the attitude of workers in the event of a conflict between the great European powers (question posed by the German sections);
8. The work books, summary of the grievances of the workers of each profession (question emanating from the Belgian sections).

52. One hundred delegates were registered, but a large number only attended the opening session, and soon the number of delegates present dropped to around sixty.

53. Here is the text of that declaration:

“Considering that, in our opinion, the question of property was only put on the agenda in the last session;

“That it was studied, from a general point of view, only in a completely insufficient manner; from an agronomic point of view, only in an incomplete manner;

“That in the presence of the affirmation of a certain number of delegates who declare themselves not to be enlightened, it was natural to postpone the question to a future congress;

“The delegates whose names follow, who abstained or who voted against, thus decline responsibility for the vote.”

54. Here are the other resolutions taken by the Brussels Congress.

“Against the war, the Congress adopted an Address to the German branches, containing the following passage:

“We must consider a war between France and Germany as a civil war for the benefit of Russia.”

“This Address ends as follows:

“The International Association urges the workers to speak out against any war and to oppose it by all means, to refuse their cooperation in this systematic assassination, to organize propaganda to enlighten the unfortunate people who are forced to make war.”

“The Congress adopted the following resolution:

“The Congress recommends that the workers stop all work, in the event that war breaks out. It counts on the solidarity of the workers of all countries for this strike of the peoples against the war.”

“On machines, the Congress declares that they must belong to the workers and operate for their benefit, that it is through association and mutual credit that the producer must come to own them. But that it is necessary, from now on, to intervene in the introduction of machines into the workshops, so that this progressive transformation of the tools only takes place accompanied by serious guarantees, or fair compensation for the worker.

“On the other questions, the Congress only renewed the resolutions taken on these subjects in Geneva and Lausanne.

55. The Congress of Berne had received a letter from Sainte-Pélagie from the members of the International Association who were detained there.

ADDRESS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
DETAINED IN SAINTE-PÉLAGIE.

To the members of the Congress of Berne.

Citizens!

In the presence of the resolution taken by the Congress of Brussels, relative to the League of Peace and Liberty, the undersigned, members of the International Association, think:

1. That from the point of view of the principles that form the basis of the International Association, the delegates sent to the Congress to deliberate on a specific agenda, did not have a mandate to take a resolution of this importance without consulting their groups;

2. That from the point of view of the liberty of which we are pursuing the conquest, the right to believe oneself to be the sole expression of the aspirations of an era cannot belong to any isolated association.

Consequently:

We are pleased to recognize the usefulness of the League of Peace and Freedom alongside the International Workingmen's Association, and believe that the diversity of the respective elements that compose them opposes their fusion.

We therefore regret the invitation to dissolve addressed to the League by the members of the Brussels Congress; this determination can only commit its authors.

We take this opportunity to send you the expression and assurance of our sympathies.

Prison of Sainte-Pélagie, September 17, 1868.

A. COMBAULT, C. MOLLIN, L. GRANJON, R.
MALON, E. CLUSERET, E. VARLIN, HUMBERT,
E. LANDRIN.

M. Lemonnier also read a letter from M. Jules Favre, in response to the invitation addressed to him to attend the Congress.

M. Ch. Lemonnier.

Sir,

I would have been very happy to be able to be part of the assembly to which you do me the honor of summoning me and to affirm once again my deep and growing horror for war. It appears to me as a growing challenge of barbarism to civilization and the main reason that makes me regard it with aversion is that in the face of science, which tends more and more to take hold of the world, it is almost always struck by sterility. Moreover, it today carries over Europe the specter of ruin and bankruptcy. It loses its heroic character to become a calculation of destruction; the excess of evil will produce good, I am deeply convinced of it, and I will applaud with all my heart all the efforts that will be attempted to demonstrate these useful truths.

But this year I am held back by the imperative necessity of taking some care of my somewhat shaken health.

I beg you to be so kind as to present my apologies to the honorable Mr. Vogt, as well as to the other members of the office, and to accept for yourself the expression of my most distinguished sentiments.

JULES FAVRE.

Juan-de-Lavy, September 9, 1868.

