

**KARL  
MARX  
FREDERICK  
ENGELS**

---

**Collected  
Works**



**Volume 21  
Marx and Engels  
1867-1870**

## Contents

Preface .....	XIII
---------------	------

### KARL MARX AND FREDERICK ENGELS

#### WORKS

November 1867-mid-July 1870

1. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Fenian Prisoners at Manchester and the International Working Men's Association .....	3
2. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Position of the International on Prussian Protectionist Tariffs .....	5
3. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolution on Changing the Place of the International's Congress in 1868 .....	6
4. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resolution of the General Council on Félix Pyat's Provocative Behaviour .....	7
5. <i>K. Marx</i> . Declaration of the General Council Concerning the British Government's Attitude Towards Tsarist Russia .....	8
6. <i>K. Marx</i> . Draft Resolution on the Consequences of Using Machinery under Capitalism Proposed by the General Council to the Brussels Congress .....	9
7. <i>K. Marx</i> . To the President and Executive Committee of the General Association of German Workers .....	10
8. <i>K. Marx</i> . Draft Resolution on the Reduction of the Working Day Proposed by the General Council to the Brussels Congress .....	11
9. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association .....	12
10. <i>F. Engels</i> . To the Directorate of the Schiller Institute .....	18

11. <i>F. Engels</i> . On the Dissolution of the Lassallean Workers' Association .....	20
12. <i>F. Engels</i> . On the Dissolution of the Lassallean Workers' Association (Postscript) .....	24
13. <i>K. Marx</i> . Connections Between the International Working Men's Association and English Working Men's Organisations .....	25
14. <i>K. Marx</i> . How Mr. Gladstone's Bank Letter of 1866 Procured a Loan of Six Millions for Russia .....	28
15. <i>K. Marx</i> . Preamble to the Resolutions of the Geneva (1866) and Brussels (1868) Congresses of the International .....	31
16. <i>K. Marx</i> . Statement to the German Workers' Educational Society in London .....	32
17. <i>K. Marx</i> . The International Working Men's Association and the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy .....	34
18. <i>K. Marx</i> . Resumé of the Meetings of the General Council. <i>International Working Men's Association to the Editor of "The Bee-Hive"</i> .....	37
19. <i>F. Engels</i> . Report on the Miners' Guilds in the Coalfields of Saxony .....	39
20. <i>K. Marx</i> . The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to the Central Bureau of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy .....	45
21. <i>K. Marx</i> . The Belgian Massacres. <i>To the Workmen of Europe and the United States</i> .....	47
22. <i>K. Marx</i> . Address to the National Labour Union of the United States .....	53
23. <i>K. Marx</i> . Preface to the Second Edition of <i>The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte</i> .....	56
24. <i>F. Engels</i> . Karl Marx .....	59
25. <i>K. Marx</i> . Report of the General Council on the Right of Inheritance .....	65
26. <i>K. Marx</i> . Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association .....	68
27. <i>K. Marx</i> . Draft Resolution of the General Council on the Policy of the British Government Towards the Irish Prisoners .....	83
28. <i>K. Marx</i> . The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland .....	84
29. <i>K. Marx</i> . Obituary .....	92
30. <i>F. Engels</i> . Preface to the Second Edition of <i>The Peasant War in Germany</i> .....	93
31. <i>K. Marx</i> . The English Government and the Fenian Prisoners .....	101
32. <i>K. Marx</i> . Concerning the Conflict in the Lyons Section .....	108

33. K. Marx. The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to Committee Members of the Russian Section in Geneva .....	110
34. K. Marx. Confidential Communication .....	112
35. K. Marx. To the International Metalworkers' Society .....	125
36. K. Marx. Resolution of the General Council on <i>The Bee-Hive</i> .....	126
37. K. Marx. Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections. <i>Declaration of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association</i> .....	127
38. K. Marx. Draft Resolution of the General Council on the "French Federal Section in London" .....	131
39. K. Marx. Resolution of the General Council on the Convocation of the Congress in Mainz .....	132
40. K. Marx and F. Engels. To the Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party .....	133
41. K. Marx. General Council Resolution on the Federal Committee of Romance Switzerland. <i>The General Council to the Romance Federal Committee</i> .....	136
42. K. Marx. The Lock-out of the Building Trades at Geneva. <i>The General Council of the International Working Men's Association to the Working Men and Women of Europe and the United States</i> .....	137
43. F. Engels. Notes for the Preface to a Collection of Irish Songs ....	140
44. K. Marx. Confidential Communication to All Sections .....	142
45. K. Marx. Programme for the Mainz Congress of the International .....	143
46. F. Engels. The History of Ireland .....	145
Natural Conditions .....	147
Old Ireland .....	168

#### FROM THE PREPARATORY MATERIALS

1. K. Marx. Notes for an Undelivered Speech on Ireland .....	189
2. K. Marx. Outline of a Report on the Irish Question Delivered to the German Workers' Educational Society in London on December 16, 1867 .....	194
3. K. Marx. Remarks on the Programme and Rules of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy .....	207
4. K. Marx. Ireland from the American Revolution to the Union of 1801. <i>Extracts and Notes</i> .....	212
I. From 1778 to 1782. Independence .....	212
II. From 1782 (after the Declaration of Independence) to 1795 .....	230

III. ....	252
Summary .....	270
5. <i>F. Engels</i> . Notes on Goldwin Smith's Book <i>Irish History and Irish Character</i> .....	283
6. <i>F. Engels</i> . Varia on the History of the Irish Confiscations .....	297
7. <i>F. Engels</i> . Plan for <i>The History of Ireland</i> .....	307
8. <i>F. Engels</i> . Plan of Chapter Two and Fragments for <i>The History of Ireland</i> .....	308

## APPENDICES

1. Record of a Speech on the Irish Question Delivered by Karl Marx to the German Workers' Educational Society in London on December 16, 1867 .....	317
2. Record of Marx's Speeches on Changing the Place of the Congress of the International in 1868. <i>From Newspaper Reports of the General Council Meetings of May 26 and June 16, 1868</i> .....	320
3. <i>Wilhelm Eichhoff</i> . The International Working Men's Association. Its Establishment, Organisation, Political and Social Activity, and Growth .....	322
4. Record of Marx's Speech on the Successes of the International in Germany and France. <i>From the Newspaper Report of the General Council Meeting of July 21, 1868</i> .....	381
5. Record of Marx's Speech on the Consequences of Using Machinery under Capitalism. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of July 28, 1868</i> .....	382
6. Appeal to the German Workers in London .....	385
7. Record of Marx's Speech on the Reduction of the Working Day. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of August 11, 1868</i> .....	387
8. Record of Marx's Speech on the Influence of Competition in Cotton Industry on the Condition of the Working Men in France. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of January 5, 1869</i> .....	388
9. Record of Marx's Speech on the Condition of the Coalminers in the Coalfields of Saxony. <i>From the Newspaper Report of the General Council Meeting of February 23, 1869</i> .....	389
10. Resolution of the General Council on the Programme of the Basle Congress .....	391
11. Record of Marx's Speeches on Landed Property. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of July 6, 1869</i> .....	392
12. Record of Marx's Speech on the Right to Inheritance. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of July 20, 1869</i> .....	394

13. Record of Marx's Speeches on General Education. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meetings of August 10 and 17, 1869</i> .....	398
14. Address of the Land and Labour League to the Working Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland .....	401
15. Record of Marx's Speech on the Policy of the British Government with Respect to the Irish Prisoners. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of November 16, 1869</i> .....	407
16. Record of Marx's Speeches on the Policy of the British Government with Respect to the Irish Prisoners. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meetings of November 23 and 30, 1869</i> .....	411
17. Record of Marx's Speech on the Significance of the Irish Question. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of December 14, 1869</i> .....	413
18. Articles by Jenny Marx on the Irish Question .....	414
I. ....	414
II. ....	417
III. ....	420
IV. ....	425
V. ....	429
VI. Agrarian Outrages in Ireland .....	434
VII. The Death of John Lynch .....	437
VIII. Letter from England .....	439
19. Letter of the General Council to Robert William Hume in New York .....	442
20. Record of Marx's Speech on <i>The Bee-Hive</i> . <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of April 26, 1870</i> .....	444
21. Account of a Letter by Karl Marx to the Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party .....	445
22. Record of Marx's Speech on the Split in the Romance Federation. <i>From the Minutes of the General Council Meeting of June 28, 1870</i> .....	446

NOTES AND INDEXES

<i>Notes</i> .....	449
<i>Name Index</i> .....	533
<i>Index of Quoted and Mentioned Literature</i> .....	572
<i>Index of Periodicals</i> .....	593
<i>Subject Index</i> .....	599

## ILLUSTRATIONS

Page of the Minute Book with Marx's manuscript of "Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections" .....	129
First page of Engels' <i>History of Ireland</i> .....	149
Map of Ireland .....	158-59
Page of Marx's manuscript <i>Ireland from the American Revolution to the Union of 1801</i> .....	213

**TRANSLATORS:**

**KATE COOK:** Works 31; Appendix 18

**VIC SCHNEIERSON:** From the Preparatory Materials 2;  
Appendix 3

**BARRIE SELMAN:** Works 10, 11, 12, 16, 40, 43, 46

**JOAN and TREVOR WALMSLEY:** Works 7, 24





## Preface

Volume 21 of the *Collected Works* of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels contains works dating from November 1867 to mid-July 1870, most of them relating to the activity of the First International—documents, reports, articles, statements, and outlines. Much space is devoted to works, speeches, and preparatory materials on the Irish question.

The period dealt with in this volume saw a sharpening of the economic and social conflicts in Europe and the United States of America, mass working-class actions, an intensification of the Irish national liberation struggle, a deepening of the crisis of Louis Bonaparte's Second Empire, and a mounting threat of war in Europe.

This volume, like volume 20, reflects Marx's diverse activity in the First International and the efforts of its General Council, led by him, to strengthen the unity of the working class and cultivate the spirit of proletarian internationalism and class consciousness in it. The First International (the International Working Men's Association—IWMA) had constituted itself by then, and the time had come for its ideological and organisational consolidation. Its federations and sections had become active in many European countries and in the United States. In Britain its base consisted of the trade unions, which numbered tens of thousands of workers; and in other countries unions were also beginning to take their place as the first class organisations of the proletariat. The International Working Men's Association, Engels wrote in 1869, had already shown in more than one place in Europe that it was a force the ruling classes were compelled to reckon with (see this volume, p. 64).

After the approval of the International's basic documents defining the relationship between economic and political struggle, Marx set out to substantiate and publicly proclaim the principles of scientific socialism in the programme of the International. Besides this, he was engaged in working out the tactics of the proletariat to suit the concrete situation of the late 1860s, defining its independent class attitude to the national question and to the question of war and peace. The General Council's documents written by Marx, like his speeches at meetings of the Council on various aspects of the working-class and general democratic movement, show him as the true leader of the first mass international working-class political organisation which, at least as far as the workers' movement was concerned, Engels described in his article "Karl Marx" as an "epoch-making organisation" (p. 64).

In 1866 and in the following year most countries in Europe were gripped by economic crisis, accompanied by a capitalist offensive on workers' wages. The actions of the proletariat against this economic oppression grew to unprecedented proportions, often leading to the suppression of strikes by armed force. The masters, as Marx observed in 1869, transformed their private feuds with their men into "a state crusade against the International Working Men's Association" (p. 71). As before, the General Council saw its main objectives as defending the vital interests of the working class, assisting the strike movement, and securing unity of working-class action at national and international level. All its activity was directed to stimulating the international solidarity of the working class and winning more of its detachments to the side of the International Association.

Written by Marx, such General Council appeals as "The Belgian Massacres" and "The Lock-out of the Building Trades at Geneva", as well as the annual reports to the Brussels and Basle congresses of the IWMA, are evidence of the far-flung organisational efforts of the Council and of Marx's own efforts to bring material aid and moral support to the strikers. "This was a great opportunity to show the capitalists," Marx wrote in the "Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association" concerning the strike of the Rouen weavers, "that their international industrial warfare, carried on by screwing wages down now in this country, now in that, would be checked at last by the international union of the working classes" (p. 74). And in a number of large-scale strikes, the workers owed their victory to the direct assistance of the International.

The documents and materials in this volume demonstrate the intensive efforts made by Marx and the General Council to form and to consolidate sections of the International in various countries. Particular space is devoted to articles and documents on the German workers' movement. Marx's and Engels' previous writings against Lassalleanism, to which was added the German and international working-class movement's own experience, had helped some sections of the German working class to shake off the influence of Lassallean dogma and had strengthened the opposition within the General Association of German Workers to its Lassallean leaders. Marx's letter, "To the President and Executive Committee of the General Association of German Workers", and Engels' articles "On the Dissolution of the Lassallean Workers' Association" note that the class struggle of the German proletariat and the pressure of the rank and file had compelled the leaders of that organisation to include agitation for political freedom, regulation of the working day, and international cooperation of the working classes—that is, points "from which, in fact, any serious workers' movement must proceed" (p. 10)—on the agenda of its Hamburg Congress (General Assembly) in August 1868.

The constitution of the North-German Confederation greatly furthered the unification of Germany from above under the supremacy of reactionary and militarist Prussia, leading to the emergence in Europe of a source of new wars, in addition to the France of Louis Bonaparte. However, Marx and Engels held that, objectively, Germany's unification was hastening the country's development, and gave the working class new opportunities for revolutionary struggle, which it should use as best it could for "the *national* organisation and unification of the German proletariat" (see Engels' letter to Marx of July 25, 1866, Vol. 42 of the present edition). Conditions were thus maturing in Germany for an independent proletarian party. Marx and Engels welcomed the German working class's steps to that end, and gave August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht all possible assistance in forming such a party. To relieve Marx of at least part of the tremendous burden of his work for the International, Engels took over most of the correspondence with Germany.

On Marx's advice, the General Council sent a representative to the Nuremberg Congress of the Union of German Workers' Associations (September 1868), many of which were simultaneously sections of the International. The congress showed that the delegates were acquainted with the documents of the International. One of the sources of their knowledge was the then just

published pamphlet by Wilhelm Eichhoff, *The International Working Men's Association*, on which Marx had collaborated (see Appendices in this volume). Marx praised the Nuremberg Congress, which came out in favour of adhering to the International (see this volume, pp. 15 and 33). Its decision signified a break between the majority of the Union and the liberal bourgeoisie, and the Union's adoption of proletarian, class positions.

The founding of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party in Eisenach in 1869, as Marx saw it, was a victory for the ideas of the International in the German working-class movement. In the "Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association", Marx stressed the proletarian character of the newly formed party, representing more than 150,000 workers from Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, with a programme "literally embodying the leading principles of our Statutes" (p. 79). As Lenin observed later, "a sound basis" had been laid in Eisenach "for a genuinely Social-Democratic workers' party". And he added: "In those days the essential thing was the *basis* of the party" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 19, Moscow, 1973, p. 298).

A few of the works appearing in the present volume reflect the resolve of Marx and Engels to heighten the theoretical level of the German workers' movement by propagating the ideas of scientific socialism and criticising Lassalleanism.

Shortly before the Eisenach Congress, Engels wrote and published "Karl Marx", the first brief biography of him, showing the importance of his activity and of his theories for the emancipation struggle of the working class. Attacking the attempts to portray Lassalle as the founder of the workers' movement in Germany, Engels demonstrated that "nothing could be less correct" (p. 59), showing that the movement had been initiated by Marx and the Communist League founded by him. Engels described the League as a "well-organised socialist party", stressing that later Lassalle had merely taken possession of the ground prepared by it. Not only did Engels' article set out the basis for the criticism of Lassalle; it also called on the German workers to carry on the revolutionary traditions of the Communist League.

To further the German workers' knowledge of the ideas of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels republished *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (Marx) and *The Peasant War in Germany* (Engels), both of which they supplied with new prefaces.

Engels' preface to the second edition of *The Peasant War in Germany* (February 1870) was of tremendous help to the newly formed Social-Democratic Party, impressing upon it a most important point—the attitude of the working class and its party to the peasants. Engels made a concrete historical study of the economic and political situation in Germany after 1848, and specified and projected one of Marxism's most crucial theoretical and political tenets, spelling out the need for an alliance between the working class and the peasantry, a tenet formulated by Marx and Engels on the basis of the 1848-49 revolutions. Engels warned against taking the peasants in capitalist society to be a uniform mass. He stressed the existence of different sections of peasants, and the need for considering the peculiarities of each section if there was to be a firm alliance with the labouring majority in the countryside in opposition to the capitalist farmers. He called attention to the relevance for Germany as well as Britain of the resolution of the IWMA Congress in Basle (1869), that it was in the interest of society to transform landed property into common, national property (p. 100).

Having formed their party, the German Social-Democrats had to think of expanding its mass base and of its relation to the trade unions. The "Resumé of the Meetings of the General Council" and the "Report of the General Council to the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association" set out Marx's views on the relationship between the party and the unions. He called on the leaders of the party to defy Lassallean sectarianism and take the initiative in forming trade unions "on the model of the English ones" but with a broader base, giving due consideration to the relevant decisions of the Geneva, Lausanne, and Brussels congresses of the International. In January 1869, Marx noted with satisfaction that in Germany the trade unions, "brought into existence by the efforts of the International Working Men's Association, number already 110,000 members" (p. 37).

The documents included in this volume show that Marx devoted meticulous attention to the working-class movement in England. England, he noted, was "the only country *where the great majority of the population consists of wages-labourers*" and where "the class struggle and the organisation of the working class by the *Trades Unions* have *acquired* a certain degree of maturity and universality" (p. 86).

As noted earlier, Marx urged working men in other countries to avail themselves of the organisational experience of the British workers when forming unions of their own. He attached great importance to the General Council's activity as the Federal Council for England. As in previous years, this activity was designed, above all, and with some success, to place the trade unions under the influence of the International. In an article, "Connections Between the International Working Men's Association and English Working Men's Organisations", Marx wrote: "Not one significant organisation of the British proletariat exists which is not directly, by its own leaders, represented on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association" (p. 26). Some of the British trade unionists backed the line of the General Council at congresses of the International.

However, it was clear to Marx that the International would not help the British proletariat take the revolutionary road unless it managed to isolate the right-wing trade union leaders. Marx criticised their reformist view of the aims of the workers' movement, their slide to the platform of the Liberal Party, as demonstrated, among other things, by the 1868 general election, and their ambiguous posture on the Irish question. He called on the General Council to strengthen the revolutionary trend in the British working-class movement. He commended the activity of Robert Shaw, a member of the General Council and representative of the British workers. He praised Shaw's "truly revolutionary intelligence" and absence of "petty ambition or personal interest" (p. 92). When the sharp aggravation of the economic crisis in Britain in the late 1860s, which caused widespread impoverishment, aroused sentiment favouring nationalisation of land and gave birth to the socialistic Land and Labour League, Marx helped draw up the "Address of the Land and Labour League to the Working Men and Women of Great Britain and Ireland", pointing out in it that "nothing short of a transformation of the existing social and political arrangements could avail" in abolishing the existing evils (p. 404).

The increasing political instability of Louis Bonaparte's regime, accompanied by an upsurge of mass revolutionary activity, enhanced the International's influence in France. The Bonapartist government therefore resolved to cripple the Paris Section of the International Association. It framed court proceedings against it on two occasions in 1868 (see the account of the trials in

Eichhoff's pamphlet, this volume, pp. 366-74). Nearly all the defendants used their courtroom speeches to propagate the ideas of the International. The trials and repression of members of the International won it the sympathy of working men and of some democrats, and as Marx wrote in "The Fourth Annual Report of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association", have "given it a fresh impulse by forcing the Empire to drop its patronising airs to the working classes" (p. 14).

The revolutionary tide in France kept rising steadily. Large-scale strikes and political demonstrations in the winter of 1868-69 and the election campaign in the spring of 1869 were clear evidence of the people's mood. The election programme of a group of Paris workers was published, which the General Council praised as a programme based on the principles of the Association. In January 1870, analysing the prospects of revolution in Europe, Marx conjectured that the "revolutionary *initiative* will probably come from France" (p. 86).

To buttress its position, Louis Bonaparte's government resorted to one more demagogic manoeuvre, scheduling a plebiscite for May 8, 1870. Before that date, it arrested leaders of the sections of the International on false charges of conspiring against the emperor. On the instructions of the General Council, Marx wrote a declaration, "Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections", published in the press of the International and the French workers' papers. Exposing the motives behind the plebiscite, Marx firmly denied that the International was involved in any secret conspiracies, stating that the Rules bind all the sections of the Association to act in broad daylight and that "the very nature of an Association which identifies itself with the working classes, would exclude from it every form of secret society. If the working classes, who form the great bulk of all nations, who produce all their wealth, and in the name of whom even the usurping powers always pretend to rule, conspire, they conspire publicly, as the sun conspires against darkness, in the full consciousness that without their pale there exists no legitimate power" (p. 127).

While standing by the true representatives of the French proletariat in the International, the General Council publicly dissociated itself from the French Federal Section in London, an organisation of the followers of Félix Pyat, a petty-bourgeois democrat. The section had lost contact with the International in 1868, but continued its adventurist and often provocative activity, ostensibly in the name of the International (p. 131).



The mass of the proletariat had by then declared adherence to the International, and the pro-socialist elements were gathered in its General Council. Along with the publication of Volume One of Marx's *Capital* in 1867 and its popularisation in the press (see present edition, Vol. 20), all this helped combat Proudhonism, Lassalleanism and other petty-bourgeois trends, and contributed to the ground being laid for the acceptance of socialist principles as the foundation of the programme endorsed by congresses of the International.

The present volume contains Marx's speeches at meetings of the General Council during the preparation of the agenda of the Brussels (1868) and Basle (1869) congresses and the drafts of the resolutions whose adoption he urged on the consequences of using machinery under capitalism, on the reduction of the working day, and on public ownership of the means of production, including land. His speeches and resolutions were all designed to bring home the key socialist principles of the programme of the International to members of the General Council.

Of special interest are the records of Marx's speeches during the preparations for the Brussels Congress on the consequences of using machinery under capitalism and on the reduction of the working day. At the General Council meeting of July 28, 1868 (pp. 382-84), Marx set forth the basic ideas on machinery which he had developed in Volume One of *Capital*. Showing the calamitous consequences for the working classes of the use of machinery in capitalist society, Marx stressed at the same time that it led to "associated organised labour". In his draft resolution, Marx pointed out that "machinery has proved a most powerful instrument of despotism and extortion in the hands of the capitalist class", but noted that, on the other hand, "the development of machinery creates the material conditions necessary for the superseding of the wages-system by a truly social system of production" (p. 9).

Marx argued for the necessity of demanding the reduction of the working day (p. 387). In his draft resolution on this subject he reaffirmed the relevant resolution of the Geneva Congress (1866), and said that the time had arrived "when practical effect should be given to that resolution" (p. 11).

The preliminary discussion of the agenda of the Brussels Congress by the General Council yielded good results. Despite the resistance of the Proudhonist right, the Congress adopted the socialist principles of making the means of production, mines, collieries, railways, the land (including arable land), common

property, and acknowledged the advantages of the public ownership of the means of production. The Congress also adopted Marx's resolutions on the consequences of the use of machinery in capitalist society and on the reduction of the working day.

The question of landed property, already settled at the Brussels Congress, was, as a result of Marx's motion, again on the agenda of the next congress, which gathered in Basle in 1869. This was prompted by the need for isolating any advocates of private landownership and for defining the tactics of the International on the peasantry.

Marx spoke twice during the preliminary discussion of the issue at the meeting of the General Council (pp. 392-93). He explained the error of those who favoured small private property, chiefly the Proudhonists, and of those among the British members of the International who argued in favour of the nationalisation of land with references to the "natural right" of the farmers.

Marx maintained that "to push this natural right to its logical consequences would land us at the assertion of every individual to cultivate his own share", that is, to the assertion of small private property in land. Not the will of individuals, he pointed out, but the "social right and social necessity determined in what manner the means of subsistence must be procured" (p. 392). Marx guided the members of the General Council towards understanding that any consistent solution of the agrarian question called for a revolutionary transformation of all society, which also meant nationalisation of land and its conversion into collective property.

The confirmation of the Marxian platform by the Basle Congress was a victory for revolutionary proletarian socialism over various schools of petty-bourgeois socialism, and marked an important stage in working socialist principles into the programme of the International.

The Brussels resolutions on public property showed that most members of the Association had put aside the Proudhonist dogma and held a common view of the aim of the proletarian struggle, that of building socialist society. It was left to Marx to set out a common approach to attaining this aim. But here, in questions related to the motive forces of the socialist revolution and the attitude to the state and to the allies of the proletariat, he encountered obdurate resistance from followers of the petty-bourgeois schools, notably anarchism. The chief exponent of anarchism at that time was the Russian revolutionary Mikhail Bakunin, whose views were a variety of pre-Marxian petty-bourgeois socialism, reflecting the sentiment of ruined petty

proprietors, and were totally unsuited to chart any realistic way of ending capitalist oppression.

Some of the documents in this volume deal with the struggle by Marx and the General Council against Bakunin's anarchist views on key aspects of the theory and tactics of the proletarian class movement, and against the disruptive activity of Bakunin and his followers in the International.

In the autumn of 1868 in Geneva, Bakunin gathered a following of heterogeneous elements to form the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy. In its Programme and Rules, the Alliance declared itself part of the IWMA, claimed ideological supremacy, and also the right to autonomy within the International. He expected thereby to use the Working Men's Association for the propagation of anarchist ideas in the international working-class movement.

What the International should do about Bakunin's Alliance was discussed at a meeting of the General Council on December 15, 1868, when it was considering the request for its admission to the Association. The document Marx wrote on behalf of the General Council, "The International Working Men's Association and the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy" (pp. 34-36), defended the unity and structural principles of proletarian organisations. Marx exposed Bakunin's designs of gaining control of the International and subordinating it to his ideological influence by getting it to admit the Alliance as an independent international organisation with its own programme, organisational structure, and administrative bodies. The Alliance was denied admission to the International Working Men's Association, the reason given being that under its Rules it admitted only local and national organisations, and not international ones. For the time being Marx saw fit to refrain from any critical examination of the programme of the Alliance. But in his "Remarks on the Programme and Rules of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy" (given in this volume in the section "From the Preparatory Materials"), in which he also took note of Engels' opinion, Marx produced the first rough outline of a criticism of these documents. He revealed the confused, purely declarative and demagogical nature of the Bakunist programme, whose main points—"equalisation of classes", "abolition of the right of inheritance", and abstention from political struggle—were likely seriously to damage the workers' movement. Probing the intentions of Bakunin and his followers in respect of the International, Marx pointed out that "they want to compromise us under our own patronage" (p. 209).

A criticism of the basic provision of the Bakuninist programme, that of the "political, economical, and social equalisation of classes", is given in a letter of the General Council to the Central Bureau of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, drawn up by Marx on March 9, 1869 (pp. 45-46) in reply to the Alliance's second application for admission. Marx's reply is a model of principled tactics working for the unity of the labour movement. He pointed out that it was not the function of the General Council to examine the programmes of societies seeking admission, and that all it asked was whether their tendency did not run against the General Rules. Thereupon, Marx showed that the Bakuninists' demand for "political, economical, and social *equalisation of classes*" did run against the General Rules since it amounted to the bourgeois slogan of "harmony of capital and labour". He amplified: "It is not the logically impossible '*equalisation of classes*', but the historically necessary, superseding '*abolition of classes*'..., this true secret of the proletarian movement, which forms the great aim of the Int. W. Ass." (p. 46).

Again rejected by the General Council, the Central Bureau of the Alliance introduced a few amendments to its programme and publicly announced the dissolution of its international organisation, suggesting to its sections that they adhere to the International. But, in fact, Bakunin and his followers retained a secret Alliance.

The fight against the Bakuninists broke out in earnest at the Basle Congress (1869) over the right of inheritance, an item included in its agenda on their insistence.

Marx attached much importance to the question of inheritance, associating it with the attitude to the peasants, and the ways of winning them for the socialist transformation of the countryside. When the matter was discussed at a meeting of the General Council in the summer of 1869 preliminary to the Congress, and in a special report written for its delegates (pp. 65-67 and 394-97), Marx came to grips with Bakunin's idea of abolishing the right of inheritance as the starting point of the social revolution and the only way of eliminating private property in the means of production. Marx approached the issue in the light of historical materialism and concluded that to proclaim the abolition of the right of inheritance "would be a thing false in theory, and reactionary in practice" (p. 66). Like all civil legislation, he explained, the laws of inheritance were not the cause but the effect of the social order. What the working class must grapple with, he said, "is the cause and not the effect, the economical

basis—not its juridical superstructure” (p. 65). The beginning of the social revolution, he emphasised, “must be to get the means to socialise the means of labour” (p. 396).

Marx also saw the danger that Bakunin’s idea entailed for the tactical tasks of workers’ organisations. Any call for the abolition of the right of inheritance, he warned, would inevitably turn the peasants, the workers’ natural allies, away from them. Explaining the substance of the differences of opinion with Bakunin over this important point of revolutionary tactics in a letter to Paul Lafargue of April 19, 1870, Marx said: “The proclamation of the abolition of inheritance ... would be not a serious act, but a foolish menace, rallying the whole peasantry and the whole small middle class round the reaction” (see present edition, Vol. 43).

The Bakuninists’ abortive attempt to seize control of the International at the Basle Congress precipitated an open war against the General Council in the *Égalité*, organ of the Romance Federal Council, which then adhered to Bakunin’s views. The General Council was accused of breaching the Rules, of refusing to form a special federal council for Britain, of toying with matters that were of no concern to the working men’s movement, such as the Irish question, all of which was said to be doing untold harm to the international interests of the proletariat.

In “The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland” and the “Confidential Communication” which he addressed to the Committee of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany as the Corresponding Secretary for Germany, Marx criticised the Bakunist papers, and explained the General Council’s position on a number of essential topics related to the international working-class movement. Scrutinising the International’s stand on the Irish question, for example, Marx demonstrated the connection between the social and national questions, and emphasised that the Bakunist dogma about the non-connection between the social movement and the political movement ran counter to the Rules of the IWMA (see pp. 89, 120-21).

A sharp controversy with the Bakuninists developed in the years that followed. At the centre of it stood the workers’ attitude to the state and to political struggle. In the polemics with Bakunin at the Basle Congress, Marx’s comrades defended the need for the proletariat to fight for political power. Seeing the importance of the question, an item on the “relationship between the political action and the social movement of the working class” (p. 143) was, at Marx’s suggestion, put on the agenda of the next congress of the International to be held in Mainz in the summer of 1870. But that

congress was not destined to convene owing to the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war.

The Russian Section of the International, formed in Geneva in March 1870, gave the General Council considerable help in the fight against Bakuninism. In a letter to its members (pp. 110-11), Marx informed them officially of its admission to the International and wrote that he was pleased to accept their proposal to be their representative on the General Council. By that time, Marx was well enough acquainted with the struggle of the Russian revolutionary democrats against Tsarism, and with the thinking of Russian progressives, and had read the works of Russian economists. All of this led him to conclude that Russia "is also beginning to take part in the movement of our age" (p. 111).

With the international contradictions growing sharper in the late 1860s and a war threat hanging over Europe, the question of war and the position to be taken by the proletariat if it broke out, was still, as before, in the focus of Marx's attention and that of the International Association. It was also discussed at the Brussels Congress.

In a letter of September 10, 1868, which he wrote to Georg Eccarius and Friedrich Lessner who had gone to Brussels as delegates of the General Council, Marx observed that the working class was not yet sufficiently organised to throw any substantial weight into the scales. However, he pointed out that the Congress must protest in the name of the working class and denounce the instigators of a war between France and Germany that was "ruinous for both countries and ruinous for Europe in general" (see present edition, Vol. 43).

The resolution of the Brussels Congress reflected in the main the ideas of Marx and his followers, stating that a final end would be put to wars only by thorough social reform, and that the number of wars and the extent of the calamities wrought by them could be diminished if the peoples, above all the working classes, resisted their governments and exposed their policy of conquest by all available means. However, the resolution contained a number of concrete proposals which Marx subjected to criticism in the above-mentioned letter to Eccarius and Lessner.

The fight for peace was becoming one of the official aims of the international workers' movement, and its success depended in many ways on the international unity of the proletariat. In the "Address to the National Labour Union of the United States",

which Marx wrote on behalf of the General Council, he clearly saw that “the working classes are bestriding the scene of history no longer as servile retainers, but as independent actors, conscious of their own responsibility, and able to command peace where their would-be masters shout war” (p. 54).

Much space is devoted in this volume to the works, speeches, extracts and notes of Marx and Engels on the Irish question, an intricate amalgam of acute social and national contradictions. The national liberation movement in Ireland had grown to imposing proportion in the 1860s. This was due to the change in the methods of English colonial exploitation and the social and economic processes that were running their course in Ireland—the conversion from small-scale farming to large-scale, capitalist pasturage, accompanied by mass evictions of tenants, who were thus consigned to hunger or the agony of emigration. Marx described the system as a “quiet business-like extinction” (p. 192). The response to it was the Fenian movement, which “took root ... in the mass of the people, the lower orders” (p. 194). While giving their due to the courage and fighting spirit of the champions of Irish independence, Marx disapproved of their conspiratory tactics. The failed attempt of the Fenians to start an uprising in early 1867, their persecution and trial, aroused the public in Ireland and England.

In this setting, Marx and Engels faced the task of defining the proletariat's attitude to the national question, of working out the tactics in relation to the national liberation movement, and of instilling the spirit of proletarian internationalism among the workers. With Ireland as an example, Marx and Engels spelled out their views on the national liberation struggle of oppressed nations and its bearing on the world revolutionary process, the relationship between the national liberation movement and the international workers' movement, the attitude of the proletariat in the metropolitan countries towards the colonial policies of their governments, and the allies of the proletariat in the revolution. “The policy of Marx and Engels on the Irish question,” wrote Lenin, “serves as a splendid example of the attitude the proletariat of the oppressor nations should adopt towards national movements, an example which has lost none of its immense *practical* importance” (*Collected Works*, Vol. 20, Moscow, 1972, p. 442).

In a series of documents dating from November to December 1867, such as “The Fenian Prisoners at Manchester and the International Working Men's Association”, “Notes for an Undeli-

vered Speech on Ireland”, “Outline of a Report on the Irish Question Delivered to the German Workers’ Educational Society in London on December 16, 1867”, and some later works, Marx formulated the General Council’s attitude to the struggle of the Irish people and called on the English working class and the international workers’ movement to support it. The discussions of the issue at General Council meetings witnessed clashes with George Odger, Benjamin Lucraft, and other right-wing trade union leaders, who, in effect, shared the anti-Irish sentiment of the bourgeois radicals.

Marx backed the historical right of oppressed peoples to fight for their liberation. The English, he noted sarcastically, claimed “a divine right to fight the Irish on their native soil, but every Irish fighting against the British Government in England is to be treated as an outlaw” (p. 189). Stigmatising the British Government’s policy towards the Fenians, he branded the death sentence passed on four of them as an act of political revenge (p. 3). Marx also outlined the attitude the English working class should adopt on the Irish question: “Repeal [of the Union with Great Britain forced on Ireland in 1801—*Ed.*] as one of the articles of the English Democratic Party” (p. 193). In the outline of a report to the German Workers’ Educational Society in London, Marx showed the pernicious effects for Ireland of the many centuries of British exploitation and oppression. He cited Thomas Francis Meagher, the Irish democrat, on the results of British rule in Ireland: “One business alone survives!... the Irish coffin-maker’s” (pp. 199-200). Marx looked closely into the process of the forcible expropriation of Irish farmers. Eccarius’ record of this report singles out Marx’s words that the Irish question is “not simply a question of nationality, but a question of land and existence” (p. 319).

Marx returned to the Irish question again in the autumn of 1869, when a broad movement was launched for the amnesty of imprisoned Fenians, in which the International took an active part. Speaking at a meeting of the General Council, Marx depicted the colonialist, anti-popular substance of the policy of Gladstone’s Liberal government, which “are the servants of the oppressors of Ireland” (p. 409). In the “Draft Resolution of the General Council on the Policy of the British Government Towards the Irish Prisoners”, submitted by Marx on November 16, 1869, he noted explicitly that the General Council “express their admiration of the spirited, firm and high-souled manner in which the Irish people carry on their Amnesty movement” (p. 83).

To impart international resonance to the Irish question and attract the attention of the European proletariat, the General



Council, on Marx's suggestion, had this resolution published in the organs of the International on the continent and in the European democratic press, as well as in the British labour press.

Marx's article, "The English Government and the Fenian Prisoners", exposed the brutal treatment of participants in the Irish national liberation movement by the British authorities. Marx's daughter Jenny wrote eight articles on this subject for the Paris *La Marseillaise*, the third of which was composed with Marx's assistance. They are given in the Appendices to this volume (pp. 414-41).

The most exhaustive exposition of the relation between the working-class and the national liberation movements was given by Marx in a General Council circular, "The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland" (January 1870), and in the "Confidential Communication" (March 1870). Coming to grips with the Bakuninists' nihilist attitude to the national liberation movement, Marx underlined the international significance of the Irish question and its bearing on the struggle of the English proletariat for radical social transformation in England itself. Marx stressed that the participants in the Irish independence movement were natural allies of the English working class. The proletariat of the two countries, therefore, he noted, must do all they can to overcome the antagonism between them artificially nourished by the bourgeoisie. "Any people that oppresses another people," Marx observed, "forges its own chains." He argued for the necessity of granting Ireland independence, including complete separation from England. "The position of the International Association with regard to the Irish question is very clear," he states. "Its first concern is to advance the social revolution in England. To this end a great blow must be struck in Ireland" (p. 89).

All that Marx and the General Council did for the Irish national liberation movement attracted the attention of the Irish workers to the International and laid the ground for the founding of Irish sections, and, naturally, enlisted sympathy for the Irish revolutionary movement among the English workers and workers abroad.

The General Council's attitude to the Irish question and the analysis of its various aspects were based on the profound study Marx and Engels made of Ireland's history from ancient times. Their manuscripts (included in this volume), though uncompleted, present an integral view of Ireland's history on a historical materialist

basis. They define the main periods in the country's history and examine its key problems. This study has lost none of its relevance today. What distinguishes it is its broad view of the topics at hand. Marx and Engels used extensive source material to trace the stages, forms and methods of Ireland's colonial subjugation, the beginnings and gradual growth of the national liberation movement, and its specific features and peculiarities. Their manuscripts provide evidence of their deep interest in the history of pre-capitalist societies—an interest that did not slacken in later years.

Marx's manuscript, "Ireland from the American Revolution to the Union of 1801. Extracts and Notes" (see "From the Preparatory Materials" in this volume), was written preliminary to the discussion of the Irish question by the General Council.

His study of the period from 1776 to 1801 enabled him to determine the most typical features of the policy of the English ruling classes in Ireland. His attention was drawn to the colonialist nature of the Union of 1801 (abolition of the autonomy of Irish Parliament), the dissolution of which was sought by generation after generation of fighters for Ireland's independence. The thought Marx expressed in his letter to Engels of December 10, 1869 (see present edition, Vol. 43), that "the English reaction in England had its roots (as in Cromwell's time) in the subjugation of Ireland", is present throughout the manuscript.

Marx painted a picture of English rule in Ireland, and analysed the motive forces of the Irish national liberation movement and the role of the peasantry in it. He also produced a vivid portrayal of the Irish bourgeois revolutionaries, the left wing of the United Irishmen, pinpointing its weaknesses and the reasons for the failure of the uprising of 1798, whose lessons were of great significance for the Irish national liberation movement as a whole.

The manuscript shows the influence of the American War of Independence and, especially, the French Revolution on the emergence and growth of the independence movement in Ireland (pp. 238-39). Marx's observations are of immense relevance for understanding the international nature of these historic events.

The uncompleted manuscript of Engels' *History of Ireland*, like his preparatory material for it ("Notes on Goldwin Smith's Book *Irish History and Irish Character*" and "Varia on the History of the Irish Confiscations"), included in this volume, are evidence of his intention to produce a large, comprehensive history of Ireland from ancient times, shedding light on the phases of her subjugation and the fight of the Irish for liberation.

Engels completed only the first chapter of the manuscript of his *History of Ireland* ("Natural Conditions") and the beginning of the second ("Old Ireland"), both of which appear in the main section of this volume. The first chapter is devoted to the geological structure and climate of Ireland, though it also touches on questions of a political nature. Engels rejects the attempts of the English ruling classes to justify British colonial rule in Ireland with references to the unfavourable geographic conditions for independent economic development and the "ignorance and sloth" of the country's native population, from which it follows that Ireland's very climate condemned it to supplying beef and butter for the English rather than bread for the Irish (pp. 148, 161). Engels portrays Ireland's ancient history and the social and political system of the Celtic clans. Challenging the chauvinist idea of Ireland's backwardness, he demonstrates the contribution of the Irish Christian missionaries and scholars to European culture in the early Middle Ages (p. 171), and notes the bitter Irish resistance to the invasion of the Norsemen. The manuscript refutes the theories that attribute the foundation of many European states to the Northern conquerors. Engels shows, on the contrary, that the conquests of the Norsemen were really nothing more than piratic raids (p. 179). He denounces the tendency to portray the national liberation struggle as banditism or to ascribe to it merely religious motives. The hiding or the distortion of facts relating to the Irish people's struggle, he observes, is intended to vindicate English domination.

In his "Notes for the Preface to a Collection of Irish Songs", Engels speaks of the deliberate obliteration of Ireland's finest cultural traditions by the English conquerors from the seventeenth century on, with the result that Gaelic was understood in the country by only few people and the nation was forfeiting its rich culture (p. 141).

Two of Engels' manuscripts, "Notes on Goldwin Smith's Book *Irish History and Irish Character*" and "Varia on the History of the Irish Confiscations", reflect his views on the later period of Irish history. His précis of Goldwin Smith's book is of special interest. Goldwin Smith was an English liberal historian and economist, and his book attracted Engels' attention as an example of how Irish history was being falsified for the benefit of the liberal bourgeoisie to justify its colonial subjection and social and national oppression. Engels' polemical notes show that he saw one of his tasks as exposing this tendency, as well as the chauvinist conception of Irish history. Referring to Smith, he writes: "Behind the cloak of

objectivity, the apologetic English bourgeois professor" (p. 283). Smith extolled the English conquerors for bringing civilisation to the country, and denounced the Irish national liberation movement as lacking reason and national roots. The concessions that the Irish had wrested from the English in many centuries of continuous struggle Smith portrays as acts of "goodwill" on the part of the English. He ignores the strong influence of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution on the Irish movement for national liberation. The English concessions, as Engels observes, are ascribed by Smith to the English "spirit of toleration", the "liberal ideas of the new era", and the like. "These are the '*general causes*' which have to be kept in mind," Engels exclaims, "but by no means the real ones!" (p. 295).

Engels' "Varia on the History of the Irish Confiscations" deals with the basic aspect of English rule in Ireland, that of the land confiscations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Here he surveys the expropriation of the country's native population and Ireland's conversion into a stronghold of English landlordism. He traces England's policy in Ireland over a century and a half, and offers evidence that the leaders of the seventeenth-century English Revolution inherited the colonialist tradition of their absolutist predecessors. Engels shows that the confiscations were accompanied by the ruthless suppression of the resistance put up by the native population. "The Irish," he observes, "were denied all rights..., with resistance treated as rebellion" (pp. 297-98).

In the Appendices to this volume the reader will find Wilhelm Eichhoff's pamphlet, *The International Working Men's Association. Its Establishment, Organisation, Political and Social Activity, and Growth*, which appears in English translation for the first time. It is the first history of the First International. Written with the collaboration of Marx, it offers a detailed account of the foundation and the early years of the International, its class nature, and its responsibilities in organising the economic and political struggle of the proletariat in various countries. Eichhoff pays high tribute to Marx for his role in establishing and directing the International, and in drawing up its programmatic documents. The pamphlet contains the texts of a few of the most important ones, notably the Inaugural Address and the Provisional Rules.

Eichhoff's pamphlet made an important contribution to the spread and propagation of the ideas of the First International, and to its struggle against trends that were hostile to Marxism. It was a

dependable source for later works on the history of the First International.

\* \* \*

The present volume contains 54 works of Marx and Engels, eight of which are appearing in English for the first time, including Marx's address "To the President and Executive Committee of the General Association of German Workers" and "Statement to the German Workers' Educational Society in London", and Engels' article "Karl Marx" and the plan of the second chapter of his *History of Ireland*. Among Appendices three documents appear in English for the first time.

In cases where documents of the International written by Marx or with his collaboration have reached us in more or less authentic versions in several languages, their publication in this volume is based on the English-language source, whether handwritten or printed. Any discrepancies in content or sense from sources in other languages are given in footnotes.

All the texts have been translated from the German except where otherwise stated. Headings supplied by the editors where none existed in the original are given in square brackets. Asterisks indicate footnotes by the author; editors' footnotes are indicated by index letters.

Misprints found in quotations, proper names, place names, figures, dates, and so on, have been checked and corrected with reference to the sources used by Marx and Engels. All known literary and documentary sources used by them are cited in footnotes and in the index of quoted and mentioned literature. Words written in English in the original are given in small caps.

The volume was compiled and the preface written by Marina Doroshenko and Valentina Ostriкова (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU). The documents of the First International in the main part of the volume, Marx's "Remarks on the Programme and Rules of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy" and the documents on the history of the First International in the Appendices, were prepared by Valentina Ostriкова, who also wrote the relevant notes. The index of quoted and mentioned literature to these documents is by Valentina Ostriкова, who was assisted by Yuri Vasin.

The basic works of Marx and Engels on the history of Ireland (Engels' *History of Ireland* and the section "From the Preparatory

Materials”), all of Jenny Marx’s articles on the Irish question (in the Appendices), and the relevant notes and bibliography were compiled by Marina Doroshenko.

The text of Wilhelm Eichhoff’s pamphlet, *The International Working Men’s Association* (in the Appendices), and the notes and bibliography for it, were prepared by Yuri Vasin.

The name index and the index of periodicals are by Yuri Vasin in collaboration with Yelena Kofanova, the subject index is by Vasily Kuznetsov, and the editor of the volume is Tatyana Yeremeyeva (all from the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The English translations were made by Barrie Selman and Joan and Trevor Walmsley (Lawrence and Wishart), Kate Cook and Vic Schneierson (Progress Publishers), and edited by Nicholas Jacobs (Lawrence and Wishart), Lydia Belyakova, Victor Schnittke and Yelena Vorotnikova (Progress Publishers), and Vladimir Mosolov, scientific editor (Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CC CPSU).

The volume was prepared for the press by Lydia Belyakova, Anna Vladimirova and assistant editor Natalia Kim (Progress Publishers).



**KARL MARX**  
and  
**FREDERICK ENGELS**

**WORKS**

November 1867—mid-July 1870





## Karl Marx

### THE FENIAN PRISONERS AT MANCHESTER AND THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>1</sup>

At a special meeting of the General Council of the I.W.A. held at the office 16, Castle Street, East, W., on Wednesday evening<sup>a</sup> the following memorial was adopted:

“Memorial of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association.

“To the Right Hon. Gathorne-Hardy, her Majesty's Secretary of State.

“The memorial of the undersigned, representing working men's associations in all parts of Europe, showeth:

“That the execution of the Irish prisoners condemned to death at Manchester will greatly impair the moral influence of England upon the European Continent. The Execution of the four prisoners<sup>b</sup> resting upon the same evidence and the same verdict which, by the free pardon of Maguire, have been officially declared, the one false, the other erroneous, will bear the stamp not of a judicial act, but of political revenge. But even if the verdict of the Manchester jury and the evidence it rests upon had not been tainted by the British Government itself, the latter would now have to choose between the blood-handed practices of old Europe and the magnanimous humanity of the young Transatlantic Republic.<sup>2</sup>

“The commutation of the sentence for which we pray will be an act not only of justice, but of political wisdom.

---

<sup>a</sup> November 20, 1867.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Edward Condon, Michael Larkin, William Philip Allen, Michael O'Brien.—*Ed.*

“By order of the General Council of the I. W. Association,  
*John Weston*, Chairman  
*R. Shaw*, Secretary for America  
*Eugène Dupont*, Secretary for France  
*Karl Marx*, Secretary for Germany  
*Hermann Jung*, Secretary for Switzerland  
*P. Lafargue*, Secretary for Spain  
*Zabicki*, Secretary for Poland  
*Derkinderen*, Secretary for Holland  
*Besson*, Secretary for Belgium  
*G. Eccarius*, General Secretary.”<sup>a</sup>

November 20, 1867

Adopted by the General Council on  
 November 20, 1867

Reproduced from the copy of  
 Marx's manuscript made by Marx's  
 wife, Jenny Marx

First published in French in *Le Courier*  
*français*, No. 163, November 24, 1867

---

<sup>a</sup> In *Le Courier français* the names of Hermann Jung and Anton Zabicki are omitted.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[THE POSITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
ON PRUSSIAN PROTECTIONIST TARIFFS]<sup>3</sup>

The trades unions established in Germany by the agency and with the assistance of the International Working Men's Association have furnished the chiefs of the iron trade in the Rhenish province, with an argument against the Prussian Government with regard to a reduction of the import duties on foreign iron. The Chamber of Commerce of Elberfeld and Barmen is of opinion that a reduction of the import duties on iron will completely ruin the Prussian iron masters. The English capitalists maintain that they must reduce the wages of their workmen to be able to cope with the foreigners. The German iron masters demand the continuance of protection against the English to save themselves from utter ruin; yet the wages received by the Prussian workmen are less than half what the British workman receives, and the hours of labour are more. In its report of April 14th to the Government, the Chamber of Commerce states:

"The iron trade of Germany once prostrate a remedy is impossible. Much capital will then be lost, and thousands of working men deprived of the means of subsistence—a matter that would be the more critical, as the labour question becomes more and more serious, and the International Working Men's Association assumes a more and more active and menacing attitude."

This statement proves that the Association has not laboured in vain. The capitalists demand a public inquiry into the present state of the Prussian iron trade. The workmen insist that the inquiry shall include an investigation of the condition of the workpeople employed in the trade.

Written between May 5 and 12, 1868

Reproduced from the newspaper

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 344, May 16, 1868

## Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION ON CHANGING THE PLACE  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL'S CONGRESS IN 1868]<sup>4</sup>

1. Considering, that the Belgian Parliament has just prolonged for three years the law by which every foreigner may be expelled [from] the country by the Belgian executive government<sup>5</sup>;

2. that the dignity of the I. W. Association is incompatible with the meeting of the Congress at a place where they would be at the mercy of the local police;

3. that Article 3 of the Rules of the I.W.A.<sup>a</sup> provides that the General Council may, in case of need, change the place of meeting of the Congress;

the General Council resolves that the Congress of the I.W.A. do assemble in London on the 5th of September, 1868.

Introduced at the General Council meeting of June 2, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute Book of the General Council

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 347, June 6, 1868

---

<sup>a</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association. Founded September 28th, 1864, London [1867], p. 4.—Ed.*

## Karl Marx

### [RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL ON FÉLIX PYAT'S PROVOCATIVE BEHAVIOUR]<sup>6</sup>

Resolved. That the General Council of the I.W.A. repudiates all responsibility for the address<sup>a</sup> delivered at the public meeting in Cleveland Hall by Félix Pyat, who is in no way connected with the Association.

Adopted by the General Council on  
July 7, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in French in *La Liberté*,  
No. 55, July 12, 1868

---

<sup>a</sup> *L'Espiègle*, No. 25, July 5, 1868.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx  
 [DECLARATION  
 OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL CONCERNING  
 THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT'S  
 ATTITUDE TOWARDS TSARIST RUSSIA]<sup>7</sup>

The Council of the I. W. Association denounces the last manifestation of the subserviency to Russia of the British Government by suppressing the adjective "Polish" before the word "refugees" in the budget one month after the Russian Government had by an ukase<sup>a</sup> suppressed the name of Poland.

Adopted by the General Council on  
 July 14, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute  
 Book of the General Council

First published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 352,  
 July 18, 1868

---

<sup>a</sup> Marx means Alexander II's ukase of February 29, 1868 abolishing the Government Commission for Home Affairs in the Kingdom of Poland and the additional rules to the Regulations on the Gubernia and Uyezd Administration in the Gubernias in the Kingdom of Poland approved by His Majesty on December 19 (31), 1866.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE CONSEQUENCES  
OF USING MACHINERY UNDER CAPITALISM  
PROPOSED BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS]<sup>8</sup>

Resolved: that on the one side machinery has proved a most powerful instrument of despotism and extortion in the hands of the capitalist class;

that on the other side the development of machinery creates the material conditions necessary for the superseding of the wages-system by a truly social system of production.

Adopted by the General Council on  
August 11, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in French in a special  
supplement to *Le Peuple Belge*, No. 38,  
September 11, 1868



Karl Marx

TO THE PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OF THE GENERAL ASSOCIATION OF GERMAN WORKERS<sup>9</sup>

London, August 18, 1868

In order to conclude preparations for the Brussels Congress a meeting of the Executive Committee of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association<sup>10</sup> has been called for August 22, and a plenary session of the General Council for August 25. As I have been given the task of making reports on both days I find that I am unable to accept the invitation,<sup>a</sup> by which I am greatly honoured, to attend the Congress of the General Association of German Workers in Hamburg.

I am happy to see that the programme of your Congress<sup>b</sup> lays down those points from which, in fact, any serious workers' movement must proceed: agitation for complete political freedom, regulation of the working day, and systematic international cooperation of the working class in the great, historical task which it has to accomplish for the whole of society. Good luck in your work!

With democratic greetings

*Karl Marx*

First published in *Der Social-Demokrat*,  
No. 100, August 28, 1868

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

<sup>a</sup> J. B. Schweitzer, "An Herrn Carl Marx in London. Berlin, 6. Juli 1868", *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 95, August 14, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. B. Schweitzer, "An die Mitglieder des Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiter-Vereins", *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 80, July 10, 1868.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE REDUCTION  
OF THE WORKING DAY  
PROPOSED BY THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE BRUSSELS CONGRESS]<sup>11</sup>

A resolution having been passed unanimously by the Congress of Geneva 1866 to this effect: "That the legal limitation of the working day is a preliminary condition indispensable for the ulterior social improvements,"<sup>a</sup> the Council is of opinion that the time is now arrived when practical effect should be given to that resolution and that it has become the duty of all the branches to agitate that question practically in the different countries where the International Working Men's Association is established.

Adopted by the General Council on  
August 25, 1868

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 359,  
August 29, 1868

---

<sup>a</sup> *The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868*, London [1869], pp. 4-5.—Ed.

## Karl Marx

### THE FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>12</sup>

The year 1867-68 will mark an epoch in the history of the Association. After a period of peaceable development it has assumed dimensions powerful enough to provoke the bitter denunciations of the ruling classes and the hostile demonstrations of governments.<sup>a</sup> It has entered upon the phases of strife.

The French Government took, of course, the lead in the reactionary proceedings against the working classes. Already last year we had to signalise some of its underhand manoeuvres. It meddled with our correspondence, seized our Statutes, and the Congress documents.<sup>b 13</sup> After many fruitless steps to get them back, they were at last given up only under the official pressure of Lord Stanley, the English Minister of Foreign Affairs.

But the Empire has this year thrown off the mask and tried to directly annihilate the International Association by *coups de police* and judiciary prosecution. Begot by the struggle of classes, of which the days of June, 1848, are the grandest expression, it could not but assume alternately the attitudes of the official saviour of the Bourgeoisie and of the paternal protector of the Proletariat. The growing power of the International having manifested itself in the strikes of Roubaix, Amiens, Paris, Geneva, &c.,<sup>14</sup> reduced our would-be patron to the necessity of turning our Society to his own account or of destroying it. In the beginning he was ready enough to strike a bargain on very moderate terms.<sup>c</sup> The manifesto of the Parisians read at the Congress of Geneva<sup>d 15</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The German text has "and persecutions by governments".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German text has "and the Geneva Congress documents on the French frontier".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German text has: "In the beginning not much was demanded."—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The German text further has: "(1866) and published in Brussels in the following year".—*Ed.*

having been seized at the French frontier, our Paris Executive demanded of the Minister of the Interior the reasons of this seizure.<sup>a</sup> M. Rouher then invited one of the members of the Committee<sup>b</sup> to an interview, in the course of which he declared himself ready to authorise the entry of the manifesto on the condition of some modifications being inserted.<sup>c</sup> On the refusal of the delegate of the Paris Executive, he added,

“Still, if you would introduce some words of gratitude to the Emperor, who has done so much for the working classes, one might see what could be done.”<sup>d</sup>

M. Rouher's, the sub-Emperor's, insinuation was met by a blank rebuff. From that moment the Imperial Government looked out for a pretext to suppress the Association. Its anger was heightened by the anti-chauvinist agitation on the part of our French members after the German war. Soon after, when the Fenian panic had reached its climax, the General Council addressed to the English Government a petition<sup>e</sup> demanding the commutation of the sentence of the three victims of Manchester, and qualifying their hanging as an act of political revenge.<sup>f</sup> At the same time it held public meetings in London for the defence of the rights of Ireland. The Empire, always anxious to deserve the good graces of the British Government, thought the moment propitious for laying hands upon the International.<sup>g</sup> It caused nocturnal perquisitions to be made, eagerly rummaged the private correspondence, and announced with much noise<sup>h</sup> that it had discovered the centre of the Fenian conspiracy, of which the International was denounced as one of the principal organs.<sup>16</sup> All its laborious researches, however, ended in nothing.<sup>i</sup> The public prosecutor himself threw down his brief in disgust.<sup>j</sup> The attempt at converting the

<sup>a</sup> “A M. le ministre de l'intérieur. Vendredi. 9 mars 1867”. In *Le Courrier français*, No. 112, May 1, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Antoine Marie Bourdon, the section's archivist.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Instead of “to an interview ... being inserted” the German has: “to an interview. In the course of the meeting that followed he first demanded that certain passages in the Manifesto should be moderated and altered”.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Le Courrier français*, No. 112, May 1, 1868. The quotation gives the general meaning of Rouher's speech.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See this volume, pp. 3-4.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> After the word “petition” the German has the following text: “in which the forthcoming execution of the three Manchester martyrs was described as a judicial murder” (the reference is to William Philip Allen, Michael Larkin and Michael O'Brien).—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> The German further has “on both sides of the Channel”.—*Ed.*

<sup>h</sup> The German has “in the English press”.—*Ed.*

<sup>i</sup> In the German text this sentence reads: “Much ado about nothing.”—*Ed.*

<sup>j</sup> In the German text this sentence reads: “The legal investigation found not a shadow of a *corpus delicti* despite its zeal.”—*Ed.*

International Association into a secret society of conspirators having miserably broken down, the next best thing was to prosecute our Paris branch as a non-authorised society of more than 20 members.<sup>17</sup> The French judges, trained by the Imperialist discipline, hastened, of course, to order the dissolution of the Association and the imprisonment of its Paris Executive.<sup>a</sup> The tribunal had the *naïveté* to declare in the preamble of its judgment that the existence of the French Empire was incompatible with<sup>b</sup> a working men's association that dared to proclaim truth, justice, and morality as its leading principles.<sup>c</sup> The consequences of these prosecutions made themselves felt in the departments, where paltry vexations on the part of the Prefects succeeded to the condemnations of Paris. This Governmental chicanery, however, so far from annihilating the Association, has given it a fresh impulse<sup>d</sup> by forcing the Empire to drop its patronising airs to the working classes.

In Belgium the International Association has made immense strides. The coal lords of the basin of Charleroi, having driven their miners to riots by incessant exactions, let loose upon those unarmed men the armed force which massacred many of them.<sup>e</sup> It was in [the] midst of the panic thus created that our Belgian branch took up the cause of the miners, disclosed their miserable economical condition,<sup>f</sup> rushed to the rescue of the families of the dead and wounded, and procured legal counsel for the prisoners, who were finally all of them acquitted by the jury.<sup>18</sup> After the affair of Charleroi the success of the International in Belgium was assured. The Belgian Minister of Justice, Jules Bara, denounced the International Association in the Chamber of Deputies and made of its existence the principal pretext for the renewal of the law against foreigners.<sup>19</sup> He even dared to threaten he should

<sup>a</sup> Instead of "and the imprisonment of its Paris Executive" the German text has "and fined the Committee members and sentenced them to imprisonment".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the German text the beginning of this sentence reads as follows: "Yet the tribunal had the *naïveté* to state two things, in the preamble of its judgement: on the one hand that the power of the I.W.A. was growing and, on the other, that the December Empire was incompatible with..."—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See the tribunal's sentences of March 20 and May 22, 1868 in *Procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Bureau de Paris*, Paris, 1868, pp. 39-40 and 128.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the German text then follows a separate sentence: "Nothing has enhanced its influence in France more strongly than the fact that it finally forced the December government to break clearly with the working class."—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> In the German text the words "which massacred many of them" are omitted.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> The German text has "in the press and at public meetings".—*Ed.*

prevent the Brussels Congress from being held.<sup>a</sup> The Belgian Government ought at last to understand that petty States have no longer any *raison d'être* in Europe except they be the asylums of liberty.

In Italy, the progress of the Association has been impeded by the reaction following close upon the ambushade of Mentana<sup>20</sup>; one of the first consequences was the restriction put upon the right of association and public meeting. But the numerous letters which have come to our hands fully prove that the Italian working class is more and more asserting its individuality quite independently of the old parties.

In Prussia, the International cannot exist legally, on account of a law which forbids all relations with foreign societies.<sup>21</sup> Moreover, in regard to the General Union of the German Working Men, the Prussian Government has imitated Bonapartism on a shabby scale. Always ready to fall foul of each other, the military Governments are cheek by jowl when entering upon a crusade against their common enemy, the working classes. In spite, however, of all these petty tribulations, small groups spread over the whole surface of Germany had long since rallied round our Geneva centre.<sup>22</sup> The General Union of the German Working Men, whose branches are mostly confined to Northern Germany, have in their recent Congress held at Hamburg decided to act in concert with the International Working Men's Association,<sup>23</sup> although debarred from joining it officially.<sup>b</sup> In the programme of the Nuremberg Congress, representing upwards of 100 working men's societies, which mostly belong to Middle and Southern Germany, the direct adhesion to the International has been put on the order of the day.<sup>c</sup> At the request of their leading committee we have sent a delegate to Nuremberg.<sup>24</sup>

In Austria the working-class movement assumes a more and more revolutionary aspect.<sup>d</sup> In the beginning of September a congress was to meet at Vienna, aiming at the fraternisation of the working men of the different races of the Empire. They had also sent an address to the English and French working men, in which they declared for the principles of the International.<sup>e</sup> Your

<sup>a</sup> Marx refers to Jules Bara's speech in the Chamber of Deputies on May 16, 1868, published in *La Liberté*, No. 47, May 17, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the German text the end of the sentence reads: "although by law it is unable to join the I.W.A. officially".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 35, August 29, 1868, pp. 275-76.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The German text has "distinct character".—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> "Die Arbeiter Wien's an die französischen und englischen Arbeiter", *Der Vorbote*, No. 8, August 1868, pp. 120-22.—*Ed.*

General Council had already appointed a delegate to Vienna<sup>a</sup> when the Liberal Government of Austria, on the very point of succumbing to the blows of the feudal reaction, had the shrewdness to stir the anger of the working men by prohibiting their congress.

In the struggle maintained by the building trades of Geneva the very existence of the International in Switzerland was put on its trial. The employers made it a preliminary condition of coming to any terms with their workmen that the latter should forsake the International. The working men indignantly refused to comply with this dictate. Thanks to the aid received<sup>b</sup> from France, England, Germany, &c., through the medium of the International, they have finally obtained a diminution of one hour<sup>c</sup> of labour and 10 per cent<sup>d</sup> increase of wages. Already deeply rooted in Switzerland, the International has witnessed since that event a rapid increase in the number of its members. In the month of August last the German working men residing in Switzerland (about 50 societies) passed at their Congress in Neuenburg a unanimous vote of adhesion to the International.<sup>25</sup>

In England the unsettled state of politics,<sup>e</sup> the dissolution of the old parties, and the preparations for the coming electoral campaign have absorbed many of our most active members, and, to some degree, retarded our propaganda. Nevertheless, we have entered into correspondence with numerous provincial trades' unions, many of which have sent in their adhesion. Among the more recent London affiliations those of the Carriers' Society and the City Men's Shoemakers are the most considerable as regards numbers.

Your General Council is in constant communication with the National Labour Union of the United States. On its last Congress of August, 1867, the American Union had resolved to send a delegate to the Brussels Congress,<sup>f</sup> but, pressed for time, was unable to take the special measures necessary for carrying out the vote.<sup>26</sup>

The latent power of the working classes of the United States has recently manifested itself in the legal establishment of a working

<sup>a</sup> Peter Fox.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German text has "by them in Switzerland itself as well as".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The words "one hour" are omitted in the German text.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> "10 per cent" omitted in the German text.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The German text has "the political movement" instead of "the unsettled state of politics".—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> Richard Trevellick.—*Ed.*

day of eight hours in all the workshops of the Federal Government, and in the passing [of] laws to the same effect by many State Legislatures.<sup>27</sup> However, at this very moment the working men of New York, for example, are engaged in a fierce struggle for enforcing the eight hours' law, against the resistance of rebellious capital. This fact proves that even under the most favourable political conditions all serious success of the proletariat depends upon an organisation that unites and concentrates its forces; and even its national organisation is still exposed to split on the disorganisation of the working classes in other countries, which one and all compete in the market of the world, acting and reacting the one upon the other. Nothing but an international bond of the working classes can ever ensure their definitive triumph. This want has given birth to the International Working Men's Association. That Association has not been hatched by a sect or a theory. It is the spontaneous growth of the proletarian movement, which itself is the offspring of the natural and irrepressible tendencies of modern society. Profoundly convinced of the greatness of its mission, the International Working Men's Association will allow itself neither to be intimidated nor misled. Its destiny, henceforward, coalesces with the historical progress of the class that bear in their hands the regeneration of mankind.<sup>a</sup>

London, September 1

Adopted by the General Council on September 1, 1868

First published in French in a special supplement to *Le Peuple Belge*, September 8, 1868: "Troisième congrès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Compte rendu officiel", Bruxelles, 1868; in English in *The Times*, No. 26225, September 9, 1868

Reproduced from *The Times* and checked with the copy of the German manuscript made by Marx's wife, Jenny Marx

---

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript there follows: "For the General Council: *Robert Shaw*, Chairman *J. George Eccarius*, General Secretary."—*Ed.*



Frederick Engels  
 TO THE DIRECTORATE  
 OF THE SCHILLER INSTITUTE<sup>28</sup>

Manchester, September 16, 1868

Mr. Davisson has informed me that at its meeting of September 7 the Directorate took the decision to invite Mr. Karl Vogt to give a lecture at the Institute.

Much as I regret it, this decision obliges me to resign my post as chairman as well as that of member of the Directorate.

I do not need to enter here into the objective grounds on which, had I been present, I would have voted against the decision. It is not these reasons which make my decision a duty.

My resignation stems only from reasons not connected with the Institute. During 1859 and 1860 my political friends and I levelled grave charges of a political nature against Mr. Vogt, presenting evidence to support them. (See the work *Herr Vogt* by Karl Marx, London, 1860.) Mr. Vogt has so far remained silent in the face of these accusations, which have subsequently been repeated by other quarters.

This entire affair, as well as the polemic about it at the time, is probably unknown to the other members of the Directorate, or forgotten by them. They are quite entitled to disregard Mr. Vogt's political character and regard him as the more or less agreeable populariser of the scientific discoveries of others. I cannot afford to do so. Were I to remain in the Directorate after the above decision, I would be denying my entire political past and my political friends. I would be giving a vote of confidence to a man who, I consider it proved, was in 1859 a paid agent of Bonapartism.

Only such a compelling necessity could induce me to resign from a post in which I considered it my duty to remain under difficulties now fortunately overcome.<sup>29</sup>

I thank the members of the Directorate cordially for the confidence they have so lavishly bestowed on me, and leave them with the request to retain towards me the same friendly sentiments that I shall always cherish for them.

Yours faithfully,

*F. E.*

First published in German in the *Bulletin of the International Institute of Social History*, Amsterdam, No. 2, 1950

Printed according to the manuscript draft

Published in English for the first time

# Demokratisches Wochenblatt.

Organ der deutschen Volkspartei.

No. 40.

Leipzig, den 3. Oktober.

1868.

Frederick Engels

## ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE LASSALLEAN WORKERS' ASSOCIATION<sup>30</sup>

“The government *knows*, and the bourgeoisie knows too, that the whole German workers' movement today is only *tolerated*, only survives, for as long as the government *chooses*. For as long as it serves the government's purpose for this movement to exist and for the bourgeois opposition to be faced with new, independent opponents, thus long will it tolerate this movement. From the moment that this movement turns the workers into an independent force, and thereby becomes a danger to the government, there will be an abrupt end to it all. The whole manner in which the men-of-Progress agitation in the press, associations and assemblies has been put down, should serve as a warning to the workers. The same laws, edicts and measures which were applied in that case, can be applied against *them* at any time and deal a lethal blow to their agitation; *and they will be so applied as soon as this agitation becomes dangerous*. It is of the greatest importance that the workers should be clear about this point, and do not fall prey to the same illusion as the bourgeoisie in the New Era,<sup>31</sup> when it was similarly only *tolerated* but imagined it was already in the saddle. And if anyone should imagine the present government would free the press, the right of association and the right of assembly from their present fetters, he is clearly among those to whom there is no point in talking. And unless there is freedom of the press, the right of association and the right of assembly, no workers' movement is possible.”

These words may be found on pages 50 and 51 of a pamphlet, *Die preussische Militärfrage und die deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, by

Frederick Engels, Hamburg, 1865.<sup>a</sup> At that time the attempt was made to bring the General Association of German Workers—in its time the only organised association of social-democratic workers in Germany—under the wing of the Bismarck ministry by presenting the workers with the prospect of the government granting universal suffrage. “Universal, equal and direct suffrage” was of course preached by Lassalle as the sole and infallible means for the working class to win political power<sup>b</sup>; is it any wonder that under these circumstances such subordinate things as freedom of the press and the right of association and assembly, which even the bourgeoisie stood for, or at least claimed to stand for, should be looked down upon? If the bourgeoisie took an interest in such things was that not a good reason for the workers to steer clear of the agitation for them? This view was opposed by the pamphlet mentioned above. The leaders of the General Association of German Workers knew better, and the author only had the satisfaction that the Lassalleans of his hometown Barmen declared him and his friends outlawed and excommunicated.

And what is the state of affairs today? “Universal, direct and equal suffrage” has existed for two years. Two parliaments have already been voted in. The workers, instead of sitting at the helm of state and decreeing “state aid” according to Lassalle’s directions, manage with the utmost difficulty to get half a dozen deputies elected into parliament. Bismarck is Federal Chancellor, and the *General Association of German Workers has been dissolved*.

But why universal suffrage failed to bring the workers the promised millennium, they were already able to find out from Engels. In the above pamphlet it says on page 48<sup>c</sup>:

“And regarding universal direct suffrage itself, one has only to go to France to realise what tame elections it can give rise to, if one has only a large and ignorant rural population, a well-organised bureaucracy, a well-regimented press, associations sufficiently kept down by the police and no political meetings at all. How many workers’ representatives does universal<sup>d</sup> suffrage send to the French chamber, then? And yet the French proletariat has the advantage over the German of far greater concentration and longer experience of struggle and organisation.

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 75-76 (Engels introduced some additional italics in quoting this passage in the present article).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> F. Lassalle, *Offenes Antwortschreiben an das Central-Comité zur Berufung eines Allgemeinen deutschen Arbeiter-Congresses zu Leipzig*, Zurich, 1863, p. 5.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 74-75.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In Engels’ pamphlet: “universal direct.”—*Ed.*

“Which brings us to yet another point. In Germany the rural population is twice the size of the urban population, i. e.,  $\frac{2}{3}$  earn their living from agriculture and  $\frac{1}{3}$  from industry. And since in Germany the big landowner is the rule and the small peasant with his strips the exception, put another way that means: if  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the workers are at the beck and call of the capitalists,  $\frac{2}{3}$  **are at the beck and call of the feudal lords**. Let those who never stop railing at the capitalists but never utter a word in anger against the feudalists take that to heart! The feudalists exploit twice as many workers in Germany as the bourgeoisie.... But that is by no means all. The patriarchal economic system on the old feudal estates generates a hereditary dependence of the rural day labourer or cottager on ‘his lordship’, which makes it far more difficult for the agricultural proletarian to enter the urban workers’ movement. The clergy, the systematic obscurantism in the country, the bad schooling and the remoteness of the people from the world at large do the rest. The agricultural proletariat is the section of the working class which has most difficulty in understanding its own interests and its own social situation and is the last to do so, in other words, it is the section which remains the longest an unconscious tool in the hands of the privileged class which is exploiting it. And which class is that? **Not the bourgeoisie**, in Germany, **but the feudal aristocracy**. Now even in France, where after all virtually all the peasants are free and own their land, and where the feudal aristocracy has long been deprived of all political power, universal suffrage has not put workers into the Chamber but has almost totally excluded them from it. What would be the consequence of universal suffrage in Germany, where the feudal aristocracy is still a real social and political power and where there are *two* agricultural day labourers for *every* industrial worker? The battle against feuda’ and bureaucratic reaction—for the two are inseparable in our country—is in Germany identical with the struggle for the intellectual and political emancipation of the rural proletariat—and until such time as the rural proletariat is also swept along into the movement, the urban proletariat cannot and will not achieve anything at all in Germany and universal<sup>a</sup> suffrage will not be a weapon for the proletariat but a *snare*.

“Perhaps this exceptionally candid but necessary analysis will encourage the feudalists to espouse the cause of universal direct suffrage. So much the better.”

The General Association of German Workers has been dissolved

---

<sup>a</sup> In Engels’ pamphlet: “universal direct”.—*Ed.*

not merely under the rule of universal suffrage but also precisely *because* universal suffrage rules. Engels had predicted that it would be suppressed as soon as it became *dangerous*. At its last general assembly<sup>32</sup> the Association had decided: 1. to work for **full political liberty** and 2. to cooperate with the International Working Men's Association.<sup>a</sup> These two resolutions comprise a complete break with the entire past of the Association. With them, it emerged from its previous sectarian position into the broad field of the workers' movement. But in higher places they seem to have imagined that this was to a certain extent a breach of agreement. At other times it would not have mattered so much; but since the introduction of universal suffrage, when they have to be careful to shield their rural and provincial proletariat from such subversive tendencies! Universal suffrage was the last nail in the coffin of the General Association of German Workers.

It does the Association credit that it foundered precisely on this breach with narrow-minded Lassalleanism. Whatever may take its place will consequently be built on a far more general, principled basis than the few incessantly reiterated Lassallean phrases about state aid could offer. The moment the members of the dissolved Association started thinking instead of believing, the last obstacle in the way of an amalgamation of all German social-democratic workers into one big party disappeared.

Written at the end of September 1868

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 40, October 3, 1868

Published in English for the first time

---

<sup>a</sup> "Die Generalversammlung des Allg. deutsch. Arbeiter-Vereins", *Der Social-Demokrat*, Nos. 100 and 102, August 28 and September 2, 1868.—*Ed.*

Frederick Engels  
ON THE DISSOLUTION  
OF THE LASSALLEAN WORKERS' ASSOCIATION  
(POSTSCRIPT)<sup>33</sup>

In the article which appeared under the above heading (in the previous issue), the following note should be added at the end of the quotation from the pamphlet by Engels on universal suffrage<sup>a</sup>:

At that time the "President of Mankind", *Bernhard Becker*, bequeathed by Lassalle to the Association,<sup>34</sup> was heaping the vilest insults on "the Marx Party", *i. e. Marx, Engels and Liebknecht*.<sup>\*</sup> Now, in his obscene screed *Enthüllungen über das tragische Lebensende Ferdinand Lassalle's*, which lays bare his own piteous soul and is only of interest because of the suppressed documents it reproduces, the very same Becker bowdlerises Engels in the following way:

"Yet, why is there no *agitation for unconditional freedom of association and assembly and freedom of the press?* Why do the workers not seek to remove the fetters placed on them in the period of reaction?" (P. 133.) "...Only by further development of the democratic basis can Lassalleanism be renewed and led over into pure socialism. To this end it is necessary among other things that the interests of the *Junkers* or wealthy landowners *should no longer be spared* but that socialist theory should be supplemented and completed by *applying it to the great mass of agricultural labourers* who in Prussia outnumber by far the population of the towns." (P. 134.)

It can be seen that the author of the pamphlet (F. Engels) may be content with its effect on his opponents.

Written at the beginning of October 1868

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 41, October 10, 1868

Published in English for the first time

\* This pretty business is now being continued by Countess *Hatzfeldt*, the "mother" of the Försterling-Mende caricature of the General Association of German Workers.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>a</sup> See previous article.—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION AND  
ENGLISH WORKING MEN'S ORGANISATIONS]<sup>36</sup>

The unusual seriousness with which the English and particularly the London press treats the *International Working Men's Association* and its *Brussels Congress* (*The Times* alone devoted four leading articles to it<sup>a</sup>) has stirred up a real devil's sabbath in the German bourgeois press. It, the German press, takes the English press to task for its error in believing that such importance is attached to the International Working Men's Association in England! It has discovered that the English TRADES UNIONS, which, through the International Working Men's Association, have given considerable financial support to the Paris, Geneva and Belgian workers in their fight against capital,<sup>37</sup> have absolutely *no* connection with that very same International Working Men's Association!

"Apparently all this is based," we have in writing from London, "on the assertion of a certain *M. Hirsch*\* whom Schulze-Delitzsch sent specially to London to kick up such a fuss. *M. Hirsch* says so, and *M. Hirsch* is an honourable man! The honourable *Hirsch* aroused the suspicions of London trade unionists because [he] bore *no* letters of recommendation from the International Working Men's Association. They simply *made a fool of him*. No wonder then that *Hirsch* got it all wrong. If he had been taken seriously, he could have been told, without being entrusted with

\* Reference is to Dr. *Max Hirsch*, the "famous" economist of the *Duncker Volks-Zeitung*. Until his voyage of discovery into the English unknown, apparently no one in London had any idea of the existence of this new saviour of society.

<sup>a</sup> *The Times*, Nos. 26225, 26228, 26230 and 26234, September 9, 12, 15 and 19, 1868.—*Ed.*



anything really confidential, what the whole of London knows—that the General Council of TRADES UNIONS in London<sup>38</sup> consists of six or seven people, of whom three, *Odger* (Secretary of the General Trades Council and shoemakers' delegate), *R. Applegarth* (delegate of the Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners) and *Howell* (delegate of the bricklayers and Secretary of the Reform League<sup>39</sup>), are at the same time members of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. He would have discovered further that the rest of the affiliated TRADES UNIONS (there are about 50 in London alone, not counting the provincial TRADES UNIONS) are represented on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association by another *five members*, namely, *R. Shaw*, *Buckley*, *Cohn*, *Hales* and *Maurice*; furthermore every union has the right and makes a practice of sending delegates to the General Council for special purposes. Further, the following English organisations are represented on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association:

“*co-operative societies*, which sent three delegates<sup>a</sup> to the Brussels Congress, by *Wlm. Weston*<sup>b</sup> and *Williams*;

“the *Reform League*, by *Dell*, *Cowell Stepney* and *Lucraft*, all three are also on the Executive Committee of the Reform League;

“the *National Reform Association*,<sup>40</sup> set up by the late agitator *Bronterre O'Brien*, by its President *A. A. Walton* and *Milner*;

“lastly, the *atheist* popular movement by its famous orator *Mrs. Harriet Law* and *Mr. Copeland*.

“It is clear that not one significant organisation of the British proletariat exists which is not directly, by its own leaders, represented on the General Council of the International Working Men's Association. Finally, there is *The Bee-Hive*, under *George Potter*'s management, the official organ of the English TRADES UNIONS, which is at the same time the official organ of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, on whose meetings it reports weekly.

“The discoveries of the honourable *Hirsch* and the subsequent jubilation in the German bourgeois press have provided just the right fodder for the London correspondent of the *Weser-Zeitung* and the London correspondent of the *Augsburgerin*,<sup>c</sup> who signs himself Δ. This person—for one and the same person writes for

<sup>a</sup> Frederick Dean (a smith), John Foster Sr (a carpenter) and John Foster Jr (a mechanic)—all three members of co-operative societies in Hull.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> John Weston is more likely the man meant here.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*.—*Ed.*

the two papers—lives, for reasons best known to himself, in a remote corner a few hours away from London. There he coyly culls his extracts from *The Times*, *The Morning Star* and *The Saturday Review*, and serves them up with an aesthetic fish sauce to suit the taste of his public. From time to time, as is the case here, he also digs up the gossip of German papers and has it reprinted under a false date in the *Weser-Zeitung* and the *Augsburgerin*. The said correspondent of the *Weser-Zeitung* and the *Augsburgerin* is none other than the notorious literary lumpenproletarian *Elard Biscamp*. Long rejected by any decent society, this unfortunate seeks consolation in the bottle for the broken heart caused him by Prussia annexing his native Hesse-Cassel as well as his friend *Edgar Bauer*.<sup>41</sup>”

Written on October 4, 1868

Printed according to the newspaper

First published in *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 42, October 17, 1868

## Karl Marx

HOW MR. GLADSTONE'S BANK LETTER OF 1866  
PROCURED A LOAN OF SIX MILLIONS  
FOR RUSSIA<sup>42</sup>

Mr. Gladstone's letter of the 11th of May, 1866,<sup>a</sup> suspended the Bank Charter Act of 1844<sup>43</sup> on the following conditions:—

1. That the minimum rate of discount should be raised to 10 per cent.

2. That if the Bank overstepped the legal limitation of its note issue, the profits of such overissue should be transferred from the Bank to the Government.

Consequently the Bank raised its minimum rate of discount to 10 per cent. (which means 15 to 20 per cent. for the common run of merchants and manufacturers), and *did not* infringe the *letter* of the Act in regard to the *note issue*. They collected, in the evening, notes from their banking friends and other connexions in the City to reissue them in the morning. They infringed, however, the spirit of the Act by allowing, under the Government letter, their *Reserve* to dwindle down to zero, and *that Reserve*, according to the contrivances of the Act of 1844, forms the only available assets of the Bank as against the liabilities of its banking department.

Mr. Gladstone's letter, therefore, suspended Peel's Act in such a way as to perpetuate and even artificially exaggerate its worst effects. Neither Sir G. C. Lewis's letter of 1857 nor Lord John Russell's letter of 1847<sup>44</sup> lay open to the same censure.

The Bank maintained the 10 per cent. minimum rate of discount for more than 3 months. This rate was regarded by Europe as a danger signal.

The most morbid sense of distrust in English solvency having thus been created by Mr. Gladstone, out comes Lord Clarendon,

<sup>a</sup> W. E. Gladstone and J. Russell, "To the Governor and Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England. May 11, 1866", *The Times*, No. 25497, May 14, 1866.—*Ed.*

the man of the Paris Conference,<sup>45</sup> with an explanatory letter, published in *The Times*, to the English Embassies on the Continent.<sup>a</sup> He told the Continent, in so many words, that the *Bank of England* was *not bankrupt* (although it was *really so*, according to the Act of 1844), but that, to a certain degree, *English* industry and commerce were so. The immediate effect of his letter was not a "run" of the Cockneys upon the Bank, but a "run" (for money) of *Europe upon England*. (That expression was used at the time by Mr. Watkin in the House of Commons.<sup>b</sup>) Such a thing was quite unheard of in the annals of English commercial history. Gold was shipped from London to France, while, simultaneously, the official minimum rate of discount was 10 *per cent. in London*, and 3½ *to 3 per cent. at Paris*. This proves that the withdrawal of gold was no regular commercial transaction. It was solely the effect of Lord Clarendon's letter.

The 10 per cent. minimum rate of discount having thus been kept up for more than three months, there followed the inevitable reaction. From 10 per cent. the minimum rate receded by quick steps to 2 per cent., which, a few days ago, was still the official Bank rate.<sup>46</sup> Meanwhile, all *English* securities, railway shares, bank shares, mining shares, every sort of home investment, had become utterly depreciated, and was anxiously shunned. Even the Consols declined. (On one day, during the Panic, the Bank *declined* making advances upon Consols.) Then the hour had struck for *Foreign Investments*. Foreign Government Loans were contracted, under the most facile conditions, on the London market. At their head stood a *Russian Loan for 6 millions sterling*.<sup>47</sup> This Russian Loan, which, a few months ago, had miserably broken down at the Paris Bourse, was now hailed as a godsend on the London Stock Exchange. Last week only Russia has come out with a new loan for 4 millions sterling. Russia was in 1866, as she is now (November 9, 1868), almost breaking down under financial difficulties, which, consequent on the agricultural revolution she is undergoing, have assumed a most formidable aspect.

This, however, is the least thing Peel's Act does for Russia—to keep the English money-market open to her. That Act puts England, the richest country in the world, *literally at the mercy of the Muscovite Government*, the most bankrupt Government in Europe.

---

<sup>a</sup> G. W. Clarendon, "Foreign Office. May 12", *The Times*, No. 25504, May 22, 1866.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx refers to Watkin's speech of July 31, 1866, published in *The Times*, No. 25565, August 1, 1866.—*Ed.*

Suppose the Russian Government had had lodged, in the name of a private firm, German or Greek, from one to one and a half millions sterling at the beginning of May, 1866, in the banking department of the Bank of England. By the sudden and unexpected withdrawal of that sum, she might have forced the banking department to stop payment at once, although there were more than thirteen millions sterling of gold in the issue department. The bankruptcy of the Bank of England might, then, have been enforced by a telegram from St. Petersburg.

What Russia was not prepared for in 1866, she may make ready to do—if Peel's Act be not repealed—in 1876.

Written on November 9, 1868

Reproduced from the journal

First published in *The Diplomatic Review*,  
December 2, 1868

Karl Marx

[PREAMBLE TO THE RESOLUTIONS  
OF THE GENEVA (1866) AND BRUSSELS (1868)  
CONGRESSES OF THE INTERNATIONAL]<sup>48</sup>

As some of the resolutions passed at the first Congress may be considered as part of the platform of principles of the International Working Men's Association, and the reports of that Congress have had but a limited circulation, the General Council deems it advisable to republish them with the issue of the resolutions passed at the last Congress.

Amongst the various subjects that came under the consideration of the first—the Geneva Congress—the following are the most important.<sup>49</sup>

Written at the end of October-November 3, 1868

Reproduced from the newspaper

Adopted by the General Council on November 3, 1868

First published in *The Bee-Hive Newspaper*, No. 371, November 21, 1868

Karl Marx  
[STATEMENT  
TO THE GERMAN WORKERS' EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY  
IN LONDON]<sup>50</sup>

November 23, 1868  
1 Modena Villas, Maitland Park,  
Haverstock Hill, London

*To Mr C. Speyer, Secretary of the German Workers' Educational Society*

Dear friend,

I have been informed that the Society has decided to issue a circular letter to the German workers,<sup>a</sup> the theme of which is said to be the "mass unification of the German workers of South and North in consequence of the Berlin Congress of September 26".<sup>51</sup>

In these circumstances I am obliged to announce my *resignation from the Workers' Society*.

Such a letter is obviously intended as, or implies, a public alignment of the London German Workers' Educational Society *for Schweitzer* and his organisation and *against* the organisation of the Nuremberg Congress,<sup>52</sup> which embraces most of South Germany and various parts of North Germany. As I am known in Germany as a member of the Society, in fact its oldest member, *I* would be held responsible for this step in spite of all possible assurances to the contrary.

You must, however, realise that I cannot accept such responsibility.

*Firstly:* During the disputes between the Nuremberg organisation, represented by Liebknecht, Bebel, etc., and the Berlin organisation, represented by Schweitzer, both parties have contacted me in writing. I have replied that as the Secretary of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association

---

<sup>a</sup> K. Speyer, "Der deutsche Arbeiter-Bildungsverein in London an die Arbeiter Deutschlands", *Der Vorbote*, No. 12, December 1868; No. 1, January 1869.—*Ed.*

for Germany I have to maintain an *impartial* position. I have advised both parties, if they cannot and will not amalgamate with each other, to look for ways and means of working for the common goal peacefully *side by side*.

*Secondly*: In reply to a letter from Herr von Schweitzer to me, I have set out for him in detail the reasons why I can neither approve the manner in which the Berlin Congress was managed nor the statutes adopted by it.<sup>53</sup>

*Thirdly*: The Nuremberg Congress has affiliated itself *directly* to the International Working Men's Association. The Hamburg Congress—of which the Berlin Congress was a continuation—has *only indirectly* affiliated itself by a statement of sympathy, owing to the obstacles placed in its path by the Prussian legislation. In spite of these obstacles, however, the newly formed Democratic Workers' Association of Berlin,<sup>54</sup> which belongs to the Nuremberg organisation, has publicly and officially affiliated itself to the International Working Men's Association.

I repeat that in these circumstances the decision of the Society leaves me no other choice than to announce my resignation from it. I trust you will be so kind as to convey these lines of mine to the Society.

Yours sincerely,

*Karl Marx*

First published in *Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen von J. Ph. Becker, J. Dietzgen, F. Engels, K. Marx u. A. an F. A. Sorge u. A.*, Stuttgart, 1906

Printed according to the manuscript

Published in English for the first time



## Karl Marx

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
AND THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE  
OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY<sup>55</sup>

Just about a month ago a certain number of citizens formed in Geneva the *Central Initiatory Committee* of a new international society named *The International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, stating that it was their "special mission to study political and philosophical questions on the basis of the grand principle of equality, etc."

The programme and rules printed by this Initiatory Committee<sup>a</sup> were only communicated to the *General Council* of the *International Working Men's Association* at its meeting on December 15. According to these documents, the said "*International Alliance is merged entirely in the International Working Men's Association*", at the same time as it is *established* entirely outside this Association.

Besides the *General Council* of the *International Association*, elected at the Geneva, Lausanne and Brussels working men's congresses, there is to be, in line with the initiatory rules, another *Central Council* in Geneva, which is self-appointed. Besides the local groups of the *International Association*, there are to be local groups of the *International Alliance*, which "through their national bureaux", operating outside the national bureaux of the *International Association*, "shall ask the *Central Bureau of the Alliance to admit them into the International Working Men's Association*"; the Alliance Central Committee thereby takes upon itself the right of admittance to the *International Association*. Lastly, the *General Congress of the International Association* will have its parallel in the

---

<sup>a</sup> *Programme et Règlement de l'Alliance Internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste*, Genève [1868] (see this volume, pp. 207-09). Here and below Marx quotes this document.—*Ed.*

*General Congress of the International Alliance*, for, as the initiatory rules say,

“At the annual Working Men’s Congress the delegation of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, as a branch of the International Working Men’s Association, shall hold public meetings in a separate building.”<sup>a</sup>

Considering,

That the presence of a second international body operating within and outside the *International Working Men’s Association* would be the infallible means of its disorganisation;

That every other group of individuals, residing anywhere at all, would have the right to imitate the Geneva initiatory group and, under more or less plausible excuses, to bring into the *International Working Men’s Association* other international associations with other “special missions”;

That the *International Working Men’s Association* would thereby soon become a plaything for intriguers of all race and nationality<sup>b</sup>;

That, moreover, the *Rules of the International Working Men’s Association* admit only local and national branches into its ranks (see Article 1 and Article 6 of the *Rules*);

That sections of the *International Association* are forbidden to give themselves rules or administrative regulations contrary to the General Rules and Administrative Regulations of the *International Association* (see Article 12 of the *Administrative Regulations*)<sup>c</sup>;

That the Rules and Administrative Regulations of the *International Association* can only be revised by the *General Congress* in the event of two-thirds of the delegates present voting in favour of such a revision (see Article 13 of the *Administrative Regulations*)<sup>d</sup>,

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 209.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Les prétendues scissions dans l’Internationale* by Marx and Engels (Genève, 1872, p. 7) has: “for intriguers of any nationality and any party”.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men’s Association. Founded September 28th, 1864*, London [1867], pp. 4-5, 7.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> During discussion of the draft resolution at the General Council meeting on December 22, 1868, on Dupont’s proposal an addition was made to this part of the resolution which was not recorded in full in the Minute Book. The text of this addition, edited apparently by Marx, was included in the final version of the circular (see K. Marx and F. Engels, *Les prétendues scissions dans l’Internationale*, Genève, 1872, p. 8) and reads as follows:

“That this question was decided beforehand in the resolutions against the *Peace League*, unanimously passed at the General Congress in Brussels<sup>56</sup>;

“That in its resolutions the Congress declared there was no justification for the *Peace League’s* existence since, according to its recent declarations, its aim and principles were identical with those of the *International Working Men’s Association*;

“That a few members of the Geneva *Initiatory* group, as delegates to the Brussels Congress, had voted for these resolutions.”—Ed.