56. The program of the nihilistic sect consists in establishing under no relation, neither of sex nor of family, any difference between man and woman; consequently, the adherents of both sexes will wear short hair, loose clothing that conceals the forms, masculine hairstyles, and blue glasses intended to veil the color of the eyes and the liveliness of the gaze.

No compliments, not even politeness among themselves, witness the following anecdote whose two heroes are: André Roussette and Mme Bakunin.

The French lawyer, discussing in one of the rooms of the municipal palace of Berne, with the wife of the *barbarian*, was going to refute an argument of the nihilist touching on the subject of motherhood. Embarrassed to find a topical

sentence without being hurtful, he hesitated to answer. "Be careful, citizen Rousselle," the emancipated woman said to him sternly, "you will be polite." Who remained silent? It was Rousselle.

Motherhood being the fact of an inequality of nature, the nihilists avoid it by all possible means, and if they cannot achieve it, the nihilist woman willingly abandons the fruit of her loves, or rather of her natural necessities.

Here is what a Russian wrote about it:

Saint Petersburg, January 17, 1870.

I see that foreign newspapers, especially those of Germany, are discussing at random the so-called conspiracy recently discovered in Russia. As today this affair, rather mysterious, indeed, in its origin, is more or less cleared up, I am in a position to give you information on the subject on the accuracy of which you can count.

You know that for quite a long time a strange sect, but appropriate in many respects to the Russian character, has been spreading in this country. I mean the *nihilists* who recognize neither religion, nor property, nor marriage, who profess a crude materialism, a return to nature, as they express it, and dream of a complete social leveling, a sort of peasant democracy founded on the basis of communism. It is especially among the youth of the schools and within the liberal professions that this doctrine is making frightening progress, and one can say that almost the entire new generation is more or less affected by nihilism. Spread throughout Russia, invested by the government itself, in the Polish provinces, with the role of Russifiers, the nihilists have their leaders in Switzerland, voluntary exiles for the most part, who give them their watchwords.

The leaders of nihilism wanted to take advantage of the date of February 19 (March 3) next, the day when the peasants will be definitively freed from all obligations towards their former lords and will be able to leave the lands where they work to provoke a kind of peasant revolt, a general massacre of the owners and, taking advantage of the anarchy that would have followed, to overthrow the government and seize power. To this end they had printed, partly in Switzerland, partly, it is said, in Moscow itself, a mass of proclamations that were to be distributed profusely among the peasants. They had already begun to send out packets of these proclamations to their affiliates in each province, when the government got hold of one of these consignments, which was not difficult.

At the same time, a man named Ivanoff, a student at the Moscow Agricultural Academy, driven, it is said, by remorse, denounced to the authorities several of his friends and acquaintances whom he knew to belong to this conspiracy. The government did not fail to have them arrested, but Ivanoff paid dearly for his denunciation. He was found dead one morning; he had first been shot, then strangled and thrown into a pond.

No one doubts that this was revenge by the conspirators whom he had betrayed, and a certain Netchayeff, a voluntary emigrant in Switzerland, who had returned clandestinely to Russia, is even named as the principal perpetrator

of this assassination. It is further said that after this crime, the latter managed to reach the frontier again.

In short, this whole affair has led to the arrest of forty to fifty people, both in Moscow and in St. Petersburg. They are mostly young people, students, journalists, etc. Among them, however, is a justice of the peace from our capital, Mr. Tcherkessoff, in whose office a bundle of proclamations was seized. It is said that a high court of justice will soon be established to investigate and judge this trial.

While waiting for the revelations of the procedure, society is greatly alarmed by its discoveries; and this is not without reason, if we judge by the proclamations of which I am sending you some samples.

In order to be better understood by the peasants, the author of these pieces has had recourse to popular language:

"Brothers!" he said, "we are at the end of our patience, existence becomes harder for us day by day. We have been deceived with vain promises. This land that God had made for all men, our masters have seized it. Where then is justice? — Alas! nowhere; tyranny reigns everywhere.

"Formerly it was not so. The fields belonged to those who cultivated them. Our ancestors knew neither nobles, nor priests, nor merchants, nor hoarders; so they lived free and happy! But foreign princes came from beyond the sea, dragging in their wake their nobility, their officials, their hoarders; they subjugated the poor people and seized their fields, and since then they have lived off the price of their sweat!...