*The General Council of the International Working Men's Association* unanimously agreed at its meeting on December 22, 1868, that:

- 1) All articles of the *Rules* of the *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, defining its relations with the *International Working Men's Association*, are declared null and void;
- 2) *The International Alliance of Socialist Democracy* may not be admitted as a branch of the *International Working Men's Association*;
- 3) These resolutions be published in all countries where the *International Working Men's Association* exists.<sup>a</sup>

By order of the *General Council*  
of the *International Working Men's Association*

London, December 22, 1868

Adopted by the General Council on  
December 22, 1868

First published in the pamphlet *Les  
prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale*,  
Genève, 1872

Printed according to the manu-  
script, checked with various copies  
and the pamphlet

Translated from the French

---

<sup>a</sup> Point 3 was not included in the final text of the resolution. Neither was it included in the pamphlet *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale*.—Ed.

Karl Marx

[RESUMÉ OF THE MEETINGS  
OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL]<sup>57</sup>

INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
TO THE EDITOR OF *THE BEE-HIVE*

Sir,—At the meeting of this Association, held on the 5th inst., letters were read from Germany announcing the adhesion of 2,000 miners, from Lugau, in Saxony, and arrangements are in progress with two other bodies, of 7,000 miners each, with a view of their joining the International Working Men's Association.<sup>58</sup>

A democratic Working Men's Club has been formed at Berlin<sup>59</sup>; the members have joined the International Working Men's Association, and declared themselves opposed to the Prussian Government and to Schultze-Delitzsch. The trades' unions in Germany, on the model of the English ones, with some improvements suggested by the resolutions of the Geneva, Lausanne, and Brussels Working Men's Congresses, brought into existence by the efforts of the International Working Men's Association, number already 110,000 members.

The Belgian secretary<sup>a</sup> stated that in Belgium they had sixty branches, and that they were getting new members at the rate of 1,000 per week.<sup>60</sup>

The secretary for Switzerland<sup>b</sup> stated that he had received information concerning some riband weavers of Basel, who had been locked out.<sup>61</sup> The matter will come up again on Tuesday, when the Council will be in possession of the facts.

The secretary for France<sup>c</sup> reported an agreement come to between the cotton masters of Rouen, the northern and some other departments of France, to reduce the workmen's wages, in

---

<sup>a</sup> Marie Bernard.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Hermann Jung.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Eugène Dupont.—*Ed.*

order to undersell the English manufacturers in their own markets.<sup>a</sup>

The following resolution, proposed by Citizen Applegarth, and seconded by Citizen Marx, was unanimously agreed to:—

Resolved—That in the opinion of this Council the attempt of the employers of Rouen, of the northern and other departments of France, to reduce the wages of their workpeople with the avowed object of underselling the manufacturers of England in their own markets is deserving the reprobation of the workmen and employers of all nations. That while recognising the right of free competition carried on by legitimate means, we utterly deprecate the extension of trade by reducing the wages of workpeople already underpaid.

Resolved—That the various societies be invited to send delegates to the next meeting of the Council, to be held on Tuesday 19 inst. at eight p. m., to devise the best means to frustrate the unwarrantable attempts of the French manufacturer, and to render to the workmen concerned such assistance as they may need.<sup>62</sup>

*Hermann Jung*,<sup>b</sup> Sec. pro. tem.

6th Jan. 1869

First published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 379,  
January 16, 1869

Reproduced from the newspaper

---

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 388.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *The Bee-Hive* has a mistake: "Henry Lang".—*Ed.*

## Frederick Engels

### REPORT ON THE MINERS' GUILDS IN THE COALFIELDS OF SAXONY<sup>63</sup>

The first *wage scale* we take, e. g., that of the Niederwürschnitz Company, shows us the overall condition of the miners in the collieries of the Erzgebirge. A week's wage for adult miners amounts to from 2 talers to 3 talers 12 silver groschen 6 pfennigs, for juveniles between 1 taler 10 silver groschen and 1 taler 20 silver groschen. A week's wage for an average miner amounts approximately to  $2\frac{2}{3}$  talers. At the demand of the owners the workers have to work at piece rates. The *wage scale* is arranged in such a way that the piece rate will not usually exceed the normal rate for a day's work. Every worker must give a month's notice to leave, and that on the first day of the month. Consequently, if he refuses to work at piece rates on the terms proposed, he can be *forced* to it for 4-8 weeks at the least. Such being the circumstances, it is simply ridiculous to talk of regulating the piece rate by mutual agreement, of a free contract between worker and capitalist!

Wages are paid in two instalments; an advance is made on the 22nd of the month, the remainder for that month being paid on the 8th of the following month. The capitalist therefore retains wages that he *owes* his workers for a full three weeks on the average—this compulsory loan to the employer is all the more agreeable since money is thus obtained without the payment of interest.

As a rule the miners work in twelve-hour shifts, and the afore-mentioned weekly wages are paid for 6 twelve-hour working days. The twelve-hour working day includes 2 hours (2 half hours and 1 full hour) for meals, or so-called *rest periods*. If the work is urgent, shifts last eight hours (i. e., each man does 3 shifts in 48 hours) with *half an hour for meals*; they may even last six hours, in which case "*no rest period is granted*".

These facts offer a gloomy picture of the condition of the miners. But to appreciate their serf-like status we must also examine the *rules of the miners' guilds*. Let us take the rules for the coal-mines, those of (I) the high and mighty *Prince Schönburg*, (II) the *Niederwürschnitz Company*, (III) the *Niederwürschnitz-Kirchberg Company*, and (IV) the *Joint Lugau companies*.

The income of the miners' guilds consists of (1) the workers' entrance fees and dues, fines, unclaimed wages, etc., and (2) contributions from the capitalists. The workers pay 3 or 4 per cent of their wages, the owners of (I) pay 7 silver groschen 5 pfennigs monthly for every paid-up miner, of (II) 1 pfennig for every scheffel<sup>a</sup> of coal sold, of (III) as initial contribution and to found a miners' guild fund—500 talers; after that the same dues as the workers, and of (IV) like those of (II), plus a membership fee of 100 talers from each of the joint companies.

Are we not overwhelmed by this picture of friendly harmony between capital and labour? After that, who will dare to go on harping on their contradictory interests? But, as the great German thinker Hansemann once said, "business is business".<sup>b</sup> So we might ask what the worker has to pay for the magnanimity of the "exalted coal-owners". Let's see.

The capitalists contribute in one instance (III) as much as the workers, in all other instances appreciably less. For this they lay claim to the following rights in respect of *the property of the guild*:

I. "*No property rights in respect of the guild fund shall accrue to members of the miners' guild, and they shall not expect to obtain more from the fund than the amount to which they, according to the rules, are entitled in certain circumstances, in particular they shall not be able to propose sharing the fund and its ready cash even in the event of any of the works ceasing to operate. Should there be a complete shut-down in the coal-mines of Prince Schönburg in Oelsnitz*", then, after satisfaction of ready claims, "*the right to dispose of the remainder is vested in the Prince, owner of the coalfields.*"

II. "In the event of the joint Niederwürschnitz Coal Company closing down, the miners' guild fund shall also be closed down, and *the right to dispose of the remaining money is vested in the management.*"

Members of the guild fund have *no property rights in respect of the guild fund*.

III. as in II.

IV. "The guild fund shall be considered the *inalienable property* of its present members and those who join it in future. Only in the unexpected event of the

<sup>a</sup> 1 scheffel is one-eighth of a ton.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> From Hansemann's speech in the first United Diet on June 8, 1847 (see *Preussens erster Reichstag*, Th. 7, Berlin, 1847, p. 55).—*Ed.*

complete liquidation of all the joint coal-mines and the consequent closing down of the miners' guild"—now, in this unexpected event one might have expected the workers to be able to divide up among themselves any money remaining. Nothing of the sort! In this case "the management of the last closed trust shall direct suggestions to the *Royal District Board*. The last-named authority shall *decide* how this sum of money is to be used."

In other words, the workers pay the greater part of the contributions to the guild fund, but the capitalists *arrogate to themselves the ownership of the fund*. The capitalists seem to make the workers a present. Actually, the workers are forced to make a present to their capitalists. Together with the property right, the latter obtain control of the fund.

The *chairman* of the fund board is the coalfield manager. He is the chief administrator of the fund, he decides all disputed issues, determines the amount of fines, etc. Next below him is the *secretary of the guild*, who is also the treasurer. He is either appointed by the capitalist or has to get the latter's approval if he is elected by the workers. Then come the ordinary *members of the board*. They are usually elected by the workers, but in one instance (III) the capitalist appoints three members of the board. What sort of "board" this actually is can be seen from the rule obliging "*it to hold a meeting at least once a year*". Actually it is run by the chairman, and the board members carry out his orders.

This Mr. Chairman, the coalfield manager, is a powerful person in other respects too. He can reduce the probation period for new members, issue extra allowances, even (III) expel workers whose reputation he deems poor, and he can always appeal to the capitalist, whose decision is final on *everything concerning the miners' guild*. Prince Schönburg and the managers of the joint stock companies can, for instance, alter the guild rules, raise the workers' dues, reduce sick benefits and pensions, create new obstacles or formalities in dealing with claims on the fund. In short, they *can do what they like with the workers' money*, with the one reservation that they need the sanction of the government authorities, who have never yet displayed any *desire* to know anything about the condition or needs of the workers. In enterprise III the managers even reserve themselves the right to expel from the guild any worker *who has been brought to trial by them, even if he has been acquitted!*

And what are the benefits for which the miners so blindly subordinate their own affairs to an alien despotism? Listen to this!

1) In the event of sickness they receive medical treatment and a weekly allowance, in enterprise I—up to a third of their wages, in



III—up to a half of their wages, in II and IV—up to a half or, if the illness is due to an accident at work,  $\frac{2}{3}$  and  $\frac{3}{4}$  respectively. 2) The incapacitated receive a pension depending on their length of service, and hence on their contributions to the guild fund, from  $\frac{1}{20}$  to  $\frac{1}{2}$  of their last wages. 3) If a member dies his widow receives an allowance of between  $\frac{1}{5}$  and  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the pension which her husband was entitled to, and a weekly pittance for each child. 4) A burial allowance in the event of death in the family.

The noble prince and enlightened capitalists who compiled these rules, and the paternal government which endorsed them, owe the world the solution of this problem: if a miner with the full average wage of  $2\frac{2}{3}$  talers a week is half starved, how can he live on a pension of, say,  $\frac{1}{20}$  of this wage, some 4 silver groschen a week?

The tender concern which the rules display for the interests of capital comes out clearly in the way mine accidents are treated. With the exception of enterprises II and IV there is no special allowance if illness or death occurs through an accident “in the course of duty”. *In not a single case is the pension increased if disability follows from a mine accident.* The reason is very simple. This clause would substantially increase payments out of the fund and very soon make even the most short-sighted see the real nature of *presents* from the capitalist gentlemen.

The rules imposed by the capitalists of Saxony differ from the constitution imposed by Louis Bonaparte<sup>a</sup> in that the latter still awaits the crowning touch whereas the former already have it in the form of the following article applicable to all:

“Every worker who *leaves* the company, be it voluntarily, *be it compulsorily*, thereby leaves the guild and *forfeits all rights and claims both to its fund and to the money he himself has contributed.*”

Thus, a man who has worked 30 years in one mine and contributed his share to the guild fund, forfeits all his hard-earned rights to a pension as soon as the capitalist *chooses to sack him!* This article turns the wage-worker into a serf, ties him to the soil, exposes him to the most shameful mistreatment. If he is no lover of kicks, if he resists the cutting of wages to starvation level, if he refuses to pay arbitrarily imposed fines, if he dares to insist on official verification of weights and measures—he will always receive the same old answer: get out, but your fund contributions and your fund rights stay with us!

It seems paradoxical to expect manly independence and self-respect from people in such a humiliating position. Yet these

<sup>a</sup> *Constitution faite en vertu des pouvoirs délégués par le peuple français à Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte, par le vote des 20 et 21 décembre 1851.—Ed.*

miners can be counted—much to their credit—among the vanguard fighters of the German working class. Their masters are therefore beginning to be greatly worried, despite the tremendous hold the present organisation of the miners' guilds gives them. The most recent and meanest of their rules (III, dating from 1862) contains the following grotesque clause against strikes and associations:

"Every guild member *must always be satisfied with the pay accruing to him in accordance with the wage scale*, he must never take part in joint action to force higher wages, to say nothing of inciting his workmates to the same, but should, rather, etc."

Why have the Lycurguses of the *Niederwürschnitz-Kirchberg* Coalfield Company, Messers. *B. Krüger, F. W. Schwamkrug* and *F. W. Richter* not also deigned to make it a rule that henceforward every coal purchaser "*must always be satisfied*" with the coal prices fixed by their exalted selves? This is too much even for Herr von Rochow's "limited understanding of the loyal subject".<sup>64</sup>

As a result of agitation among the miners, *preliminary draft rules* for the unification of miners' guilds of all coalfields in Saxony were recently published (Zwickau 1869). They were drawn up by a workers' committee under the chairmanship of Mr. *J. G. Dinter*. The main points are: 1) All guilds to be united in a single guild. 2) Members retain their rights as long as they live in Germany and pay their dues. 3) A general meeting of all adult members constitutes the supreme authority. It elects an executive committee, etc. 4) Contributions by the masters to the guild fund must make up half those paid by the workers.

This draft in no way reflects the views of the most intelligent miners of Saxony. It comes rather from a section which prefers reforms with the permission of capital. It bears the stamp of unpracticality on its brow. What a naïve idea indeed that the capitalists, unrestrained rulers over the miners' guilds up to now, will surrender their power to a democratic general workers' meeting and still pay their contributions!

The *basic evil* lies in the very fact that the capitalists *contribute*. As long as this continues, they cannot be removed from running the guild and the fund. To be genuine workers' societies, the miners' guilds must rely exclusively on workers' contributions. Only thus can they become TRADES UNIONS which protect individual workers from the arbitrariness of individual masters. The insignificant and dubious advantages which come from the capitalists' contributions—can they ever compensate for the state of serfdom into which they force the workers? Let the Saxon miners always

remember that what the capitalist puts into the guild fund he *gets it all back, and more, from the workers' wages*. Guilds of this type have the unique effect of *suspending the operation of the law of supply and demand to the exclusive advantage of the capitalist*. In other words, by the *unusual* hold which they give capital over individual workers, they press down wages even *below* their usual average level.

But should the workers then present the existing funds—naturally after compensation for the acquired rights—to the capitalists? This question can only be decided by *law*. Although *endorsed by the supreme royal authority*, certain articles in the rules patently conflict with generally accepted legal regulations concerning contracts. In all circumstances, however, the separation of the workers' money from the capitalists' money remains the essential precondition to any reform of the miners' guilds.

The contributions of the Saxon coalfield owners to the guild funds are an involuntary admission that capital is up to a certain point responsible for accidents which threaten the wage worker with mutilation or death during the execution of his duty at his place of work. But instead of allowing this responsibility to be made the pretext for extending the despotism of capital, as is the case now, the workers must agitate for *this responsibility being regulated by the law*.

Written between February 17 and 21,  
1869

Published according to the news-  
paper

First published as a supplement to  
*Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 12,  
March 20, 1869

Karl Marx

THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION TO THE  
CENTRAL BUREAU OF THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE  
OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY<sup>65</sup>

London, 9 March, 1869

Citizens,

According to Article I of its<sup>a</sup> Statutes, the Int. W. Ass.<sup>b</sup> admits "all working men's societies ... aiming at the same end, viz., the protection, advancement, and *complete emancipation of the working classes*".<sup>c</sup>

Since the various sections of working men in the same country, and the working classes in different countries, are placed under different circumstances and have attained to different degrees of development, it seems almost necessary that their theoretical notions, which reflect the real movement, should also diverge.

The community of action, however, called into life by the Intern. W. Ass., the exchange of ideas facilitated by the public organs of the different national sections, and the direct debates at the General Congresses, are sure by and by to engender a common theoretical programme.

Consequently, it belongs not to the functions of the General Council to subject the programme of the Alliance to a critical examination.<sup>d</sup> We have not to inquire whether, yes or no, it be a true scientific expression of the working-class movement.<sup>e</sup> All we have to ask is whether its *general tendency* does not run against the

<sup>a</sup> The clean copy in French has "our".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Here and below in the French copy the name of the International is given in full.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1867], p. 4.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, pp. 207-10.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The clean copy in French has "an adequate expression of the proletarian movement" instead of "a true scientific expression of the working-class movement".—*Ed.*

general tendency of the<sup>a</sup> Int. W. Ass., viz., *the complete emancipation of the working class?*

One phrase in your programme lies open to this objection. It occurs [in] Article 2:

“Elle (l’Alliance) veut avant tout *l’égalisation* politique, économique et sociale des classes.” (“The Alliance aims above all at the political, economical, and social equalisation ... of classes.”<sup>66</sup>)

The “*égalité des classes*”, literally interpreted, comes to the “*Harmony of Capital and Labour*” (“l’harmonie du capital et du travail”) so persistently preached by the bourgeois socialists. It is not the logically impossible “*equalisation of classes*”, but the historically necessary, superseding “*abolition of classes*” (abolition des classes), this true secret of the proletarian movement, which forms the great aim of the Int. W. Ass.

Considering, however, the context, in which that phrase “*égalité des classes*” occurs, it seems to be a mere slip of the pen, and the General Council feels confident that you will be anxious to remove from your programme an expression which offers such a dangerous misunderstanding.

It suits the *principles* of the Int. W. Ass. to let every section freely shape its own theoretical programme, except the single case of an infringement upon its general tendency. There exists, therefore, no obstacle to the transformation of the sections of the Alliance into sections of the Int. W. Ass.

The dissolution of the Alliance, and the entrance of its sections into the Int. W. Ass, once settled, it would, according to our Regulations, become necessary to inform the General Council of the residence and the numerical strength of each new section.<sup>b</sup>

Adopted by the General Council on  
March 9, 1869

First published in the pamphlet *Les  
prétendues scissions dans l’Internationale*,  
Genève, 1872

Reproduced from the English  
rough copy, checked with Marx’s  
clean copy in French

<sup>a</sup> The clean copy in French has “our”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the English manuscript the following text is crossed out: “It is self-understood that every section is bound to admit all workmen who accept the general statutes of the I. W. Association without adopting the special programme of the section.”—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE BELGIAN MASSACRES<sup>67</sup>

TO THE WORKMEN OF EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES

There passes hardly a week in England without strikes—and strikes upon a grand scale. If, on such occasions, the Government was to let its soldiers loose upon the Working Class, this land of strikes would become a land of massacres, but not for many a week. After a few such physical force experiments, the powers that be would be nowhere. In the United States, too, the number and scale of strikes have continued to increase during the last few years, and even sometimes assumed a riotous character. But no blood was spilt. In some of the great military states of continental Europe, the era of strikes may be dated from the end of the American Civil War. But here, again, no blood was spilt. There exists but one country in the civilised world where every strike is eagerly and joyously turned into a pretext for the official massacre of the Working Class. That country of single blessedness is *Belgium!* the model state of continental constitutionalism, the snug, well-hedged, little paradise of the landlord, the capitalist, and the priest. The earth performs not more surely its yearly revolution than the Belgian Government its yearly Working Men's massacre. The massacre of this year does not differ from last year's massacre,<sup>a</sup> but by the ghastlier number of its victims, the more hideous ferocity of an otherwise ridiculous army, the noiser jubilation of the clerical and capitalist press, and the intensified frivolity of the pretexts put forward by the Governmental butchers.

It is now proved, even by the involuntary evidence of the

---

<sup>a</sup> Marx refers to the events in Charleroi (Belgium) in March 1868. See this volume, pp. 14-15.—*Ed.*

capitalist press,<sup>a</sup> that the quite legitimate strike of the puddlers in the Cockerill Ironworks, of Seraing, was only converted into a riot by a strong posse of cavalry and gendarmerie suddenly launched upon that place in order to provoke the people. From the 9th to the 12th of April these stout warriors not only recklessly charged with sabre and bayonet the unarmed workmen, they indiscriminately killed and wounded harmless passers-by, forcibly broke into private houses, and even amused themselves with repeated furious onslaughts on the travellers pent up in the Seraing Railway Station. When these days of horror had passed away, it became bruited about that Mr. *Kamp*, the mayor of Seraing, was an agent of the Cockerill Joint Stock Company, that the Belgian Home Minister, a certain Mr. *Pirmez*, was the largest shareholder in a neighbouring colliery also on strike, and that His Royal Highness the Prince of Flanders had invested 1,500,000 francs in the Cockerill concern.<sup>68</sup> Hence people jump to the truly strange conclusion that the Seraing massacre was a sort of joint stock company *coup d'état*, quietly plotted between the firm Cockerill and the Belgian Home Minister, for the simple purpose of striking terror unto their disaffected subjects. This calumny, however, was soon after victoriously refuted by the later events occurring in Le Borinage, a colliery district where the Belgian Home Minister, the said Mr. *Pirmez*, seems not to be a leading capitalist. An almost general strike having broken out amongst the miners of that district, numerous troops were concentrated, who opened their campaign at Frameries by a fusillade, which killed nine and grievously wounded twenty miners, after which little preliminary exploit the Riot Act, singularly enough styled in French "*les sommations préalables*",<sup>69</sup> was read, and then the butchery proceeded with.

Some politicians trace these incredible deeds to motives of a sublime patriotism. While just negotiating on some ticklish points with their French neighbour,<sup>70</sup> the Belgian Government, they say, were bound in duty to show off the heroism of their army. Hence that scientific division of arms, displaying, first, the irresistible impetuosity of the Belgian cavalry at Seraing, and then the steady vigour of the Belgian infantry at Frameries. To frighten the foreigner, what means more infallible than such homely battles, which one does not know how to lose, and such domestic battlefields, where the hundreds of workmen killed, mutilated,

---

<sup>a</sup> See "Moralités de l'affaire de Seraing" and "Episodes de troubles de Seraing et du Borinage", *L'Internationale*, Nos. 14 and 15, April 18 and 25, 1869.—*Ed.*

and made prisoners, shed so glorious a lustre upon those invulnerable warriors, who, all of them, to a man, get off with their skins safe.

Other politicians, on the contrary, suspect the Belgian ministers to be sold to the Tuileries, and to periodically enact these horrible scenes of a mock civil war, with the deliberate aim of affording Louis Bonaparte a pretext for saving society in Belgium as he has saved it in France. But was Ex-Governor Eyre ever accused of having organised the Negro massacre at Jamaica in order to wrest that island from England and place it into the hands of the United States?<sup>71</sup> No doubt the Belgian ministers are excellent patriots of the Eyre pattern. As he was the unscrupulous tool of the West-Indian planter, they are the unscrupulous tools of the Belgian capitalist.

The Belgian capitalist has won fair fame in the world by his eccentric passion for, what he calls, *the liberty of labour* (*la liberté du travail*). So fond is he of the liberty of his hands to labour for him all the hours of his life, without exemption of age or sex, that he has always indignantly repulsed any factory law encroaching upon that liberty. He shudders at the very idea that a common workman should be wicked enough to claim any higher destiny than that of enriching his master and natural superior. He wants his workman not only to remain a miserable drudge, overworked and underpaid, but, like every other slave-holder, he wants him to be a cringing, servile, broken-hearted, morally prostrate, religiously humble drudge. Hence his frantic fury at strikes. With him, a strike is a blasphemy, a slave's revolt, the signal of a social cataclysm. Put, now, into the hands of such men—cruel from sheer cowardice—the undivided, uncontrolled, absolute sway of the state power, as is actually the case in Belgium, and you will no longer wonder to find the sabre, the bayonet, and the musket working in that country as legitimate and normal instruments for keeping wages down and screwing profits up. But, in point of fact, what other earthly purpose could a Belgian army serve? When, by the dictation of official Europe, Belgium was declared a *neutral country*,<sup>72</sup> it ought, as a matter of course, have been forbidden the costly luxury of an army, save, perhaps, a handful of soldiers, just sufficient to mount the royal guard and parade at a royal puppet-show. Yet, within its 536 square leagues of territory, Belgium harbours an army greater than that of the United Kingdom or the United States. The field service of this neutralised army is fatally computed by the number of its *razzias* upon the working class.



It will easily be understood that the *International Working Men's Association* was no welcome guest in Belgium. Excommunicated by the priest, calumniated by the respectable press, it came soon to loggerheads with the Government. The latter tried hard to get rid of it by making it responsible for the Charleroi colliery strikes of 1867-68, strikes wound up, after the invariable Belgian rule, by official massacres, followed by the judicial prosecution of the victims. Not only was this cabal baffled, but the Association took active steps, resulting in a verdict of *not guilty* for the Charleroi miners, and, consequently, in a verdict of *guilty* against the Government itself.<sup>73</sup> Fretting at this defeat, the Belgian ministers gave vent to their spleen by fierce denunciations, from the tribune of the Chamber of Deputies, against the *International Working Men's Association*, and pompously declared they should never allow its General Congress to meet at Brussels.<sup>a</sup> In the teeth of their menaces the Congress met at Brussels. But now at last the *International* is to succumb before the 536 square leagues of Belgian Omnipotence. Its culpable complicity during the recent events has been proved beyond the possibility of doubt. The emissaries of the Brussels Central Committee for Belgium and some of the Local Committees stand convicted of several flagrant crimes. In the first instance, they have tried hard to calm the excitement of the workmen on strike, and warn them off the Government traps. In some localities they have actually prevented the effusion of blood. And last, not least, these ill-boding emissaries observed on the spot, verified by witnesses, noted carefully down and publicly denounced the sanguinary vagaries of the defenders of order. By the simple process of imprisonment they were at once converted from the accusers into the accused. Then the domiciles of the members of the Brussels Committee were brutally invaded, all their papers seized, and some of them arrested on the charge of belonging to an association "*founded for the purpose of attempting the lives and properties of individuals*".<sup>b</sup> In other words, they were impeached of belonging to an *Association of Thugs*,<sup>74</sup> commonly styled the *International Working Men's Association*. Hunted on by the raving capucinades of the clerical and the savage howls of the capitalist press, this swaggering pigmy government is decidedly anxious to drown itself in a morass of ridicule, after having weltered in a sea of blood.

<sup>a</sup> A reference to the speech of Jules Bara, the Belgian Minister of Justice, in the Chamber of Deputies on May 16, 1868, published in *La Liberté*, No. 47, May 17, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Arrestations et condamnations", *L'Internationale*, No. 16, May 2, 1869.—*Ed.*

Already the Belgian Central Committee at Brussels has announced its intention to institute, and afterwards publish the results of, a full inquiry into the massacres of Seraing and Le Borinage.<sup>a</sup> We will circulate their revelations all over the world, in order to open the eyes of the world on the pet funfaronade of the Belgian capitalist: *La liberté, pour faire le tour du monde, n'a pas besoin de passer par ici (la Belgique).*\*

Perhaps, the Belgian Government flatters itself that having, after the revolutions of 1848-49, gained a respite of life by becoming the police agent of all the reactionary governments of the Continent, it may now again avert imminent danger by conspicuously playing the gendarme of capital against labour. This, however, is a serious mistake. Instead of delaying, they will thus only hasten the catastrophe. By making Belgium a byword and a nickname with the popular masses all over the world, they will remove the last obstacle in the way of the despots bent upon wiping that country's name off the map of Europe.

The General Council of the *International Working Men's Association* hereby calls upon the workmen of Europe and the United States to open monetary subscriptions for alleviating the sufferings of the widows, wives, and children of the Belgian victims, and also for the expenses incident upon the legal defence of the arrested workmen, and the inquiry proposed by the Brussels Committee.

By order of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association,

*R. Applegarth*, Chairman  
*R. Shaw*, Secretary for America  
*Bernard*, Secretary for Belgium  
*Eugène Dupont*, Secretary for France  
*Karl Marx*, Secretary for Germany  
*Jules Johannard*, Secretary for Italy  
*A. Zabicki*, Secretary for Poland  
*H. Jung*, Secretary for Switzerland  
*Cowell Stepney*, Treasurer  
*J. G. Eccarius*, Secretary to the General Council

London, May 4th, 1869

\* Liberty in travelling round the world has no need of passing through Belgium.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *L'Internationale*, No. 15, April 25, 1869.—*Ed.*

All contributions for the victims of the Belgian massacre to be sent to the Office of the General Council, 256, High Holborn, London, W.C.

Adopted by the General Council on May 4, 1869

Reproduced from the leaflet

First published as a leaflet, *The Belgian Massacres. To the Workmen of Europe and the United States*, May 1869

## Karl Marx

### ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL LABOUR UNION OF THE UNITED STATES<sup>76</sup>

Fellow-workmen,

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

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

In a congratulatory address to Mr. Lincoln on his re-election as president, we expressed our conviction that the American civil war

---

<sup>a</sup> *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association*, London, 1864.—*Ed.*

would prove of as great import to the advancement of the working class as the American war of independence had proved to that of the middle class.<sup>a</sup> And, in point of fact, the victorious termination of the anti-slavery war has opened a new epoch in the annals of the working class. In the States themselves, an independent working-class movement, looked upon with an evil eye by your old parties and their professional politicians, has since that date sprung into life. To fructify it wants years of peace. To crush it, a war between the United States and England is wanted.

The next palpable effect of the civil war was, of course, to deteriorate the position of the American workman. In the United States, as in Europe, the monster incubus of a national debt was shifted from hand to hand, to settle down on the shoulders of the working class. The prices of necessaries, says one of your statesmen, have since 1860 risen 78 per cent, while the wages of unskilled labour rose 50 per cent, those of skilled labour 60 per cent only. "Pauperism," he complains, "grows now in America faster than population." Moreover, the sufferings of the working classes set off as a foil the new-fangled luxury of financial aristocrats, shoddy aristocrats,<sup>77</sup> and similar vermin bred by wars. Yet for all this the civil war did compensate by freeing the slave and the consequent moral impetus it gave to your own class movement. A second war, not hallowed by a sublime purpose and a great social necessity, but of the Old World's type, would forge chains for the free labourer instead of tearing asunder those of the slave. The accumulated misery left in its track would afford your capitalists at once the motive and the means to divorce the working class from its bold and just aspirations by the soulless sword of a standing army.

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

In the name of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association,

British nationality: *R. Applegarth*, carpenter<sup>b</sup>;  
*M. J. Boon*, engineer; *J. Buckley*, painter; *J. Hales*,  
elastic web-weaver; *Harriet Law*; *B. Lucraft*, chair-

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, "To Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States of America" (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 20).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> At its meeting on May 11, 1869 the General Council decided that all Council members signing the address should indicate their profession.—*Ed.*

maker; *J. Milner*, tailor; *G. Odger*, shoemaker; *J. Ross*, bootcloser; *B. Shaw*, painter; *Cowell Stepney*; *J. Warren*, trunk-maker; *J. Weston*, handrail-maker. French nationality: *E. Dupont*, instrument-maker; *Jules Johannard*, lithographer; *Paul Lafargue*. German nationality: *G. Eccarius*, tailor; *F. Lessner*, tailor; *W. Limburg*, shoemaker; *Marx, Karl*. Swiss nationality: *H. Jung*, watchmaker; *A. Müller*, watchmaker. Belgian nationality: *M. Bernard*, painter. Danish nationality: *J. Cohn*, cigar-maker. Polish nationality: *Zabicki*, compositor.

*B. Lucraft*, Chairman  
*Cowell Stepney*, Treasurer

*J. George Eccarius*, General Secretary

London, May 12th, 1869

Adopted by the General Council on May  
11, 1869

Reproduced from the leaflet

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

Karl Marx

PREFACE  
[TO THE SECOND EDITION  
OF *THE EIGHTEENTH BRUMAIRE*  
OF LOUIS BONAPARTE]<sup>78</sup>

My friend *Joseph Weydemeyer*,\* who died so early, intended to publish a political weekly in New York starting from January 1, 1852. He invited me to provide a history of the coup d'état for it. Down to the middle of February, I accordingly wrote him weekly articles under the title: *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. Meanwhile Weydemeyer's original plan had failed. Instead, in the spring of 1852 he began to publish a monthly, *Die Revolution*, the first issue of which consists of my *Eighteenth Brumaire*.<sup>79</sup> A few hundred copies of this found their way into Germany at that time, without, however, getting into the actual book trade. A German bookseller of extremely radical pretensions to whom I offered the sale of my book was most virtuously horrified at a "presumption" so "contrary to the times".<sup>80</sup>

It will be seen from the above that the present work was written under the immediate pressure of events and its historical material does not extend beyond the month of February (1852). Its republication now is due in part to the demand of the book trade, in part to the urgent requests of my friends in Germany.

Of the works on the same subject written at approximately the same time as mine, only two deserve notice: Victor Hugo's *Napoléon le petit* and Proudhon's *Coup d'état*.<sup>a</sup>

Victor Hugo confines himself to bitter and witty invective against the responsible publisher of the coup d'état. The event itself

\* Military commandant of the St. Louis district during the American Civil War.

<sup>a</sup> V. Hugo, *Napoléon le petit*, London, 1852; P. J. Proudhon, *La Révolution sociale démontrée par le coup d'état du 2 décembre*, Paris, 1852.—Ed.

appears in his work like a bolt from the blue. He sees in it only the violent act of a single individual. He does not notice that he makes this individual great instead of little by ascribing to him a personal power of initiative such as would be without parallel in world history. Proudhon, for his part, seeks to represent the coup d'état as the result of preceding historical development. Unnoticeably, however, his historical construction of the coup d'état becomes a historical apologia for its hero. Thus he falls into the error of our so-called *objective* historians. In contrast to this, I demonstrate how the *class struggle* in France created circumstances and relations that made it possible for a grotesque mediocrity to play a hero's part.

A revision of the present work would have robbed it of its specific colouring. Accordingly I have confined myself to mere correction of printer's errors and to striking out allusions now no longer intelligible.

The concluding words of my work<sup>a</sup>: "But when the imperial mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the bronze statue of Napoleon will crash from the top of the Vendôme Column<sup>81</sup>", have already been fulfilled.

Colonel Charras opened the attack on the Napoleon cult in his work on the campaign of 1815.<sup>b</sup> Subsequently, and particularly in the last few years, French literature made an end of the Napoleon legend with the weapons of historical research, of criticism, of satire and of wit. Outside France this violent breach with the traditional popular belief, this tremendous mental revolution, has been little noticed and still less understood.

Lastly, I hope that my work will contribute towards eliminating the school-taught phrase now current, particularly in Germany, of so-called *Caesarism*. In this superficial historical analogy the main point is forgotten, namely, that in ancient Rome the class struggle took place only within a privileged minority, between the free rich and the free poor, while the great productive mass of the population, the slaves, formed the purely passive pedestal for these combatants. People forget *Sismondi's* significant saying: The Roman proletariat lived at the expense of society, while modern society lives at the expense of the proletariat.<sup>c</sup> With so complete a difference between the material, economic conditions of the ancient

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 11, p. 197.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. B. A. Charras, *Histoire de la campagne de 1815. Waterloo*, Brussels, 1857.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> J. C. L. Simonde de Sismondi, *Études sur l'économie politique*, t. 1, Paris, 1837, p. 24.—*Ed.*



and the modern class struggles, the political figures produced by them can likewise have no more in common with one another than the Archbishop of Canterbury has with the High Priest Samuel.

*Karl Marx*

*London, June 23, 1869*

First published in the second edition of  
Marx's *Der Achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis  
Bonaparte*, Hamburg, July 1869

Printed according to the text of  
the 1869 edition

## Frederick Engels

KARL MARX<sup>82</sup>

It has become the habit in Germany to regard Ferdinand Lassalle as the founder of the German workers' movement. And yet nothing could be less correct. If six or seven years ago in all the manufacturing districts, in all the major towns, the centres of the working population, the proletariat flooded to see him in vast numbers, and his journeys were triumphal processions which the reigning princes might have envied—had the ground not been quietly fertilized beforehand for it to bear fruit so rapidly? If the workers acclaimed his teachings, was this because those teachings were new to them, or because they had long been more or less familiar to the thinkers amongst them?

Life moves quickly for today's generation and they are quick to forget. The movement of the forties, which culminated in the revolution of 1848 and ended with the reaction of 1849 to 1852, has already been forgotten together with its political and socialist literature. It is therefore necessary to recall that before and during the revolution of 1848 there existed amongst the workers, precisely in western Germany, a well-organised socialist party,<sup>83</sup> which broke up after the Cologne Communist trial,<sup>84</sup> it is true, but whose individual members continued quietly to prepare the ground of which Lassalle later took possession. One must further recall that there existed a man who, as well as organising that party, had devoted his life's work to the scientific study of what was called the social question, i. e. the critique of political economy, and even prior to 1860 had published some of the significant results of his researches.<sup>a</sup> Lassalle was a highly talented

<sup>a</sup> This refers to Marx's work *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.—Ed.

and well-educated fellow, a man of great energy and almost boundless versatility; he was clearly cut out to play a part in politics whatever the circumstances. But he was neither the initial founder of the German workers' movement, nor was he an original thinker. Everything he wrote was derived from elsewhere, not without some misunderstandings either; he had a forerunner and an intellectual superior, whose existence he kept a secret, of course, whilst he vulgarised his writings, and the name of that intellectual superior is Karl Marx.<sup>85</sup>

*Karl Marx* was born on May 5, 1818 in Trier, where he received a classical education. He studied jurisprudence at Bonn and later in Berlin, where, however, his preoccupation with philosophy soon turned him away from law. In 1841, after spending five years in the "metropolis of intellectuals", he returned to Bonn intending to habilitate. At that time the first "New Era"<sup>86</sup> was in vogue in Prussia. Frederick William IV had declared his love of a loyal opposition, and attempts were being made in various quarters to organise one. Thus the *Rheinische Zeitung* was founded at Cologne; with unprecedented daring Marx used it to criticise the deliberations of the Rhine Province Assembly, in articles which attracted great attention.<sup>a</sup> At the end of 1842 he took over the editorship himself and was such a thorn in the side of the censors that they did him the honour of sending a censor<sup>b</sup> from Berlin especially to take care of the *Rheinische Zeitung*. When this proved of no avail either the paper was made to undergo dual censorship, since, in addition to the usual procedure, every issue was subjected to a second stage of censorship by the office of Cologne's Regierungspräsident.<sup>c</sup> But nor was this measure of any avail against the "obdurate malevolence" of the *Rheinische Zeitung*, and at the beginning of 1843 the ministry issued a decree declaring that the *Rheinische Zeitung* must cease publication at the end of the first quarter. Marx immediately resigned as the shareholders wanted to attempt a settlement, but this also came to nothing and the newspaper ceased publication.<sup>87</sup>

His criticism of the deliberations of the Rhine Province Assembly compelled Marx to study questions of material interest. In pursuing that he found himself confronted with points of view which neither jurisprudence nor philosophy had taken account of.<sup>88</sup> Proceeding from the Hegelian philosophy of law, Marx came

<sup>a</sup> K. Marx, "Proceedings of the Sixth Rhine Province Assembly".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Wilhelm Saint-Paul.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Karl Heinrich von Gerlach.—*Ed.*

to the conclusion that it was not the state, which Hegel had described as the "top of the edifice", but "civil society", which Hegel had regarded with disdain, that was the sphere in which a key to the understanding of the process of the historical development of mankind should be looked for. However, the science of civil society is political economy, and *this* science could not be studied in Germany, it could only be studied thoroughly in England or France.

Therefore, in the summer of 1843, after marrying the daughter of Privy Councillor von Westphalen in Trier (sister of the von Westphalen who later became Prussian Minister of the Interior), Marx moved to Paris, where he devoted himself primarily to studying political economy and the history of the great French Revolution. At the same time he collaborated with Ruge in publishing the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, of which, however, only one issue was to appear. Expelled from France by Guizot in 1845, he went to Brussels and stayed there, pursuing the same studies, until the outbreak of the February revolution. Just how little he agreed with the commonly accepted version of socialism there, even in its most erudite-sounding form, was shown in his critique of Proudhon's major work *Philosophie de la misère*,<sup>a</sup> which appeared in 1847 in Brussels and Paris under the title of *The Poverty of Philosophy*. In that work can already be found many essential points of the theory which he has now presented in full detail. The *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, London, 1848, written before the February revolution and adopted by a workers' congress in London, is also substantially his work.<sup>b</sup>

Expelled once again, this time by the Belgian government under the influence of the panic caused by the February revolution, Marx returned to Paris at the invitation of the French provisional government. The tidal wave of the revolution pushed all scientific pursuits into the background; what mattered now was to become involved in the movement. After having worked during those first turbulent days against the absurd notions of the agitators, who wanted to organise German workers from France as volunteers to fight for a republic in Germany,<sup>89</sup> Marx went to Cologne with his friends and founded there the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, which appeared until June 1849 and which people on the Rhine still remember well today. The freedom of the press of 1848 was

<sup>a</sup> P. J. Proudhon, *Système des contradictions économiques, ou Philosophie de la misère*, t. 1-2, Paris, 1846.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Written by Marx and Engels, the *Manifesto* was adopted at the second congress of the Communist League (November 29-December 8, 1847).—*Ed.*

probably nowhere so successfully exploited as it was at that time, in the midst of a Prussian fortress, by that newspaper. After the government had tried in vain to silence the newspaper by persecuting it through the courts—Marx was twice brought before the assizes for an offence against the press laws and for inciting people to refuse to pay their taxes, and was acquitted on both occasions—it had to close at the time of the May revolts of 1849 when Marx was expelled on the pretext that he was no longer a Prussian subject, similar pretexts being used to expel the other editors. Marx had therefore to return to Paris, from where he was once again expelled and from where, in the summer of 1849,<sup>a</sup> he went to his present domicile in London.

In London at that time was assembled the entire *fine fleur*<sup>b</sup> of the refugees from all the nations of the continent. Revolutionary committees of every kind were formed, combinations, provisional governments *in partibus infidelium*,<sup>c</sup> there were quarrels and wrangles of every kind, and the gentlemen concerned no doubt now look back on that period as the most unsuccessful of their lives. Marx remained aloof from all of those intrigues. For a while he continued to produce his *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in the form of a monthly review (Hamburg, 1850), later he withdrew into the British Museum and worked through the immense and as yet for the most part unexamined library there for all that it contained on political economy. At the same time he was a regular contributor to the *New-York Tribune*, acting, until the outbreak of the American Civil War, so to speak, as the editor for European politics of this, the leading Anglo-American newspaper.

The coup d'état of December 2 induced him to write a pamphlet, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, New York, 1852, which is just now being reprinted (Meissner, Hamburg),<sup>d</sup> and will make no small contribution to an understanding of the untenable position into which that same Bonaparte has just got himself. The hero of the coup d'état is presented here as he really is, stripped of the glory with which his momentary success surrounded him. The philistine who considers his Napoleon III to be the greatest man of the century and is unable now to explain to

<sup>a</sup> About August 26, 1849.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Flower.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> *In partibus infidelium*—literally: in parts inhabited by infidels. The words are added to the title of Roman Catholic bishops appointed to purely nominal dioceses in non-Christian countries. Here the words mean “in exile”.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> K. Marx, *Der achtzehnte Brumaire des Louis Bonaparte*, 2. Ausg., Hamburg, 1869.—Ed.

himself how this miraculous genius suddenly comes to be making bloomer after bloomer and one political error after the other—that same philistine can consult the aforementioned work of Marx for his edification.

Although during his whole stay in London Marx chose not to thrust himself to the fore, he was forced by Karl Vogt, after the Italian campaign of 1859, to enter into a polemic, which was brought to an end with Marx's *Herr Vogt* (London, 1860). At about the same time his study of political economy bore its first fruit: *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Part One, Berlin, 1859. This instalment contains only the theory of money, presented from completely new aspects. The continuation was some time in coming, since the author discovered so much new material in the meantime that he considered it necessary to undertake further studies.

At last, in 1867, there appeared in Hamburg: *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy*, Volume I. This work contains the results of studies to which a whole life was devoted. It is the political economy of the working class, reduced to its scientific formulation. This work is concerned<sup>a</sup> not with rabble-rousing phrasemongering, but with strictly scientific deductions. Whatever one's attitude to socialism, one will at any rate have to acknowledge that in this work it is presented for the first time in a scientific manner, and that it was precisely Germany that accomplished this. Anyone still wishing to do battle with socialism, will have to deal with Marx, and if he succeeds in that then he really does not need to mention the *dei minorum gentium*.<sup>b</sup>

But there is another point of view from which Marx's book is of interest. It is the first work in which the actual relations existing between capital and labour, in their classical form such as they have reached in England, are described in their entirety and in a clear and graphic fashion. The parliamentary inquiries provided ample material for this, spanning a period of almost forty years and practically unknown even in England, material dealing with the conditions of the workers in almost every branch of industry, women's and children's work, night work, etc.<sup>90</sup>; all this is here made available for the first time. Then there is the history of factory legislation in England which, from its modest beginnings with the first acts of 1802,<sup>91</sup> has now reached the point of limiting working hours in nearly all manufacturing or cottage industries to

<sup>a</sup> Added in the manuscript: "not with political propaganda".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Gods of lesser stock; approximate meaning: celebrities of lesser stature.—*Ed.*

60 hours per week for women and young people under the age of 18, and to 39 hours per week for children under 13.<sup>92</sup> From this point of view the book is of the greatest interest for every industrialist.

For many years Marx has been the “best-maligned” of the German writers, and no one will deny that he was unflinching in his retaliation and that all the blows he aimed struck home with a vengeance. But polemics, which he “dealt in” so much, was basically only a means of self-defence for him. In the final analysis his real interest lay with his science, which he has studied and reflected on for twenty-five years with unrivalled conscientiousness, a conscientiousness which has prevented him from presenting his findings to the public in a systematic form until they satisfied him as to their form and content, until he was convinced that he had left no book unread, no objection unconsidered, and that he had examined every point from all its aspects. Original thinkers are very rare in this age of epigones; if, however, a man is not only an original thinker but also disposes over learning unequalled in his subject, then he deserves to be doubly acknowledged.

As one would expect, in addition to his studies Marx is busy with the workers’ movement; he is one of the founders of the International Working Men’s Association, which has been the centre of so much attention recently and has already shown in more than one place in Europe that it is a force to be reckoned with. We believe that we are not mistaken in saying that in this, at least as far as the workers’ movement is concerned, epoch-making organisation the German element—thanks precisely to Marx—holds the influential position which is its due.

Written on about July 28, 1869

First published in *Die Zukunft*, No. 185,  
August 11, 1869

Printed according to the newspaper, checked against the manuscript

Published in English for the first time

Karl Marx

REPORT OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE RIGHT OF INHERITANCE<sup>93</sup>

1. The right of inheritance is only of social import, in so far as it leaves to the heir the power which the deceased wielded *during his lifetime*, viz., *the power of transferring to himself*, by means of his property, the *produce of other people's labour*. For instance, land gives the living proprietor the power to transfer to himself, under the name of rent, without any equivalent, the produce of other people's labour. Capital gives him the power to do the same under the name of profit and interest. The property in public funds gives him the power to live without labour upon other people's labour, &c.

*Inheritance* does not *create* that power of transferring the produce of one man's labour into another man's pocket—it only relates to the change in the individuals who yield that power. Like all other civil legislation, the laws of inheritance are not the *cause*, but the *effect*, the *juridical consequence* of the *existing economical organisation of society*, based upon private property in the means of production, that is to say, in land, raw material, machinery, &c. In the same way the right of inheritance in the slave is not the cause of slavery, but, on the contrary, slavery is the cause of inheritance in slaves.

2. What we have to grapple with, is the cause and not the effect, the economical basis—not its juridical superstructure. Suppose the means of production transformed from private into social prosperity, then the right of inheritance—(so far as it is of any social importance)—would die of itself, because a man only leaves after his death what he possessed during his lifetime. Our great aim must, therefore, be to supersede those institutions which give to some people, *during their lifetime*, the economical power of



transferring to themselves the fruits of the labour of the many. Where the state of society is far enough advanced, and the working class possesses sufficient power to abrogate such institutions, they must do so in a *direct way*. For instance, by doing away with the public debt, they get of course, at the same time, rid of the inheritance in public funds. On the other hand, if they do not possess the power to abolish the public debt, it would be a foolish attempt to abolish the right of inheritance in public funds.

*The disappearance of the right of inheritance* will be the natural result of a social change superseding private property in the means of production; but the *abolition of the right of inheritance* can never be the *starting-point* of such a social transformation.

3. It was one of the great errors committed about 40 years since by the disciples of St. Simon, to treat the *right of inheritance*, not as the *legal effect*, but as the economical cause of the present social organisation.<sup>94</sup> This did not at all prevent them from perpetuating in their system of society private property in land, and the other means of production. Of course elective and life-long proprietors, they thought, might exist as elective kings have existed.

To proclaim the abolition of the *right of inheritance* as the *starting-point* of the social revolution, would only tend to lead the working class away from the true point of attack against present society. It would be as absurd a thing as to abolish the laws of contract between buyer and seller, while continuing the present state of exchange of commodities.

It would be a thing false in theory, and reactionary in practice.

4. In treating of the laws of inheritance, we necessarily suppose that *private property* in the means of production continues to exist. If it did no longer exist amongst the living, it could not be transferred from them, and by them, after their death. All measures, in regard to the right of inheritance, can therefore only *relate* to a state of *social transition*, where, on the one hand, the present economical base of society is not yet transformed, but where, on the other hand, the working masses have gathered strength enough to *enforce transitory measures* calculated to bring about an ultimate radical change of society.

Considered from this standpoint, changes of the laws of inheritance form only part of a *great many other transitory measures* tending to the same end.

These transitory measures, as to inheritance, can only be:

(a) Extension of the inheritance duties already existing in many states, and the application of the funds hence derived to purposes of social emancipation.

(b) Limitation of the testamentary right of inheritance, which—as distinguished from the *intestate* or *family right of inheritance*—appears an arbitrary and superstitious exaggeration even of the principles of private property themselves.

Written on August 2-3, 1869

Reproduced from the pamphlet

Adopted by the General  
Council on August 3, 1869

First published in the pamphlet *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland*, London [1869]

Karl Marx

REPORT OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
TO THE FOURTH ANNUAL CONGRESS  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION<sup>95</sup>

Citizens,<sup>a</sup>

The delegates of the different sections will give you detailed reports on the progress of our Association in their respective countries. The report of your General Council will mainly relate to the guerilla fights between capital and labour—we mean the strikes which during the last year have perturbed the continent of Europe, and were said to have sprung neither from the misery of the labourer nor from the despotism of the capitalist, but from the secret intrigues of our Association.

A few weeks after the meeting of our last Congress, a memorable strike on the part of the ribbon-weavers and silk-dyers occurred in Basle, a place which to our days has conserved much of the features of a mediaeval town with its local traditions, its narrow prejudices, its purse-proud patricians, and its patriarchal rule of the employer over the employed. Still, a few years ago a Basle manufacturer boasted to an English secretary of embassy, that

“the position of the master and the man was on a better footing here than in England”, that “in Switzerland the operative who leaves a good master for better wages would be *despised* by his own *fellow-workmen*”, and that “our advantage lies principally in the length of the working time and the moderation of the wages”.

You see, *patriarchalism*, as modified by modern influences, comes to this—that the master is good, and that his wages are bad, that the labourer feels like a mediaeval vassal, and is exploited like a modern wages-slave.

---

<sup>a</sup> The word “Citizens” is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

That patriarchalism may further be appreciated from an official Swiss inquiry into the factory employment of children and the state of the primary public schools. It was ascertained that

“the Basle school atmosphere is the worst in the world, that while in the free air carbonic acid forms only 4 parts of 10,000, and in closed rooms should not exceed 10 parts, it rose in Basle common schools to 20-81 parts in the forenoon, and to 53-94 in the afternoon”.<sup>a</sup>

Thereupon a member of the Basle Great Council, Mr. Thurneysen, coolly replied,

“Don’t allow yourselves to be frightened. The parents have passed through schoolrooms as bad as the present ones, and yet they have escaped with their skins safe”.<sup>b</sup>

It will now be understood that an economical revolt on the part of the Basle workmen could not but mark an epoch in the social history of Switzerland. Nothing more characteristic than the starting-point of the movement. There existed an old custom for the ribbon-weavers to have a few hours’ holiday on Michaelmas.<sup>c</sup> The weavers claiming this small privilege at the usual time in the factory of Messrs. Dubary and Sons, one of the masters declared, in a harsh voice and with imperious gesticulation,

“Whoever leaves the factory will be dismissed at once and for ever”.<sup>d</sup>

Finding their protestations in vain, 104 out of 172 weavers left the workshop without, however, believing in their definite dismissal, since master and men were bound by written contract to give a fourteen days’ notice to quit. On their return the next morning they found the factory surrounded by gendarmes, keeping off the yesterday’s rebels, with whom all their comrades now made common cause.<sup>e</sup> Being thus suddenly thrown out of work, the weavers with their families were simultaneously ejected

---

<sup>a</sup> See Report of the commission inquiring into the state of public schools in Switzerland. Quoted from J. Ph. Becker, *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeiterbewegung in Basel im Winter 1868 auf 1869*, Genf, 1869, S. 34.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German pamphlet this sentence reads: “According to an old custom the workers in Basle take a quarter of a day off on the last day of the Autumn Fair.” The next sentence begins as follows: “When, on November 9, 1868 the weavers claimed...”.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See “Bericht über die Arbeiterbewegung in Basel”, *Der Vorbote*, No. 12, December 1868, p. 177.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Instead of “with whom all their comrades now made common cause” the German pamphlet has two separate sentences: “Even the weavers who had not taken a quarter of a day off did not want to go in either. The general slogan was: ‘All or none’”.—*Ed.*

from the cottages they rented from their employers, who, into the bargain, sent circular letters round to the shopkeepers<sup>a</sup> to debar the houseless ones from all credit for victuals.<sup>b</sup> The struggle thus begun lasted from the 9th of November, 1868, to the spring of 1869. The limits of our report do not allow us to enter upon its details. It suffices to state that it originated in a capricious and spiteful act of capitalist despotism, in a cruel lock-out, which led to strikes, from time to time interrupted by compromises, again and again broken on the part of the masters, and that it culminated in the vain attempt of the Basle "High and Honourable State Council" to intimidate the working people by military measures and a quasi state of siege.

During their sedition the workmen were supported by the International Working Men's Association. But that was not all.<sup>c</sup> That society the masters said had first smuggled the modern spirit of rebellion into the good old<sup>d</sup> town of Basle. To again expel that mischievous intruder from Basle became, therefore, their great preoccupation. Hard they tried, though in vain, to enforce the withdrawal from it as a condition of peace, upon their subjects. Getting generally worsted in their war with the International they vented their spleen in strange pranks. Owing some industrial branch establishments at Lörrach, in Baden,<sup>e</sup> these republicans induced the grand-ducal official<sup>f</sup> to suppress the International section at that place, a measure which, however, was soon after rescinded by the Baden Government. The Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung*, a paper of world-wide circulation, presuming to report on the Basle events in an impartial spirit, the angry worthies threatened it in foolish letters with the withdrawal of their subscriptions.<sup>g</sup> To London they expressly sent a messenger on the fantastic errand of ascertaining the dimensions of the International general "treasury-box". Orthodox Christians as they are, if they had lived at the time of nascent Christianity, they would, above all things, have spied into St. Paul's banking accounts at Rome.

Their clumsily savage proceedings brought down upon them some ironical lessons of worldly wisdom on the part of the Geneva

<sup>a</sup> The German pamphlet has "butchers, bakers, grocers".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Ph. Becker, op. cit., p. 5.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> This sentence is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the German pamphlet the word "Imperial" has been added.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The German pamphlet has "at Lörrach, a Baden border village situated near Basle".—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> The German has "local magistrate".—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Nos. 9 and 13, January 9 and 13, 1869.—*Ed.*

capitalist organs.<sup>a</sup> Yet, a few months later, the uncouth Basle vestrymen might have returned the compliment with usurious interest to the Geneva men of the world.

In the month of March there broke out in Geneva a buildings' trade strike, and a compositors' strike, both bodies being affiliated to the International. The builders' strike was provoked by the masters setting aside a convention solemnly entered upon with their workmen a year ago. The compositors' strike was but the winding-up of a ten years' quarrel which the men had during all that time in vain tried to settle by five consecutive commissions. As in Basle, the masters transformed at once their private feuds with their men into a state crusade against the International Working Men's Association.<sup>b</sup>

The Geneva State Council dispatched policemen to receive at the railway stations, and sequester from all contact with the strikers, such foreign workmen as the masters might contrive to inveigle from abroad. It allowed the "Jeunesse Dorée", the hopeful loafers of "La Jeune Suisse",<sup>c,96</sup> armed with revolvers, to assault, in the streets and places of public resort, workmen and workwomen. It launched its own police ruffians on the working people on different occasions, and signally on the 24th May, when it enacted at Geneva, on a small scale, the Paris scenes which Raspail has branded as "Les orgies infernales des casse-têtes".<sup>97</sup> When the Geneva workmen passed in public meeting an address to the State Council, calling upon it to inquire into these infernal police orgies,<sup>d</sup> the State Council replied by a sneering rebuke.<sup>e</sup> It evidently wanted, at the behest of its capitalist superiors,<sup>f</sup> to madden the Geneva people into an *émeute*, to stamp that *émeute* out by the armed force, to sweep the International from the Swiss soil, and to subject the workmen to a Decembrist regime. This scheme was baffled by the energetic action and moderating influence of our Geneva Federal Committee.<sup>98</sup> The masters had at last to give way.

<sup>a</sup> The German pamphlet has "the Geneva capitalists".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See *L'Égalité*, Nos. 10, 11 and 13, March 27, April 3 and 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The words "the hopeful loafers of 'La Jeune Suisse'" are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> "Adresse au Conseil d'État de la République de Genève. Genève, le 31 mai 1869", *L'Égalité*, No. 20, June 5, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> E. Morhardt, "Genève, le 2 mai (lisez juin) 1869. Le Chancelier de la République et Canton de Genève", *L'Égalité*, No. 20, June 5, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> The words "at the behest of its capitalist superiors" are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

And now listen to some of the invectives of the Geneva capitalists and their press-gang against the International. In public meeting they passed an address to the State Council, where the following phrase occurs:

“The International Committee at Geneva ruins the Canton of Geneva by decrees sent from London and Paris; it wants here to suppress all industry and all labour.”<sup>a</sup>

One of their journals stated

“That the leaders of the International were secret agents of the Emperor,<sup>b</sup> who, at the opportune moment, were very likely to turn out public accusers against this little Switzerland of ours.”<sup>c</sup>

And this on the part of the men who had just shown themselves so eager to transplant at a moment’s notice the Decembrist regime to the Swiss soil, on the part of financial magnates, the real rulers of Geneva and other Swiss towns, whom all Europe knows to have long since been converted from citizens of the Swiss republic into mere feudatories of the French *Crédit Mobilier*<sup>99</sup> and other international swindling associations.

The massacres by which the Belgian Government did answer in April last to the strikes of the puddlers at Seraing and the coal-miners of Borinage, have been fully exposed in the address of the General Council to the workmen of Europe and the United States.<sup>d</sup> We considered this address the more urgent since, with that constitutional model government, such working men’s massacres are not an accident, but an institution. The horrid military drama was succeeded by a judicial farce. In the proceedings against our Belgian General Committee at Brussels, whose domiciles were brutally broken in by the police, and many of whose members were placed under secret arrest, the judge of instruction finds the letter of a workman, asking for 500 “*Internationales*”, and he at once jumps to the conclusion that 500 fighting-men were to be dispatched to the scene of action. The 500 “*Internationales*” were 500 copies of the *Internationale*, the weekly organ of our Brussels Committee.

A telegram to Paris by a member of the International, ordering a certain quantity of powder, is raked up.<sup>e</sup> After a prolonged research, the dangerous substance is really laid hand on at

<sup>a</sup> *L'Égalité*, No. 11, April 3, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German pamphlet has “Emperor Napoleon”.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *L'Égalité*, No. 13, April 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, pp. 47-52.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The German pamphlet has the verb *stiebert* coined from *Stieber* (sleuth, detective)—an allusion to the Chief of the Prussian police Stieber.—*Ed.*

Brussels. It is powder for killing vermin. Last, not least, the Belgian police flattered itself, in one of its domiciliary visits, to have got at that phantom treasure which haunts the great mind of the continental capitalist, viz.: the International treasure, the main stock of which is safely hoarded at London, but whose offsets travel continually to all the continental seats of the Association. The Belgian official inquirer thought it buried in a certain strong box, hidden in a dark place. He gets at it, opens it forcibly, and there was found—some pieces of coal. Perhaps, if touched by the hand of the police, the pure International gold turns at once into coal.

Of the strikes that, in December, 1868, infested several French cotton districts, the most important was that at Sotteville-lès-Rouen. The manufacturers of the Department de la Somme had not long ago met at Amiens, in order to consult how they might undersell<sup>a</sup> the English manufacturers in the English market itself. Having made sure that, besides protective duties, the comparative lowness of French wages had till now mainly enabled them to defend France from English cottons, they naturally inferred that a still further lowering of French wages would allow them to invade England with French cottons. The French cotton-workers, they did not doubt, would feel proud at the idea of defraying the expenses of a war of conquest which their masters had so patriotically resolved to wage on the other side of the Channel. Soon after it was bruited about that the cotton manufacturers of Rouen and its environs had, in secret conclave, agreed upon the same line of policy. Then an important reduction of wages was suddenly proclaimed at Sotteville-lès-Rouen, and then for the first time the Normand weavers rose against the encroachments of capital. They acted under the stir of the moment. Neither had they before formed a trades union nor provided for any means of resistance. In their distress they appealed to the International committee at Rouen, which found for them some immediate aid from the workmen of Rouen, the neighbouring districts, and Paris. Towards the end of December, 1868, the General Council was applied to by the Rouen Committee, at a moment of utmost distress throughout the English cotton districts, of unparalleled misery in London, and a general depression in all branches of British<sup>b</sup> industry. This state of things has continued in England to this moment. Despite such

---

<sup>a</sup> In the German text this word is given in brackets after the German verb *unterkaufen*.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "British" is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*



highly unfavourable circumstances, the General Council thought that the peculiar character of the Rouen conflict would stir the English workmen to action. This was a great opportunity to show the capitalists that their international industrial warfare, carried on by screwing wages down now in this country, now in that, would be checked at last by the international union of the working classes. To our appeal the English workmen replied at once by a first contribution to Rouen, and the London Trades Council resolved to summon, in unison with the General Council, a metropolitan monster meeting on behalf of their Normand brethren.<sup>100</sup> These proceedings were stopped by the news of the sudden cessation of the Sotteville strike. The miscarriage of that economical revolt was largely compensated for by its moral results. It enlisted the Normand cotton-workers into the revolutionary army of labour, it gave rise to the birth of trades unions at Rouen, Elboeuf, Darnétal, and the environs; and it sealed anew the bond of fraternity between the English and French working classes.

During the winter and spring of 1869 the propaganda of our Association in France was paralysed, consequent upon the violent dissolution of our Paris section in 1868,<sup>101</sup> the police chicaneries in the departments, and the absorbing interest of the French general elections.

The elections once over, numerous strikes exploded in the Loire mining districts, at Lyons, and many other places. The economical facts revealed during these struggles between masters and men, struck the public eye like so many dissolving views of the high-coloured fancy pictures of working-class prosperity under the auspices of the Second Empire. The claims of redress on the part of the workmen were of so moderate a character, and so urgent a nature that, after some show of angry resistance, they had to be conceded, one and all. The only strange feature about those strikes was their sudden explosion after a seeming lull, and the rapid succession in which they followed each other. Still, the reason of all this was simple and palpable. Having, during the elections, successfully tried their hands against their public despot, the workmen were naturally led to try them after the elections against their private despots. In one word, the elections had stirred their animal spirits. The governmental press, of course, paid as it is to misstate and misinterpret unpleasant facts, traced these events to a secret *mot d'ordre* from the London General Council, which, they said, sent their emissaries, from place to place, to teach the otherwise highly satisfied French workmen that it was a bad thing to be overworked, underpaid, and brutally

treated. A French police organ, published at London, the "*International*"—(see its number of August 3)—has condescended to reveal to the world the secret motives of our deleterious activity.

"The strangest feature," it says, "is that the strikes were ordered to break out in such countries where misery is far from making itself felt. These unexpected explosions, occurring so opportunely for certain neighbours of ours, who had first to apprehend war, make many people ask themselves whether these strikes took place on the request of some foreign Machiavelli, who had known how to win the good graces of this all-powerful Association."<sup>a</sup>

At the very moment when this French police print impeached us of embarrassing the French Government by strikes at home, in order to disembarrass Count Bismarck from war abroad, a Prussian paper<sup>b</sup> accused us of embarrassing the Northern German Bund<sup>102</sup> with strikes, in order to crush German industry for the benefit of foreign manufactures.

The relations of the International to the French strikes we shall illustrate by two cases of a typical character. In the one case, the strike of St. Étienne and the following massacre at Ricamarie, the French Government itself will no longer dare to pretend that the International had anything whatever to do with it. In the Lyons case, it was not the International that threw the workmen into strikes, but, on the contrary, it was the strikes that threw the workmen into the International.

The miners of St. Étienne, Rive-de-Giers, and Firminy had calmly, but firmly, requested the managers of the mining companies to reduce the working day, numbering 12 hours hard underground labour, and revise the wages tariff. Failing in their attempt at a conciliatory settlement, they struck on the 11th of June. For them it was of course a vital question to secure the co-operation of the miners that had not yet turned out to combine with them.<sup>c</sup> To prevent this, the managers of the mining companies requested and got from the Prefect of the Loire a forest of bayonets. On the 12th of June, the strikers found the coal pits under strong military guard. To make sure of the zeal of the soldiers thus lent to them by the government, the mining companies paid each soldier a franc daily. The soldiers paid the companies back by catching, on the 16th June,<sup>d</sup> about 60 miners eager to get at a conversation with their brethren in the coal pits. These prisoners were in the afternoon of the same day escorted to

<sup>a</sup> "La Dictature universelle", *L'International*, No. 2345, August 3, 1868.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German pamphlet has "a paper of Rhenish-Prussian manufacturers".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German pamphlet has "the miners who continued to work".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The date is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

St. Étienne by a detachment (150 men), of the fourth regiment of the line. Before these stout warriors set out, an engineer of the Dorian mines distributed them 60 bottles of brandy, telling them at the same time, they ought to have a sharp eye on their prisoners' gang, these miners being savages, barbarians, ticket-of-leave men. What with the brandy, and what with the sermon, a bloody collision was thus prepared for. Followed on their march by a crowd of miners, with their wives and children, surrounded by them on a narrow defile on the heights of the Moncel, Quartier Ricamarie, requested to surrender the prisoners, and, on their refusal, attacked by a volley of stones, the soldiers, without any preliminary warning, fired with their *chassepots*<sup>a</sup> pell-mell into the crowd, killing 15 persons, amongst whom were two women and an infant, and dangerously wounding a considerable number. The tortures of the wounded were horrible. One of the sufferers was a poor girl of 12 years, Jenny Petit, whose name will live immortal in the annals of the working-class martyrology. Struck by two balls from behind, one of which lodged in her leg, while the other passed through her back, broke her arm, and escaped through her right shoulder. "Les chassepots avaient encore fait merveille."<sup>103</sup>

This time, however, the government was not long in finding out that it had committed not only a crime, but a blunder. It was not hailed as the saviour of society by the middle class. The whole municipal council of St. Étienne tendered its resignation in a document, denouncing the scoundrelism of the troops, and insisting upon their removal from the town.<sup>b</sup> The French press rung with cries of horror! Even such conservative prints as the *Moniteur universel* opened subscriptions for the victims.<sup>c</sup> The government *had* to remove the odious regiment from St. Étienne.

Under such difficult circumstances, it was a luminous idea to sacrifice on the altar of public indignation a scapegoat always at hand,<sup>d</sup> the International Working Men's Association. At the judicial trial of the so-called rioters, the act of accusation divided them into 10 categories, very ingeniously shading their respective darkness of guilt. The first class, the most deeply tinged, consisted of workmen<sup>e</sup> more particularly suspected to have obeyed some secret *mot d'ordre* from abroad, given out by the International. The

<sup>a</sup> The words "with their *chassepots*" are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Massacres de Saint-Étienne", *La Liberté*, No. 105, June 27, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Le Moniteur universel*, No. 172, June 21, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The words "always at hand" are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The German pamphlet has "5 workmen".—*Ed.*

evidence was, of course, overwhelming, as the following short extract from a French paper will show:

“The interrogatory of the witnesses did not allow ‘neatly’ to establish the participation of the International Association. The witnesses affirm *only* the presence, at the head of the bands, of some *unknown* people, wearing white frocks and caps. *None of the unknown ones have been arrested, or appear in the dock.* To the question: do you *believe* in the intervention of the International Association? a witness replies: I *believe* it but *without any proofs whatever!*”<sup>a</sup>

Shortly after the Ricamarie massacres, the dance of economical revolts was opened at Lyons by the silk-winders, most of them females. In their distress they appealed to the International,<sup>b</sup> which, mainly by its members in France and Switzerland, helped them to carry the day. Despite all attempts at police intimidation, they publicly proclaimed their adhesion to our Society,<sup>c</sup> and entered it formally by paying the statutory contributions to the General Council. At Lyons, as before at Rouen, the female workers played a noble and prominent part in the movement. Other Lyons trades have since followed in the track of the silk-winders. Some 10,000 new members were thus gained for us in a few weeks amongst that heroic population which more than thirty years ago inscribed upon its banner the watchword of the modern Proletariat: “Vivre en travaillant ou mourir en combattant!”<sup>d</sup> 104

Meanwhile the French Government continues its petty tribulations against the International. At Marseilles our members were forbidden meeting for the election of a delegate to Basle. The same paltry trick was played in other towns. But the workmen on the Continent, as elsewhere, begin at last to understand that the surest way to get one’s natural rights is to exercise them at one’s personal risk.

The Austrian workmen, and especially those of Vienna, although entering their class<sup>e</sup> movement only after the events of 1866,<sup>105</sup> have at once occupied a vantage-ground. They marched at once under the banners of socialism and the International,

<sup>a</sup> “L’Internationalomanie”, *L’Internationale*, No. 33, August 29, 1869 (italics by Marx in the quotation).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A. Richard, “Aux membres du Conseil général des sections belges. 6 juillet 1869”, *L’Internationale*, No. 26, July 11, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> “Déclaration au Conseil général de Londres. Lyon, 6 juillet 1869”, *L’Internationale*, No. 26, July 11, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> “Live working or die fighting.” In the German pamphlet the French sentence is followed by the German translation of it in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The word “class” is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

which, by their delegates at the recent Eisenach Congress,<sup>106</sup> they have now joined *en masse*.

If anywhere, the liberal middle class has exhibited in Austria its selfish instincts, its mental inferiority, and its petty spite against the working class. Their ministry, seeing the empire distracted and threatened by an internecine struggle of races and nationalities, pounces upon the workmen who alone proclaim the fraternity of all races and nationalities. The middle class itself, which has won its new position not by any heroism of its own, but only by the signal disaster of the Austrian army,<sup>107</sup> hardly able as it is, and knows itself to be, to defend its new conquests from the attacks of the dynasty, the aristocracy, and the clerical party, nevertheless wastes its best energies in the mean attempt to debar the working class from the rights of combination, public meeting, free press and free thought. In Austria, as in all other states of continental Europe, the International has supplanted the *ci-devant spectre rouge*.<sup>a</sup> When, on the 13th of July, a workmen's massacre on a small scale was enacted at Brünn, the cottonopolis of Moravia, the event was traced to the secret instigations of the International, whose agents, however, were unfortunately invested with the rare gift of rendering themselves invisible.<sup>b</sup> When some leaders of the Vienna work-people figured before the judicial bench, the public accuser stigmatised them as tools of the foreigner. Only, to show how conscientiously he had studied the matter, he committed the little error of confounding the middle-class League of Peace and Liberty<sup>108</sup> with the working men's International Association.<sup>109</sup>

If the workmen's movement was thus harassed in Cis-Leithanian Austria,<sup>110</sup> it has been recklessly prosecuted in Hungary. On this point the most reliable reports from Pest and Pressburg have reached the General Council. One example of the treatment of the Hungarian workmen by the public authorities may suffice. Herr von Wenckheim, the Hungarian Home Minister, was just staying at Vienna on public business.<sup>c</sup> Having for months been interdicted from public meetings and even from entertainments destined for the collection of the funds of a sick club, the Pressburg workmen sent at last delegates to Vienna,<sup>d</sup> then and there to lay their

<sup>a</sup> Old red spectre (see A. Romieu, *Le spectre rouge de 1852*, Bruxelles, 1851).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The German pamphlet has: "whose agents were in possession of magic caps".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The German pamphlet has "with the Hungarian delegation".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> In the German pamphlet the following words have been added: "among whom was the well-known agitator Niemtzik".—*Ed.*

grievances before the illustrious Herr von Wenckheim.<sup>a</sup> Puffing and blowing his cigar, the illustrious one received them with the bullying apostrophe,<sup>b</sup> “Are you workmen? Do you work hard?”<sup>c</sup> For nothing else you have to care. You do not want public clubs; and if you dabble in politics, we shall know what measures to take against you. I shall do nothing for you. Let the workmen grumble to their heart’s content!” To the question of the workmen, whether the good pleasure of the police was still to rule uppermost, the liberal<sup>d</sup> minister replied: “Yes, under my responsibility.” After a somewhat prolonged but useless explanation the workmen left the minister telling him, “Since state matters influence the workmen’s condition, the workmen must occupy themselves with politics, and they will certainly do so.”<sup>e</sup>

In Prussia and the rest of Germany, the past year was distinguished by the formation of trades unions all over the country. At the recent Eisenach Congress the delegates of 150,000<sup>f</sup> German workmen, from Germany proper, Austria, and Switzerland, have organised a new democratic social party, with a programme literally embodying the leading principles of our Statutes.<sup>g</sup> Debarred by law from forming sections of our Association, they have, nevertheless, formally entered it by resolving<sup>h</sup> to take individual cards of membership from the General Council. At its congress at Barmen,<sup>i</sup> the Allgemeine Deutsche Arbeiterverein has also reaffirmed its adhesion to the principles of our Association, but simultaneously declared the Prussian law forbade them joining us.<sup>i</sup>

New branches of our Association have sprung up at Naples, in Spain, and in Holland.

<sup>a</sup> The German pamphlet has “before the Home Minister”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Instead of “Puffing and blowing his cigar ... with the bullying apostrophe” the German pamphlet has: “It was hard to receive audience from this high gentleman, and when the ministerial room at last opened, the workers were met by the minister in a manner which was quite disrespectful.”—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German pamphlet the following words have been added: “asked the minister puffing his cigar and twisting it in his mouth”.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The word “liberal” is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See *Volksstimme*, No. 9, August 8, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> The German pamphlet has “more than 150,000”.—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> “Programm und Statuten der social-demokratischen Arbeiter-Partei”, *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 33, August 14, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>h</sup> The German pamphlet has “they resolved”.—*Ed.*

<sup>i</sup> This sentence is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

At Barcelona a Spanish, and at Amsterdam a Dutch organ of our Association is now being issued.<sup>a</sup>

The laurels plucked by the Belgian Government on the glorious battlefields of Seraing and Frameries seem really to have roused the angry jealousy of the Great Powers. No wonder, then, that *England* also had this year to boast a workman's massacre of its own. The Welsh coal-miners, at Leeswood Great Pit, near Mold, in Denbighshire, had received sudden notice of a reduction of wages by the manager of those works, whom, long since, they had reason to consider a most incorrigible petty oppressor. Consequently, they collected aid from the neighbouring collieries, and, besides assaulting him, attacked his house, and carried all his furniture to the railway station, these wretched men fancying in their childish ignorance thus to get rid of him for good and all. Proceedings were of course taken against the rioters; but one of them was rescued by a mob of 1,000 men, and conveyed out of the town.<sup>b</sup> On the 28th May, two of the ringleaders were to be taken before the magistrates of Mold by policemen under the escort of a detachment of the 4th Regiment of the line, "The King's Own". A crowd of miners, trying to rescue the prisoners, and, on the resistance of the police and the soldiers, showering stones at them, the soldiers—without any previous warning—returned the shower of stones by a shower of bullets from their breechloaders (Snider fusils).<sup>c</sup> Five persons, two of them females,<sup>d</sup> were killed, and a great many wounded. So far there is much analogy between the Mold and the Ricamarie massacres, but here it ceases. In France, the soldiers were only responsible to their commander. In England, they had to pass through a coroner's jury inquest; but this coroner was a deaf and daft of fool, who had to receive the witnesses' evidence through an ear trumpet, and the Welsh jury, who backed him, were a narrowly prejudiced class jury. They declared the massacre "Justifiable Homicide".<sup>e</sup>

In France, the rioters were sentenced from 3 to 18 months' imprisonment, and soon after, amnestied. In England, they were condemned to 10 years' penal servitude! In France, the whole press resounded with cries of indignation against the troops. In England, the press was all smiles for the soldiers, and all frowns for their victims! Still the English workmen have gained much by

<sup>a</sup> *La Federacion and De Werkman*.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This sentence is omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The words in brackets are omitted in the German pamphlet.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The German pamphlet has "and a child".—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See "Riot at Mold", *The Bee-Hive*, No. 400, June 12, 1869.—*Ed.*

losing a great and dangerous illusion. Till now they fancied to have their lives protected by the formality of the Riot Act,<sup>112</sup> and the subordination of the military to the civil authorities. They know now, from the official declaration of Mr. Bruce, the liberal Home Minister, in the House of Commons—firstly, that without going through the premonitory process of reading the Riot Act, any country magistrate, some fox-hunter or parson, has the right to order the troops to fire on what he may please to consider a riotous mob; and, secondly, that the soldier may give fire on his own hook, on the plea of self-defence.<sup>a</sup> The liberal Minister forgot to add that, under these circumstances, every man ought to be armed, at public expense, with a breachloader, in self-defence against the soldier.

The following resolution was passed at the recent General Congress of the English Trades Unions at Birmingham:

“That as local organisations of labour have almost disappeared before organisations of a national character, so we believe the extension of the principle of free trade, which induces between nations such a competition that the interest of the workman is liable to be lost sight of and sacrificed in the fierce international race between capitalists, demands that such organisations should be still further extended and made international. And as the International Working Men’s Association endeavours to consolidate and extend the interests of the toiling masses, which are everywhere identical, this Congress heartily recommends that Association to the support of the working men of the United Kingdom, especially of all organised bodies, and strongly urges them to become affiliated to that body, believing that the realisation of its principles would also conclude to lasting peace between the nations of the earth.”<sup>113</sup>

During last May, a war between the United States and England seemed imminent. Your General Council, therefore, sent an address to Mr. Sylvis, the President of the American National Labour Union,<sup>114</sup> calling on the United States’ working class to command peace where their would-be masters shouted war.<sup>b</sup>

The sudden death of Mr. Sylvis, that valiant champion of our cause, will justify us in concluding this report, as an homage to his memory, by his reply to our letter<sup>c</sup>:

“Your favour of the 12th instant, with address enclosed, reached me yesterday. I am very happy to receive such kindly words from our fellow-working men across the water: our cause is a common one. It is war between poverty and wealth: labour occupies the same low condition, and capital is the same tyrant in all parts

<sup>a</sup> Marx refers to Bruce’s speech in the House of Commons on June 7, 1869, published in *The Times*, No. 26442, June 8, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 53-55.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> In the German pamphlet the reply is datelined: “Philadelphia, May 26, 1869”.—*Ed.*



of the world. Therefore I say our cause is a common one. I, in behalf of the working people of the United States, extend to you, and through you to those you represent, and to all the downtrodden and oppressed sons and daughters of toil in Europe, the right hand of fellowship. Go ahead in the good work you have undertaken, until the most glorious success crowns your efforts. That is our determination. Our late war resulted in the building up of the most infamous monied aristocracy on the face of the earth. This monied power is fast eating up the substance of the people. We have made war upon it, and we mean to win. If we can, we will win through the ballot-box: if not, then we will resort to sterner means. A little blood-letting is sometimes necessary in desperate cases."<sup>a</sup>

By order of the Council,

*R. Applegarth*, Chairman

*Cowell Stepney*, Treasurer

*J. George Eccarius*, General Secretary<sup>b</sup>

First published in English in the pamphlet *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association, held at Basle, in Switzerland*, London [1869], and in German as a separate pamphlet in Basle in September 1869

Reproduced from the text in the *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association*, checked with the German pamphlet

---

<sup>a</sup> Sylvis' reply of May 26, 1869 to the General Council's letter was published in *The Bee-Hive*, No. 400, June 12, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> At the end of the report the German pamphlet has: "London, September 1, 1869. Office: 256, High Holborn, W.C."—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE POLICY  
OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT TOWARDS  
THE IRISH PRISONERS]<sup>115</sup>

Resolved,

that in his reply to the Irish demands for the release of the imprisoned Irish patriots—a reply contained in his letter to Mr. O'Shea etc., etc.<sup>a</sup>—Mr. Gladstone deliberately insults Irish Nation;

that he clogs political amnesty with conditions alike degrading to the victims of misgovernment and the people they belong to;

that having, in the teeth of his responsible position, publicly and enthusiastically cheered on the American slave-holders' Rebellion,<sup>116</sup> he now steps in to preach to the Irish people the doctrine of passive obedience;

that his whole proceedings with reference to the Irish Amnesty question are the true and genuine offspring of that "*policy of conquest*" by the fiery denunciation of which Mr. Gladstone ousted his Tory rivals from office<sup>117</sup>;

that the *General Council of the "International Working Men's Association"* express their admiration of the spirited, firm and high-souled manner in which the Irish people carry on their Amnesty movement;

that these resolutions be communicated to all the branches of, and working men's bodies connected with, the "*International Working Men's Association*" in Europe and America.

Introduced by Marx on November 16,  
1869

Reproduced from the manuscript,  
checked with the Minute Book of  
the General Council

Adopted by the General Council on  
November 30, 1869

First published in *Reynolds's Newspaper*,  
No. 1006, November 21, 1869

<sup>a</sup> In the Minute Book of the General Council this text in parentheses reads as follows: "in a reply contained in his letter to Mr. O'Shea d. d. Oct. 18, 1869, and to Mr. Isaac Butt d.d. Oct. 23, 1869" (see W. E. Gladstone, "The Government and the Fenians. Hawarden, Chester, Oct. 18" and "Hawarden, Chester, Oct. 23", *The Times*, Nos. 26579 and 26583, October 23 and 27, 1869).—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE FEDERAL COUNCIL  
OF ROMANCE SWITZERLAND<sup>118</sup>

At its extraordinary meeting on January 1, 1870, the *General Council* resolved:

1) We read in the *Égalité* of December 11, 1869:

"It is *certain* that it" (the General Council) "is neglecting extremely important matters.... We remind it of them" (the General Council's *obligations*) "with Article 1 of the Regulations, etc.: 'The General Council is *commissioned* to carry the resolutions of the Congress into effect'.... *We could put enough questions to the General Council for its replies* to make up quite a long report. *They will come later....* Meanwhile... etc."<sup>a</sup>

The General Council does not know of any article, either in the Rules or in the Regulations, which *would oblige it* to enter into correspondence or into polemic with the *Égalité* or to provide "*replies*" to "*questions*" from newspapers. The *Federal Council* of Romance Switzerland alone represents the branches of Romance Switzerland vis-à-vis the General Council. When the Romance Federal Council addresses requests or reprimands to us through the only legitimate channel, that is to say through its *secretary*, the General Council will always be ready to reply. But the *Romance Federal Council* has no right either to *abdicate* its functions in favour of the *Égalité* and the *Progrès*, or to let these newspapers *usurp* its functions. Generally speaking, the General Council's correspondence with the national and local committees cannot be published without greatly prejudicing the Association's general interests. Consequently, if other organs of the International were to follow the example of the *Progrès* and the *Égalité*, the General Council would be faced with the alternative of either discrediting

---

<sup>a</sup> See "Réflexions", *L'Égalité*, No. 47, December 11, 1869.—Ed.

itself publicly by its silence or violating its obligations by replying publicly.<sup>a</sup>

The *Égalité* joins the *Progrès* (a paper which is not sent to the General Council) in inviting *Le Travail* (a Paris paper which has not hitherto declared itself an organ of the *International*, and which is also not sent to the General Council) to demand an explanation from the General Council.<sup>b</sup> That is almost a League of Public Welfare.<sup>119</sup>

2) Now, assuming that the questions put by the *Égalité* come from the Romance Federal Council, we shall answer them on condition that such questions do not reach us in such a manner in future.

3) *Question of a Bulletin.* In the resolutions of the Geneva<sup>c</sup> Congress, which are inserted in the regulations, it is laid down that the national committees shall send the General Council *documents* dealing with the proletarian movement<sup>d</sup> and that the General Council shall thereupon publish a bulletin in the *different languages* as often as *its means permit* ("As often as *its means permit*, the General Council shall publish a report, etc.")<sup>e</sup>.

The General Council's obligation was thus made dependent on *conditions* that have never been fulfilled. Even the statistical inquiry provided for by the Rules, decided by consecutive General Congresses, and demanded yearly by the General Council, has never been made. No document has been presented to the General Council. As far as the *means* are concerned, the General Council would have long since ceased to exist had it not been for

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript, after the word "publicly", Marx had crossed out the words: "The *Progrès* (which is not sent to the General Council as it *should be* in accordance with resolutions thrice adopted by General Congresses) has taken the initiative in usurping the Federal Council's functions."—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The manuscript has the following passage crossed out: "The same people who last year, immediately after their tardy entry into our Association, formed the dangerous project of founding another international association within the International Working Men's Association, under their personal control and based in Geneva, have returned to their project and still believe in their special mission to usurp the supreme authority of the International Association. The General Council reminds the Romance Federal Council that it is *responsible* for the question of the newspapers *L'Égalité* and *Le Progrès*."—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866*, Geneva, 1866, pp. 13 and 26.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association. Founded September 28th, 1864*, London [1867], p. 6. The sentence in brackets is given by Marx in English.—*Ed.*

local contributions from England and the personal sacrifices of its members.

Thus, the Regulations passed at the Geneva<sup>a</sup> Congress have remained a dead letter.<sup>b</sup>

As regards the Basle Congress, it did not discuss the *fulfilment* of these existing Regulations. It discussed the possibility of issuing a bulletin in good time and *it did not pass any resolution* (see the *German report* published in Basle under the eyes of the Congress<sup>c</sup>).

For the rest, the General Council believes that the purpose of the bulletin is at the moment perfectly fulfilled by the different organs of the *International* published in the different languages and exchanged among them. It would be absurd to do by costly bulletins what is being done already without any expense. On the other hand, a bulletin which would print what is not contained in the organs of the *International* would only help our enemies to see behind the scenes.

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

Long before the foundation of the *Égalité*, this proposition was made periodically inside the General Council by one or two of its English members.<sup>120</sup> It was always rejected almost unanimously.

Although revolutionary *initiative* will probably come from France, England alone can serve as the *lever* for a serious *economic* Revolution. It is the only country where there are no more peasants and where landed property is concentrated in a few hands. It is the only country where the *capitalist form*, that is to say combined labour on a large scale under capitalist masters, embraces virtually the whole of production. It is the only country *where the great majority of the population consists of WAGES-LABOURERS*. It is the only country where the class struggle and the organisation of the working class by the *TRADES UNIONS* have *acquired* a certain degree of maturity and universality. It is the only country where, because of its domination on the world market, every revolution in economic matters must immediately affect the whole world. If landlordism and capitalism are classical features in England, on the other hand, the *material conditions* for their *destruction* are the most mature here. The General Council now being in the *happy position of having its hand*

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> In the manuscript, after the words "dead letter", the following is crossed out: "They were treated as such by the Basle Congress."—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Verhandlungen des IV. Congresses des internationalen Arbeiterbundes in Basel*, Nos. 1-7, 7-14, September 1869, p. 90.—*Ed.*

directly on this great lever of the proletarian revolution, what folly, we might say even what a crime, to let this lever fall into purely English hands!

The English have all the *material* necessary for the social revolution. What they lack is the *spirit of generalisation and revolutionary ardour*. It is only the General Council that can provide them with this, that can thus accelerate the truly revolutionary movement in this country, and consequently *everywhere*. The great results we have already achieved in this respect are attested to by the most intelligent and influential of the newspapers of the ruling classes, as e.g. *The Pall Mall Gazette*, *Saturday Review*, *The Spectator* and *The Fortnightly Review*, to say nothing of the so-called radicals in the *COMMONS* and the *LORDS* who, a little while ago, still exerted a great influence on the leaders of the English workers. They accuse us publicly of having poisoned and almost extinguished the *English spirit* of the working class and of having pushed it into revolutionary socialism.

The only way to bring about this change is to act like the *General Council* of the *International Association*. As the General Council we can initiate measures (e.g., the founding of the *Land and Labour League*<sup>121</sup>) which later, in the process of their execution, will appear to the public as spontaneous movements of the English working class.

If a *Federal Council* were formed apart from the *General Council*, what would be the immediate results?

Placed between the *General Council* and the *General Council of Trades Unions*,<sup>122</sup> the *Federal Council* would have no authority whatever. On the other hand, the *General Council of the International* would lose control of the *great lever*. If we had preferred the showman's chatter to serious and unostentatious work, we would perhaps have committed the mistake of replying publicly the *Égalité's* question as to why the *General Council* permits "such a burdensome combination of functions".

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

5) *Question of the General Council Resolution on the Irish Amnesty.*<sup>a</sup>

If England is the *BULWARK* of landlordism and European capitalism, the only point where official England can be struck a great blow is *Ireland*.

In the first place, Ireland is the *BULWARK* of English landlordism. If it fell in Ireland, it would fall in England. In Ireland this is a hundred

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 83.—*Ed.*

times easier because *the economic struggle there is concentrated exclusively on landed property*, because this struggle is at the same time national, and because the people there are more revolutionary and more exasperated than in England. Landlordism in Ireland is maintained solely by the *English army*. The moment the *forced union* between the two countries<sup>123</sup> ends, a social revolution will immediately break out in Ireland, though in outmoded forms. English landlordism would not only lose a great source of its wealth, but also its *greatest moral force*, i.e., that of *representing the domination of England over Ireland*. On the other hand, by maintaining the power of its landlords in Ireland, the English proletariat makes them invulnerable in England itself.

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

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

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

Lastly, England today is seeing a repetition of what happened

on a monstrous scale in ancient Rome. Any people that oppresses another people forges its own chains.

Thus, the position of the International Association with regard to the Irish question is very clear. Its first concern is to advance the social revolution in England. To this end a great blow must be struck in Ireland.<sup>a</sup>

The General Council's resolutions on the Irish amnesty<sup>b</sup> serve only as an introduction to other resolutions<sup>124</sup> which will affirm that, quite apart from international justice, it is a *precondition to the emancipation of the English working class* to transform the present *forced union* (i.e., the enslavement of Ireland) into *equal and free confederation* if possible, into *complete separation* if need be.<sup>c</sup>

For the rest, the naïve doctrines of the *Égalité* and the *Progrès* about the CONNEXION, or rather, the NON-CONNEXION, between the social movement and the political movement have never, as far as we know, been recognised by any of our International congresses. They run counter to our Rules. The Rules say<sup>125</sup>:

"That the *economical emancipation* of the working classes is therefore the great end to which every *political movement* ought to be subordinate *as a means*."<sup>d</sup>

The words "*as a means*"<sup>e</sup> were omitted in the French translation made in 1864 by the Paris Committee.<sup>f</sup> When questioned by the General Council, the Paris Committee excused itself by the difficulties of its political situation.<sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup> After the words "in Ireland" the manuscript has the following words crossed out: "and the Irish economic-national struggle must be exploited in all ways possible".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 3-4 and 83.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> After "if need be" the following words are crossed out in the manuscript: "The difficulties and even personal dangers which face General Council members who take such a stand may be judged by the fact that *The Bee-Hive* in its reporting of our meetings not only omitted *our resolutions* but did not even mention the fact that the General Council is concerned with the Irish question. The General Council was thus obliged to print its resolutions and send them to all TRADES UNIONS separately. The oracles of *L'Égalité* are now at liberty to say that it is a '*local political movement*', that, in their opinion, a *Federal Council* should deal with such bagatelle, and that there is no need to '*better* the existing governments'. *L'Égalité* might just as well have said that we intend to '*better* the Belgian Government' by denouncing its massacres."—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Here and below quotations from the Provisional Rules of the Association are given in English in the manuscript (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 14).—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Marx uses the English phrase and gives the French equivalent "*comme moyen*" in parentheses.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> *Congrès ouvrier. Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Règlement Provisoire* [Paris, 1864], p. 1.—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> The next five paragraphs were added by Marx on a separate sheet.—*Ed.*



There are other mutilations of the authentic text. Thus the first clause of the preamble to the Rules reads: "The struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means ... a struggle ... for equal rights and duties, and the *abolition of all class rule*."<sup>a</sup>

The Paris translation has "equal rights and duties", i.e., it reproduces a general phrase which may be found virtually in all *democratic manifestoes* of the last hundred years and which means different things in the mouth of different classes, but leaves out the concrete demand: "*the abolition of all class rule*."<sup>b</sup>

Further, in the second clause of the preamble to the Rules we read: "That the economical subjection of the *man of labour* to the *monopoliser of the means of labour*, that is, *the sources of life*, etc."