After having become masters of our country, the conquerors built cities there from which they still dominate us. It is to them that we owe these oppressive laws and these heavy taxes that reduce us to misery. They are happy! How could they not be? They fatten themselves on our bread! Their cities are so well fortified that it is impossible for us to attack them, unless we throw the *red cock* at them (in popular language, to throw the red cock means to *set fire*)...

"They said to themselves: everything belongs to the tsar, to the nobles, to the priests, to the merchants; the people are only our slaves.

"In truth, we peasants are no more than vile animals to our masters; they saddled and bridled us, then they mounted on our backs. Woe to him who dares to utter a complaint! Siberia and the fusillade are there to put an end to the audacious... But if discontent begins to translate into agitation, it is true that our lords take it in another tone; oh! then they are lavish with promises and lies. Tranquillity restored, the fine words are forgotten and the persecution begins again more violent than ever...

"The Czar was drunk when he signed the ukase which was read to us on February 19, 1861; what does this ukase say? — You, peasants, are free; but on one condition: that you will not own an inch of land, neither plowed land, nor forest. — It is fortunate for the Czar that he signed this ukase while drunk...

"The popes told us: the Czar is the God of the earth, the members of the nobility fulfill the office of angels to him.... We have been content to bow our heads...

“There was a moment in our history when it was permissible to hope..., the Czar and all his offspring had just died! Unfortunately the nobility brought a prince from the German country, and it is from this foreigner that came the line of sovereigns who have oppressed us for so long. This German family has multiplied infinitely; the priests in the churches can barely list the names of these different members; and it eats a lot, and its courtiers spend enormously... So we are in the depths of the deficit, and we have lost hope of paying our debts... Imbeciles that we are! we are governed by Germans who deign to do it to fill their pockets... Our Czar and the Grand Dukes are incapable of governing us. They are content to run along the main roads and notice if we shout loudly, hurrah! and if we catch our caps with skill, after having thrown them in the air in sign of joy...

“There is only one thing left for us to do, it is to strangle our masters like dogs! No quarter! They must all disappear!... Their cities must be set on fire! Our country must be purified by fire!... What good are these cities? They only serve to engender servitude. When the peasant is the lord of his house, of his field, when he can work in the factory of his village, he will no longer feel the need to become a servant in a city.... Since they have cannons and rifles and we are disarmed, it is only by fire that we can attack and defeat them. Once the walls behind which this rabble entrenches itself are reduced to ashes, it will be necessary for it to die of hunger.”

57. Here is the piece that ran through Paris following this Congress; it was said to have come from the pen of Tridon:

A note of announcement.

We have the pain of announcing the lamentable end of the Peace Congress, which died in Bern, in the arms of reaction, previously equipped with all the chrisms of liberalism, and taking to the grave the regrets of all the so-called right-thinking papers.

Today a Congress has no chance of duration and action except in proportion to its revolutionaryism. Now, the deleterious influences that we have denounced, and which have been defeated, have taken their revenge in Bern. They have allied themselves with bourgeois doctrinarianism to stamp their feet on the social revolution. (Fribourg has avenged Tolain.) Peace, then, and rest to the Peaceful Congress.

But honor to citizens Jaclard, Bakunin, Wiroubof, to our friend Richard, formerly delegated to Brussels, to all those finally who held high the flag and fought so vigorously against the bourgeois and working-class doctrinaires. Their defeat is certainly worth more than the shameful victory of the Fribourgs, the Rousselles, the Clamagerans, the Chaudeys and other Protestant lawyers or ministers.

The latter, Chaudey, has peremptorily demonstrated how far a certain unhealthy Proudhonism could lead, published after the death of the master and to sully his memory.

Let him meditate, if he can, on these words of Proudhon himself:
“If there are Proudhonians, and I am assured that they are, they are assuredly imbeciles!”

Hum! an *imbecile* after the Congress of Berne, that is very sweet.