The Paris translation substitutes the word "*capital*" for "*the means of labour, that is, the sources of life*", an expression which includes the land as well as the other means of labour.

The original authentic text was, however, restored in the French translation published in pamphlet form in Brussels by the *Rive Gauche* (1866).<sup>126</sup>

#### 6) *Liebkecht-Schweitzer Question*.

The *Égalité* writes:

"Both these groups belong to the *International*."

That is incorrect. The Eisenachers' group (which the *Progrès* and the *Égalité* would like to turn into Citizen Liebkecht's group) belongs to the *International*. *Schweitzer's group does not belong to it*.<sup>c</sup>

Schweitzer himself explained at length in his newspaper (*Social-Demokrat*) why the *Lassallean organisation* could not join the *International* without destroying itself.<sup>d</sup> Without realising it, he was speaking the truth. His artificial *sectarian organisation* is opposed to the *historical and spontaneous organisation* of the working class.

The *Progrès* and the *Égalité* have summoned the General Council to state publicly its "*opinion*" on the personal differences between Liebkecht and Schweitzer. Since Citizen *Johann Philipp Becker* (who is *slandered* as much as Liebkecht in Schweitzer's paper<sup>e</sup>) is a member of the *Égalité's editorial board*, it seems most strange that its editors are not better informed about the facts. They should have known that Liebkecht, in the *Demokratisches*

<sup>a</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, p. 14.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx uses the English phrase and gives the French equivalent in brackets. "l'abolition des classes".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The rest of the text was inserted by Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Marx is referring to Schweitzer's leading article in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 82, July 16, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 24, February 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

*Wochenblatt*,<sup>a</sup> publicly invited Schweitzer to accept the General Council as *arbiter of their differences*,<sup>b</sup> and that Schweitzer no less publicly refused to acknowledge the authority of the General Council.<sup>c</sup>

For its part the General Council has employed all possible means to put an end to this scandal.<sup>d</sup> It instructed its Secretary for Germany<sup>e</sup> to correspond with Schweitzer; this has been done for two years, but all attempts by the Council have broken down in the face of Schweitzer's firm resolution to preserve at all cost his autocratic power together with the sectarian organisation. It is up to the General Council to determine the favourable moment when its public intervention in this quarrel will be more useful than damaging.

7) Since the *Égalité's* accusations are public and could be considered as emanating from the Romance Committee of Geneva, the General Council is to communicate this reply to all committees corresponding with it.

*By order of the General Council*

Written on about January 1, 1870

Approved by the General Council on January 1, 1870

Published in part in the pamphlet *Les prétendues scissions dans l'Internationale*, Genève, 1872

Printed according to the manuscript copy made by Marx's wife and checked by the author

Translated from the French

<sup>a</sup> A mistake in the original: *Volksstaat* instead of *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> W. Liebknecht, "Erklärung. Leipzig, 18. Februar 1869", *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 8, February 20, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 24, February 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The copy of the manuscript in Jung's handwriting further has: "which casts aspersions on the proletarian party in Germany".—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Karl Marx.—*Ed.*

# L'INTERNATIONALE

ORGANE DES SECTIONS BELGES

DE L'ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DES TRAVAILLEURS.

PARAISSANT LE SAMEDI.

Karl Marx

OBITUARY<sup>127</sup>

Citizen Robert Shaw, Correspondent of the London General Council for North America, and one of the founders of the International, died this week of pulmonary tuberculosis.

He was one of the most active members of the Council. A pure heart, iron character, passionate temperament, truly revolutionary intelligence, quite above any petty ambition or personal interest. A poor worker himself, he could always find a worker poorer than himself to help. As meek as a child in personal affairs, he indignantly rejected all manner of compromise in his public life. It is principally due to his constant efforts that the TRADES UNIONS have rallied around us. But this same work made him plenty of implacable foes. The English TRADES UNIONS, all of local origin, all originally founded with the exclusive purpose of maintaining wages, etc., were all more or less afflicted by the narrowness that characterised the medieval guilds. There was a little conservative party that wanted at all cost to preserve the basic framework of unionism. Since the foundation of the International, Shaw made it his life's aim to break these voluntary chains and transform the unions into organised centres of the proletarian revolution. Success almost always crowned his efforts, but ever since that moment his life became a terrible battle in which his feeble health had to give way. He was already dying when he left for the Brussels Congress (September 1868). After his return, his good bourgeois masters banned him from all their works. He leaves a wife and daughter in poverty, but the English workers will not leave them in the lurch.

Written after January 4, 1870

First published in *L'Internationale*,  
No. 53, January 16, 1870

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Translated from the French

## Frederick Engels

### PREFACE [TO THE SECOND EDITION OF *THE PEASANT WAR IN GERMANY*]<sup>128</sup>

The following work was written in London in the summer of 1850, the recent counter-revolution still fresh in mind; it appeared in the 5th and 6th issues of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue*, edited by Karl Marx, Hamburg, 1850. My political friends in Germany desire it to be reprinted, and I accede to their desire, because, to my regret, the work is still timely today.

It makes no claim to providing material derived from independent research. On the contrary, all the material on the peasant risings and on Thomas Münzer is taken from Zimmermann.<sup>a</sup> His book, despite gaps here and there, is still the best compilation of factual data. Moreover, old Zimmermann enjoyed his subject. The same revolutionary instinct, which prompted him throughout the book to champion the oppressed class, made him later one of the best of the extreme Left<sup>129</sup> in Frankfurt.<sup>b</sup>

If, nevertheless, Zimmermann's presentation lacks inner cohesion; if it does not succeed in showing the political and religious controversies of the times as a reflection of the contemporary class struggles; if it sees in these class struggles only oppressors and oppressed, evil folk and good folk, and the ultimate victory of the evil ones; if its exposition of the social conditions which determined both the outbreak and the outcome of the struggle is extremely defective, it was the fault of the time in which the book

---

<sup>a</sup> W. Zimmermann, *Allgemeine Geschichte des grossen Bauernkrieges*, Th. 1-3, Stuttgart, 1841-1843.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The third edition (1875) further has: "It is true that since then he is said to have aged somewhat."—*Ed.*

came into existence. On the contrary, for its time, it is written quite realistically and is a laudable exception among the German idealist works on history.

My presentation, while sketching the historical course of the struggle only in its bare outlines, attempted to explain the origin of the Peasant War, the position of the various parties that played a part in it, the political and religious theories by which those parties sought to clarify their position in their own minds, and finally the result of the struggle itself as following logically from the historically established social conditions of life of these classes; that is to say, it attempted to demonstrate the political structure of Germany at that time, the revolts against it, and the contemporary political and religious theories not as causes but as results of the stage of development of agriculture, industry, roads and waterways, commerce in commodities and money then obtaining in Germany. This, the only materialist conception of history, originates not with myself but with Marx, and can also be found in his works on the French Revolution of 1848-49, in the same *Revue*, and in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.<sup>130</sup>

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

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

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

As a result of the war of 1866 Austria fell into the lap of the bourgeoisie as a gift. But it does not know how to rule, it is

---

<sup>a</sup> F. Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany* (present edition, Vol. 10, p. 482).— Ed.

powerless and incapable of anything. It can do only one thing: savagely attack the workers as soon as they begin to stir. It still remains at the helm solely because the *Hungarians* need it.

And in Prussia? True, the national debt has increased by leaps and bounds, the deficit has become a permanent feature, state expenditure grows from year to year, the bourgeoisie have a majority in the Chamber and without them taxes cannot be increased nor loans floated. But where is their power over the state? Only a few months ago, when there was again a deficit, the bourgeoisie occupied a most favourable position. By holding out only just *a little*, they could have forced far-reaching concessions. What do they do? They regard it as a sufficient concession that the government *allows them* to lay at its feet close on 9 millions, not just *one* year, oh no, but *every year*, and for all time to come.<sup>131</sup>

I do not want to blame the poor National-Liberals<sup>132</sup> in the Chamber more than they deserve. I know they have been left in the lurch by those who stand behind them, by the mass of the bourgeoisie. This mass does not *want* to rule. It still has 1848 in its bones.

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

In other respects the above statement has been fully confirmed. Beginning with 1850, the more and more definite recession into the background of the small states, which serve now only as levers for Prussian or Austrian intrigues; the increasingly violent struggle between Austria and Prussia for supremacy; finally, the forcible settlement of 1866,<sup>133</sup> under which Austria retains its own provinces, while Prussia subjugates, directly or indirectly, the whole of the North, and the three states of the Southwest<sup>a</sup> are left out in the cold for the time being.

In all this grand performance<sup>134</sup> only the following is of importance for the German working class:

First, that through universal suffrage the workers have got the power of being directly represented in the legislative assembly.

Secondly, that Prussia has set a good example by swallowing three other crowns held by the grace of God.<sup>135</sup> Even the National-Liberals do not believe that *after* this operation it still possesses the same immaculate crown, held by the grace of God, which it formerly ascribed to itself.

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

<sup>a</sup> Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg.—*Ed.*

And fourthly, that the German-Austrians will now at last have to make up their minds as to which they want to be, Germans or Austrians; whom they prefer to belong to—Germany or their extra-German trans-Leithan appendages.<sup>136</sup> It has been obvious for a long time that they have to give up one or the other, but this has been continually glossed over by the petty-bourgeois democrats.

As regards the other important issues relative to 1866, which since then have been thrashed out *ad nauseam* between the National-Liberals on the one hand, and the People's Party<sup>137</sup> on the other, the history of the next few years should prove that these two standpoints are so bitterly hostile to one another solely because they are the opposite poles of one and the same narrow-mindedness.

The year 1866 has changed almost nothing in the social relations of Germany. The few bourgeois reforms—uniform weights and measures, freedom of movement, freedom of occupation, etc., all within limits acceptable to the bureaucracy—do not even come up to what the bourgeoisie of other West European countries have enjoyed for a long time, and leave the main abuse, the bureaucratic license system, untouched.<sup>138</sup> For the proletariat all laws concerning freedom of movement, the right of naturalisation, the abolition of passports, etc., are anyhow made quite illusory by the common police practices.

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

It is the misfortune of the German bourgeoisie to arrive too late, as is the favourite German manner. The period of its florescence is occurring at a time when the bourgeoisie of the other West

European countries is already politically in decline. In England, the bourgeoisie could get its real representative, Bright, into the government only by an extension of the franchise, whose consequences are bound to put an end to all bourgeois rule. In France, where the bourgeoisie as such, as a class in its entirety, held power for only two years, 1849 and 1850, under the republic, it was able to continue its social existence only by abdicating its political power to Louis Bonaparte and the army. And in view of the enormously increased interaction of the three most advanced European countries, it is today no longer possible for the bourgeoisie to settle down to comfortable political rule in Germany after this rule has had its day in England and France.

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

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

These allies are all reactionary by nature. There is the monarchy with its army and its bureaucracy; there is the big feudal nobility; there are the small country squires, and there are even the priests. With all of these the bourgeoisie made pacts and bargains, if only to save its dear skin, until in the end it had nothing left to barter.

---

<sup>a</sup> F. Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany* (present edition, Vol. 10, p. 482).—*Ed.*



And the more the proletariat developed, the more it became aware of itself as a class and acted as a class, the more faint-hearted did the bourgeois become. When the astonishingly bad strategy of the Prussians triumphed over the astonishingly worse strategy of the Austrians at Sadowa, it was difficult to say who heaved a deeper sigh of relief—the Prussian bourgeois, who was also defeated at Sadowa, or the Austrian.

In 1870 our big bourgeois are acting exactly the same way as the middle burghers acted in 1525. As to the petty bourgeois, artisans and shopkeepers, they will always be the same. They hope to swindle their way up into the big bourgeoisie; they are afraid of being pushed down into the proletariat. Hovering between fear and hope, they will save their precious skins during the struggle and join the victor when the struggle is over. Such is their nature.

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

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

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

The *lumpenproletariat*, this scum of depraved elements from all classes, with headquarters in the big cities, is the worst of all the possible allies. This rabble is absolutely venal and absolutely brazen. If the French workers, in every revolution, inscribed on the houses: *Mort aux voleurs!* Death to thieves! and even shot some, they did so not out of reverence for property, but because they rightly considered it necessary above all to keep that gang at bay. Every leader of the workers who uses these scoundrels as

guards or relies on them for support proves himself by this action alone a traitor to the movement.

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

Or they are *tenant farmers*. In this case the situation is for the most part the same as in Ireland. Rents are pushed so high that in times of average crops the peasant and his family can barely make ends meet; when the crops are bad he is on the verge of starvation, is unable to pay his rent and is consequently entirely at the mercy of the landowner. The bourgeoisie never does anything for these people, unless it is compelled to. From whom then should they expect salvation if not from the workers?

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

Wherever medium-sized and large estates prevail, *farm labourers* form the most numerous class in the countryside. This is the case throughout the North and East of Germany and it is *there* that the industrial workers of the towns find their *most numerous and most natural allies*. In the same way as the capitalist confronts the industrial worker, the landowner or large tenant confronts the farm labourer. The same measures that help the one must also help the other. The industrial workers can free themselves only by transforming the capital of the bourgeois, that is, the raw materials, machines and tools, and the means of subsistence they need to work in production, into the property of society, that is, into their own property, used by them in common. Similarly, the farm labourers can be rescued from their hideous misery only

when, primarily, their chief object of labour, the land itself, is withdrawn from the private ownership of the big peasants and the still bigger feudal lords, transformed into public property and cultivated by cooperative associations of agricultural workers on their common account. And here we come to the famous resolution of the International Working Men's Congress in Basle that it is in the interest of society to transform landed property into common, national property.<sup>139</sup> This resolution was adopted mainly for countries where there is large-scale landed property, and, consequently, big estates are operated, with one master and many labourers on them. This state of affairs is still largely predominant in Germany, and therefore, next to England, the resolution was *most timely precisely for Germany*. The agricultural proletariat, the farm labourers—that is the class from which the bulk of the armies of the princes is recruited. It is the class which, thanks to universal suffrage, now sends into parliament the large number of feudal lords and Junkers; but it is also the class nearest to the industrial workers of the towns, which shares their living conditions and is steeped even more in misery than they. This class is impotent because it is split and scattered, but its latent power is so well known to the government and nobility that they let the schools fall into decay deliberately in order to keep it ignorant. It is the immediate and most urgent task of the German labour movement to breathe life into this class and draw it into the movement. The day the mass of the farm labourers will have learned to understand their own interests, a reactionary—feudal, bureaucratic or bourgeois—government will become impossible in Germany.

Written on about February 11, 1870

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

Printed according to the text of  
the second edition of the book,  
checked with the preface to the  
third edition (Leipzig, 1875)

Karl Marx

THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT AND  
THE FENIAN PRISONERS<sup>140</sup>

London, February 21, 1870

I

The silence which is observed in the European press concerning the disgraceful acts committed by this oligarchical bourgeois government is due to a variety of reasons. Firstly, the English Government is *rich* and the press, as you know, is *immaculate*. Moreover, the English Government is the model government, recognised as such by the landlords, by the capitalists on the Continent and even by Garibaldi (see his book<sup>a</sup>): consequently we should not revile this ideal government. Finally, the French Republicans are narrow-minded and selfish enough to reserve all their anger for the Empire. It would be an insult to free speech to inform their fellow countrymen that *in the land of bourgeois freedom* sentences of 20 years hard labour are given for offences which are punished by 6 months in prison *in the land of barracks*. The following details concerning the treatment of Fenian prisoners have been taken from English journals:

*Mulcahy*, sub-editor of the newspaper *The Irish People*,<sup>b</sup> sentenced for taking part in the Fenian conspiracy, was harnessed to a cart loaded with stones with an iron collar round his neck at Dartmoor.

*O'Donovan Rossa*, owner of *The Irish People*, was shut up for 35 days in a pitch-black dungeon with his hands chained behind his back day and night. They were not even unchained to allow him

---

<sup>a</sup> G. Garibaldi, *The Rule of the Monk, or Rome in the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The name of the newspaper is in English in the original, with the French translation in brackets.—*Ed.*

to eat the miserable slops which were left for him on the earthen floor.<sup>a</sup>

*Kickham*, one of the editors of *The Irish People*, although he was unable to use his right arm because of an abscess, was forced to sit with his fellow prisoners on a heap of rubble in the November cold and fog and break up stones and bricks with his left hand. He returned to his cell at night and had nothing to eat but 6 ounces of bread and a pint of hot water.<sup>b</sup>

*O'Leary*, an old man of sixty or seventy kept in prison, was put on bread and water for three weeks because he would not renounce *paganism* (this, apparently, is what a jailer called free thinking) and become either Papist, Protestant, Presbyterian or even Quaker, or take up one of the many religions which the prison governor offered to the heathen Irish.<sup>c</sup>

*Martin H. Carey* is incarcerated in a lunatic asylum at Millbank. The silence and the other bad treatment to which he was subjected have made him lose his reason.<sup>d</sup>

Colonel *Richard Burke* is in no better condition. One of his friends writes that his mind is affected, he has lost his memory and his behaviour, manners and speech are those of a madman.<sup>e</sup>

The political prisoners are dragged from one prison to the next as if they were wild animals. They are forced to keep company with the vilest knaves; they are obliged to clean the pans used by these wretches, to wear the shirts and flannels previously worn by these criminals, many of whom are suffering from the foulest diseases, and to wash in the same water. Before the arrival of the Fenians at Portland all the criminals were allowed to talk with their visitors. A visiting cage was installed for the Fenian prisoners. It consists of three compartments divided by partitions of thick iron bars; the jailer occupies the central compartment and the

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 414-15, 417-19. See also *The Irishman*, No. 49, June 12, 1869, "O'Donovan Rossa. To the Editor of *The Irishman*; The Press on the Treatment of the Political Prisoners: The Treatment of O'Donovan Rossa"; *The Irishman*, No. 30, January 22, 1870, "The Political Prisoners—Misguided Men and Their Desires".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment of the Treason-Felony Convicts in the English Convict Prisons*, London, 1867, p. 19. See also this volume, p. 422.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 12, September 18, 1869, "The Irishman in Paris. John O'Mahony and Pagan O'Leary".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 20, November 13, 1869, "Gladstone and His Victims. To the Editor of the *Irishman*".—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 30, January 22, 1870, "The Irish Political Prisoners and Her Majesty's Government"; No. 27, January 1, 1870: "More Prison Horrors. Irish Political Prisoners Being Done to Death in English Prisons".—*Ed.*

prisoner and his friends can only see each other through this double row of bars.

In the docks you can find prisoners who eat all sorts of slugs, and frogs are considered dainties at Chatham. General Thomas Burke said he was not surprised to find a dead mouse floating in the soup. The convicts say that it was a bad day for them when the Fenians were sent to the prisons. (The prison regime has become much more severe.)

---

I should like to add a few words to these extracts.

Last year *Mr. Bruce*, the Home Secretary, a great liberal, great policeman and great mine owner in Wales who cruelly exploits his workers, was questioned on the bad treatment of Fenian prisoners and O'Donovan Rossa in particular.<sup>a</sup> At first he denied everything, but was later compelled to confess.<sup>b</sup> Following this Mr. Moore, an Irish member in the House of Commons, demanded an enquiry into the facts.<sup>c</sup> This was flatly refused by the *radical ministry* of which that demigod Mr. Gladstone (he has been compared to Jesus Christ publicly) is the head, and that old bourgeois demagogue, John Bright, is one of the most influential members.<sup>d</sup>

Recently, when rumours concerning the bad treatment of the Fenians were resumed, several members of Parliament requested Mr. Bruce for permission to visit the prisoners *in order to be able to verify the falseness of these rumours*.<sup>e</sup> Mr. Bruce refused this permission on the grounds that the prison governors were afraid that the prisoners would be too excited by visit of this kind.<sup>f</sup>

Last week the Home Secretary was again submitted to questioning. He was asked whether it was true that O'Donovan Rossa received corporal punishment (i. e., whipping)<sup>g</sup> after his election

---

<sup>a</sup> J. Gray, Enquiry in the House of Commons concerning the treatment of the Irish prisoners, *The Irishman*, No. 3, July 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> H. A. Bruce, Speech in the House of Commons on June 4, 1869, *The Irishman*, No. 3, July 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> "Mr. G. H. Moore's Motion upon the Treatment by England of Irish Political Prisoners", *The Irishman*, No. 1, July 3, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, pp. 408, 415.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Ph. Callan, "To the Right Hon. H. A. Bruce, Home Secretary. Reform Club, January 18", *The Irishman*, No. 32, February 5, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> H. A. Bruce, "To P. Callan, Esq., M.P., Home Office, January 19", *The Irishman*, No. 32, February 5, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> C. W. White, Speech in the House of Commons on February 18, 1870, *The Times*, No. 26975, February 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

to Parliament as the member for Tipperary<sup>141</sup>; the Minister confirmed that he had not received such treatment since 1868<sup>a</sup> (which is tantamount to admitting that the political prisoner had been given the whip over a period of two to three years).

I am also sending you extracts (which we are going to publish in our next issue) concerning the case of Michael Terbert, a Fenian sentenced as such to forced labour, serving his sentence at Spike Island Convict Prison in the county of Cork, Ireland. You will see that the CORONER<sup>b</sup> himself<sup>c</sup> attributes this man's death to the torture which was inflicted on him. This investigation was held last week.<sup>d</sup>

In the course of two years *more than twenty* Fenian workers have died or gone insane thanks to the philanthropy of these good bourgeois souls, backed by these good landlords.

You are probably aware that the English press professes a chaste distaste for the dreadful general security laws which grace *la belle France*. Well, except for a few short intervals, it has been general security laws that formed the Irish Charter. Since 1793 the English Government has taken advantage of any pretext to suspend the Habeas Corpus Bill (a law guaranteeing the liberty of the individual)<sup>142</sup> regularly and periodically, in fact all laws, except that of brute force. In this way thousands of people have been arrested in Ireland on *suspicion of being suspected of Fenianism* without ever having been tried, brought before a judge or court, or even charged. Not content with depriving them of their liberty, the English Government has had them tortured in the most savage way imaginable. The following is but one example.

One of the prisons where persons suspected of being Fenians were buried alive is *Mountjoy Prison* in Dublin. The prison inspector, Murray, is a despicable brute. He maltreated the prisoners so cruelly that some of them went mad. The prison doctor, an excellent man called M'Donnell (who also played a creditable part in the enquiry into Michael Terbert's death), spent several months writing letters of protest which he addressed in the first instance to Murray himself. As Murray did not reply, he sent accusing letters to higher authorities,<sup>e</sup> but being an expert jailer Murray intercepted these letters.

<sup>a</sup> H. A. Bruce, Speech in the House of Commons on February 18, 1870, *The Times*, No. 26975, February 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx uses the English term and gives the French equivalent in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> John Moore.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> "Inquest at Spike Island.—Condemnation of the Prison Treatment", *The Irishman*, No. 34, February 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *The Irishman*, Nos. 7, 12 and 15, August 14, September 18 and October 9, 1869.—*Ed.*

Finally M'Donnell wrote directly to Lord Mayo, then Viceroy of Ireland. This was during the period when the Tories were in power (Derby and Disraeli). What effect did his actions have? The documents relating to the case were published by order of Parliament<sup>a</sup> and ... Dr. M'Donnell was dismissed from his post!!! Whereas Murray retained his.

Then the so-called radical ministry of Gladstone came to power, the tender, unctuous, magnanimous Gladstone who had shed such warm, sincere tears before the eyes of the whole of Europe over the fate of Poerio and other members of the bourgeoisie who were badly treated by King Bomba.<sup>143</sup> What did this idol of the progressive bourgeoisie do? While insulting the Irish by his insolent replies to their demands for an amnesty,<sup>b</sup> he not only confirmed the monster Murray in his post, but endowed the position of the chief jailer with a nice fat sinecure as a token of his particular satisfaction!<sup>c</sup> There's the apostle of bourgeois philanthropy for you!

But something had to be done to pull the wool over the eyes of the public. It was essential to appear to be doing something for Ireland, and a law regulating the land question (LAND BILL)<sup>144</sup> was proclaimed with a great song and dance. All this is nothing but a pose with the ultimate aim of deceiving Europe, winning over the Irish judges and advocates with the prospect of endless disputes between landlords and farmers, conciliating the landlords with the promise of financial aid from the state and deluding the more prosperous farmers with a few mild concessions.

In the long introduction to his grandiloquent and confused speech Gladstone admits that even the "benevolent" laws which liberal England bestowed on Ireland over the last hundred years have always led to the country's further decline.<sup>d</sup> And after this naive confession the same man persists in torturing those who want to put an end to this harmful and stupid legislation.

---

<sup>a</sup> *Report of the Commissioners on the Treatment of the Treason-Felony Convicts in the English Convict Prisons*, London, 1867. See also this volume, pp. 424, 426-28.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 83.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Irishman*, No. 19, November 6, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Marx refers to Gladstone's speech in the House of Commons on February 15, 1870, *The Times*, No. 26673, February 16, 1870.—*Ed.*



## II

The following is an account taken from an English newspaper of the results of an enquiry into the death of Michael Terbert,<sup>a</sup> a Fenian prisoner who died at Spike Island Prison due to the bad treatment which he had received.

On Thursday last<sup>b</sup> Mr. John Moore, Coroner of the Middleton district, held an inquest at Spike Island Convict Prison,<sup>c</sup> on the body of a convict [...] named Michael Terbert, who had died in hospital.

Peter Hay, governor of the prison, was called first. He deposed—The deceased, Michael Terbert, came to this prison in June, 1866; I can't say how his health was at the time; he had been convicted on the 12th of January, 1866, and his sentence was seven years' penal servitude; he appeared delicate for some time past, as will appear from one of the prison books, which states that he was removed on the recommendation of medical officers, as being unfit for cellular discipline. Witness then went into a detail of the frequent punishments inflicted on the deceased for breach of discipline, many of them for the use "of disrespectful language to the medical officer".<sup>d</sup>

Jeremiah Hubert Kelly deposed—I remember when Michael Terbert came here from Mountjoy Prison; it was then stated that he was unfit for cellular discipline—that means being always confined to a cell<sup>e</sup>; certificate to the effect was signed by Dr. M'Donnel: [...] I found him, however, to be in good health, and I sent him to work. I find by the record<sup>f</sup> that he was in hospital from the 31st January, 1869, until the 6th February, 1869; he suffered then from increased affection of the heart, and from that time he did not work on the public works, but in-doors, at oakum; from the 19th March, 1869, until the 24th March,<sup>g</sup> 1869, he was in hospital, suffering from the same affection of heart; from the 24th April till the 5th May he was also in hospital from spitting of blood; from the 19th May till the 1st June he was in hospital for heart disease; from the 21st June till the 22nd June he was under hospital treatment for the same; he was also in hospital from the 22nd July till the 15th August, for the same—from 9th November till the 13th December for debility, and from 20th December to the 8th February, when he died from acute dropsy; on the 13th November he first appeared to suffer from dropsy, and it was then dissipated; I visit the cells every day, and I must have seen him when under punishment from time to time; it is my duty to remit, by recommendation, that punishment, if I consider the prisoner is not fit to bear it; I think I did so twice in his case.

As a medical man, did you consider that five days on bread and water per day was excessive punishment for him, notwithstanding his state of health in Mountjoy and here?—I did not; the deceased had a good appetite; I don't think that the treatment induced acute dropsy, of which he died [...]

<sup>a</sup> See *The Irishman*, No. 34, February 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *L'Internationale* has "On Thursday, February 17".—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *L'Internationale* has "Spike-Island Prison".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *L'Internationale* has no quotation marks here.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> The words "that means being always confined to a cell" are omitted in *L'Internationale*.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> *L'Internationale* has "I remember".—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> *L'Internationale* has "March 26".—*Ed.*

Martin O'Connell, resident apothecary of Spike Island, was next examined—Witness mentioned to Dr. Kelly last July that while the deceased was labouring under heart disease he should not have been punished; [...] he was of opinion that such punishment as the deceased got was prejudicial to his health, considering that he was an invalid for the past twelve months [...] he could not say that invalids were so punished, as he only attended cells in Dr. Kelly's absence; he was certain, considering the state of the deceased man's health, that five days continuously in cells would be injurious to his health; [...] The Coroner then [...] dealt forcibly with the treatment which the prisoner had received [...] alternating between the hospital and the punishment cell.

The jury returned the following verdict: "We find that Michael Terbert died in hospital at Spike Island Convict Prison, on the 8th of February, 1870, of dropsy; he was twenty-five years of age,<sup>a</sup> and unmarried. We have also to express in the strongest terms our total disapproval of the frequent punishment he suffered in cells on bread and water for several days in succession during his imprisonment in Spike Island, where he had been sent in June, 1866, from Mountjoy Prison, for the reason that in Dr. M'Donnell's opinion he was unfit for cellular discipline at Mountjoy; and we express our condemnation of such treatment."

Written on February 21, 1870

First published in the newspaper *L'Internationale*, Nos. 59 and 60, February 27 and March 6, 1870

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the French

The account of the enquiry into Terbet's death is reproduced from *The Irishman*

---

<sup>a</sup> *L'Internationale* has "36 years of age".—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[CONCERNING THE CONFLICT  
IN THE LYONS SECTION]<sup>145</sup>

Citizens! The Lyonese section of the International Working Men's Association, in virtue of a resolution passed at the Congress of Basle, 1869, to the effect that the General Council shall act as umpire in cases where differences arise between members of the Association,<sup>a</sup> has appealed to the Council to decide between Albert Richard on one side and Schettel, Cormier, A. Blanc, Chanoz and Vindry on the other side, the latter being members of the old section of Lyons.

The General Council, having examined the documents sent by that section, declares the accusations made to be without the least foundation and confirms the verdict of the two special commissions appointed on that subject: the first at the Congress of Lausanne, 1867, and the second at Geneva, 1869, and maintains Albert Richard in the post of Corresponding Secretary of the International Working Men's Association conformably to the Rules and Regulations.

Considering also that the call made by the old members upon the radical burgesses to give a decision in this case which ought only to have been known to the members of the Association is contrary to the Rules, spirit, and interest of the Association and of a nature of profiting the enemies, the General Council censures energetically the conduct of the old members of the section.

The General Council takes advantage of the position in which it is placed by this misunderstanding to remind all the members of

---

<sup>a</sup> Marx refers to the resolution of the Basle Congress adopted on September 9, 1869 (see *Report of the Fourth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1869], p. 21).—*Ed.*

the Association that before any publication or any public action it should be apprised of it, as this mode of proceeding is calculated to excite personal animosities which should be carefully avoided at all times, and produces divisions in our ranks, and can only be useful to our adversaries at a time when all the activity, all the strength, and all the energy of our members should be concentrated for the speedy triumph of the principles of the International Working Men's Association.

Adopted by the General Council on  
March 8, 1870

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in *L'Internationale*, No. 63,  
March 27, 1870, under the signature of  
Eugène Dupont

Karl Marx

THE GENERAL<sup>a</sup> COUNCIL OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
TO COMMITTEE MEMBERS  
OF THE RUSSIAN SECTION IN GENEVA<sup>146</sup>

Citizens,

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

You say in your programme:

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

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

A few months ago I received from St. Petersburg Flerovsky's work *The Condition of the Working Class in Russia*.<sup>147</sup> This is a real eye-opener for Europe. *Russian optimism*, which is spread over the Continent even by the so-called revolutionaries, is mercilessly exposed in this work. It will not retract from its worth if I say that in one or two places it does not fully satisfy criticism from the

<sup>a</sup> "Chief" in the Russian original.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "Pervaya russkaya sektiya. Programma", "Ustav russkoi sekti", *Narodnoye Dyelo*, No. 1, April 15, 1870.—*Ed.*

purely theoretical point of view. It is the book of a serious observer, a courageous worker, an unbiased critic, a great artist and, above all, of a person intolerant of oppression in all its forms and of all national anthems, and ardently sharing all the sufferings and all the aspirations of the producing class.

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

Fraternal greetings,

*Karl Marx*

London, March 24, 1870

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

Printed according to the newspaper

Translated from the Russian

## Karl Marx

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION<sup>148</sup>

The Russian Bakunin (although I have known him since 1843, I shall here ignore everything not absolutely necessary for the understanding of what follows) met Marx in London<sup>a</sup> shortly after the foundation of the *International*. There the latter took him into the Association, for which Bakunin promised to work to the best of his ability. Bakunin went to Italy and received there from Marx the *Provisional Rules* and *Address to the Working Classes*,<sup>b</sup> answered "very enthusiastically" and did nothing. After some years, during which nothing was heard from him, he turned up again in Switzerland. There he joined, not the *International*, but the *League de la paix et de la liberté*.<sup>149</sup> After the congress of this Peace League (Geneva, 1867) Bakunin got on to its *Executive Committee*, but found opponents there, who not only denied him any "dictatorial" influence, but watched him closely as being "suspect as a *Russian*". Shortly after the Brussels Congress of the *International* (September 1868) the *Peace League* held its congress at Berne. Here Bakunin acted the FIREBRAND and—be it remarked *en passant*—denounced the occidental bourgeoisie in the tone in which Muscovite optimists are accustomed to attack Western civilisation—to palliate their own barbarism. He proposed a number of resolutions, which, *absurd in themselves*, were intended to instil fear into the bourgeois cretins and allow Monsieur Bakunin to *leave* the Peace League and *enter* the *International* with *éclat*. It suffices to note that the programme proposed by Bakunin to the Bern<sup>c</sup> Congress<sup>150</sup> contains

<sup>a</sup> On November 3, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association*, London, 1864.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—*Ed.*

such absurdities as the “equality of classes”, “abolition of the right of inheritance as the first step of the social revolution”, etc.—empty babblings,<sup>a</sup> a garland of ostensibly horrifying hollow fancies, in short an insipid improvisation, calculated purely to make a certain short-lived effect. Bakunin’s friends in Paris (where a Russian<sup>b</sup> has a seat on the editorial board of the *Revue Positiviste*) and in London proclaim to the world Bakunin’s resignation from the Peace League as *un événement*<sup>c</sup> and declare his grotesque programme—that *olla podrida*<sup>d</sup> of outworn platitudes—wonderfully awe-inspiring and original.

Bakunin meanwhile had joined the *Branche Romande* of the *International* (in Geneva). It took him years to decide upon this step. But it did not take days for Monsieur Bakunin to decide to transform the *International* and turn it into an instrument of *his own*.

Behind the back of the London General Council—which was informed only when everything was apparently already *arranged*—he founded the so-called *Alliance des Démocrates Socialistes*.<sup>151</sup> The programme of this society<sup>e</sup> was none other than that proposed by Bakunin at the Berne Peace Congress. The society thereby proclaimed itself from the outset as a propaganda society of the specifically Bakuninist cult, and Bakunin himself, *one of the most ignorant men in the field of social theory*, suddenly appeared here as the *founder of a sect*. The theoretical programme of this Alliance was however pure farce. The serious aspect of the affair lay in its practical organisation. This society was to be *international*, with its Central Committee in *Geneva*, that is, under Bakunin’s personal direction. At the same time it was to be an “integral” part of the *International Working Men’s Association*. Its BRANCHES were to be represented at the “next congress” of the *International* (in Basle) and were at the same time to hold their own congress in separate sittings, *side by side with the other*, etc., etc.

The human material which at first stood at Bakunin’s disposal consisted of the majority at that time of the *Comité Fédéral*

<sup>a</sup> See *Deuxième Congrès de la Paix et de la Liberté convoqué pour le 22 septembre 1868 à Berne. Programme*, Berne [1868], and “Discours de M. Bakounine” in *Discours prononcés au Congrès de la Paix et de la Liberté à Berne* (1868). Par M. M. Mroczkowski et Bakounine, Geneva, 1869, pp. 5-23.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> G. N. Vyrubov.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> An event.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> Hotch-potch.—Ed.

<sup>e</sup> *Programme et Règlement de l’Alliance internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste*, Geneva [1868] (see this volume, pp. 207-09).—Ed.



*Romand* of the *International* in Geneva. J. Ph. Becker, whose propagandist zeal at times runs away with his head, was pushed forward to the front of the stage. In Italy and Spain Bakunin had a few allies.

The General Council in London was fully informed. However, it let Bakunin proceed undisturbed up to the moment when he found it necessary to send the General Council, through J. Ph. Becker, the Rules (and programme) of the *Alliance des Démocrates Socialistes* for approval. The General Council answered with a thoroughly reasoned resolution—wholly “judicial” and “objective” in tone, but full of irony in its “considerations”—which concluded as follows:

1. The General Council does *not* admit the Alliance as a branch of the *International*.

2. All the paragraphs of the Rules of the Alliance referring to its relations with the *International* are declared *null and void*.

The considerations for this resolution demonstrated clearly and forcefully that the *Alliance* was nothing but an instrument to disorganise the *International*.<sup>a</sup>

The blow was unexpected. Bakunin had already turned the *Égalité*, central organ of the French-speaking members of the *International* in Switzerland, into his *own* organ, and had, in addition, started at *Loche* a little private journal of his own, the *Progrès*. The *Progrès* is playing this role up to the present day under the editorship of a fanatical adherent of Bakunin, a certain *Guillaume*.

After several weeks' reflection the Central Committee of the Alliance finally sent its answer to the General Council, over the signature of Perron, a Genevese. In its eagerness to serve the good cause, the Alliance was ready to *sacrifice its independent organisation*, but on one condition—namely, that the General Council declare its recognition of the *Alliance's* “radical” principles.

The General Council replied: It was not its function to sit in judgment on the theoretic value of the programmes of its various sections. It had only to see that those programmes contained *nothing directly contradictory to the letter and spirit of the Rules*. It must therefore insist upon the absurd phrase about the *égalité des classes* being struck from the programme of the *Alliance* and replaced by the *abolition des classes* (which was done). For the rest, the Alliance could enter the *International* *after dissolving its own independent international organisation*, and supplying the General

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 34-36.—*Ed.*

Council with a list of all its BRANCHES<sup>a</sup> (which, *nota bene*, was not done).

The incident was therewith closed. *Nominally*, the *Alliance* dissolved itself; *actually*, it remained in existence, under the leadership of Bakunin, who at the same time controlled the Genevese *Comité Romand Fédéral* of the *International*.

To its former press organs were added the *Federacion* of Barcelona and, *after* the Basle Congress, the Naples *Eguaglianza*.

Bakunin now attempted to reach his goal—the transformation of the *International* into his personal instrument—by other means. Through our Romance Committee at Geneva he proposed to the General Council the inclusion of the “*inheritance question*” in the agenda of the Basle Congress.<sup>b</sup> The General Council agreed, in order to be able to deal a direct blow to Bakunin. Bakunin’s plan was this: the Basle Congress, in accepting the “*principles*” (?) put forward by Bakunin at Berne, will show the world that it is not Bakunin who has come over to the *International*, but the *International* that has gone over to Bakunin. Obvious result, the London General Council (of whose hostility to the warming up of the *vieillerie Saint-Simoniste*<sup>c</sup> Bakunin was fully aware) would have to resign and the Basle Congress would *transfer the General Council to Geneva*, that is, the *International* would come under the dictatorship of Bakunin.

Bakunin set a complete *conspiracy* going to secure a majority at the Basle Congress. Even *false* mandates were not lacking, such as Monsieur Guillaume’s mandate for Locle, etc. Bakunin himself begged mandates from Naples and Lyons. Every kind of slander against the General Council was spread abroad. Some were told that *élément bourgeois* dominated the Council, others that it was the seat of *communisme autoritaire*, etc.

The results of the Basle Congress are well known. Bakunin’s proposals were not accepted and the General Council remained in London.

The annoyance which followed this failure—perhaps Bakunin had based all kinds of private speculations on the assumption of success—found expression in the irritable comments of the *Égalité* and *Progrès*. These papers meanwhile were assuming more and more the posture of official oracles. Now one, now another Swiss section of the *International* was excommunicated because, contrary

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 45-46.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See “The International Working Men’s Association. Council Meeting. Tuesday, April 13 [1869]”, *The Bee-Hive*, No. 392, April 17, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Saint-Simonian old rubbish.—*Ed.*

to Bakunin's explicit instructions, it had taken part in the political movement, etc. Finally the rage against the General Council, so long restrained, broke out openly. The *Progrès* and *Égalité* derided, attacked, and declared that the General Council was not fulfilling its duties, for example in regard to the quarterly bulletin; that the General Council must give up its direct control over England and have an English Central Committee established alongside it, to deal with English affairs only; that the resolutions of the General Council on the imprisoned Fenians went beyond its functions, since it should not deal with questions of local politics. Moreover, the *Progrès* and *Égalité* took up the cudgels for Schweitzer and categorically demanded that the General Council declare itself officially and *publiquement*<sup>a</sup> on the Liebknecht-Schweitzer question. The newspaper *Le Travail* (in Paris), into which Schweitzer's Paris friends smuggled articles in his favour, was praised on that account by the *Progrès* and *Égalité*, the latter calling upon the *Travail* to make common cause against the General Council.<sup>b</sup>

The time had now come for action to be taken. What follows is an exact copy of the circular sent by the General Council to the Central Committee of the Romance Federation in Geneva. The document is too long for me to translate into German [original in French].<sup>c</sup>

*The General Council to the Federal Council of Romance Switzerland in Geneva.*

At its extraordinary meeting on January 1, 1870, the General Council resolved:

1) We read in the *Égalité* of December 11, 1869:

"It is *certain* that the General Council is neglecting extremely important matters.... We remind the General Council of its obligations with Article 1 of the Regulations: 'The General Council is *commissioned* to carry the resolutions of the Congress into effect'.... We could put enough questions to the General Council for its replies to make up quite a long report. They will come later. Meanwhile, etc."

The General Council does not know of any article, either in the Rules or in the Regulations, which *would oblige* it to enter into correspondence or into polemic with the *Égalité* or to provide "replies" to "questions" of any newspaper whatsoever.

*The Federal Council of Romance Switzerland* alone represents the

<sup>a</sup> Publicly.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *L'Égalité*, Nos. 42, 43 and 47, November 6, 13 and December 11, 1869; *Le Progrès*, No. 25, December 4, 1869.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, pp. 84-91.—Ed.

branches of Romance Switzerland at the General Council. When the Federal Council addresses requests or reprimands to us through the only legitimate channel, that is to say through its *secretary*, the General Council will always be ready to reply. But the Romance Federal Council has no right either to *abdicate* its functions in favour of the *Égalité* and the *Progrès*, or to let these newspapers *usurp* its functions. Generally speaking, the General Council's correspondence with the national and local committees cannot be published without greatly prejudicing the Association's general interests.

Consequently, if other organs of the *International* were to follow the example of the *Progrès* and the *Égalité*, the General Council would be faced with the alternative of either discrediting itself publicly by its silence or violating its obligations by replying publicly. The *Égalité* joins the *Progrès* in inviting *Le Travail* to demand an explanation from the General Council. That is almost a League of Public Welfare.<sup>152</sup>

2) Now, assuming that the questions put by the *Égalité* come from the *Romance Federal Council*, we shall reply to them, but only on condition that such questions shall not in the future be communicated to us in the same way.

### 3) *Question of a Bulletin.*

In the resolutions of the Geneva<sup>a</sup> Congress, which are inserted in the Regulations, it is laid down that the national committees shall send the General Council *documents* dealing with the proletarian movement<sup>b</sup> and that the General Council shall thereupon publish a bulletin in the *different languages* "as often as its means permit" ("As often as its means permit, the General Council shall publish a report, etc.")<sup>c</sup>.

The General Council's obligation was thus made dependent on *conditions* that have never been fulfilled. Even the *statistical inquiry* prescribed by the Rules, ordered by consecutive General Congresses, and demanded yearly by the General Council, has never been made. As far as the *means* are concerned, the General Council would have long since ceased to exist had it not been for local contributions from England and the personal sacrifices of its members.

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Congrès ouvrier de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs tenu à Genève du 3 au 8 septembre 1866*, Geneva, 1866, pp. 13 and 26.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1867], p. 6. (The quotation in brackets is given in English in the manuscript.)—Ed.

Thus, the Regulations passed at the Geneva<sup>a</sup> Congress have remained a dead letter.

As regards the Basle Congress, it did not discuss the *fulfilment* of an existing regulation. It discussed the possibility of issuing a bulletin in good time and *it did not pass any resolution*.

For the rest, the General Council believes that the original purpose of such a bulletin is at the moment perfectly fulfilled by the different organs of the *International* published in the different languages and exchanged among them. It would be absurd to do by costly bulletins what is being done already without any expense. On the other hand, a bulletin which would print what is not contained in the organs of the *International* would only help our enemies to see behind the scenes.

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

Long before the foundation of the *Égalité*, this proposition was periodically made inside the General Council by one or two of its English members.<sup>153</sup> It was always rejected almost unanimously.

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

The English have all the *material* necessary for the social revolution. What they lack is *the spirit of generalisation and revolutionary ardour*. It is only the General Council that can provide

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript mistakenly has "Lausanne".—Ed.

them with this, that can thus accelerate the truly revolutionary movement in this country, and consequently *everywhere*. The great results we have already achieved in this respect are attested to by the most intelligent and influential of the newspapers of the ruling classes, as for example, *The Pall Mall Gazette*, *Saturday Review*, *The Spectator* and *The Fortnightly Review*, to say nothing of the so-called radicals in the *COMMONS* and the *LORDS* who, a little while ago, still exerted a great influence on the *leaders* of the English workers. They accuse us publicly of having poisoned and almost extinguished *the English spirit* of the working class and of having pushed it into revolutionary socialism.