58. Published by the Commission.

Communication of two documents

EMANATING FROM A COMMISSION ESTABLISHED BY THE MEETING OF THE SALLE MOLIÈRE, IN WHICH ARE RECORDED THE PRINCIPLES AND MEANS OF EXECUTION BY WHICH THE WORKERS HOPE TO IMPROVE THEIR LOT AND WHICH THEY ASK, MOREOVER, TO BE SUBMITTED FOR THE DISCUSSION AND VERDICT OF PUBLIC OPINION.

The discussion will begin next Friday and will continue on the following Fridays, at eight o'clock in the evening,

Citizens,

Faced with the incessant complaints of the workers, complaints that are cruelly justified by their daily suffering, it is impossible to remain inactive, not to seek some remedy that will destroy, or at least diminish, to the last possible limit, this perpetual discomfort.

It is only too obvious that, in the current economic state, labor does not have its normal organization. Indeed, the most elementary principles of justice are everywhere distorted and misunderstood, and some men are blind enough to defend the blatant abuses of which we are victims.

It is time finally that we thought about it: as long as we have not escaped capitalist oppression, there will be neither well-being nor dignity for us.

The principal cause of our intolerable situation is our ignorance! Certainly, it would become difficult to exploit us if we were all convinced of these principles, superior to any social form: that only he who produces has the right to consume; that he who does not work necessarily lives on the work of others, and that, if the necessary is lacking somewhere, it is because there is a superfluity elsewhere.

All men having needs must produce, and there will be harmony in society only when each one, equipped with the intellectual and material elements of production, can freely dispose of the whole of his product; then no more parasites, whose voracious appetites increase constantly, without us ever being able to fill the abyss.

To obtain this result, what must we do? Nothing that is not of a possible and immediately achievable application: to unite.

Let us therefore chase away this mistrust, which keeps us apart from each other and causes our weakness; let us remember above all that slander is the weapon of our adversaries, and that it alone would be enough to delay our emancipation for a long time yet.

It is up to us to want, it is up to us to work tirelessly, from now on, to escape from this state of moral degradation which is not death, but which is not life either, true life....

We affirm that, when men are united by a contract and they confine themselves within the limits drawn by themselves, this contract must be sacred, and no one other than the contracting parties has the right to interfere in the relations that exist between them.

Workers have only one way to emancipate themselves: to form groups, by profession or otherwise, and to establish solidarity between all these groups by federating them.

To forbid them this path is to subject them to arbitrariness.

Recommending savings to workers is a mockery, their wages being already insufficient to meet their most pressing needs.

Wage labor, the last form of slavery, must disappear.

The distribution of the products of labor, based on the equivalence of functions and the mutuality of services, will bring justice to social relations.

In the name of our dignity, we reject all protection, from whatever quarter it is offered to us;

In the name of liberty, we refuse to submit to any request for authorization, when it is the exercise of a natural right;

In the name of equality, we demand common right to judge our personal affairs, on the condition that we provide the necessary elements contradictorily with our adversaries;

Finally, in the name of solidarity, we urge all workers to unite to support these principles and propagate them by persuasion and practice wherever there are proletarians.

Citizens, see from the foregoing at what point of view we have placed ourselves, to respond to the desire you expressed by charging us with presenting you with the bases of trade union chambers.

The trade union chambers already constituted in large numbers (and new ones are formed every day), clearly prove that we feel the need to unite to resist effectively in the war of capital against labor.

And here, we sincerely declare that all our sympathies are with those of our comrades who, knowing how to make wide use of the tolerance granted to them, have contributed to spreading the spirit of unity among the workers.

But we know that trade union chambers are not based on any written law; a mere whim can suppress them at the first attempt they make to increase the well-being of their members, or only if the number of members becomes too considerable. We therefore require a law that changes the tolerance that we are willing to grant into a legal right.

Up to now, the workers have not yet clearly formulated what they wanted; we believe we have done so, barring any discussion, and we submit this statement to the appreciation of public opinion, which is the judge, in the last resort, of the legitimacy of all demands.

Our work is therefore a draft law rather than a draft statute; we have specified in it what we know is necessary for the workers to free themselves from the yoke of exploitation, the immoral source of all social inequality.

Chambers of Labor.

CHAPTER I.

ORGANIZATION.

1. All workers in the same profession have the right to join together under conditions determined by them and to choose from among themselves a council responsible for defending the general interests of the group thus united, or the particular interests of each of its members.

2. The group may include all or only a part of the workers, which allows the existence of several chambers of labor in the same profession.

3. Groups may even be formed by workers united from different professions.

CHAPTER II.

PURPOSE.

Section I.

1. The chamber of labor may settle amicably all difficulties that arise between its different members.

2. It intervenes, amicably, as far as possible, in conflicts that arise between its members and their employers, namely:

1. On the number of working hours in the day;
2. Workshop regulations;
3. Wage rates;
4. The use of old or new machines;
5. The use of harmful materials;
6. The occupation of unsanitary premises.

3. It acts, in accordance with its statutes, in disputes that affect the entire group.

Section II.

1. The Chamber of Labor determines the conditions of apprenticeship contracts and monitors their execution.

2. It collects and makes available to its members all statistical documents, especially those concerning their specialty.

3. It gathers the elements necessary for the creation of so-called vocational technical education, for which it organizes the courses according to the needs of the group.

Section III.

1. The Chamber of Labor may provide each of its members with unemployment compensation.

2. It provides them with compensation in the event that work is suspended following a decision taken either by the council when it concerns only one workshop, or by the entire group when it concerns several.

3. The Chamber of Labor organizes mutuality between its members by providing them with compensation in the event of accidents or illness, and pensions for incapacity to work or old age.

4. The Chamber of Labor has the primary mission of eliminating employers; it achieves this result:

1. By facilitating the organization of cooperative production and consumption societies;

2. By participation contracts between workers and employers;

3. By buying back, for the benefit of its associates, the tools of the workshops where they are employed.

CHAPTER III.

CONFLICTS.

1. All disputes concerning one or more members, or the entire association, shall be brought by the chamber before the competent courts.

2. All legal costs, as well as any fines that may result from convictions, shall be borne by the social fund.

3. The chamber of labor may refuse to pursue a case that it does not consider just; in this case, the member or members remain free to pursue it at their own risk.

CHAPTER IV.

CONTRIBUTIONS.

1° The social fund is funded by general or special contributions, equal for each of its members or proportional, according to the will of the members.

2. The fund may receive payments from its members in current accounts or deposits; but it may only dispose of them according to their will.

CHAPTER V.

FEDERATION.

1° The chambers of labor may and must meet to more effectively support their common or particular interests; this meeting or federation can include all the private chambers.

LAST WORD. As long as these principles are not legally recognized, it will be completely false to claim that we are free; as long as we do not have the possibility of dealing with our bosses on a power-to-power basis, we will be in slavery, because poverty will force us to accept their conditions.

ADAM (Camille), leatherworker,
AMOUROUX, hatter,
CARMIGNAC, mason,
FÉLIX, carpenter,
GAILLARD, shoemaker,
GRUEL, stonemason,
HAVREZ, locksmith,
MAY, silversmith,
MUIRON, quantity surveyor,
PAULET, employee,

PINDY, carpenter,
ROUSSEAUX, stonemason.

The signatories of this project were only the front men of the principal Parisian members of the International, whose particular ideas emerge very visibly from the statement of principles, which recalls in more than one point the formulas of the Geneva Memoir.

This publication, printed by Rouge, was obliged to pay a stamp duty of four centimes per copy, as a political brochure.

For about two months this was the program of the sessions of the Molière hall. The so-called Federation of the Corderie followed.

59. At this Congress, we saw strange delegations and representatives who were completely unknown to the groups that had delegated them. To cite only two examples, Tolain represented the bakers of Marseilles, and Bakunin the oval workers of Lyons. To speak, one had to be a delegate; one took the delegation where one could.

60. For this question, as for that of the inheritance, the nominal vote took place aloud, by yes and no, and it was not without a certain feeling of admiration for their adversaries that the communists heard Tolain, Chemalé, Langlois and Murat, energetically resisting the torrent of yes votes, clearly pronounce their negative vote.