The only way to bring about this change is to act like *the General Council of the International Association*. As the General Council we can initiate measures (for example, the founding of the *Land and Labour League*<sup>154</sup>) which later, in the process of their execution, will appear to the public as spontaneous movements of the English working class.

If a *Federal Council* were formed apart from the *General Council*, what would be the immediate results? Placed between the *General Council of the International* and the *General Council of TRADES UNIONS*,<sup>155</sup> the Federal Council would have no authority whatever. On the other hand, the *General Council of the International* would lose *control of the great lever*. If we had preferred the showman's chatter to serious and unostentatious work, we would perhaps have committed the mistake of replying publicly the *Égalité's* question as to why "the General Council permits such a burdensome combination of functions".

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

5) *Question of the General Council Resolutions on the Irish Amnesty*.<sup>a</sup>

If England is the *BULWARK* of landlordism and European capitalism, the only point where official England can be struck a great blow is *Ireland*.

In the first place, Ireland is the *BULWARK* of English landlordism. If it fell in Ireland, it would fall in England. In Ireland this is a hundred times easier because *the economic struggle there is concentrated exclusively on landed property*, because this struggle is at the same time *national*, and because the people there are more revolutionary and more exasperated than in England. Landlordism in Ireland is maintained solely by *the English army*. The moment the forced Union<sup>156</sup> between the two countries ends, a

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 83.—*Ed.*

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

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

Moreover, this antagonism is reproduced on the other side of the Atlantic. The Irish, chased from their native soil by the bulls and the sheep, reassemble in the United States where they constitute a huge, ever-growing section of the population. Their only thought, their only passion, is hatred for England. The English and American governments—that is to say, the classes they represent—play on these feelings in order to perpetuate the *international struggle* which prevents any serious and sincere alliance between the working classes on both sides of the Atlantic, and, consequently, their common emancipation.

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

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

Thus, the position of the International Association with regard to the Irish question is very clear. Its first concern is to advance the social revolution in England. To this end a great blow must be struck in Ireland.

The General Council's resolutions on the Irish amnesty<sup>a</sup> serve only as an introduction to other resolutions<sup>157</sup> which will affirm that, quite apart from international justice, it is a *precondition to the emancipation of the English working class* to transform the present *forced Union*—i. e., the enslavement of Ireland—into *equal and free confederation* if possible, into *complete separation* if need be.

For the rest, the doctrines of the *Égalité* and the *Progrès* on the CONNEXION, or rather, the NON-CONNEXION, between the social movement and the political movement have never, as far as we know, been recognised by any of our Congresses. *They run counter to our Rules.* The Rules say:

“That the *economical emancipation* of the working classes is [...] the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means.”<sup>b</sup>

The words “as a means”<sup>c</sup> were omitted in the French translation made in 1864 by the Paris Committee.<sup>d</sup> When questioned by the General Council, the Paris Committee excused itself by the difficulties of its political situation.

There are other mutilations of the authentic text of the Rules. Thus, the first clause of the preamble to the Rules reads:

“The struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means ... a struggle ... for *equal rights and duties*, and the *abolition of all class rule.*”<sup>e</sup>

The Paris translation has “equal rights and duties”, that is it reproduced the general phrase which may be found virtually *in all democratic manifestoes* of the last hundred years and which means different things in the mouth of different classes, but *leaves out* the concrete demand: “*the abolition of classes*”.

Further, in the second clause of the preamble to the Rules we read: “That the economical subjection of the *man of labour* to the *monopoliser of the means of labour*, that is, *the sources of life*, etc.”

The Paris translation substitutes the word “*capital*” for “*the means of labour, that is, the sources of life*”, an expression which includes the land as well as the other means of labour.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 3-4 and 83.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Here and below quotations from the Provisional Rules are given in English in the manuscript (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 14).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Marx uses the English phrase and gives the French equivalent “*comme moyen*” in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Congrès ouvrier. Association Internationale des Travailleurs. Règlement Provisoire* [Paris, 1864], p. 1.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> See present edition, Vol. 20, p. 14.—*Ed.*



The original authentic text was restored in the French translation published in Brussels in 1866.<sup>a</sup>

6) *Liebknecht-Schweitzer Question.*

The *Égalité* writes:

“Both these groups belong to the *International*”. That is incorrect. The Eisenachers’ group (which the *Progrès* and the *Égalité* would like to turn into Citizen Liebknecht’s group) belongs to the *International*. *Schweitzer’s group does not belong to it.*

Schweitzer himself explained at length in his newspaper, the *Social-Demokrat*, why the *Lassallean organisation* could not join the *International* without destroying itself.<sup>b</sup> Without realising it, he was speaking the truth: His artificial *sectarian organisation* is opposed to the *real organisation* of the working class.

The *Progrès* and the *Égalité* have summoned the General Council to state publicly its “*opinion*” on the personal differences between Liebknecht and Schweitzer. Since Citizen *J. Ph. Becker* (who is *slandered* as much as Liebknecht in Schweitzer’s paper<sup>c</sup>) is a member of the *Égalité’s editorial board*, it seems most strange that its editors are not better informed about the facts. They should have known that Liebknecht, in the *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, publicly invited Schweitzer to accept the *General Council* as *arbiter of their differences*,<sup>d</sup> and that Schweitzer no less publicly refused to acknowledge the authority of the General Council.<sup>e</sup>

The General Council has employed all possible means to put an end to this scandal. It instructed its Secretary for Germany<sup>f</sup> to correspond with Schweitzer; this has been done, but all attempts by the Council have broken down in the face of Schweitzer’s firm resolution to preserve at all cost his autocratic power together with the *sectarian organisation*.

It is up to the General Council to determine the favourable moment when *its public intervention* in this quarrel will be more useful than damaging.<sup>g</sup>

*By order of the General Council etc.”*

<sup>a</sup> *Manifeste de l’Association Internationale des Travailleurs suivi du Règlement provisoire*, Bruxelles, 1866, pp. 15-18.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> A reference to the leading article in *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 82, July 16, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 24, February 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> W. Liebknecht, “Erklärung. Leipzig, 18. Februar 1869”, *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*, No. 8, February 20, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> *Der Social-Demokrat*, No. 24, February 24, 1869.—*Ed.*

<sup>f</sup> Karl Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>g</sup> In his “Confidential Communication” Marx omitted Point 7 of the circular.—*Ed.*

The French Committees (although Bakunin had been actively intriguing in Lyons and Marseilles and had won over a few young hotheads), as well as the *Conseil Général Belge*<sup>a</sup> (Brussels), have fully endorsed this circular of the General Council.

The copy for Geneva was delayed somewhat (because *Jung*, Secretary for Switzerland, was very busy). It therefore crossed with an official letter from *Perret*, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Romance Federation in Geneva, to the General Council.<sup>158</sup>

The crisis had broken out in Geneva before the arrival of our letter. Some members of the editorial board of the *Égalité* had opposed the policy dictated by Bakunin. Bakunin and his followers (including six editors of the *Égalité*) wanted to force the Geneva *Central Committee* to dismiss the unruly members. The Geneva Committee, however, had long grown tired of Bakunin's despotism and saw itself with great displeasure being forced by him into opposition to the other German-Swiss Committees, the General Council, etc. It therefore endorsed the attitude of those members of the *Égalité* editorial board who opposed Bakunin. Thereupon Bakunin's six followers resigned from the editorial board, hoping thereby to put an end to the publication of the paper.<sup>b</sup>

In answer to our letter the Geneva Central Committee declared that the attacks in the *Égalité* had been made without its approval, that it had never endorsed the policy preached therein and that in future the paper would be edited under the strict supervision of the Committee, etc.<sup>159</sup>

Bakunin thereupon retired from Geneva to Ticino. As far as Switzerland is concerned, he now has a say only in the *Progrès* (Locle).

Shortly afterwards *Herzen* died. Bakunin, who from the time that he decided to set himself up as *director of the European workers' movement* had denied his old friend and patron Herzen, hastened to sing his praises immediately after his death.<sup>c</sup> Why? Herzen, though personally wealthy, allowed the pseudo-socialist, Pan-Slavist party in Russia, which was friendly towards him, to pay him 25,000 francs annually for propaganda. By his paean of praise Bakunin directed this stream of money to himself and—*malgré sa haine de l'héritage*<sup>d</sup>—thereby entered financially and morally upon the "*Herzen heritage*" *sine beneficio inventarii*.<sup>e 160</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Belgian General Council.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See *L'Égalité*, Nos. 2 and 3, January 8 and 15, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Marx means Bakunin's tribute to Herzen published in the form of letters in *La Marseillaise*, Nos. 72 and 73, March 2 and 3, 1870, and reprinted in *Le Progrès*, Nos. 10, 11 and 12, March 5, 12 and 19, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Despite his hatred of inheritance.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Without benefit of inventory.—*Ed.*

At the same time a COLONY of young Russian REFUGEES settled in Geneva, students whose intentions are really honest and whose sincerity is proved by the adoption of the *fight against Pan-Slavism* as the chief point of their programme.<sup>a</sup>

They publish a paper in Geneva called *La Cause du Peuple*.<sup>b</sup> ABOUT two weeks ago they applied to London, sending in their Programme and Statutes,<sup>c</sup> and requesting permission to form a Russian branch.<sup>161</sup> Permission was given.

In a separate letter to Marx they asked him to represent them provisionally on the General Council. That too was done.<sup>d</sup> At the same time they indicated—and apparently *wished to excuse themselves* to Marx on this account—that in the immediate future they would have to expose Bakunin publicly, since the man spoke in *two entirely different tongues*, one in Russia, another in Europe.<sup>162</sup>

The game of this very dangerous intriguer—at least in the domain of the *International*—will soon be played out.

Written on about March 28, 1870

First published in *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 2,  
No. 15, 1902

Printed according to the manu-  
script

Translated from the German and  
the French

---

<sup>a</sup> "Pervaya russkaya sektsiya. Programma", *Narodnoye Dyelo*, No. 1, April 15, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Narodnoye Dyelo*.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> "Ustav russkoi sektsii", *Narodnoye Dyelo*, No. 1, April 15, 1870.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> See this volume, pp. 110-11.—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[TO THE INTERNATIONAL METALWORKERS' SOCIETY]<sup>163</sup>

London, April 18, 1870

Dear Friends,

About a fortnight ago<sup>a</sup> the Executive Committee of the AMALGAMATED ENGINEERS finally invited the General Council of the International Working Men's Association to send delegates to discuss the establishment of direct links with the metalworkers in Germany and the engineers in Paris. They now request you to answer the following questions before they come to a decision about you:

- 1) The number of hours of work per day?
- 2) How many working days a week? Is Sunday a working day?
- 3) The amount of wages?
- 4) Is overtime paid and at what rates?
- 5) The number of members?
- 6) How much is their contribution per week?
- 7) Has the trade union anything to do with funds for sick relief, etc.?
- 8) Which trades are covered by the union?

With fraternal greetings

*Karl Marx*

Written on April 18, 1870

First published in *Die Tagwacht*, No. 16,  
May 5, 1870Printed according to the news-  
paperPublished in English for the first  
time

---

<sup>a</sup> On April 7.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON *THE BEE-HIVE*]<sup>164</sup>

Considering,

1) that the different International sections of the Continent and the United States have been advised by the General Council of the International Working Men's Association to subscribe to the *Bee-Hive* newspaper as the official organ of the General Council and the representative in the English press of the Working-Class movement<sup>a</sup>;

2) that the *Bee-Hive* has not only erased from the official reports of the General Council such resolutions as might displease its patrons, but, by way of suppression, has systematically misrepresented the tenor of consecutive sittings of the General Council;

3) that mainly since its recent change of proprietorship,<sup>165</sup> while still pretending to be the exclusive organ of the working class, the *Bee-Hive* has, in reality, become the organ of a capitalist fraction who want to keep the proletarian movement in their leading strings and use it as a means for the furtherance of their own class and party purposes;

The General Council of the International Working Men's Association, in its sitting of the 26th of April 1870, has unanimously resolved to sever its connection with the *Bee-Hive*, and to publicly announce this resolution to its different sections in England, on the Continent, and in the United States.

Drawn up in early May 1870

Adopted by the General Council  
on May 17, 1870

First published in *Der Volksstaat*,  
No. 38, May 11, 1870

Reproduced from Marx's manuscript pasted into the Minute Book of the General Council

<sup>a</sup> *Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association*, London, 1864, p. 15.—*Ed.*

## Karl Marx

[CONCERNING THE PERSECUTION OF THE MEMBERS  
OF THE FRENCH SECTIONS]<sup>166</sup>DECLARATION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

On the occasion of the last pretended complot, the French Government has not only arrested many members of our Paris and Lyons sections, but insinuated by its organs that the *International Working Men's Association* is an accomplice of that pretended complot.<sup>a</sup>

According to the tenor of our Statutes, it is certainly the special mission of all our branches in England, on the Continent, and in the United States, to act not only as centres for the organisation of the working class, but also to aid, in their different countries, all political movements tending to the accomplishment of our ultimate end, viz., the *economical emancipation of the working class*. At the same time, these Statutes bind all the sections of our Association to act in open daylight. If our Statutes were not formal on that point, the very nature of an Association which identifies itself with the working classes, would exclude from it every form of secret society. If the working classes, who form the great bulk of all nations, who produce all their wealth, and in the name of whom even the usurping powers always pretend to rule, conspire, they conspire publicly, as the sun conspires against darkness, in the full consciousness that without their pale there exists no legitimate power.

If the other incidents of the complot denounced by the French Government are as false and unfounded as its insinuations against

---

<sup>a</sup> See *Le Moniteur universel*, Nos. 121, 122, 125, 128, May 1, 2, 5, 8, 1870; *La Presse*, May 2, 1870; *Le Constitutionnel*, May 1, 1870; *Le Figaro*, No. 122, May 2, 1870.—Ed.

the *International Working Men's Association*, this last complot will worthily range with its two predecessors of grotesque memory.<sup>167</sup> The noisy and violent measures against our French sections are exclusively intended serving one single purpose—*the manipulation of the plebiscite*.

Adopted by the General Council on May 3, 1870

First published as a pamphlet, *Declaration of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association*, on May 4, 1870

Reproduced from Marx's manuscript pasted into the Minute Book of the General Council, and checked with the text of the pamphlet

who withdrew his assurance of support to, & sympathies with the Association, Cit. Jung announced the receipt of a letter from a young Belgian peasant residing at present in Wallis, who desired to become a member of the Association & act as one of its most devoted Champions.

A letter from Cit. Richard of Lyons announced the formation of a new section at Richard, H. Cit. Berlin was travelling to establish new branches. The letter contained a cheque for 6 L. 1/8 0. of which 10/6 were for the St. Etienne section the rest for Lyons.

Cit. Marx then called the attention of the ~~Committee~~ to the circumstances that many members of the Association had been arrested in France & that the government papers had endeavoured to spread it abroad that the Association was implicated in a pretended plot against the emperor. To refute those insinuations he proposed the following:

On the occasion of the last pretended complaint, the French government has not only arrested many members of our Paris and Lyons sections, but continues to insinuate in the organs that the International Workingmen's Association is an accomplice of that pretended complaint. According to the tenor of our Statutes, it is certainly the especial mission of all our branches, in logic, on the Continent, and in the United States, to act not only as centres for the organization of the working class, but also to lead, in these different countries, all political movements leading to the accomplishment of our ultimate end, viz. the economic emancipation of the working class. At the same time, these branches bind all the sections of our Association to act <sup>on an</sup> ~~on~~ the same light of the same four stable principles were not bound on that point, the very nature of an Association which identifies itself with the working classes, would exclude from it, any form of secret society. If the working classes, who form the great bulk of all nations, who produce all their wealth, and in the name of whom are the sweeping powers always put to death, conspire, they conspire publicly, in the unconcealed, unguessed darkness, in the full consciousness that without these powers they enjoy no legal rights or power. If the other incidents of the complaint denounced by the French government are as false and unfounded as its insinuations against the International Workingmen's Association, this last complaint will infallibly bring with it two predecessors of grotesque mendacity. The rising and violent movements against our French sections are exclusively intended serving one single purpose — the manipulation of the public mind.

Cit. Haris's seconded the proposal, which was adopted unanimously.

Page of the Minute Book with Marx's manuscript of "Concerning the Persecution of the Members of the French Sections"





## Karl Marx

[DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE "FRENCH FEDERAL SECTION IN LONDON"]<sup>168</sup>

Considering,

that addresses, resolutions and manifestoes emanating from a *French society in London* which styles itself: "*International Working Men's Association, French Federal Branch*", have recently been published by continental papers and ascribed to the "*International Working Men's Association*"<sup>169</sup>;

that the "*International Working Men's Association*" is at present undergoing severe persecutions on the part of the Austrian and French Governments which eagerly catch at the most flimsy pretexts for justifying such persecutions;

that under these circumstances the General Council would incur a serious responsibility in allowing any society not belonging to the "*International*" to use and act in its name;

the General Council hereby declares that the so-called *London French Federal Branch* has since two years ceased to form part of the "*International*" and to have any connection whatever with the General Council in London or any Branch<sup>a</sup> of that Association on the continent.

London, 10 May 1870

Adopted by the General Council on  
May 10, 1870

First published in *The Penny Bee-Hive*,  
No. 418, May 14, 1870

Reproduced from Marx's manu-  
script pasted into the Minute Book  
of the General Council

<sup>a</sup> The words "in London or any Branch" and "on the continent" were inserted by Eccarius when the resolution was being discussed by the General Council.—*Ed.*

Karl Marx

[RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
ON THE CONVOCAATION OF THE CONGRESS  
IN MAINZ]<sup>170</sup>

Considering,

That by the Basle Congress Paris was appointed as the meeting-place for this year's Congress of the International Working Men's Association;

That the present French regime continuing, the Congress will not be able to meet at Paris;

That nevertheless the preparations for the meeting render an immediate resolution necessary;

That article 3 of the Statutes obliges the Council to change, in case of need, the place of meeting appointed by the Congress<sup>a</sup>;

That the Central Committee of the German Social-Democratic Working Men's Party has invited the General Council to transfer this year's Congress to Germany<sup>171</sup>;

The General Council has in its sitting of the 17th of May unanimously resolved that this year's Congress of the International Working Men's Association be opened on the 5th September next and meet at Mayence.

Adopted by the General Council on  
May 17, 1870

Reproduced from the Minute  
Book of the General Council

First published in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 42,  
May 25, 1870

---

<sup>a</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1867], p. 4.—*Ed*

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels  
 TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE GERMAN  
 SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC WORKERS' PARTY<sup>172</sup>

86 Mornington Street,  
 Stockport Road, Manchester  
 London, June 14, 1870

*Dear Friends,*

Today I received a letter from Stumpf (Mainz), in which he says, among other things:

"Liebknecht authorises me to write to you that because of the Reichstag elections, which are to be held precisely at that time, it might be better to hold the congress here on October 5. Last Monday<sup>a</sup> the congress in Stuttgart<sup>173</sup> also came out in favour of October 5. I hear that Geib is authorised to write to you in this matter."

Liebknecht and the other members of the International ought at least to be familiar with its Rules, which expressly state:

"§ 3. The General Council may, in case of need, change *the place, but has no power to postpone the time of meeting.*"<sup>b</sup>

When I spoke in the General Council in favour of your urgent invitation to have the congress moved to Germany, I naturally assumed that you had taken all the circumstances into consideration. According to the Rules there can be no question of postponing the congress.

Another passage in Stumpf's letter is also far from reassuring. In it he says:

"I have just come from the Burgomaster. He wants a solvent citizen to guarantee that *if the Schweitzer people were to start a fighting*, the town would be recompensed for any damage in the Electoral Hall of Marble, which has been promised to us for the congress, etc."

---

<sup>a</sup> June 6.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Rules of the International Working Men's Association*, London [1867], p. 4. Italics by Marx and Engels.—*Ed.*

You proposed the towns of Mainz, Darmstadt or Mannheim, thus in fact assuming, vis-à-vis the General Council, the responsibility of ensuring that the congress can be held in any of these towns without scandalous scenes which would make the International, and the German working class in particular, the laughing-stock of the whole world. I hope that you have taken all the necessary precautions in this respect.

What is the numerical proportion of Schweitzer supporters in Mainz and district to your own people?

In the event that a scandal cannot be avoided, steps must be taken in advance to ensure that it rebounds on its instigators. The *plan of the Prussian police* to obstruct the international congress in Mainz—which they are unable to prevent from convening by direct means—through their tool, the Schweitzer organisation, or to prevent the peaceful holding of its sessions, must be denounced in the *Volksstaat*, *Zukunft* and in other German papers open to us. As soon as this had been done in Germany, the General Council would then arrange for similar articles to be published in London, Paris, etc. The International can stand a conflict with Mr. Bismarck, but not alleged *spontaneous* “typical German factional brawls between workers” labelled “struggles of principle”.

I daresay that Stumpf—in collaboration with you—will see to it that the delegates find cheap lodgings.

*Salut et fraternité*

Karl Marx

I take this opportunity of sending the Committee my kindest regards. Ever since the Schweitzerites in Forst informed the Burgomaster *in advance* of their intention to create mayhem and he allowed matters to take their course, the connection between these gentlemen and the police is an *established fact*. Perhaps Stumpf could enquire of the Schweitzerites through the Burgomaster of Mainz whether they have been instructed “to fight”. It is anyway high time these people were exposed in the press everywhere as police agents pure and simple, and next time they try their hand at “fighting” they should be given a taste of their own medicine. This is naturally out of the question at the congress, but in the meantime they can be given a thrashing fit to put them off fighting for good. The manner in which Herr Bismarck is portraying these things in the English press is evident from the enclosed cutting, which is doing the rounds of all the

papers. The *North German Correspondence* is an organ founded by Bismarck with Guelphic money.<sup>174</sup>

With kindest regards

F. Engels

Written on June 14, 1870

First published in *Der Volksstaat*, No. 51,  
June 26, 1872

Printed according to the news-  
paper

Published in English for the first  
time

Karl Marx

GENERAL COUNCIL RESOLUTION  
ON THE FEDERAL COMMITTEE  
OF ROMANCE SWITZERLAND<sup>175</sup>

THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE ROMANCE  
FEDERAL COMMITTEE

Considering,

That although a majority of delegates at the Chaux-de-Fonds Congress elected a new Romance Federal Committee, this majority was only nominal;

That the Romance Federal Committee in Geneva, having always fulfilled its obligations to the General Council and to the International Working Men's Association, and having always acted in conformity with the Association's Rules, the General Council does not have the right to relieve it of its title,

The General Council, at its meeting of June 28, 1870, unanimously resolved that the Romance Federal Committee residing in Geneva shall retain its title, and that the Federal Committee residing in Chaux-de-Fonds shall select another, local title of its own choosing.

In the name and by order of the General Council of the  
International Working Men's Association,

*H. Jung,*  
Secretary for Switzerland

London, June 29, 1870

Adopted at the General Council meeting  
of June 28, 1870

Printed according to the news  
paper

First published in *Le Mirabeau*, No. 53,  
July 24, 1870

Translated from the French.

Karl Marx

THE LOCK-OUT OF THE BUILDING TRADES  
AT GENEVA<sup>176</sup>

THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION  
TO THE WORKING MEN AND WOMEN  
OF EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES

Fellow-Workers,

The Master Builders of Geneva have, after mature consideration, arrived at the conclusion that "the entire Freedom of Labour"<sup>a</sup> is best calculated to promote the happiness of the labouring poor. In order to secure this blessing to their work-people, they resolved to carry into practice, on June 11th, a trick of English invention, viz., the lock-out of upwards of 3,000 mechanics till then in their employ.

Trade Unionism being of recent growth in Switzerland, the same master builders of Geneva used to indignantly denounce it as an English importation. Two years ago, they taunted their men with a lack of Patriotism for trying to transplant on Swiss soil such an exotic plant as the limitation of the working day with fixed rates of wages per hour. They never doubted but there must be some keen mischief-mongers behind the scene, since their own native workmen, if left to themselves, would naturally like nothing better than drudging from twelve to fourteen hours a day for whatever pay the master might find it in his heart to allow. The deluded men, they publicly asserted, were acting under dictation from London and Paris, much the same as Swiss diplomatists are wont to obey the behests from St. Petersburg, Berlin, and Paris. However, the men were not to be cajoled, taunted, or intimidated into the persuasion that limiting the daily hours of toil to ten, and fixing the rate of wages per hour was something derogatory to the

---

<sup>a</sup> Here and below Marx describes the builders' strike of 1868 according to J. Ph. Becker's book *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeitseinstellung in Genf im Frühjahr 1868*, Geneva, 1868, pp. 6, 7, 38 and 39.—Ed.



dignity of a Free Citizen, nor could they by any provocation be inveigled into acts of violence affording the masters a plausible pretext for enforcing public repressive measures against the unions.

At last, in May, 1868, M. Camperio, the then Minister of Justice and Police, brought about an agreement that the hours of labour should be nine a day in winter, and eleven a day in summer, wages varying from forty-five to fifty centimes an hour. That agreement was signed in the presence of the Minister by both masters and men. In the spring of 1869 some masters refused to pay more wages for a day's labour of eleven hours, than they had paid during winter for nine hours. The matter was again compromised by making 45 centimes an hour, the uniform rate of wages for artisans in the building trade. Although clearly comprised in this settlement, the plasterers and painters had to toil away on the old conditions because they were not then yet sufficiently organised to enforce the new ones. On the 15th of May last, they claimed to be put on a level with the other trades, and on the flat refusal of the masters, struck work the following week. On the 4th of June, the master builders resolved that if the plasterers and painters did not return to work on the 9th, the whole of the building operatives should be locked out on the 11th. This menace was carried into effect. Not satisfied with having locked out the men, the masters publicly called upon the federal government to forcibly dissolve the union<sup>a</sup> and expel the foreigners from Switzerland.<sup>177</sup> Their benevolent and truly liberal attempts at restoring the freedom of labour, were, however, baffled by a monster meeting, and a protest on the part of the Swiss non-building operatives.<sup>178</sup>

The other Geneva trades have formed a committee to manage the affairs for the men locked-out. Some house owners who had contracted for new buildings with the master builders, considered the contracts broken, and invited the men employed on them to continue the work as if nothing had happened. This proposal was at once accepted. Many single men are leaving Geneva as fast as they can. Still there remain some 2,000 families deprived of their usual means of subsistence.<sup>b</sup> The General Council of the International Working Men's Association, therefore, calls upon all honest working men and women, throughout the civilised world, to assist

---

<sup>a</sup> The French text has: "International Association".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See *L'Égalité*, No. 24, June 18, 1870.—*Ed.*

both by moral and material means the Geneva building trades in their just struggle against capitalist despotism.

By order of the Council,

*B. Lucraft, Chairman*  
*John Weston, Treasurer*  
*George Eccarius, Gen. Sec.*

256, High Holborn, London, W.C.,  
July 5th, 1870

Adopted by the General Council on  
July 5, 1870

Reproduced from the leaflet

First published as a leaflet

## Frederick Engels

[NOTES FOR THE PREFACE TO A COLLECTION  
OF IRISH SONGS]<sup>179</sup>

Some of the Irish folk-melodies are of ancient origin, others have emerged in the last 300-400 years, a good number as late as the last century, many of these composed by Carolan, one of the last Irish bards. These bards, or harpists—poets, composers and singers in one person—used to be very numerous: every Irish chieftain kept his own at his castle. Many also travelled around the country as wandering minstrels, persecuted by the English, who quite rightly saw in them the main bearers of the national, anti-English tradition. The old songs about the victories of Finn Mac Cumhal (whom Macpherson stole from the Irish and turned into a Scot under the name of Fingal in his *Ossian*,<sup>a 180</sup> which is entirely based on these Irish songs), about the splendour of the old royal palace of Tara, about the heroic feats of King Brian Borumha, and the later songs about the struggles of the Irish chieftains against the Sassenach (English) were preserved by these bards in the living memory of the nation; and they also celebrated in song the deeds of contemporary Irish chieftains in their struggle for independence. But when the Irish people were utterly crushed in the seventeenth century by Elizabeth, James I, Oliver Cromwell and William of Orange,<sup>b</sup> robbed of their land holdings in favour of English intruders, outlawed and turned into a nation of pariahs, the wandering minstrels were hounded as fiercely as the Catholic priests, and towards the beginning of this century

---

<sup>a</sup> [J. Macpherson,] *Fingal, an Ancient Epic Poem in Six Books, together with Several Other Poems composed by Ossian, the Son of Fingal, translated from the Gaelic Language* (in *The Works of Ossian*, 1765).— Ed.

<sup>b</sup> William III.— Ed.

they gradually died out. Their names are forgotten, of their verses only fragments remain; the most beautiful legacy which they bequeathed to their enslaved but undefeated people are their melodies.

Poems in the Irish language are all composed in stanzas of four lines. For this reason, most of the melodies, especially the older ones, are based on this four-line rhythm, although the link is often somewhat obscured. This rhythm is often followed by a refrain or a coda on the harp. Many of these old melodies are known only by their Irish names or opening words, even though in most of Ireland Irish is now only understood by old people, or not at all. But the greater part of the melodies, being more recent, already have English names or texts.

The melancholy that prevails in most of these melodies is even today the expression of the national mood. How could it be otherwise among a people whose rulers are always inventing new, more up-to-date methods of oppression? The latest method, introduced forty years ago and carried to extremes for the past twenty years, is the mass eviction of the Irish from house and home, and that—in Ireland—is tantamount to deportation. Since 1841 the population of the country has decreased by two and a half million, and more than three million Irishmen have emigrated. All in the interests and at the behest of the large landowners of English origin. If this goes on for another thirty years, the only Irishmen left will be those in America.

Written on about July 5, 1870

Printed according to the manuscript

First published, in Italian, in the journal  
*Movimento Operaio*, No. 2, Milan, 1955

Karl Marx

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION TO ALL SECTIONS<sup>181</sup>

1) The General Council requests all sections to give their delegates formal instructions concerning the advisability of changing the venue of the General Council for 1870-71.

2) In the event of agreement on the change, the General Council will propose Brussels as the venue for the General Council that year.

Written on July 14, 1870

First published in Marx and Engels,  
*Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16,  
Moscow, 1960

Printed according to the manu-  
script

Translated from the French

Karl Marx

PROGRAMME FOR THE MAINZ CONGRESS  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL <sup>182</sup>

- 1) On the need to abolish the public debt. Discussion of the right to equitable compensation.
- 2) Relationship between the political action and the social movement of the working class.<sup>183</sup>
- 3) Practical means of converting landed property into social property (*see Note*).
- 4) On the conversion of banks of issue into national banks.
- 5) Conditions of cooperative production on a national scale.
- 6) On the need for the working class to draw up *general statistics of labour*, in conformity with the Geneva Congress resolutions of 1866.<sup>a</sup>
- 7) Reconsideration by the Congress of the question of the means to do away with war.

*Note to Point 3: The Belgian General Council* has proposed this question:

“The practical means of forming *agricultural sections* within the *International* and of establishing solidarity between agricultural proletarians and proletarians of other industries.”

---

<sup>a</sup> See *The International Working Men's Association. Resolutions of the Congress of Geneva, 1866, and the Congress of Brussels, 1868*, London [1869], p. 4.—Ed.

The *General Council of the International Association* believes this question is contained in Point 3.

Written on July 14, 1870

First published as a leaflet, *The Fifth Annual Congress of the International Working Men's Association*, on July 12, 1870

Printed according to the manuscript

Translated from the French

Frederick Engels

[THE HISTORY OF IRELAND]<sup>184</sup>



Written between May and the first half of  
July 1870

First published in *Marx-Engels Archives*,  
Russian edition, Vol. X, Moscow, 1948

Printed according to the manu-  
script

### NATURAL CONDITIONS

The country whose history is to occupy us is situated in the north-western corner of Europe, an island of 1,530 German or 32,500 English square miles. But between Ireland and the rest of Europe another island lies transversally, three times the size, which we for brevity's sake usually refer to as England; it completely encloses Ireland from the north, east and south-east, only leaving it a clear view in the direction of Spain, Western France and America.

The channel between the two islands, 50-70 English miles wide at the narrowest points in the south, 13 miles wide at one place in the north and 22 miles at another, enabled the Irish Scots in the north to emigrate to the neighbouring island and found the Kingdom of Scotland even before the 5th century. In the south it was too wide for the boats of the Irish and the Britons and even posed a serious obstacle to the Romans' flat-bottomed coasting vessels. But when the Frisians, Angles and Saxons, and after them the Scandinavians, ventured out on to the high seas, out of sight of land, in their keeled vessels, this channel was no longer an obstacle. Ireland became the object of raids by the Scandinavians and easy prey for the English. As soon as the Normans had formed a strong, uniform government in England, the influence of the larger neighbouring island made itself felt—in those days this meant a war of conquest.<sup>185</sup>

Then, in the course of the war, there followed a period when England attained supremacy at sea, thus ruling out the possibility of successful foreign intervention.

Once the whole of the larger island was finally united in a single state, it was then bound to attempt the complete assimilation of Ireland, too.

If this assimilation has succeeded, the whole process belongs to history. History is its judge, but it could never be reversed. If, however, assimilation has *failed* after seven hundred years of struggle; if instead all the intruders who swept in over Ireland in waves, one after the other, were assimilated by *Ireland*; if, even at present, the Irish are no more English, or “West Britons”, as they are called, than the Poles are West Russians after a mere century of oppression; if the struggle is still not at an end and there is no prospect of any end at all except through the extermination of the oppressed RACE—if all this is so, then all the geographical excuses in the world will not suffice to prove that England’s calling is to conquer Ireland.

---

In order to understand the soil conditions of present-day Ireland, we must go back a long way, right back to the age when the so-called carboniferous system was formed.\*

The centre of Ireland, north and south of the line from Dublin to Galway, forms a wide plain at an average height of 100-300 feet above sea-level. This plain, the ground-plan—as it were—of all Ireland, comprises the massive layer of limestone, which forms the middle stratum of the carboniferous system (CARBONIFEROUS LIMESTONE) and immediately on top of which lie the coal-bearing strata (the COAL-MEASURES<sup>a</sup> proper) in England and elsewhere.

In the south, as in the north, this plain is surrounded by a mountain chain which mainly follows the coastline and almost exclusively consists of older rock formations, which have broken through the limestone: granite, mica-schist, Cambrian, Cambro-Silurian, Upper Silurian, Devonian and the argillaceous schist and sandstone, rich in copper and lead, belonging to the bottom layer of the carboniferous system and containing, in addition, some gold, silver, tin, zinc, iron, cobalt, antimony glance, and manganese.

Only in a few places is the limestone itself high enough to form mountains: in the centre of the plain, in Queen’s County,<sup>186</sup> rising to 600 feet, and in the west, on the southern shore of Galway Bay, rising to just over 1,000 feet (Burren Hills).

\* Unless otherwise stated, the geological data given here are taken from: J. Beete Jukes, *The Student’s Manual of Geology*, New Edition, Edinburgh, 1862. Jukes was the local director of the geological survey of Ireland and is therefore the leading authority on this topic, which he treats in particular detail.

<sup>a</sup> The terms in small caps are given in English in the manuscript after their German equivalents.—Ed.





In several places in the southern half of the limestone plain there are isolated ranges of 700-1,000 feet [above] sea-level and of considerable extent, formed by the coal-bearing strata. They occur in synclines in the surface of the limestone, protruding from it as plateaus with fairly steep sides.

"The escarpments in these widely separated tracts of coal-measures are so similar, and the beds composing them so precisely alike, that it is impossible to suppose otherwise than that they originally formed continuous sheets of rock, although they are now separated by sixty or eighty miles.... This belief is strongly confirmed by the fact, that there are often, between the two larger areas, several little outlying patches in which the coal-measures are found capping the summits of small hills [...] and that wherever the undulation of the limestone is such as to bring its upper beds down beneath the level of the present surface of the ground, we invariably find some of the lower beds of the coal-measures coming in upon them" (Jukes, p. 286).<sup>a</sup>

Yet other factors, which would lead us into too much detail here and can be found in Jukes, pp. 286-89, leave no doubt that, as Jukes says, the entire central plain of Ireland is a result of denudation, so that, the coal-measures and the upper limestone deposits having been washed away—an average thickness of at least 2,000-3,000 feet, perhaps 5,000-6,000 feet of stone,—it is now principally the bottom layers of limestone that have emerged on the surface. Even on the highest ridge of the Burren Hills, County Clare, which consist of pure limestone and are 1,000 feet high, Jukes found (p. 513) yet another small outcrop of the coal-measures.

In fact, in the south of Ireland there are still some fairly significant tracts possessing coal-measures; but among them only isolated spots contain coal thick enough to make mining worthwhile. Moreover, the coal itself is anthracitic, i.e. it contains little hydrogen and cannot be used for all industrial purposes without additives.

In the north of Ireland there are also several not very extensive coalfields whose coal is bituminous, i.e. ordinary pit-coal rich in hydrogen, and whose stratification does not entirely match that of the coal districts further south. It is, however, quite evident that the coal-measures were washed away here too: large pieces of coal, along with sandstone and blue clay from the same formation, have been found on the surface of a limestone valley to the south-east of one of these coalfields in the direction of Belturbet and Mohill. Large blocks of coal have frequently been found in the course of well-sinking in the drift of this area; and, in some cases, the

---

<sup>a</sup> J. Beete Jukes, *The Student's Manual of Geology*, pp. 285-86.—Ed.

amounts of coal were so considerable that it was thought that deeper excavation would lead to a coal seam (Kane, *Industrial Resources of Ireland*, 2nd edition, Dublin, 1845, p. 265).

It can be seen that Ireland's misfortune is ancient indeed: it commences immediately after the coal-measures were deposited. A country whose coal deposits have been washed away, situated right next to a larger country with plenty of coal, was for a long time condemned by nature, as it were, to play the part of a farming land vis-à-vis the future industrial country. This sentence, pronounced millions of years ago, was not carried out until this century. What is more, we shall see later how the English gave nature a helping hand by immediately and violently trampling underfoot almost any sign of burgeoning industry in Ireland.

More recent Secondary and Tertiary deposits<sup>187</sup> occur almost solely in the north-east; among them of chief interest to us are the Keuper strata in the Belfast area, which contain more or less pure rock-salt to a thickness of up to 200 feet (Jukes, p. 554), and the chalk, which covers the whole of County Antrim, the chalk itself being overlaid with basalt. Generally speaking, the history of Ireland's geological development came to a halt from the end of the Carboniferous Period to the Ice Age.

It is known that after the end of the Tertiary Epoch there was a period when the lowlands of the middle latitudes of Europe were submerged beneath the sea and when such cold temperatures prevailed in Europe that the valleys of the islands of mountain still protruding were covered with glaciers right down to the sea. The icebergs, which detached themselves from these glaciers, carried large and small boulders from the mountains out to sea, until the ice melted and the boulders and other debris transported by the ice sank to the bottom—a process that still occurs daily along the coasts of the polar regions.

During the Ice Age Ireland, too, with the exception of the mountain tops, was submerged beneath the sea. The maximum extent of this submergence may not have been the same everywhere, but one may assume it to have been, on average, about 1,000 feet below the present level; the granite mountains to the south of Dublin must have been submerged by over 1,200 feet.

If Ireland were to sink only 500 feet, the mountain ranges alone would be left, forming two semi-circular groups of islands on either side of a broad sound stretching from Dublin to Galway. Were the land to sink even lower, these islands would shrink in size and in number until, at a drop of 2,000 feet, only the peaks of

the outermost mountains would be left sticking up out of the water.\*

As this submersion slowly took place, the limestone plain and the mountainsides must have been cleared of a great deal of older rock that had overlain them; there then followed the deposition of the "drift" peculiar to the Ice Age over the entire area that was covered by water. The matter produced by the weathering of the mountain islands, and the finely ground particles of rock scraped out of the valleys by the slowly but powerfully moving glaciers—earth, sand, gravel, stones, smoothly polished blocks in the ice itself, sharp-edged ones on its surface—all this was carried out to sea by the icebergs as they detached themselves from the shore, and eventually sank to the bottom. Depending on the circumstances, the layer thus formed consists of clay (deriving from argillaceous schist), sand (from quartz and granite), limestone gravel (from limestone mountains), marl (where finely ground limestone was mixed with clay) or of mixtures of all these components; in every case, however, it contains a quantity of stones, some large, some small, sometimes rounded, sometimes jagged, and some the size of those colossal erratic boulders which occur even more frequently in Ireland than on the North German Plain or between the Alps and the Jura.

When the land was subsequently raised up out of the sea once more, this newly formed surface acquired, more or less, its present-day composition. In Ireland little washing-away seems to have taken place in the process; with few exceptions, the drift covers all the flat land in a layer of varying thickness, extends to the valleys in the mountains and is often found high up on the mountainsides, too. The rocks occurring in it are chiefly limestone; for this reason, the entire layer is commonly termed LIMESTONE GRAVEL<sup>a</sup> here. Numerous large limestone boulders are also scattered over all the lowlying land, one or more in almost every field. Obviously, near the mountains besides the limestone, the local rocks originating there (particularly granite) are also found in large quantities. Granite from the northern shore of Galway Bay occurs in the plain to the south-east, in large quantities as far as the Galton Mountains, and in odd instances as far as Mallow (County Cork).

\* Of Ireland's 32,509 English square miles, 13,243 lie between sea-level and 250 feet; 11,797 are 251-500 feet above sea-level; 5,798 are 501-1,000 feet; 1,589 are 1,001-2,000 feet; 82 square miles are 2,001 feet or more above sea-level.

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript this term is given in English in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*



The north of the country is covered with drift to the same height above sea-level as the central plain; between the various more or less parallel chains of mountains traversing it, the south displays a similar deposit, deriving from local rocks of chiefly Silurian formation, and occurring in large quantities particularly in the valley of the Flesk and the Laune near Killarney.

The traces of the glacier on the mountainsides and the valley floors in Ireland are very common and unmistakable, particularly in the south-west. Only in Oberhasli and here and there in Sweden do I recall having seen more distinct traces of ice of every kind than in Killarney (in the Black Valley and the Gap of Dunloe).

The elevation of the land during or after the Ice Age seems to have been so pronounced that Britain was for a while connected by dry land not only with the Continent but with Ireland as well. At least, this seems to be the only explanation for the similarity of the fauna of these countries. Of the extinct large mammals Ireland had the mammoth, the Irish giant stag, the cave-bear, a species of reindeer, and others in common with the Continent. In fact, an elevation of less than 240 feet above the present level would be sufficient to join Ireland and Scotland, and one of less than 360 feet to join Ireland and Wales with wide ridges of land.\* The fact that at some time after the Ice Age Ireland occupied a higher level than at present is proved by the underwater peat bogs with upright treestumps and roots which occur all along the coast, and are identical in every respect with the lowest layers of the adjoining inland peat bogs.

---

Insofar as it is suitable for agriculture, the soil of Ireland is accordingly almost entirely composed of "drift" from the Ice Age; here, thanks to its schist and limestone origin, it is an extremely fertile light loam, unlike the barren sand with which the Scottish, Scandinavian and Finnish granites have covered such a large part of North Germany. The diversity of the rocks which have laid down their deposits on this soil—and continue to do so—provided it with a corresponding diversity of the mineral elements

\* See Map 15a in Stieler's school-atlas,<sup>a</sup> 1868. This map, as well as No. 15d of Ireland in particular, gives a very clear picture of the nature of the terrain.

<sup>a</sup> A. Stieler, *Hand-Atlas über alle Theile der Erde und über das Weltgebäude*, Gotha, 1864.—Ed.

necessary for the vegetation; and if one of these, lime, is often absent from the surface soil, there is nevertheless an abundance of limestone boulders of different sizes everywhere—quite apart from the underlying limestone bed—so that it can easily be added.

When the well-known English agronomist *Arthur Young* travelled in Ireland in the 1770s he did not know what surprised him more, the natural fertility of the soil, or the barbaric treatment meted out to it by the farmers. “A light, dry, soft, sandy loam soil” prevails wherever the land is any good at all. In the “Golden Vale” of Tipperary and elsewhere, too, he found

“the same sandy reddish loam I have already described, incomparable land for tillage”. From there, in the direction of Clonmel, “the whole way, through the same rich vein of red sandy loam I have so often mentioned. I examined it in several fields, and found it to be of an extraordinary fertility, and as fine turnip land as ever I saw”.

#### Further:

“The rich land reaches from Charleville, at the foot of the mountains, to Tipperary,” (the city), “by Kiltfennan, a line of twenty-five miles, and across from Ardpatrick to within four miles of Limerick—sixteen miles.”—“The richest land is the Corcasses on the Maag, near Adare, a tract of five miles long, and two broad, down to the Shannon... When they break this land up, they sow first oats, and get twenty barrels an acre” (14 stone or 196 pounds per barrel), “or forty common barrels, and do not reckon that an extra crop; they take ten or twelve in succession [...] till the crops grow poor, and then they sow one of horse beans, which refreshes the land enough to take ten crops of oats more; the beans are very good.... Were such barbarians ever heard of?”

#### Further, near Castle Oliver, County Limerick:

“The finest soil in the country is upon the roots of mountains; it is a rich, mellow, crumbling, putrid, sandy loam, eighteen inches to three feet deep; the colour a reddish brown. It is dry, sound land, and would do for turnips exceedingly well, for carrots, for cabbages; and, in a word, for everything. I think upon the whole it is the richest soil I ever saw, and such as is applicable to every purpose you can wish. It will fat the largest bullock, and at the same time do equally well for sheep, for tillage, for turnips, for wheat, for beans; and, in a word, for every crop [...]. You must examine into the soil before you will believe that a country, which has so beggarly an appearance, can be so rich and fertile.”

#### On the river Blackwater near Mallow

“there are tracts of flat lands, in some places one quarter of a mile broad; the grass everywhere remarkably fine. It is the finest sandy land I have anywhere seen, of a reddish-brown colour; would yield the greatest arable crops in the world, if in tillage. It is five feet deep, and [...] burns into good brick; yet it is a perfect sand. The banks of this river—from its source to the sea—are equally remarkable for beauty of prospect, and fertility of soil.”—“Friable, sandy loams, dry but fertile, are very common, and they form the best soils in the kingdom for tillage and sheep. Tipperary and Roscommon abound particularly in them. The most fertile of all are the bullock pastures of Limerick, and the banks of the Shannon, in Clare, called

the Corcasses.... Sand, which is so common in England, and yet more common through Spain, France, Germany, and Poland—quite from Gibraltar to Petersburg—is nowhere met with in Ireland, except for narrow slips of hillocks upon the sea coast. Nor did I ever meet with or hear of a chalky soil.”\*

Young’s verdict on the soil of Ireland is summarised in the following sentences:

“If I was to name the characteristics of an excellent soil, I should say *that*<sup>a</sup> upon which you may fat an ox, and feed off a crop of turnips. By the way I recollect little or no such land in England, yet it is not uncommon in Ireland” (II, p. 271). “Natural fertility, acre for acre over the two kingdoms, is certainly in favour of Ireland” (II, Part 2, p. 3).—“As far as I can form a general idea of the soil of the two kingdoms, Ireland has much the advantage” (II, Part 2, p. 12).

In 1808-10, Edward *Wakefield*, another Englishman versed in agronomy, travelled around Ireland and presented the results of his observations in a most valuable work.\*\* His comments are better arranged, more lucid and more complete than those in Young’s travel book; on the whole, however, they are both accurate.

On the whole, Wakefield finds no great diversity of soil in Ireland. Sand only occurs on the shore (it is so rare inland that large quantities of sea-sand are transported to the interior in order to improve the peat and loam soil), chalky soil is unknown (the chalk in Antrim, as mentioned above, is covered by a layer of basalt, which after weathering produces an extremely fertile surface soil—chalk constitutes the poorest soil in England),

“and tenacious clays, such as those found in Oxfordshire, in some parts of Essex, and throughout High Suffolk, I could never meet with in Ireland”.<sup>b</sup>

The Irish call any loamy soil *CLAY*<sup>c</sup>; there may be proper clay in Ireland, too, but in any case not on the surface as in some parts of England. There is limestone or calcareous gravel almost everywhere, he says.

“The former is a useful production, and is converted into a source of wealth that will always be employed with advantage.”<sup>d</sup>

Mountains and peat bogs do, of course, reduce the fertile surface considerably. In the north, he says, there is little fertile

\* *A Tour in Ireland* by Arthur Young, 3 vols., London, 177.... The above passages are in Vol. II, pp. 28, 135, 143, 154, 165 and Part 2, p. 4.<sup>188</sup>

\*\* *An Account of Ireland, Statistical and Political*. By Edward Wakefield. London, 1812, 2 vols., in 4<sup>o</sup>.<sup>189</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Author’s italics.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> E. Wakefield, *An Account of Ireland...*, Vol. I, Ch. III, p. 79.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Engels gives this English word in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.*—*Ed.*

land; yet here, too, there are extremely luxuriant valleys in every county, and even in deepest Donegal, at the foot of the wildest mountains, Wakefield unexpectedly came across a very fertile area. The intensive cultivation of flax in the north is in itself sufficient indication of the soil's fertility, since this plant never thrives in poor soil.

"A great portion of the soil of Ireland throws out a luxuriant herbage, springing up from a calcareous subsoil, without any considerable depth. I have seen bullocks of the weight of 180 stone, rapidly fattening on land incapable of receiving the print of a horse's foot, even in the wettest season, and where there were not many inches of soil. This is *one* species of the rich soil of Ireland, and is to be found throughout Roscommon, in some parts of Galway, Clare, and other districts. Some places exhibit the richest loam that I ever saw turned up by a plough; this is the case throughout Meath in particular. Where such soil occurs, its fertility is so conspicuous, that it appears as if nature had determined to counteract the bad effects produced by the clumsy system of its cultivators.—On the banks of the Fergus and Shannon, the land is of a different kind, but equally productive, though the surface presents the appearance of marsh. These districts are called 'the caucasses'" (thus writes Wakefield, differing with Young): "the substratum is a blue silt, deposited by the sea, which seems to partake of the qualities of the upper stratum; for this land can be injured by no depth of ploughing.—In the counties of Limerick and Tipperary there is another kind of rich land, consisting of a dark, friable, dry, sandy loam which, if preserved in a clean state, would throw out corn for several years in succession. It is equally well adapted to grazing and tillage, and I will venture to say, seldom experiences a season too wet, or a summer too dry. The richness of the land, in some of the vales, may be accounted for by the deposition of soil carried thither from the upper grounds by the rain. The subsoil is calcareous, so that the very richest manure is thus spread over the land below, without subjecting the farmer to any labour" (Vol. I, pp. 79, 80).

Where there is a thinnish layer of sticky loam immediately on top of the limestone, the land is no use for arable farming, yielding only miserable crops of corn; but it provides excellent sheep-walks, which go on improving it, producing a thick grass mixed with plenty of white clover and...<sup>a</sup> (Vol. I, p. 80).

Dr. Beaufort\* writes that in the west, particularly in Mayo, there are a great many *TURLOUGHs*—flat areas of differing sizes which, though not perceptibly fed by any streams or rivers, are covered with water in winter which drains away in summer through underground fissures in the limestone, leaving behind a firm, fertile grazing land.

"Independently of the caucasses," continues Wakefield, "the richest soil in Ireland is to be found in the counties of Tipperary, Limerick, Roscommon, Longford, and Meath. In Longford there is a farm called Granard Kill, which

\* Beaufort, Revd. Dr., *Memoir of a Map of Ireland*, 1792, pp. 75, 76. Quoted in Wakefield, Vol. I, p. 36.

<sup>a</sup> Omission in the manuscript. Wakefield has: "...and wild burnet".—*Ed.*

produced eight crops of potatoes without manure. Some parts of the County of Cork are uncommonly fertile, and upon the whole, Ireland may be considered as affording land of an excellent quality, though I am by no means prepared to go the length of many writers, who assert, that it is decidedly acre for acre richer than England" (Vol. 1, [pp. 80-81]).

The last remark, which is aimed at Young, stems from a misunderstanding of the statement by Young quoted above.<sup>a</sup> Young does not say that Ireland's soil is more productive than England's, taking them both in their present state of cultivation, which is naturally much higher in England; Young simply says that the *natural* fertility of the soil in Ireland is greater than in England, and Wakefield does not directly dispute this.

A Scottish agronomist, Mr. *Caird*, was sent to Ireland in 1849, after the last famine,<sup>b</sup> by Sir<sup>c</sup> Robert Peel to report on means of improving the agriculture there. In his report, published soon afterwards, on the West of Ireland, the worst hit part of the country except for the extreme north-west, he says:

"I was much surprised to find so great an extent of fine fertile land. The interior of the country is very level, and its general character stony and dry; the soil dry and friable. The humidity of the climate causes a very constant vegetation, which has both advantages and disadvantages. It is favourable for grass and green crops,\* but renders it necessary to employ very vigorous and persevering efforts to extirpate weeds. The abundance of lime everywhere, both in the rock itself, and as sand and gravel beneath the surface, are of the greatest value."

Caird also confirms that the whole of County Westmeath consists of the finest pasture land. Of the region north of Lough Corrib (County Mayo) he writes:

"The greater part of this farm" (a farm of 500 acres) "is the finest feeding land for sheep and cattle—dry, friable, undulating land, all on limestone. The fields of rich old grass are superior to anything we have, except in small patches, in any part of Scotland I at present remember. The best of it is *too good for tillage*, but about one half of it might be profitably brought under the plough... The rapidity with which the land on this limestone subsoil recovers itself, and, without any seeds being sown, reverts to good pasture, is very remarkable." \*\*

\* "GREEN CROPS"<sup>d</sup> include all cultivated fodder crops, root vegetables of all kinds and potatoes; everything but corn, grass and garden produce.

\*\* Caird, *The Plantation Scheme, or the West of Ireland as a field for investment*, Edinburgh, 1850. The above passages are on pp. 6, 17-18, 121. In 1850-51, Mr. Caird wrote travel reports for *The Times* on the condition of agriculture in the main counties of England.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 156.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> That of 1846-47.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> At this point in the manuscript the word "Ministry" appears above the word "Sir".—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Engels gives these English words in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

Finally let us hear what a French authority says\*:

“Of the two divisions of Ireland, that of the north-west, embracing a fourth of the island, and comprehending the province of Connaught, with the adjacent counties of Donegal, Clare and Kerry, resembles Wales, and even, in its worst parts, the Highlands of Scotland. Here again are two millions of unsightly hectares, the frightful aspect of which has given rise to the national proverb, ‘Go to thè devil or Connaught’\*\*. The other, or south-east and much larger division, since it [...] includes the provinces of Leinster, Ulster and Munster, equal to about six millions of hectares, is *at least equal* in natural fertility to England proper. It is not all, however, equally good; the amount of humidity there is still greater than in England. Extensive bogs cover about a tenth of the surface; more than another tenth is occupied with mountains and lakes. In fact, five only out of eight millions of hectares in Ireland are cultivated” (pp. 9, 10).—“Even the English admit that Ireland, in point of soil, is superior to England. [...] Ireland contains eight millions of hectares. Rocks, lakes, and bogs occupy about two millions of these, and two millions more are indifferent land. The remainder—that is to say about half the country—is rich land, with calcareous subsoil. What better could be conceived?” (p. 343).

It is evident that all the authorities are agreed that the soil of Ireland contains all the elements of fertility to an unusual degree, with regard to both its chemical constituents and its physical composition. The extremes—sticky, impenetrable clay, which allows no water through, and loose sand, which does not retain it for an hour—are nowhere to be found. Yet Ireland has another disadvantage. While the mountains are mainly along the coast, the watersheds between the different river basins in the interior of the country are mostly very low-lying. The rivers are not able to drain off all the rainwater into the sea, and this gives rise to extensive peat bogs in the interior, particularly on the watersheds. In the plain alone 1,576,000 acres are covered by peat bogs. These are mostly depressions or hollows in the terrain, largely former shallow lake basins, which have gradually become overgrown with moss and bog plants and filled up with their decayed remains. Like our North German bogs they are no use except for peat-cutting. With the present system of agriculture their edges can only slowly be brought under cultivation. The floor of these former lake basins consists of marl everywhere which derives its limestone content (ranging from 5 to 90%) from the shells of the freshwater mussels in the lake. Thus, each one of these peat bogs contains within itself the material for its own reclamation and cultivation. In addition, most of them are rich in iron stone. Apart

\* Léonce de Lavergne, *Rural Economy of England, Scotland and Ireland*. Translated from the French. Edinburgh, 1855.

\*\* As we shall see, this proverb owes its origin not to the dark mountains of Connaught but to the darkest period in the entire history of Ireland.<sup>190</sup>

from these lowland bogs there are another 1,254,000 acres of mountain bogs, a result of deforestation in a damp climate and one of the peculiar beauties of the British Isles. Wherever flat or gently domed peaks were deforested—which occurred on a mass scale in the 17th and first half of the 18th centuries to keep the ironworks supplied with charcoal—the effects of the rain and mist encouraged the formation of a layer of peat, which later continued down the slopes where conditions were favourable. The entire ridge of mountains which bisects Northern England from north to south as far as Derby is covered by such moors; and where large clusters of mountains are shown on the map of Ireland there are also mountain bogs in abundance. The peat bogs of Ireland are not, however, by any means irrevocably lost to agriculture; rather, in due course we shall see what rich fruits some of them are capable of yielding with the appropriate treatment, not to mention the 2 million hectares (=5 million acres) contemptuously referred to by Lavergne as “indifferent land”.

---

The climate of Ireland is determined by its position. The Gulf Stream and the prevailing south-west winds bring it warmth, making for mild winters and cool summers. In the south-west, summer lasts far into October, which, according to Wakefield (Vol. I, p. 221), is here considered the favourite month for sea-bathing. Frost is rare and does not last long; snow hardly ever lies on the ground for long on the plain. Around the bays of Kerry and Cork, which face south-west and are sheltered from the north, spring weather prevails all winter long; there, as in some other places, myrtle thrives in the open (Wakefield cites an example of a country estate with myrtle trees 16 feet high, the twigs of which were used to make stable brooms, Vol. I, p. 55), and laurel, arbutus and other evergreen plants grow into tall trees. Even in Wakefield's day the farmers in the south left their potatoes out all winter, without any being damaged by frost since 1740. On the other hand, Ireland does bear the brunt of the first heavy downpour from the heavy Atlantic rain clouds. The average rainfall in Ireland is at least 35 inches, considerably more than the average for England, but certainly less than that for Lancashire and Cheshire, and scarcely more than the average for the whole of the West of England. Nevertheless, the Irish climate is decidedly more pleasant than the English. The leaden skies which so often drip away unceasingly for days on end in England, are mainly

replaced by continental April skies there; the fresh sea breezes bring the clouds swiftly out of the blue but drive them away again just as swiftly, unless they promptly fall to earth in a sudden shower. And even rain that continues for days, such as occurs in late autumn, does not have the chronic air of English rain. The weather, like the inhabitants, has a more acute character, it moves in sharper, more sudden contrasts; the sky is like an Irish woman's face, rain and sunshine follow on each other suddenly and unexpectedly, but there is no room for the grey English boredom.

The oldest report on the Irish climate is provided by the Roman *Pomponius Mela* (*De situ orbis*) in the first century A. D. It says:

"Beyond Britain lies Hibernia, almost equal to it in extent but otherwise similar; of a rather long shape, *with skies adverse to the ripening seed*; but *abounding in grass not only luxuriant but also sweet*, so that a small part of the day suffices for the cattle to eat their fill, and if they are not removed from the pasture they will go on grazing until they burst."

"*Coeli ad maturanda semina iniqui, verum adeo luxuriosa herbis, non laetis modo, sed etiam dulcibus!*" Translated into modern English this passage may be found with others in a work by Mr. *Goldwin Smith*, sometime Professor of History at Oxford and now at Cornell University in America. He tells us that it is difficult to reap a wheat harvest in a large part of Ireland, and continues:

"Its<sup>a</sup> natural way to commercial prosperity seems to be to supply with the produce of its grazing and dairy farms the *population of England*."\*

From Mela to Goldwin Smith and up to the present day how often the assertion has been made—particularly since 1846<sup>191</sup> by the noisy chorus of Irish landowners—that Ireland has been condemned by its climate not to supply the Irish with bread but to supply the English with meat and butter, and that consequently it is the vocation of the Irish people to be shipped over the ocean in order to make way for cows and sheep in Ireland!

It is clear that to establish the facts with regard to the Irish climate is to solve a political issue of great topicality. To be sure, the climate only concerns us here insofar as it is of importance for agriculture. The observations of natural scientists who have measured the rainfall are, given the present inadequate state of

\* Goldwin Smith, *Irish History and Irish Character*, Oxford and London, 1861 [p. 3].—We know not what to admire more in this work, which sets out to justify English policy in Ireland under a mask of "objectivity", the ignorance of the professor of history or the hypocrisy of the liberal bourgeois. We shall meet with both again.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Engels has "Ireland's".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Cf. this volume, p. 283.—*Ed.*



such observations, only of secondary value for our purposes; it is not so much a matter of *how much* rain falls, but far more *how* and *when* it falls. The judgments of the agronomists are the ones that carry the most weight here.

*Arthur Young* considers Ireland to be decidedly damper than England; hence the astonishing ability of the soil to produce grass. He speaks of cases where turnip and stubble fields, left unploughed, have yielded a plentiful hay harvest the following summer, something which is unknown in England. Further, he mentions that Irish wheat is much lighter than that of drier countries; the fields are full of grass and weeds even with the best management, and harvests are so wet and difficult to gather that the yield suffers greatly thereby (*Young, Tour*, Vol. II, p. 100).

At the same time, however, he draws attention to the fact that the soil of Ireland counteracts the wetness of the climate. The soil is stony everywhere and thus lets the water through more easily.

“Harsh, tenacious, stony, strong LOAMS, difficult to work; are not uncommon in Ireland, but they are quite different from English CLAYS. If as much rain fell upon the clays of England (a soil very rarely met with in Ireland, and never without much stone) as falls upon the rocks of her sister island, those lands could not be cultivated. But the rocks here are clothed with verdure; those of limestone, with only a thin covering of mould, have the softest and most beautiful turf imaginable” (Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 3, 4).

The limestone is, as is well known, full of cracks and fissures which allow superfluous water to pass through rapidly.

*Wakefield* devotes a highly detailed chapter to the climate,<sup>a</sup> gathering together all earlier observations up to his own time. *Dr. Boate (Natural History of Ireland, 1645)*<sup>192</sup> describes the winters as mild, 3-4 frosts per year, seldom lasting more than 2-3 days; the Liffey in Dublin scarcely freezing over once in 10-12 years. March is usually dry and fair, but this is followed by a lot of rain; there are rarely 2-3 consecutive days in summer that are completely dry; in late autumn the weather is fine again. Very dry summers are rare; scarcities are never due to drought but mostly caused by the wet. On the plains there is little snow, so that the cattle could stay outside all year round. Occasionally, though, there are snowy years, such as 1635, when people were hard put to find shelter for their cattle (*Wakefield, Vol. I, p. 216 ff.*).

At the beginning of the last century *Dr. Rutty (Natural History of the County of Dublin)*<sup>b</sup> started exact meteorological observations,

<sup>a</sup> E. Wakefield, *An Account of Ireland...*, Vol. I, Chapter VI (“Climate”).—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Rutty, *An Essay towards a Natural History of the County of Dublin*, Dublin, 1772.—*Ed.*

which covered fifty years, from 1716-1765. Over this period the ratio of south and west winds to north and east winds was 73:37 (10,878 south and west against 6,329 north and east). The prevailing winds were westerly and south-westerly, followed by north-westerly and south-easterly; the least frequent being north-easterly and easterly. In summer, autumn and winter westerly and south-westerly winds prevail; easterly winds are most common in the spring and summer, when they are twice as frequent as in autumn and winter; north-easterly winds occur chiefly in the spring, and are also twice as frequent then as in autumn and winter. As a result, temperatures are more even, the winters milder, the summers cooler than in London, though the air is more humid. Even in the summer, salt, sugar, flour, etc., absorb moisture from the air, and the corn has to be kiln-dried, which does not occur in *some parts* of England (Wakefield, Vol. I, pp. 172-81).

At that time, Rutty was only able to compare the Irish climate with that of London, which, like the climate of the whole of Eastern England, is certainly drier. But if he had had access to material on the West and particularly the North-West of England, he would have found that his description of the Irish climate—the distribution of the winds over the year, the wet summers, in which sugar, salt, etc., spoil in unheated rooms—is entirely applicable to this area, except that the latter is colder in winter.

Rutty also kept lists of the meteorological character of the seasons.<sup>3</sup> In the 50 years mentioned there were 16 cold, late or too dry springs; slightly more than in London. Further, 22 hot and dry, 24 wet, 4 changeable summers; somewhat damper than in London, where the number of dry or wet summers was the same; further, 16 fine, 12 wet and 22 changeable autumns, again somewhat wetter and more changeable than in London; and 13 frosty, 14 wet and 23 mild winters, which is considerably wetter and milder than in London.

According to rain measurements made in the Botanical Gardens in Dublin during the ten year period 1802-11, the total monthly precipitation, in inches, was as follows: December, 27.31; July, 24.15; November, 23.49; August, 22.47; September, 22.27; January, 21.67; October, 20.12; May, 19.50; March, 14.69; April, 13.54; February, 12.32; June, 12.07; average per year, 23.36 (Wakefield, Vol. I, p. 191). These ten years were unusually dry; Kane (*Industrial Resources*, p. 73) gives the average for 6 years in

---

<sup>3</sup> J. Rutty, *An Essay...*, Vol. II, p. 471.—*Ed.*

Dublin as 30.87 inches, and *Symons (English Rain Fall)*<sup>a</sup> a figure of 29.79 inches for 1860-62. But how little such measurements mean with the quickly passing, purely local showers of Ireland, unless they cover a long series of years and are undertaken at a large number of stations, is proved among other things by the fact that three stations in Dublin itself recorded for the rainfall in 1862: one 24.63, the second 28.04, and the third 30.18 inches. According to *Symons*, the average precipitation of twelve stations in all parts of Ireland (varying from 25.45 to 51.44 inches) amounted to just under 39 inches for the years 1860-62.

In his book on the climate of Ireland *Dr. Patterson* says:

“The frequency of our showers, and not the amount of rainfall itself, has caused the popular notion about the wetness of our climate.... Sometimes, the spring sowing is a little delayed because of wet weather, but our springs are so frequently cold and late that early sowing is not always advisable. If frequent summer and autumn showers make our hay and corn harvests risky, then vigilance and diligence would be just as successful in such exigencies as they are for the English in their ‘CATCHING HARVESTS’<sup>b</sup>, and improved cultivation would ensure that the seed-corn would aid the peasants’ efforts.”\*

In Londonderry the number of rain-free days varied from 113 to 148 over the 10 years 1791-1802, averaging over 126. Belfast showed the same average. In Dublin, the figure varied from 168 to 205, averaging 179 (*Patterson*, *ibid.*).

According to *Wakefield’s* report, harvests in Ireland occur as follows: wheat mostly in September, more rarely in August, seldom in October; barley usually somewhat later than wheat, and oats about a week later than barley, thus fairly frequently in October. After lengthy researches, *Wakefield* comes to the conclusion that the material for a *scientific* description of the Irish climate was far from sufficient, and *nowhere* expresses the opinion that there are any serious obstacles to corn production. Rather, he finds, as we shall see, that the losses suffered during wet harvest-times are due to entirely different factors, and says explicitly:

“The soil of Ireland is so fertile, and *the climate so favourable*, that under a proper system of agriculture, the island will produce not only a *sufficiency of corn* for its own use, but a *superabundance* which may be ready at all times to relieve England when she may stand in need of assistance” (Vol. II, p. 61).

\* *Dr. W. Patterson, An Essay on the Climate of Ireland, Dublin, 1804, p. 164.*

<sup>a</sup> G. J. *Symons, British Rainfall over the British Isles, London, Stanford, 1862.—Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Engels gives the English words “catching harvests” in brackets after their German equivalent.—*Ed.*

At that time, 1812, England was, of course, at war with everyone in Europe and America,<sup>193</sup> and the import of corn was rendered much more difficult; the need for corn was paramount. Nowadays America, Romania, Russia and Germany supply enough corn, and it is cheap *meat* that is now in demand. And so the Irish climate is no longer suitable for arable farming.

Corn has been grown in Ireland since ancient times. In the oldest Irish laws, written down long before the arrival of the English, the "sack of wheat" is already a fixed measure of value; in the tributes of subjects to tribal chiefs and other chieftains wheat, barley malt and oatmeal occur almost regularly in particular stipulated quantities.\* After the English invasion the growing of corn decreased during the continuing struggles, though without ever ceasing entirely. From 1660 to 1725 it increased again, then falling off once more until about 1780; from 1780-1846 more corn was again sown, although the main crop was potatoes, and since 1846 both corn and potatoes have been steadily losing ground to cattle grazing. If the climate is not suited to the growing of corn, would it have persisted for more than a thousand years?

Admittedly there are parts of Ireland which are less suitable for growing wheat on account of the more frequent rains always found near the mountains—especially in the south and west. As well as good years, these areas often experience series of wet summers, as in 1860-1862, which inflict great harm on the wheat. But wheat is not Ireland's main cereal crop, and Wakefield even complains that too little of it is grown owing to lack of markets—there was no other market but the nearest mill. Similarly, barley was grown almost solely for the illicit stills (evading taxation). The main cereal in Ireland was and is oats. In 1810, at least ten times as much oats was grown as all the other cereal crops put together; and as the oats harvest is later than that of wheat and barley, it occurs more often in late September and in October, when the weather is generally fine, especially in the south. And anyway oats can tolerate a good deal of rain.

We have already seen above that, with regard to the amount

\* *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland—Senchus Mor*, 2 VOLS., DUBLIN, PRINTED FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONARY OFFICE, AND PUBLISHED BY ALEXANDER THOM (London, Longmans) 1865 and 1869.<sup>194</sup> See Vol. II, pp. 239-51. The value of a sack of wheat was one screpall (denarius) of 20-24 grains of silver. The value of the screpall has been established by Dr. Petrie, in *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland, anterior to the Anglo-Norman Invasion*, Dublin, 1845, 4°, pp. 212-19.

and distribution of rainfall over the seasons, the climate of Ireland corresponds almost exactly to that of north-west England. The rainfall in the mountains of Cumberland, Westmoreland and North Lancashire is far higher than in any Irish station known to me (in Coniston 96.03, in Windermere 75.02 inches, average from 1860 to 1862), and yet hay is made there and oats are grown. In the same years, the rainfall in South Lancashire varied from 25.11 in Liverpool to 59.13 in Bolton, the average of all the observations being approximately 40 inches; in Cheshire it varied from 33.02 to 43.40, the average being about 37 inches. In Ireland, as we have seen, it was not quite 39 inches in the same years. (All figures from Symons.) In both counties, cereals of all kinds, particularly wheat, are grown; Cheshire, it is true, was principally engaged in cattle-breeding and dairy farming until the last outbreak of cattle plague, but since most of the livestock died off, the climate has suddenly proved to be excellent for wheat. If the cattle plague had reached Ireland and caused such terrible devastation there as it did in Cheshire, instead of hearing about Ireland's natural calling as cattle pasture we should now have to listen to the passage from Wakefield where he predicts that Ireland is destined to be England's granary.

Looking at the matter impartially, undeterred by the interested outcry of the Irish landowners and the English bourgeoisie, we find that Ireland has areas which are more suited in their soil and climate to cattle-breeding, others more suited to arable farming, and yet others, the vast majority, which are equally suited to both, as is the case everywhere. Compared with England, Ireland is on the whole better for cattle-breeding; but compared with France, England itself is better for cattle-breeding. Does it follow that the whole of England should be turned into cattle pastures, that the entire farming population—with the exception of a few shepherds—should be sent to the factory towns or to America, in order to make room for cattle that is bound for France to pay for silks and wines? But that is exactly what the Irish landowners, wishing to raise their ground-rents, and the English bourgeoisie, wishing to depress wages, are demanding for Ireland; Goldwin Smith has said it plainly enough. And yet the social revolution entailed by such a transformation from arable land to pasturage would be far more violent in Ireland than in England. In England, where large-scale farming predominates and the farmhands have already been largely supplanted by machinery, it would mean uprooting a million at most; whereas in Ireland, where small-scale farming and even spade-farming predominate, it would mean

uprooting four million people, the extermination of the Irish people.

It is evident that even facts of nature become national issues of contention between England and Ireland. But it is also evident that the public opinion of the ruling class in England—and this alone makes itself heard on the Continent—changes according to fashion and its own interests. Today England needs corn quickly and surely—and Ireland is just made for growing wheat; tomorrow England needs meat—Ireland is no good for anything but cattle pasture. The five million Irishmen are by their mere existence a slap in the face of all the laws of political economy. They must go, let them end up where they will!

## OLD IRELAND

The classical Greek and Roman authors and the fathers of the Church give very little information about Ireland.

However, there exists a native literature that is still comparatively rich despite the loss of many Irish writings in the wars of the 16th and 17th centuries. It consists of poems, grammars, glossaries, annals and other historical writings and law-books. With very few exceptions, however, this entire literature, covering the period at least from the 8th to the 17th centuries, exists *in manuscript* only. As far as the Irish language is concerned, printing has only been in existence for a few years, that is, only since the language began to die out. Thus, only a tiny part of this rich material is accessible.

Of the annals the most important are those by Abbot *Tigernach* (died 1088), those of *Ulster*, and particularly those of the *Four Masters*. The latter were compiled in 1632-36 under the supervision of Michael O'Clery, a Franciscan monk, with the help of three other *Seanchaidhes* (students of antiquity), in the monastery of Donegal from materials which have nearly all been lost now. They were published from the extant original manuscript from Donegal in a critical edition with English translation by O'Donovan in 1856.\* The earlier editions by Dr. Charles O'Connor (the first part of the *Four Masters*, the *Annals of Ulster*, etc.) are unreliable in text and translation.<sup>195</sup>

Most of these annals begin with the mythical prehistory of Ireland, taking as their basis the old folk legends, which were spun out interminably by the bards of the 9th and 10th centuries and

\* *Annala Rioghachta Eireann. Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters.* EDITED, WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION, BY DR. JOHN O'DONOVAN. 2ND EDIT., Dublin, 1856, 7 vols, in 4°.

then put into proper chronological order by monastic chroniclers. Thus, the *Annals of the Four Masters* begin in the year of the world 2242, when Ceasair, a granddaughter of Noah, landed in Ireland 40 days before the flood; other annals trace the forebears of the Scots, the last immigrants to arrive in Ireland, in a direct line back to Japhet and relate them to Moses, the Egyptians and the Phoenicians, just as our mediaeval chroniclers traced the forebears of German tribes back to Troy, Aeneas, and Alexander the Great. The *Four Masters* devote only a couple of pages to these old fables (in which the only valuable element, the genuine old folk legend, cannot be distinguished to this day); the *Annals of Ulster* omit it completely; even Tigernach states with a critical audacity extraordinary for his day that all the monuments of the Scots before King Cimbaoth (supposedly 300 B.C.) are uncertain. But when a new national life was awakened in Ireland at the end of the last century, and with it fresh interest in Irish literature and history, these monastic fables were considered to be the most important parts. With truly Celtic enthusiasm, and specifically Irish naivety, belief in these tales was declared to be an essential ingredient of national patriotism; this did, of course, give the super-clever English scholars—whose own achievements in philological and historical criticism are justifiably famous in the rest of the world—the desired pretext for rejecting everything Irish as sheer nonsense.\*

Since the thirties of the present century, however, a far more critical spirit has come over Ireland, particularly through Petrie and O'Donovan. The above-mentioned studies by Petrie<sup>a</sup> prove that there is complete agreement between the oldest preserved inscriptions from the 6th and 7th centuries and the annals, and

\* One of the most naive products of that time is *The Chronicles of Eri, being the History of the Gaal Sciut Iber, or the Irish People, translated from the original manuscripts in the Phoenician dialect of the Scythian language by O'Connor*, London, 1822, 2 vols. The Phoenician dialect of the Scythian language is, of course, Celtic Irish, and the original manuscript is just any verse chronicle. The publisher is Arthur O'Connor, an exile of 1798,<sup>196</sup> uncle of the subsequent leader of the English Chartists, Feargus O'Connor, an alleged descendant of the old O'Connors, kings of Connaught, and, to a certain extent, pretender to the Irish throne. Before the title there is a portrait of him, a handsome, jovial, Irish face, with a striking resemblance to his nephew Feargus, grasping a crown in his right hand. Underneath it says: "O'CONNOR—CEAR-RIGE, HEAD OF HIS RACE, AND O'CONNOR, CHIEF OF THE PROSTRATE PEOPLE OF HIS NATION: 'Soumis, pas vaincus [Subjected but undefeated].'"

<sup>a</sup> G. Petrie, *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland, anterior to the Anglo-Norman Invasion*, Dublin, 1845.—Ed.



O'Donovan<sup>a</sup> is of the opinion that these begin to report historical facts as early as the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. For us it is fairly immaterial whether the credibility of the annals commences a few hundred years earlier or later, for they are, as far as that period is concerned, unfortunately, almost entirely useless for our purpose. They contain short, dry notices of deaths, accessions to the throne, wars, battles, earthquakes, plagues and Scandinavian raids, but little that has any bearing on the social life of the people. If the entire legal literature of Ireland was published, they would assume quite a different significance; many dry notices would acquire new life through explicatory passages in the law-books.

These law-books, which are very numerous, are nearly all awaiting the moment when they will see the light of day. In 1852, on the insistence of Irish students of antiquity, the English Government approved the appointment of a commission for publishing the old laws and institutions of Ireland. But how? The commission consisted of three lords (who are never far away when there is public money to be expended), three lawyers of the highest rank, three Protestant clergymen, Dr. Petrie, and an officer who is Head of the Irish Survey. Of all these gentlemen only Dr. Petrie and two of the clergymen, Dr. Graves (now Protestant Bishop of Limerick) and Dr. Todd, could claim to understand anything of the commission's task; of these, Petrie and Todd have since died. The commission was given the duty of arranging the copying, translation and publication of the old Irish manuscripts of a legal content and were authorised to employ the necessary people for the job. They employed the two best men available: Dr. O'Donovan and Professor O'Curry, who copied a good many manuscripts and made a rough translation; but before anything was ready for publication, both died. Their successors, Dr. Hancock and Professor O'Mahony, then took up the work. So far, the two volumes already mentioned, containing the *Senchus Mor*, have come out. The publishers admit that only two of the members of the commission, Graves and Todd, have taken part in the work, by making some notes in the proofs. The officer, Sir Th. Larcom, put the original maps of the survey of Ireland at the disposal of the publishers for the verification of place names; Dr. Petrie soon died, and the other gentlemen restricted their activities to conscientiously drawing their salaries for 18 years.

This is the way public duties are carried out in England, and

---

<sup>a</sup> J. O'Donovan, *Annala Rioghachta Eireann. Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, from the earliest period to the year 1616*, Dublin, 1856.—Ed.

even more so in Ireland under English rule. Without jobbery,\* nothing works. No public interests may be satisfied without a tidy sum of money or some fat sinecures for lords or government protégés coming out of it. With the money which this utterly superfluous commission has swallowed up, we in Germany would have printed the complete unprinted historical literature—and even better.

The *Senchus Mor* is to the present day our main source on conditions in old Ireland. It is a collection of ancient legal regulations which, according to the introduction (added later),<sup>a</sup> was compiled at the behest of St. Patrick and on his advice brought into harmony with Christianity, which was rapidly spreading in Ireland. The High King of Ireland, Laeghaire (428-458, according to the *Annals of the Four Masters*); the Vice-Kings Corc of Munster and Daire, probably a prince of Ulster; further, three bishops: St. Patrick, St. Benignus and St. Cairnech; and finally three law scholars, Dubthach, Fergus and Rossa; these are the men who are said to have composed the “commission” that compiled the book, and no doubt they worked harder for the money than the present commission, which only had to publish the work. The *Four Masters* gives the year of composition as 438.

The text itself is obviously based on ancient pagan material. The oldest legal formulae contained in it are all composed in verse, with a fixed metre and what is known as consonance, a kind of alliteration, or rather consonantal assonance, which is peculiar to Irish poetry and often leads into rhyme proper. Since it has been established that the old Irish law-books were translated in the 14th century from the so-called Fenian dialect (*Bérta Feini*), the language of the 5th century, into the Irish current at the time (Introduction [Vol. I], p. XXXVI *et passim*), it is understandable that in *Senchus Mor* as well the metre has been obliterated to a certain extent in many places; but it does emerge often enough, along with occasional rhymes and strongly “consonant” passages, in order to lend the text a certain rhythmic fall. It is generally enough simply to read the translation in order to uncover the

\* **JOBBERY** is the name given in England to the practice of exploiting government offices to one's own personal advantage, or to that of one's relations and friends; also using public money for indirect bribery to further the ends of a party. The individual act is called a **JOB**. The English colony in Ireland is the main hotbed of jobbery.

<sup>a</sup> *Ancient Laws of Ireland*, Vol. I, London, 1865 (Introduction to *Senchus Mor*).—Ed.

verse formulae. In between, however, there are numerous passages of undoubted prose, particularly in the second half; while the verse formulae are certainly very ancient and have been handed down in the traditional way, these prose insertions seem to originate from the compilers of the book. The *Senchus Mor* is, by the way, quoted several times in the glossary compiled in the 9th or 10th century and ascribed to Cormac, the King and Bishop of Cashel, and was undoubtedly written down long before the English invasion.

All the manuscripts (the oldest seem to date from the beginning of the 14th century or earlier) contain a number of mostly consistent glosses and longer commenting notes on the text. The glosses are wholly in the spirit of the old glossaries, with word-play deputising for etymology and the explanation of words. The notes are of very different value, often badly distorted and many of them incomprehensible, at least without some knowledge of the other law-books. The age of both is uncertain; but the greater part is probably younger than the English invasion. Since, for all that, they only show very few traces of any developments in law beyond the scope of the text, and even then only in the more precise establishment of detail, the larger, purely explicatory part can safely be used, with discretion, as a source for the older period, too.

The *Senchus Mor* contains: (1) the law of distraint, i.e. just about the whole legal procedure; (2) the law on hostages, which were handed over by people of different territories during disputes; (3) the law concerning *Saerrath* and *Daerrath* (see below)<sup>197</sup>; and (4) family law. From this book we derive a good deal of useful information on the social life of the age; but as long as many expressions remain unexplained and the other manuscripts are not published, there is much that is still obscure.

Apart from the literature, the architectural monuments, churches, round towers, fortifications and inscriptions give us an idea of the condition of the people before the English arrived.

Of the foreign sources, we need only mention a few passages on Ireland in the Scandinavian sagas and the life of St. Malachias by St. Bernard,<sup>a</sup> which do not have much to offer; we then come straightway to the first Englishman to have written about Ireland from first-hand knowledge.

Sylvester Gerald Barry, called *Giraldus Cambrensis*, Archdeacon of Brecknock, was a grandson of the amorous Nesta, daughter of

<sup>a</sup> St. Bernard, *De Vita S. Malachiae*.—Ed.

Rhys ap Tewdwr, Prince of South Wales, mistress of Henry I of England and ancestress of almost all the Norman captains who took part in the first conquest of Ireland. He went to Ireland in 1185 with John (later "Lackland") and in the following years wrote first *Topographia Hibernica*, an account of the land and its inhabitants, and then *Hibernia Expugnata*, the highly biased history of the first invasions. We are principally concerned with the first work here. Written in highly pretentious Latin, full of the maddest belief in miracles and all the clerical and national prejudices of the time and the RACE of its vain author, the book is still of great importance, being the first report in any detail by a foreigner.\*

After this the Anglo-Norman sources on Ireland naturally become more abundant; there is, however, still little information to be gained with regard to the social conditions of the part of the island that remained independent, and permitting one to draw conclusions about the old state of affairs. Not until the end of the 16th century, when Ireland was first systematically and completely subjugated, do we receive more detailed reports on the actual living conditions of the Irish people, naturally with a strong English bias. We shall see that, in the course of the 400 years that have elapsed since the first invasion, the condition of the people has changed only slightly, and not for the better. But for this very reason, the more recent writings—Hanmer, Campion, Spencer, Davies, Camden, Moryson,<sup>199</sup> et al.—to whom we shall have frequent recourse, are one of our main sources for a period five hundred years earlier, and an indispensable, badly needed complement to the scanty original sources.

---

The mythical prehistory of Ireland tells of a series of immigrations, taking place one after the other and mostly ending with the subjugation of the island by the new immigrants. The three last are: that of the Firbolgs, that of the Tuatha-de-Dananns, and that of the Milesians or Scots, who are supposed to have come from Spain. Popular Irish writing of history summarily turns the Firbolgs (*fir*=Irish *fear*, Latin *vir*, Gothic *vair*: man) into Belgians, the Tuatha-de-Dananns (*tuatha*=Irish *people, region*, Gothic *thiuda*) as necessary into Greek Danai or Germanic Danes. O'Donovan is

\* *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, ed. J. S. Brewer, London, Longmans, 1863.<sup>198</sup>—A (weak) English translation of the historical works including the two works already mentioned (*The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis*) was published in London by Bohn in 1863.

of the opinion that there is some historical basis for at least the above-mentioned immigrations. In the annals there occurs in the year 10 A.D. an insurrection of the Aitheach Tuatha (translated in the 17th century by Lynch, an expert on the old language, as *plebeiorum hominum gens*<sup>a</sup>), in other words, a plebeian revolution, in which the entire aristocracy (Saorchlann) was slain. This points to the Scottish conquerors' dominion over the older inhabitants. From folk-tales about the Tuatha-de-Dananns, O'Donovan concludes that the latter, transformed by later popular belief into elves of the mountain forest, survived into the 2nd or 3rd century A.D. in scattered mountain areas.

It is beyond doubt that the Irish were a mixed people, even before the English settled among them in their masses. As today, in the 12th century the predominant type was already fair-haired. Giraldus (*Top. Hib.*, III, 26) says of two strangers that they had long *yellow* hair, like the Irish. Nevertheless, there are still two completely different types of black-haired people, particularly in the west. One is tall and well-built with handsome features and curly hair, a type one feels one may have encountered before, in the Italian Alps or in Lombardy; this type occurs chiefly in the south-west. The other, thick-set and short in build, with coarse, straight black hair and a flat, almost negroid face, is more often found in Connaught. Huxley attributes this dark-haired element in the originally blond Celtic population to an Iberian (i.e. Basque) admixture,<sup>200</sup> which is no doubt partly true, at least. By the time the Irish make their first definite appearance in history, though, they have become a homogeneous people with a Celtic language, and there is no longer any trace of alien elements apart from the (mostly Anglo-Saxon) slaves acquired through battle or barter.

The pronouncements of the ancient classical writers about this people do not sound very edifying. *Diodor* relates that the Britons who inhabit the island called Iris (or Irin? It is the accusative Ἴριν) eat human beings.<sup>b</sup> *Strabo* goes into more detail:

"Concerning this island" (Ierne) "I have nothing certain to tell, except that its inhabitants are more savage than the Britons, since they are man-eaters as well as heavy eaters" (πολυφάγοι; according to another reading ποτηφάγοι, cabbage-eaters), "and since, further, they count it an honourable thing, when their fathers die, to devour them, and openly to have intercourse, not only with other women, but also with their mothers and sisters."<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> J. O'Donovan, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 95.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliothecae historicae*, Vol. 5.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *The Geography of Strabo*, with an English translation by Horace Leonard Jones, 8 volumes, London, 1917-32.—*Ed.*

Patriotic Irish historians have waxed not a little indignant over these alleged slanders. It remained for more recent research to show that cannibalism, and particularly the eating of parents, is probably a transitional stage of all peoples. It may come as some consolation to the Irish to learn that the ancestors of the modern Berliners still subscribed to the same practical point of view a good thousand years later:

„Über Weletabi, die in Germania sizzent, tie wir Wilze heizên, die ne scament sih nicht ze chedenne daz sie iro parentes mit niêren rehte ezen sulin, danne die wurme“<sup>a</sup> (Notker, quoted in Jacob Grimm's *Rechtsalterthümer*,<sup>b</sup> p. 488).

And under English rule, we shall see the consumption of human flesh in Ireland make its return more than once. As regards the “phanerogamia” (to borrow Fourier's phrase<sup>c</sup>) with which the Irish are reproached, such things occurred among all uncivilised peoples, and even more so among the particularly amorous Celts. It is interesting to note that even then the island bore its present native name: Iris, Irin and Jerne are identical with Eire, Erin, and that Ptolemy already knew the present-day name of the capital, Dublin, Eblana (with the correct accent Ἐβλανα).<sup>d</sup> This is all the more remarkable as the Irish Celts have since times immemorial called it by another name, Athcliath, and Duibhlinn—the black pool—is for them the name of a place on the River Liffey.

Moreover we find in *Pliny's Natural History*, IV, 16, the following passage:

“The Britons travel there” (to Hibernia) “in boats of willow branches, over which animal hides have been sewn together.”<sup>e</sup>

And later *Solinus* says of the Irish themselves:

“They sail the sea between Hibernia and Britannia in boats of willow branches which they cover with cowhides” (C. Jul. Solini *Cosmographia*, Ch. 25).

In 1810, Wakefield found that all along the west coast of Ireland “no other boats occurred except ones which consisted of a wooden frame covered over with a horse- or oxhide”. These boats

<sup>a</sup> “But the Weletabi who live in Germany and whom we call Wilze are not ashamed to say that they have more right to eat their parents than the worms have.”—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, Göttingen, 1828.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Ch. Fourier, *Le nouveau monde industriel et sociétaire, ou invention du procédé d'industrie attrayante et naturelle distribuée en séries passionnées*, Paris, 1829, pp. 399-400.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Claudius Ptolemaeus, *Geographia*, Book II, Chapter 2, Lipsiae, 1845.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1635.—*Ed.*

were of different shapes according to the area, but they were all distinguished by being uncommonly light, so that an accident rarely occurred. Of course, they were of no use for the high seas, for which reason fishing was only possible in the bays and between the islands. In Malbay, County Clare, Wakefield saw boats like these, 15 feet long, 5 feet wide and 2 feet deep; two cowhides were used for one boat, the hair to the inside, the outside tarred; it was equipped for two oarsmen. A boat like this cost about 30 shillings (Wakefield, Vol. II, p. 97). Instead of plaited willow—a wooden frame! What progress in 1,800 years and after almost 700 years of “civilising” treatment at the hands of the world’s foremost maritime nation!

For the rest, however, some symptoms of progress soon become noticeable. Under King Cormac Ulfadha, who is thought to have ruled in the second half of the 3rd century, his son-in-law, Finn Mac Cumhal, is said to have reorganised the Irish militia, the *Fianna Eirionn*,\* probably after the model of the Roman legion, with a distinction between light troops and troops of the line; all later Irish armies of which we have details distinguish between *kerne*—light—and *galloglas*—heavy—infantry, or troops of the line. The heroic deeds of this Finn were celebrated in many old lays, some of which still exist; these, and perhaps a few Scottish-Gaelic traditions, form the basis of Macpherson’s *Ossian* (Irish Oisín, son of Finn), in which Finn appears as Fingal and the scene has been switched to Scotland.<sup>201</sup> In Irish folk-lore Finn lives on as Finn Mac-Caul, a giant to whom some miraculous feat of strength is attributed in almost every locality of the island.

Christianity must have found its way to Ireland quite early, at least on the east coast. Otherwise, there is no explanation for the fact that even long before St Patrick so many Irishmen played an important part in ecclesiastical history. Pelagius the Heretic is usually considered to have been a Welsh monk from Bangor; but there was also an ancient Irish monastery of Bangor, or rather Banchor, near Carrickfergus. And that he comes from here is proved by Hieronymus, who describes him as “stupid and heavy with Scottish gruel” (“*scotorum pultibus praegravatus*”).<sup>a</sup> It is the first

\* Feini, Fenians, is the name given to the Irish nation throughout the *Senchus Mor*. Feinechus, Fenchus, the law of the Fenians, often stands for *Senchus* or for some other, lost law-book. *Feine, grad feine*, is also the designation of the plebs, the lowest free class of people.