61. In the Friday session, Brismé announced the Commission's conclusions on the question of inheritance:

Whereas the right of inheritance, which is an inseparable element of individual property, contributes to the alienation of landed property and social wealth for the benefit of a few and to the detriment of the majority; that, consequently, the right of inheritance is an obstacle to the entry of land and social wealth into collective ownership;

As, on the other hand, the right of inheritance, however restricted its action, constitutes a privilege whose greater or lesser importance does not destroy the inequity, in right, which is a permanent threat to social right;

As, moreover, the right of inheritance, in all its manifestations, in the economic order as in the political order, is an essential source of all inequalities, because it prevents all individuals from having the same means of moral and material development;

Considering that the Congress has declared itself in favor of collective land ownership, and that this statement would be illogical if it were not corroborated by the following:

The Congress recognizes that the right of inheritance must be completely and radically abolished, and that this abolition is one of the indispensable conditions for the emancipation of labor.

After the result of the discussion on individual property, the Parisians abstained from speaking, so logical did it seem to them that having voted for collectivism, the Congress would inevitably vote for the abolition of inheritance. But, oh surprise! the vote gave: 32 votes for the abolition of inheritance; 23 against and 17 abstentions. The result not giving a majority, the proposals of Eccarius, consisting of an increasing extension of inheritance taxes, were submitted to the Congress. These proposals were rejected by 32 votes against 23; abstentions: 13; absences: 8.

What had happened in the minds of the delegates? For our part, we have always believed that most of those who voted for collectivism of property had not first considered the practical consequences of the generalization of their theory. Property was an abstract thing; but the question of inheritance could arise for anyone in the short term, and they knew exactly what it could be, so the result was a referral to a more in-depth study.

64.

Statutes of the Federation

OF THE PARISIAN SECTIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

1. A federation is established between the Parisian sections of the International with the aim of facilitating relations of all kinds between the various groups of workers.

This federation is administered and represented by a Federal Council.

CONSTITUTION OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL.

2. The Federal Council is composed of delegates from the various federated sections.

The number of delegates is regulated as follows:

A section comprising 50 members at most is represented by one delegate; from 51 to 100, by 2; from 101 to 500 by 3; from 501 to 1000, by 4; from more than 1000, by 5.

Each section will appoint an equal number of substitute delegates.

Each section appoints and changes its delegates as it sees fit. Each of them must, at the beginning of the session of the Federal Council, register with the Secretary of the Interior, who verifies his mandate with an appeal to the Assembly, if the secretary or any other member so requests.

3. At the first sessions of April and October, the Federal Council will appoint its bureau consisting of: a treasurer, a secretary of the sessions, two correspondents for the outside, three for France. These numbers may be increased if necessary.

The members of the bureau are constantly revocable by the Council. Vacancies must be filled immediately. Relation of the federal council with the general council:

4. In accordance with Article 5 of the General Statutes and Article 5 of the annexed Regulations, the Federal Council will communicate with the General

Council; it will send it every month a statement of the state of the International in Paris.

Conversely, in accordance with Articles 5 of the Statutes, 2, 3, 8 of the Regulations, the latter modified by Article 3 of the administrative resolutions voted in Basel, the General Council will have to send every three months, to the Parisian Federal Council, a statement of the situation of the International Association in all countries.

RELATION OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL WITH THE FEDERATED SECTIONS:

5. Any section wishing to be part of the Parisian federation must file two copies of its Statutes and its special Regulations, one intended for the General Council. (Gen. Reg., art.14.)

6. In accordance with resolution 5 of Basel, the General Council, before admitting or refusing the affiliation of a new section or Society formed in Paris, must consult the Parisian Federation.

7. In accordance with Basel resolution 6, the Parisian Federation may refuse the affiliation of a section or Society, expel it from its midst, without being able to deprive it of its international character, the General Council alone being able to pronounce its suspension; the Congress, its suppression.

8. The Federal Council has, for its various expenses, correspondence, propaganda, etc., the following budget:

Each section adhering to the federation pays it 10 centimes per member per month.

(There may be a compromise for this figure with the Workers' Societies already contributing to the costs of a federation).

One of the delegates of the section must pay at the first Assembly of the month the sum calculated in the hands of the treasurer. The latter makes known at the third monthly meeting, by a note posted in the premises, the sections that are not in order.

After one month of delay, the suspension of the section is automatic: its delegates no longer have a voice in the Council; after three months, the removal is pronounced.

The Council may, with supporting reasons, vote for expenditures greater than its budget, and set the additional contribution of each section proportionally. But, in this case, the contribution remains purely optional.

RELATION OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL WITH THE MEMBERS.

9. Members of the federated Parisian sections and members of foreign sections passing through Paris may attend the meetings of the Council as auditors.

Members of the International who do not regularly belong to any section are not entitled to be admitted to the meetings.

10. The acts of the Federal Council will be submitted for approval to the General Assemblies of the Parisian sections, which will take place at least every three months.

If this control presented in practice some difficulties, the General Assembly could be replaced by a meeting of special delegates in triple number of delegates to the Federal Council.

REVISION OF THE STATUTES.

11. The Statutes may be revised by the General Assembly, at the request of one or more groups, communicated at least one month in advance to the federated sections.

65. Concerning this plot, the General Council of the International published a declaration in which it recalled that the statutes of the Association were formally opposed to a secret society organization, and that the insinuations against the *International* were in no way founded (unfounded).

The English concluded by saying that this last plot could be placed on the same level as the two preceding ones of grotesque memory.

Signed:

R. Applegarth, J.G. Eccarius, general secretary; R. Serrailleur, Belgium; E. Dupont, France; J. Cohn, Denmark; J. Ajopa, Italy; K. Marx, Germany; A. Zabisxi, Poland; H. Jung, Switzerland; G. Harris, B. Lucreft, T. Mottershead, J. Hales, W. Hales, F. Lessner, C. Murray, T. Weston, W. Townshend, C. Plondes, B. Gissorni, and Ruhl, members of the General Council.

66. Already from various quarters, it can be seen that the International as a body is not unanimous in its assessment of the actions of the Commune. Indeed, we note the following information in the Paris newspapers:

The Central Committee of the International Workingmen's Association, which sits in London, is astonished at the divisions that the events in Paris have created in the society. The Committee vigorously condemns those of its members who agreed to promote, by associating themselves with it, the Paris movement and to be part of the insurgent government. Among this number are citizens Johannard, Pindy and Varlin, who, moreover, are at the present time completely crushed within the Commune by the Jacobin party, represented more particularly by Delescluse.

On the other hand, the Committee approved of the workers who had refused to get involved in this affair, in which they saw nothing likely to ensure the triumph of the doctrines of the *International*. Among them are Messrs. Héligon, Fribourg, etc. As for M. Tolain, his conduct within the Committee itself is very differently assessed. While some praise his attitude, others declare that he has abandoned the workers' cause.

In any case, current events have resulted in a great division within the *International*, a division that will result in the expulsion of the violent element. It

is likely that then only honest workers will remain, in collaboration with whom it will not be impossible for governments to seek a solution that satisfies all interests and resolves a question that threatens to become the most serious of modern times.

(*La France*, May 13, 1871).

A strange incident has just occurred in London and allows us to judge the activity of the Prussian intrigues that the International is used to conceal. One of the most influential members of the London International is Mr. Benjamin Lucraft. This Benjamin Lucraft, a very eloquent orator, was appointed a year ago by the voters of Clerkenwell to the Office of Public Instruction, where he represents the workers, pending the imminent appointment to represent them in Parliament. He wrote to *The Times* to declare that the famous address in which the London International had the audacity to congratulate the Paris Commune was the work of Mr. Karl Marx, a Prussian subject, formerly secretary to Mr. von Bismark and now secretary of the London International for German correspondence. It is worth noting that Mr. Karl Marx had condemned the insurrection of March 18 in a letter he published under his own name. This circumstance adds to the value of Mr. Lucraft's revelation.

(*Liberté*, June 30, 1871).

The International judged by one of its founders.

Mr. George Odger was accused by *The Times* of having been the founder of the International Society. He has just explained to a large meeting held in Newcastle, the most democratic city in England, the part he played in this foundation.

The program of this Society was drawn up based on a pamphlet that Mr. Odger published eight or nine years ago, in which he urged the workers of various nations to federate. It was from this very well-written and very honorably thought-out pamphlet that twenty people drew inspiration to draft the statutes of the Society.

The speaker declares that the International Society is innocent of the Paris insurrection, although some of its members took part in it; but he believes that they would have led the insurrection even if the International had not existed. The speaker, visibly embarrassed despite the applause that greeted his explanations, said that imperial corruption, of which he painted a vivid picture, was the cause of the disaster, and did not go into further detail so as not to compromise the people in the prisons of Versailles, whose lives were in danger. He declared that England had nothing to fear from an revolution *au petrole*, and he formally disavowed a pamphlet published by the French Internationalists. Finally, he concluded his speech by protesting with an energy that did him credit against the killing of the hostages, a crime which a few fools had the audacity to advocate.

Mr. Georges Odger, a shoemaker, is a very intelligent man, very devoted to the popular cause, and who actively promoted the French Republic during the invasion of Paris.

(*Liberté*, July 1871).

Finally, the letter addressed to the Journal de Genève by M. Beslay:

In coming to ask for hospitality from Switzerland, following the formidable crisis that has just shaken France to its foundations, I consider it my duty to bring to light the part that I have been obliged to play in these events. I owe these explanations to myself in order to declare very loudly that I accept neither near nor far any solidarity with the men who burned Paris and shot hostages; I also owe them to the country where I have old friends, because I want to show it that my presence, in some way forced upon the Commune, has not been without some utility to Paris and to France.

M. Beslay then explains that, despite his refusals, having been appointed to the Commune, and having been obliged to sit despite his three successive resignations, he asserted himself through a program of moderation.

My speech, which was reproduced by all the newspapers, was summed up in two points: first, the program of the Commune, which I translated as follows: To the Commune what is communal, to the department what is regional, to the government what is national.

As for politics, I summed it up in two words: "Peace and labor!" so true is it that peace and labor have always seemed to me to be the two ends of the compass that must govern the world!

The publication of this speech was considered a possible link between Paris and Versailles, and I received the most pressing requests from all parties to remain in my post in the public interest.

I yielded in the hope of rendering some service, and it was then that I requested the delegation of the Bank, with the firm resolve to preserve from any harm the position of our first credit institution, which had to be kept intact at all costs, to prevent the banknote from becoming nothing more than an assignat, the day the federal battalions took possession of the offices.

But by remaining in the Commune, my line of conduct was nonetheless inflexible and consistent with the principles that had been the law of my entire life. As a member of the minority, I voted against all violence, I defended all liberties, I freed prisoners and I renewed my resignation three times.

67. Here is one of the ways in which the magistrates themselves proceed against the International:

M. the substitute:

"Chachuat is a dangerous man, president, assessor, etc., in disreputable societies and clubs.

"He belongs from afar or closely to the International, personally or through his connections."

June 21, 1st council of war of Marseille; *president*, Lieutenant-Colonel THOMASSIN.

68. Tables of delegates:

Congress of Geneva

Names.	Country represented.
Dupleix	Geneva
Becker	Geneva
Heilt	Geneva
Card	Geneva
Moll	Cologne
Cremer	London
Odger	London
Dupont	London
Eccarius	London
Vuillemier	Chaux-de-Fonds
Poeter	Chaux-de-Fonds
Cornaz	Lausanne
Müller	Stuttgart
Bütter	Magdeburg
Schlaifer	Lausanne
Burkly	Zurich
Murat	Paris
Varlin	Paris
Bourdon	Paris
Tolain	Paris
Guyard	Paris
Malon	Paris
Perrachon	Paris
Camelinat	Paris
Cultin	Paris
Chemalé	Paris
Fribourg	Paris
Aubry	Rouen
Schettel	Lyon
Richard	Lyon
Secretan	Lyon
Bony	Lyon
Bocquin	Montreux
Colliery	Chaux-de-Fonds
Hoppenworth	Geneva

As the minutes of the Congress have been partly lost, it has not been possible for us to collect all the names of the Swiss delegates who took part in the Congress.

Congress of Lausanne.

[several pages of delegate lists remain to be transcribed...]