<sup>a</sup> S. Eusebius Hieronymus, *Commentariorum in Jeremiam Prophetam libri sex*. Prologus. In: *Patrologiae...* Series latina, 1865.—Ed.

mention of Irish oatmeal porridge (Irish *lite*, Anglo-Irish *stirabout*), which even then, before the introduction of the potato, was the staple food of the Irish people, and which it remained even afterwards, alongside the potato. The main disciples of Pelagius—Coelestius and Albinus—were also Scots, i.e. Irish. From his monastery Coelestius wrote, as Gennadius<sup>a</sup> tells us, three detailed letters to his parents, from which it is evident that alphabetic writing was known in Ireland in the 4th century.

In all the writings of the early Middle Ages the Irish are called Scots, and the country Scotia. We find this term in Claudian, Isidor, Beda, the geographer of Ravenna, Eginhard and even in Alfred the Great: “Hibernia, which we call Scotland” (“Ighbernia the ve Scotland hatadh”).<sup>202</sup> What is now Scotland was called Caledonia, a foreign name, or Alba, Albania, its native one; the transference of the name Scotia, Scotland, to the northern tip of the eastern island did not take place until the 11th century. The first great wave of emigration of Irish Scots to Alba is supposed to have occurred in the middle of the 3rd century; Ammianus Marcellinus knows of them there as early as A.D. 360.<sup>b</sup> The emigration took place by the shortest sea-route, from Antrim to the Kintyre peninsula; even Nennius mentions expressly that the Britons, who then occupied the entire Scottish lowlands as far as the Clyde and the Forth, had been attacked by the Scots *from the west* and by the Picts from the north.<sup>c</sup> The seventh of the old Welsh historical *Triads*<sup>203</sup> also relates that the *gwyddyl ffichti* (see below) came from Ireland over the Norse Sea (*Môr Llychlin*) to Alba and settled on the shores of this sea. The fact that the sea between Scotland and the Hebrides is called “Norse” proves, by the way, that this *Triad* is more recent than the Norse conquest of the Hebrides. Around the year 500 larger bands of Scots came over. These gradually formed a kingdom of their own, independent both of Ireland and of the Picts. In the 9th century under Kenneth MacAlpin they finally subjugated the Picts and formed the state to which some 150 years later the name Scotland, Scotia, came to be applied, probably by the Norsemen, for the first time.

In the 5th and 6th centuries Old Welsh sources (Nennius, the *Triads*) mention raids by the *gwyddyl ffichti* or Gaelic Picts on Wales; these are generally interpreted as raids by Irish Scots. *Gwyddyl* is the Welsh form of *gavidheal*, as the Irish call

<sup>a</sup> Gennadius, *Illustrium virorum catalogus*, Basiliae, 1529.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum...*, Lipsiae, 1773.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Nennius, *Historia Britonum*, with an English version by Gunn, London, 1819, p. 15.—*Ed.*



themselves. As for the origin of the term "Picts", we may leave it to others to investigate that.

In the second quarter of the 5th century Patricius (Irish Patrick, Patraic, as the Celts always pronounce the "c" as "k" in the fashion of the ancient Romans) established the domination of Christianity without any violent upheavals. Traffic with Britain, which had long existed, now became more lively; master-builders and artisans came over and taught the Irish, who had only known *dry* stone building until then, the use of mortar. But from the 7th to the 12th century the latter was used only in church buildings, which is sufficient proof that its introduction is linked with that of Christianity, and further that from now on the clergy, the representative of foreign culture, was completely divorcing itself from the people in its intellectual development. While the social advance of the people was non-existent or extremely slow, the clergy soon developed a literary culture that was extraordinary for the time. It expressed itself chiefly in its zeal to convert the heathens and to found monasteries, as was the custom of the age. Columba converted the British Scots and the Picts; Gallus (the founder of St. Gallen) and Fridolin the Alemanni, Kilian the Franks of the Main, Virgilius the people of Salzburg; all five were Irish. Similarly, the Anglo-Saxons were converted to Christianity mainly by Irish missionaries. What is more, Ireland was considered all over Europe to be a nursery of learning, so much so that Charlemagne summoned an Irish monk, Albinus, to Pavia as teacher, whither he was later followed by another Irishman, Dungal. Of the large number of Irish scholars who were important in their day but are now mostly forgotten, the greatest was the "Father" or, as Erdmann calls him, the "Carolus Magnus" of mediaeval philosophy"—*Johannes Scotus Erigena*.<sup>b</sup> "He was the first with whom from then on true philosophy began," Hegel says of him.<sup>c</sup> Of all the West Europeans of the 9th century he alone understood Greek, and through his translation of the writings attributed to Dionysius, the Areopagite, he harked back to the last offshoot of the old philosophy, the Alexandrian Neoplatonic school.<sup>204</sup> His teaching was very daring for his time: he denied the eternity of damnation, even for the devil, and comes very close to pantheism. For this reason, contemporary orthodoxy did not shrink from slandering him. It was all of two centuries before the

<sup>a</sup> Charlemagne.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> John the Scot.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> G. W. F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*, Vol. 3, Berlin, 1836.—*Ed.*

science founded by Erigena was developed further by Anselm of Canterbury.\*

But before this development of higher culture could influence the people, it was interrupted by the raids of the Norsemen. These raids, which form the staple ingredients of Scandinavian—particularly Danish—patriotism, came too late and emanated from nations too small for them to culminate in conquest, colonisation and the formation of states on any large scale, as had been the case with the earlier incursions of the Germanic tribes. As far as historical development is concerned, the advantages they bequeathed are quite imperceptible compared with the immense and—even for Scandinavia—fruitless disturbances they caused.

At the end of the 8th century, Ireland was far from being inhabited by a single nation. A supreme kingship over the whole island existed only for appearance, and even that was by no means permanent. The provincial kings, whose number and territory were continually changing, were constantly at war with one another, and the smaller local princes also had their private feuds. On the whole, however, certain rules seem to have prevailed in these internal struggles which kept the devastation within definite bounds, so that the country did not suffer too much. But things were about to change. In 795, a few years after the first raid on England by this same predatory people, Norsemen landed on the island of Rathlin, off the coast of Antrim, and burnt everything down. In 798, they landed near Dublin and after that they are mentioned almost every year in the annals as heathens, foreigners, and pirates, never without the addition of *losccadh* (burning down) of one or several places. Their settlements in the Orkneys, Shetlands and Hebrides (Southern Isles, *Sudhreyjar* of the Old Norse sagas) served them as a base for operations against Ireland, as well as against what was to be Scotland, and against England. In the middle of the 9th century they were in possession of Dublin,\*\* which, according to

\* More about Erigena's doctrine and works in Erdmann, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, 2nd edition, Berlin, 1869, Vol. 1, pp. 241-47. Erigena, who was not, however, a clergyman, gives an early example of Irish wit. During a meal with Charles the Bald, King of France (who was sitting opposite him), he was asked by the King how great was the difference between a Scot and a sot, to which Erigena replied, "The width of a table."

\*\* The claim by Snorri in the *Haraldsaga*<sup>205</sup> that the sons of Harald Fairhair—Thorgils and Frodi—were the first Norsemen to take possession of Dublin—that is, at least 50 years later than stated—is in direct contradiction with all the contemporary Irish sources, which for this period are unquestionably authentic. Snorri is obviously confusing Thorgils, son of Harald Fairhair, with the Thorgils mentioned below (=Turgesius).

Giraldus, they first rebuilt as a proper city, just as he attributed to them the construction of Waterford and Limerick. The name Waterford is itself merely the anglicisation—here nonsensical—of the Old Norse *Vedhraftiördhr*, which means either “Bay of Storms” (*Wetterförhde*) or “Bay of Rams”. The prime necessity of the Norsemen as soon as they had settled in the country was naturally to acquire fortified ports; the population of these towns long remained Scandinavian, but by the 12th century they had long since been assimilated by the Irish in language and customs. The disputes between the Irish princes greatly facilitated the depredations and settlement of the Norsemen, and even their temporary conquest of the whole island. The extent to which the Scandinavians themselves considered Ireland to be one of their regular pillage lands is indicated by the ostensible death-song of Ragnar Lodbrök in the Snake Tower of King Ella of Northumberland, the *Krâkumâl*, composed about the year 1000.<sup>206</sup> In this song, the old pagan savagery makes one final outburst, as it were. On the pretext of singing the heroic deeds of King Ragnar, the raids of the entire Norse people in their own land as well as all along the coasts from Dünamünde to Flanders, Scotland (here called Skotland, perhaps for the first time) and Ireland are briefly described. Of Ireland it is said:

“We hew’d with our swords, heap’d high the slain,  
Glad was the wolf’s brother of the furious battle’s feast;  
Iron struck brass-shields; Ireland’s ruler, Marsteinn,  
Did not starve the murder-wolf or eagle;  
In Vedhraftiördhr the raven was given a sacrifice.

We hew’d with our swords, started a game at dawn,  
A merry battle against three kings at Lindiseyri;  
Not many could boast that they fled unhurt from there.  
Falcon fought wolf for flesh, the wolf’s fury devoured many;  
The blood of the Irish flow’d in streams on the beach in the battle.”\*

By the first half of the 9th century a Norse Viking, Thorgils, called Turgesius by the Irish, managed to subjugate Ireland

\* “Hiuggu ver meðh hiörvi, hverr láthverr of annan;  
gladh vardh gera brôdhir getu vidh sóknar laeti,  
lêt ei örn nê ýlgi, sâ er Írlandi stýrdhi,  
(môt vardh málms ok rítar) Marsteinn konungr fasta;  
vardh í Vedhra firdhi valtafn gefit hrafní.

Hiuggu ver meðh hiörvi, háðhum sudhr at morni  
leik fyrir Lindiseyri vidh lofdhúnga threnna;

completely, but with his death in 844<sup>c</sup> his kingdom, too, disintegrated and the Norsemen were driven out. The invasions and struggles continued with varying success, until finally, at the beginning of the 11th century, Ireland's national hero, Brian Borumha, originally only king of part of Munster, rose to be ruler of all Ireland and confronted the concentrated force of the invading Norsemen in a decisive battle at Clontarf (not far from Dublin) on April 23 (Good Friday), 1014. As a result, the might of the invaders was broken forever.

In anticipation of the imminent decisive battle, the Norsemen who had settled in Ireland, and on whom Leinster was dependent (the King of Leinster, Maolmordha, had ascended to the throne with their help in 999 and had kept it ever since thanks to them), sent messengers to the Southern Islands, and the Orkneys, to Denmark and Norway to request reinforcements, which duly arrived in large numbers. *Njal's Saga*<sup>207</sup> tells how Jarl Sigurd Laudrisson prepared his departure in the Orkneys, how Thorstein Siduhallsoon, Hrafn the Red and Erlinger of Straumey went with him and how he arrived at Dublin (Durflin) on Palm Sunday with all his army:

"Brodhir and all his army came too. Brodhir tried to learn by means of sorcery how the battle would go; the answer he got was this: if the battle were to be fought on Friday, King Brian would win the victory but lose his life, and if the battle were to be fought earlier, all Brian's opponents would lose their lives. Then Brodhir said that they should not join battle before Friday."<sup>d</sup>

fárr átti thví fagna (fëll margr í gyn úlfi,  
haukr sleit hold með vargi), at hann heill thadhan kaemi;  
Ýra blóðh í oegi aerit féll um skaeru."<sup>a</sup>

Vedhrafíördhr is, as we have said, Waterford; I do not know whether Lindiseyri has been located anywhere. At any rate, it does not mean Leinster, as Johnstone translates it<sup>b</sup>: the eyri (sandy spit of land, Danish *öre*) indicates a quite definite locality. Valtafn can also mean falcon feed, and is mostly so translated here, but as the raven is Odin's holy bird, the word obviously carries both meanings.

<sup>a</sup> In his translation, Engels reproduces the old alliterative verse of the original.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> J. Johnstone, *Lodbrokar-Quida; or, the Death-Song of Lodbroc*, London, 1782.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> More precisely: 845.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> Apart from minor deviations reflecting Engels's rendering of the original text, the English translation here and below follows *Njal's Saga*, translated by Magnus Magnusson and Hermann Palsson, Penguin Books, 1960.—*Ed.*

We have two versions of the battle itself: that of the Irish annals and the Scandinavian one in *Njâl's Saga*. According to the latter:

"King Brian had already reached the fortress" (Dublin) "with all his army. On Friday the army" (of the Norsemen) "came marching out of the fortress, and both armies drew up in battle array. Brodhir was on one flank and King Sigtrygg" (King of the Dublin Norsemen, according to the *Annals of Inisfallen*) "on the other. It should be said that King Brian did not wish to fight on Friday; so a wall of shields was formed round him, and his army was drawn up in front of it. Ulf Hraeda was on the flank facing Brodhir, and on the other flank facing Sigtrygg were Ospak and King Brian's sons. In the centre was Kerthialfadh, with the banner aloft before him."

When the battle got underway, Brodhir was chased by Ulf Hraeda into a wood where he found shelter. Jarl Sigurd had a great deal of trouble with Kerthialfadh, who reached the standard and slew the standard-bearer as well as the next man to seize the standard. Then they all refused to bear the standard, and Jarl Sigurd took the standard off its staff and hid it under his clothes. Soon afterwards, he was pierced by a spear, and, at this point, his part of the army seems to have been defeated. Meanwhile, Ospak had attacked the Norsemen in the rear, turning Sigtrygg's flank after a hard struggle.

"And at this all his troops broke into flight. Thorstein Siduhallsson stopped running while the others were fleeing, and tied up his shoe-thong. Kerthialfadh asked him why he was not running like the others. 'Because,' said Thorstein, 'I cannot reach home tonight, for my home is out in Iceland.' Kerthialfadh spared his life."

Now Brodhir saw from his hiding-place that Brian's army was pursuing the fugitives, and that few men were left to man the wall of shields. Then he ran from the woods, broke through the wall of shields and slew the King (Brian, who was 88 years old, was obviously unable to take part in the battle and had stayed in the camp).

"Then Brodhir shouted, 'Let the word go round that Brodhir has felled Brian.'"

But the pursuers returned, surrounded Brodhir and took him alive.

"Ulf Hraeda slit open his belly and led him round an oak tree so that his intestines wound round the trunk; and Brodhir did not die before they had all been pulled out of him. Brodhir's men were all slain."

According to the *Annals of Inisfallen* the Norse army was divided into three sections. The first consisted of the Dublin Norsemen and 1,000 Norwegian volunteers, who were all clad in

long coats of mail; the second, of the Irish auxiliaries from Leinster under King Maolmordha; the third, of reinforcements from the islands and from Scandinavia under Bruadhair, the commander of the fleet which had brought them, and Lodar, the Jarl of the Orkneys. Opposing them, Brian also drew up his army in three sections; the names of the leaders, however, do not agree with those given in *Njál's Saga*. The report of the battle itself is unimportant; shorter and clearer is that of the *Four Masters*, which follows:

"A.D. 1013" (given instead of 1014 owing to a recurrent error). "The foreigners of all western Europe assembled against Brian and Maelseachlainn" (usually called Malachy, King of Meath under Brian's sovereignty) "and they brought with them ten hundred men in coats of mail. A fierce, furious, violent and bitter battle was fought between them, the like of which had never been seen in those days, at Cluaintarbh" (ox-meadow, now Clontarf) "on the very Friday before Easter. In this battle were slain Brian, 88 years old, Murchadh, his son, 63 years old, Conaing, his nephew, Toirdhealbhach, his grandson..." (There follow a multitude of names.) "The" (enemy) "troops were finally driven back from the Tulcainn to Athcliath" (Dublin) "by Maelseachlainn by dint of heavy fighting, intrepidity and laying about the foreigners and the Leinstermen; and there fell Maelmordha, son of Murchadh, son of Finn, King of Leinster ... and there were also innumerable dead among the men of Leinster. Also slain were Dubhgall, son of Amhlanibh" (usually called Anlaf or Olaf) "and Gillaciarain, son of Gluniarn, two subordinate commanders (*tanaisi*) of the foreigners, Sichfrith, son of Lodar, Jarl of the Orkneys (*iarla insi h Oirc*), Brodar, leader of the men from Denmark, who was the man who slew Brian. The ten hundred men in coats of mail were cut to pieces, and at least 3,000 of the foreigners were slain there."<sup>a</sup>

*Njál's Saga* was written down in Iceland about a hundred years after the battle; the Irish annals are based, at least in part, on contemporary reports. The two sources are completely independent of each other; not only do they agree on the main points, but they also complement each other. We only learn from the Irish annals who Brodhir and Sigtrygg were. Sigurd Laudrisson is there called Sichfrith, son of Lodar; Sigfrith is, in fact, the correct Anglo-Saxon form of the Old Norse name Sigurd, and the Scandinavian names in Ireland—on coins as well as in the annals—mainly occur not in the Old Norse but in the Anglo-Saxon form. The names of Brian's subordinate commanders have been modified in *Njál's Saga* to suit the Scandinavian tongue; one of them, Ulf Hraeda, is even wholly Old Norse, but it would be rash indeed to infer, as some do, from this that Brian, too, had Norsemen in his army. Ospak and also Kerthialfadh seem to be Celtic names; the latter perhaps distorted from the Toirdheal-

<sup>a</sup> *Annales IV Magistorum*. In: *Recum Hibernicarum Scriptores*, Vol. III. Buckinghamiae, 1826.—Ed.

bhach mentioned in the *Four Masters*? The dates—the Friday after Palm Sunday in one, the Friday before Easter in the other—agree perfectly, as does the site of the battle; although it is called Kantaraburg in *Njâl's Saga* (otherwise = Canterbury),<sup>208</sup> it is explicitly said to be right by the gates of Dublin. The course of the battle is described most accurately in the *Four Masters*. The Norsemen were driven back from the plain of Clontarf, where they attacked Brian's army, over the Tolka, a small river flowing past the northern side of Dublin, towards the city. The fact that Brodhir killed King Brian is mentioned in both sources; the exact details are given only in the Nordic one.

It is evident that our knowledge of this battle is fairly detailed and authentic, considering the barbarism of the times. There would not be many 11th-century battles about which we have such definite and consistent reports from both parties. This did not deter Professor Goldwin Smith from describing it as a "SHADOWY<sup>a</sup> conflict" (loc. cit.,<sup>b</sup> p. 48). In the esteemed professor's head the most robust facts do, indeed, very often assume a "shadowy" form.

After the defeat at Clontarf the raids of the Norsemen became less frequent and less dangerous. The Dublin Norsemen soon came under the dominion of the neighbouring Irish princes and in a generation or two were assimilated by the native population. As the sole recompense for the havoc they had wreaked, the Scandinavians left the Irish three or four cities and the beginnings of a trading urban population.

---

The further back in history we go, the fainter are the characteristics distinguishing peoples of the same tribe one from the other. On the one hand, this is due to the nature of the sources, which become scantier the older they are, confining themselves to essentials; on the other hand, however, it is due to the development of the peoples themselves. The individual branches of the tribe were the closer to one another, were more alike, the smaller the distance separating them from the original stock. Jacob Grimm<sup>c</sup> quite rightly always treated all reports from the Roman historians describing the campaign of the Cimbri<sup>209</sup> to Adam of Bremen and Saxo Grammaticus, all the literary

<sup>a</sup> Engels gives this English word in brackets after the German equivalent.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Irish History and Irish Character*, Oxford and London, 1861.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer*, Göttingen, 1828.—*Ed.*

monuments from *Beowulf* and the *Hildebrandslied* to the *Eddas*<sup>210</sup> and the sagas, all the law-books from the *Leges barbarorum*<sup>211</sup> to the Old Danish and Old Swedish laws and the Germanic precedents, as equally valuable sources for the German national character, German customs and legal procedure. The specific character may only be of local significance, but the character reflected in it is common to the whole tribe; and the older the sources, the more these local differences tend to disappear.

Just as the Scandinavians and the Germans of the 7th and 8th centuries were less different than today, originally the Irish Celts and Gallic Celts must have been more alike than are the Irishmen and Frenchmen of today. We should not, then, be surprised to find a number of traits in Caesar's description of the Gauls<sup>a</sup> which Giraldus twelve centuries later ascribes to the Irish, and which we find in the Irish national character even today, despite the admixture of so much Germanic blood....<sup>212</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> Gaius Julius Caesar, *Commentarii de bello Gallico*.—Ed.





FROM THE PREPARATORY  
MATERIALS



## Karl Marx

[NOTES FOR AN UNDELIVERED SPEECH ON IRELAND]<sup>213</sup>

## I. EXORDIUM. THE EXECUTION

Since our last meeting<sup>a</sup> the object of our discussion, Fenianism, has entered a new phase. It has been baptised in blood by the English Government. The Political Executions at Manchester remind us of the fate of John Brown at Harpers Ferry.<sup>b</sup> They open a new period in the struggle between Ireland and England. The whole Parliament and liberal press responsible. Gladstone.

Reason: to keep up the hypocrisy that this was no political, but a common criminal affair. The effect produced upon Europe quite the contrary. They seem anxious to keep up the Act of the Long Parliament.<sup>214</sup> English [have] a divine right to fight the Irish on their native soil, but every Irish fighting against the British Government in England is to be treated as an outlaw. Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.<sup>215</sup> State of siege. Facts from *The Chronicle*. Governmental organisation of "Assassination and Violence".<sup>216</sup> Case of Bonaparte.<sup>217</sup>

## II. THE QUESTION

What is Fenianism?<sup>c</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> The meeting of the General Council of the International held on November 19, 1867.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Here the following passage is crossed out in the manuscript: "But the slaveholders have at least treated John Brown as a rebel, not as a common felon."—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, p. 194.—*Ed.*

## III. THE LAND QUESTION

## DECREASE OF POPULATION

1846			
1841: 8,222,664	}	in 25 Jahren <sup>a</sup>	1801: 5,319,867
1866: 5,571,971			2,650,693
2,650,693			
1855:	}	in 11 years	6,604,665
1866:			5,571,971
			1,032,694

Population not only decreased, but the number of the deaf-mutes, the blind, the decrepit, the lunatic, and idiotic increased relatively to the numbers of the population.

## INCREASE OF LIVE-STOCK FROM 1855 TO 1866

In the same period from 1855 to 1866 [the] number of the live-stock increased as follows: cattle by 178,532, sheep by 667,675, pigs by 315,918. If we take into account the simultaneous decrease of horses by 20,656, and equalise 8 sheep to 1 horse *total increase of live-stock*: 996,877, about one million.

Thus 1,032,694 Irishmen have been displaced by about one million cattle, pigs, and sheep. What has become of them? The *emigration list* answers.

## EMIGRATION

*From 1st May 1851 to 31 December 1866*: 1,730,189. Character of that emigration.

The process has been brought about and is still functioning upon an always enlarging scale by the *throwing together* or *consolidation of farms* (eviction) and by the simultaneous conversion of tillage into pasture.

*From 1851-1861 [the] total number of farms* decreased by 120,000, while simultaneously the number of farms of 15-30 acres increased by 61,000, that of 30 acres by 109,000 (together 170,000). The decrease was almost exclusively owed to the extinction of farms from less than one to less than 15 acres. Lord Dufferin.<sup>b</sup> The increase means only that amongst the decreased number of farms there is a larger portion of farms of large dimension.

<sup>a</sup> Years.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 428.—*Ed.*

## HOW THE PROCESS WORKS

a) *The People.*

The situation of the *mass of the people* has deteriorated, and their state is verging to a crisis similar to that of 1846.<sup>a</sup> The relative surplus population now as great as before the famine.

Wages have not risen more than 20% since the potato famine. The price of potatoes has risen nearly 200%; the necessary means of life on an average by 100%. *Professor Cliffe Leslie*, in the *London Economist* dated February 9, 1867, says:

"After a loss of  $\frac{2}{5}$  of the population in 21 years, throughout most of the island, the rate of wages is now only 1s. a day; a shilling does not go further than 6d. did 21 years ago. Owing to this rise in his ordinary food the labourer is worse off than he was 10 years ago."

b) *The Land.*1) *Decrease of land under crops.*

<i>Decrease in cereal crops:</i>	<i>Decrease in green crops:</i>
1861-1866: 470,917 acres	1861-1866: 128,061 acres

2) *Decrease per Statute Acre of every crop.* There has been decrease of *yield* in wheat, but greater 1847 to 1865 per cent: the exact decrease: oats 16.3, flax 47.9, turnips 36.1, potatoes 50%. Some years would show a greater decrease, but on the whole it has been *gradual* since 1847.<sup>b</sup>

Since the exodus, the land has been underfed and overworked, partly from the injudicious consolidation of farms, and, partly, because, under the corn-acre system,<sup>218</sup> the farmer in a great measure trusted to his labourers to manure the land for him. Rents and profits may increase, although the profit of the soil decreases. The total produce may diminish, but that part of it, which is converted into surplus produce, falling to landlord and greater farmers, instead of to the labourer. And the price of the surplus produce has risen.<sup>c</sup>

So result: Gradual expulsion of the natives, gradual deterioration and exhaustion of the source of national life, the soil.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 205.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx used the data of this paragraph in his "Outline of a Report on the Irish Question..." (see this volume, p. 204).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Marx used this passage in his "Outline of a Report on the Irish Question..." (see this volume, p. 204).—*Ed.*

## PROCESS OF CONSOLIDATION

This process has only begun; it is going on in rapid strides. The consolidation has first attacked the farms of under one to under 15 acres. It will be far from having reached the English point of consolidation, if all farms under 100 acres have disappeared. Now the state was this in 1864:

The *total area of Ireland, including bogs and waste land*: 20,319,924 acres. *Of those*  $\frac{3}{5} = 12,092,117$  acres, still form farms from *under 1 to under 100 acres*, and are in the hands of 569,844 farmers;  $\frac{2}{5} = 8,227,807$ , form farms *from 100 till over 500 acres*, and are in the hands of 31,927 persons. Thus to be cleared off 2,847,220, if we number only the farmers and their families.

This system [is a] natural offspring of the famine of 1846, accelerated by the abolition of corn-laws,<sup>219</sup> and the rise in the price of meat and wool, now systematic.

*Clearing of the Estate of Ireland*, transforming it in an English agricultural district, minus its resident lords and their retainers, separated from England by a broad water ditch.

CHANGE OF CHARACTER  
OF THE ENGLISH RULE IN IRELAND

State only tool of the landlords. *Eviction*, also employed as means of political punishment. (*Lord Abercorn*. England. *Gaels in the Highlands of Scotland*.<sup>220</sup>) Former English policy: displacing the Irish by English (Elizabeth), roundheads<sup>221</sup> (Cromwell). Since Anne 18th-century politico-economic character only in the protectionist measures of England against her own Irish colony; within that colony making *religion* a proprietary title. After the *Union*<sup>222</sup> [the] system of rack-renting and middlemen, but left the Irish, however ground to the dust, holder of their native soil. Present system, quiet business-like extinction, and government only instrument of landlords (and usurers).

---

From this altered state:

1st) *Distinguishing character of Fenianism: Socialist, lower-class movement.*

2) *Not Catholic movement.*

Priests leaders as long as Catholic Emancipation<sup>223</sup> and their leader, Daniel O'Connell, remained leader of the Irish movement.

Ridiculous Popishism of the English. High Catholic priests against Fenianism.

3) *No representative leader in the British Parliament.* Character of O'Connell's physical force movement.<sup>224</sup> Extinction of Irish party in Parliament.

4) *Nationality.* Influence of European movement, and English phraseology.

5) *America, Ireland, England*—three fields of action, leadership of America.

6) *Republican*, because America republic.

I have now given the characteristics of Fenianism.

#### IV. THE ENGLISH PEOPLE

A cause of humanity and right, but above all a specific English question.

a) *Aristocracy and Church and Army.* (France, Algiers.<sup>225</sup>)

b) *Irish in England.* Influence on wages, etc. Lowering the character of the English and Irish. *The Irish Character.* Chastity of Irishmen. Attempts at education in Ireland. Diminution of crimes.

##### *Convicted in Ireland*

	<i>Committed for trial:</i>	<i>Convicted:</i>
1852 .....	17,678	10,454
1866 .....	4,326	2,418

The decrease in the numbers of persons committed for trial in England and Wales, since 1855, is partly due to the *Criminal Justice Act of 1855*, authorising Justices to pass sentences for short periods with the consent of the prisoners, instead of committing for trial to the sessions.

Birmingham. Progress of the English people. Infamy of the English press.

c) *The Foreign Policy.* Poland, etc. Castlereagh. Palmerston.<sup>226</sup>

#### V. THE REMEDY

Foolishness of the minor parliamentary propositions.

Error of the Reform League.<sup>227</sup>

*Repeal* as one of the articles of the English Democratic Party.



## Karl Marx

[OUTLINE OF A REPORT ON THE IRISH QUESTION  
 DELIVERED TO THE GERMAN WORKERS'  
 EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY  
 IN LONDON ON DECEMBER 16, 1867]<sup>228</sup>

## I

What distinguishes Fenianism? Actually, it originates from the Irish Americans, Irishmen [living] in America. They are the initiators and LEADERS. But in Ireland itself the movement took root (and is still really rooted) only in the mass of the people, the LOWER ORDERS. That is what *characterises* it. In all earlier Irish movements the people only followed the aristocracy or MIDDLE-CLASS MEN, and always the Catholic churchmen. The Anglo-Irish chiefs and the priests during the rising against Cromwell; even James II, King of England, was at the head in the war against William III; the Protestant Republicans of Ulster (Wolfe Tone, Lord Fitzgerald) in the 1798 revolution,<sup>229</sup> and, finally, in this century the BOURGEOIS O'Connell supported by the Catholic clergy, who also played a leading role in all earlier movements excepting 1798. The Catholic clergy decreed a ban on Fenianism, which it did not lift until it realised that its attitude would deprive it of all influence on the Irish masses.

## II

Here is what baffles the English: they find the present regime mild compared with England's former oppression of Ireland. So why this most determined and irreconcilable form of opposition now? What I want to show—and what even those Englishmen who side with the Irish and concede them the right to secession from England do not see—is that the [oppression] since 1846, though less barbarian in form, has been in effect destructive, leaving no alternative but Ireland's voluntary emancipation by England or life-and-death struggle.

## III

Concerning past history the FACTS are available in any history book. Hence, I shall give only a few, firstly, to clarify the difference between the present epoch and the past and, secondly, to bring out a few points about the character of those who are now called the Irish people.

A) THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND  
BEFORE THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

1172. Henry II. Conquered less than 1/3 of Ireland. NOMINAL CONQUEST. A gift from Pope Adrian IV (Englishman). Some 400 years later another Pope (under Elizabeth) (1576), Gregory XIII, took back the present from the English (Elizabeth).<sup>230</sup> The "ENGLISH PALE".<sup>231</sup> CAPITAL: *Dublin*. Mixing of English COMMON COLONISTS with Irish, and of ANGLO-Norman nobles with Irish chiefs. Otherwise, the war of conquest was conducted (originally) as against RED INDIANS. No English reinforcements sent to Ireland until 1565 (Elizabeth).

B)\* PROTESTANT EPOCH.\* ELIZABETH. JAMES I. CHARLES I.  
CROMWELL. COLONISATION PLAN (16TH AND 17TH CENTURIES)

Elizabeth. The plan was to exterminate the Irish at least up to the RIVER Shannon, to take their LAND and settle English colonists in their place, etc. In battles against Elizabeth the still Catholic Anglo-Irish fought with the NATIVES against the English. The avowed plan of the English. \**Clearing the island of the natives, and stocking it with loyal Englishmen*. They succeeded only to plant a landowning aristocracy. English Protestant "adventurers"<sup>232</sup> (merchants, usurers), who obtained from the English crown the confiscated lands, and "gentlemen undertakers", who were to plant the ceded estates with native English families.

*James I. Ulster*. (Jacobite plantation, 1609-12.) British undertakers, "to stock the confiscated, stolen lands with Irish". \*Not until 1613 are IRISH considered ENGLISH subjects; previously they were looked upon as "OUTLAWS" and "ENEMIES" and the IRISH PARLIAMENT<sup>233</sup> governed only the *Pale*. Persecution of Catholics.

\* *Elizabeth* settled *Munster*, *James I*, *Ulster*, but *Leinster* and *Connaught* have not yet been purged. *Charles I* tried to purge *Connaught*.

*Cromwell: First national revolt of Ireland, its 2nd complete conquest, partial re-colonisation (1641-60).*

Irish Revolution of 1641. August 1649 Cromwell landing in Dublin. (Followed by Ireton, Lambert, Fleetwood, Henry Cromwell.) In 1652 the 2nd complete conquest of Ireland completed. Division of spoils: the Government itself, the "adventurers" who had lent £360,000 for the 11 years of war, the officers and soldiers, by the Acts of the English Parliament, 12 August 1652, and 26 September 1653.<sup>234</sup> Smite the Amalekites<sup>235</sup> of the Irish Nation hip and thigh, and replant the re-devastated [land] with new colonies of brand-new Puritan English.\*—Bloodshed, devastation, depopulation of entire counties, removal of their inhabitants to other regions, sale of many Irish into slavery in the West Indies.

By engaging in the conquest of Ireland, Cromwell put paid to the English Republic.

Thence the Irish mistrust of the *English people's party*.

\*C) RESTORATION OF THE STUARTS. WILLIAM III.  
SECOND IRISH REVOLT, AND THE CAPITULATION ON TERMS.<sup>236</sup>  
1660—1692\*\*

The BRITISH were then more numerous in Ireland than at any other time. \*Never higher than 3/11, never lower than 2/11 of the Irish population.

1684. *Charles II* begins to favour the Catholic interest of Ireland, and to enlist a Catholic army.

1685. *James II* gives full rein to the Catholics of Ireland. Catholic army increased and favoured. The Catholics soon began to declare that the Acts of Settlement must be repealed and the proprietors of 1641 re-established. James calls some Irish regiments to England.

1689. William III in England, 12 March 1689: James landed at *Kinsale* at the head of Irish soldiers. *Limerick capitulates to William III, 1691*. Shameful violation of the treaty, already under William III, still more under Anne.

D) IRELAND DEFRAUDED AND HUMBLED TO THE DUST.  
1692-JULY 4, 1776

α) All notions of "planting" the country with English and Scotch yeomen or tenant farmers were discarded.\* Settling German and

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript there follows "(1701) (Anne)".—Ed.

French Protestants attempted. French Protestants in the towns (woollen manufacturers) flee the English protectionist and mercantile system.

\* 1698. *The Anglo-Irish Parliament* (like obedient colonists) passed, on the command of the mother country, a *prohibitory tax on Irish woollen goods export* to foreign countries.

1698. In the same year, the English Parliament laid a *heavy tax* on the import of the home manufactures in England and Wales, and *absolutely prohibited their export to other countries*. She struck down the manufactures of Ireland, depopulated her cities, and threw the people back upon the land.

The *Williamite* (imported lords) *absentees*.<sup>237</sup> *Cry against absentee landlords since 1692*.

Likewise *legislation of England against Irish cattle*.

1698: *Molyneux pamphlet* for the independence of the Irish Parliament (i.e. the *English Colony in Ireland*) against the English.<sup>a</sup> Thus began the *struggle of the English Colony in Ireland and the English Nation*. Simultaneously, *struggle between the Anglo-Irish Colony and the Irish Nation*. William III resisted the shameful attempts of the English and Anglo-Irish Parliaments to violate the treaties of *Limerick and Galway*.

β) *Queen Anne*. (1701-13; George until 1776).

*Penal Code*<sup>238</sup> built up by the Anglo-Irish Parliament with assent of the English Parliament. Most infamous means to make *Protestant Proselytes* amongst the Irish Catholics by regulations of "*Property*". A code for the *transfer of "Property"* from Catholics to Protestants, or to make "*Anglicanism*" a *proprietary title*. (*Education. Personal disabilities*.) (No Catholic able to be a private soldier.) To teach the Catholic religion was a transportable felony, to convert a Protestant to Catholicism an act of treason. To be a Catholic Archbishop—banishment, if returning from banishment—act of high treason; hanged, disembowelled alive, and afterwards quartered. *Experiment to coerce the mass of the Irish nation into the Anglican religion*. Catholics deprived of vote for members of Parliament.<sup>239</sup>

This *Penal Code intensified the hold of the Catholic Priesthood upon the Irish people*.

*The poor people fell into habits of indolence*.

*During the palmy days of Protestant ascendancy and Catholic degradation, the Protestants did not encroach upon the Catholics in numbers.\**

<sup>a</sup> W. Molyneux, *The Case of Ireland's Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated*, Dublin, 1698.—Ed.

## E) 1776-1801. TIME OF TRANSITION

α) Before dealing with this transition period, what was the result of English terrorism?

\* *English incomers absorbed into the Irish people and Catholicised.*

*The towns founded by the English Irish.*

*No English colony (except Ulster Scotch) but English landowners.*

*The North American Revolution forms the first turning-point in Irish history.*

β) 1777 the British army surrendered at Saratoga Springs to the American "rebels". *British cabinet forced to make concessions to the Nationalist (English) party in Ireland.*

1778. *Roman Catholic Relief Bill*<sup>a</sup> (passed by the *Anglo-Irish Parliament*).<sup>240</sup> (Catholics were still excluded from acquiring by purchase, or as tenants, any freeholds<sup>241</sup> interest.)

1779. *Free trade with Great Britain.* Almost all restraints put upon Irish industry swept away.

1782. The Penal Code still further relaxed. The Roman Catholics allowed to acquire *freehold property for life, or in fee simple, and—to open schools.*

1783. Equal rights of the *Anglo-Irish Parliament*.<sup>b</sup>

*Winter 1792-93.* After the French Government had annexed Belgium, and England resolved upon French war, another portion of the Penal Code was released. Irish could become Colonels in Army, *elective franchise for Irish Parliament etc.*

*Rebellion of 1798.*<sup>c</sup> Belfast Republicans (Wolfe Tone, Lord Fitzgerald). Irish peasants not ripe.

*Anglo-Irish House of Commons voted for the Act of Union passed in 1800.*<sup>242</sup> By the Legislature and Customs Union of Britain and Ireland *closed the struggle between the Anglo-Irish and the English.* The colony protested against the illegal Act of Union.\*

## 1801-1846

a) *1801-1831.* At this time (after the end of the war<sup>243</sup>) a movement for emancipation of Catholics under way among Irish and English (1829).

<sup>a</sup> The Bill for Relieving His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects from Certain Pains and Penalties Imposed on Them by an Act of King William.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> An Act for Removing and Preventing All Doubts Which Have Arisen, or Might Arise, Concerning the Exclusive Rights... (The Renunciation Act, 1783).—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See this volume, p. 194.—*Ed.*

From 1783, \**legislative independence of Ireland*, shortly after which duties were imposed on *various articles* of foreign manufacture, avowedly with the intention of enabling some of her people to employ some of their surplus labour etc. The natural consequence was, that Irish manufactures gradually disappeared as the Act of Union came into effect.

Dublin				
<i>Master woollen manufacturers</i> .....	1800	91	1840	12
<i>Hands employed</i> .....	"	4,918	"	602
<i>Master woolcombers</i> .....	"	30	1834	5
<i>Hands employed</i> .....	"	230	"	66
<i>Carpet manufacturers</i> .....	"	13	1841	1
<i>Hands employed</i> .....	"	720	"	0
<i>Silk-loom weavers at work</i> .....	"	2,500	1840	250
Kilkenny				
<i>Blanket manufacturers</i> .....	1800	56	1822	42
<i>Hands employed</i> .....	"	3,000	"	925
Balbriggan				
<i>Calico-loom at work</i> .....	1799	2,500	1841	226
Wicklow				
<i>Handlooms at work</i> .....	1800	1,000	1841	0
Cork				
<i>Braid weavers</i> .....	1800	1,000	1834	40
<i>Worsted weavers</i> .....	"	2,000	"	90
<i>Hosiery</i> .....	"	300	"	28
<i>Woolcombers</i> .....	"	700	"	110
<i>Cottonweavers</i> .....	"	2,000	"	220

etc. The linen industry (Ulster) did not compensate for this.<sup>a</sup>

"The *cotton manufacture of Dublin*, which employed 14,000 operatives, has been destroyed; the 3,400 silk looms have been destroyed; the serge<sup>b</sup> manufacture, which employed 1,491 operatives, has been destroyed; the flannel manufacture of Rathdrum, the blanket manufacture of Kilkenny, the camlet<sup>c</sup> trade of Bandon, the worsted manufactures of Waterford, the ratteen and frieze manufactures of Carrick-on-Suir have been destroyed. One business alone survives! ... That fortunate business—which the Union Act has not struck down—that favoured, and

<sup>a</sup> This sentence is in German in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Marx gives the German equivalent *Sersche* in brackets.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Marx gives the German equivalent *Camelot* in brackets.—*Ed.*

privileged, and patronised business is the Irish coffin-maker's" (*Speech of T. F. Meagher, 1847*).\*

Every time Ireland was about to develop industrially, she was CRUSHED and reconverted into a purely AGRICULTURAL LAND.

After the latest General Census of 1861:

\* *Agricultural Population of Ireland*

(including all cottiers <sup>244</sup> and farm labourers with their families)*	4,286,019
In the 798 TOWNS (of which many were in fact small market towns)	1,512,948
	5,798,967

Therefore (1861) approximately  $\frac{4}{5}$  purely agricultural, and actually perhaps  $\frac{6}{7}$  if market towns are also counted.

Ireland is therefore purely \*agricultural: "Land is life" (*Justice Blackburne*). Land became the great object of pursuit. The people had now before them the choice between the occupation of land, *at any rent, or starvation. System of rack-renting.*

"The lord of the land was thus enabled to dictate his own terms, and therefore it has been that we have heard of the payment of £5, 6, 8, and even as much as £10 per acre. Enormous rents, low wages, farms of an enormous extent, let by rapacious and indolent proprietors to *monopolising landjobbers*, to be relet by intermediate oppressors, for five times their value, among the wretched starvers on potatoes and water."

State of popular starvation.\*

*Corn Laws in England*<sup>245</sup> create a monopoly to A CERTAIN EXTENT for the export of IRISH CORN to England. \*The average export of grain in the *first 3 years* following the passage of the Act of Union about 300,000 qrs,

1820 over 1 million qrs,

1834 yearly average of 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  million qrs.

Amount to pay *rent to absentees*, and interest to mortgagees (1834), over 30 million dollars (*about 7 million pounds sterling*). Middlemen accumulated fortunes that they *would not* invest in the improvement of land, and *could not*, under the system which prostrated manufactures, invest in machinery etc. All their accumulations were sent therefore to England for investment. An official document published by the British Government shows that the transfers of British securities from England to Ireland, i.e., the investment of Irish capital in England, in the 13 years following the adoption of free trade in 1821, amounted to as many millions of pounds sterling, and thus was Ireland forced to contribute

cheap labour and cheap capital to building up "the great works of Britain".\*

Many pigs and export of same.

1831-1841. Accretion of Ireland's population from 7,767,401 to 8,175,238

In 10 YEARS .....	407,837
In the same period there <i>emigrated</i> (somewhat more than 40,000 per YEAR) .....	450,873
The total being .....	858,710

\* O'Connell. Repeal Movement, Lichfield-House Contract with Whigs.<sup>246</sup> Partial famines. *Insurrection Acts, Arms Acts, Coercion Acts.*\*<sup>a</sup>

#### IV

#### THE PERIOD OF THE LAST 20 YEARS (FROM 1846).

##### \* CLEARING OF THE ESTATE OF IRELAND \*

Earlier, REPEATED CASES OF PARTIAL FAMINE. NOW GENERAL.

This new period was ushered in by the potato blight (1846-47), starvation and the consequent exodus.

Over one million die, in part directly from hunger, in part from DISEASES, etc. (caused by hunger). In 9 years, 1847-55, 1,656,044 left the country.

The revolution of the old agricultural system was, originally, but a natural result of the barren fields. People fled. \*(Families clubbed together to send away the youngest and most enterprising.)\* Hence, of course, the pooling of small leaseholds and substitution of pasturage for crop farming.

However, soon circumstances arose whereby this became a conscious and deliberate system.

*Firstly, the chief factor:* Repeal of the Corn Laws was one of the direct consequences of the Irish disaster. As a result, Irish corn lost its monopoly on the English market in the ordinary years. Corn prices dropped. Rents could no longer be paid. In the meantime, the price of meat, wool and other animal products has been rising steadily in the last 20 years. Tremendous growth of the wool industry in England. Pig-raising was partly connected with

<sup>a</sup> In an earlier passage in his manuscript, after the words "if market towns are also counted" (this section, pp. 199-200), Marx outlines this paragraph thus: "b) 1831-1847. O'Connell", after which the following words are crossed out: "REPEAL MOVEMENT. Lichfield-House Contract with Whigs. (Useless buildings etc.) Not to be forgotten that during the entire period successive INSURRECTION ACTS, ARMS ACTS, COERCION ACTS".—Ed.



the old system. Now, chiefly sheep and horned cattle.\*[Ireland] deprived of the English market now, as by the Act of Union of her own.\*

Contributing circumstances that made this systematic:

*Secondly:* Reorganisation of agriculture in England. Caricature of same in Ireland.

*Thirdly:* The despairing flight of starving Irish to England filled basements, hovels, WORKHOUSES in Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Glasgow with \*men, women, children in a state almost of starvation\*.

Act of Parliament passed (1847-48) that Irish \*landlords had to support their own paupers\*. (The English Pauper Law is extended to Ireland.<sup>a</sup>) Hence, the Irish (especially English) landlords, mostly deep in debt, try \*to get rid of the people and clear their estates\*.

*Fourthly:* \*Encumbered Estates Act (1853?)<sup>b</sup>:

“The landlord was ruined, for he could collect no rents, and he was at the same time liable for the payment of enormous taxes for the maintenance of his poor neighbours. His land was encumbered with mortgages and settlements, created when food was high, and he could pay no interest; and now a law was passed, by aid of which property could be summarily disposed of at a public sale, and the proceeds distributed among those who had legal claims upon it.”\*

ABSENTEE PROPRIETORS (English capitalists, INSURANCE SOCIETIES etc.) thereby multiplied, equally former MIDDLEMEN etc., who wanted to run their farms on modern economic lines.

*Eviction* of farmers partly by friendly agreement terminating tenure. But much more *EVICTON* on a large scale (forcibly by *CROWBAR BRIGADE*, beginning with the destruction of roofs), forcible *EJECTION*. (Also used as political retribution.) This has continued since 1847 to this day. (*Abercorn*, Viceroy of Ireland.) African razzias \*(razzias of the little African kings). (People driven from the land. The starving population of the towns largely increased.)

“The tenantry are turned out of the cottages by scores at a time.... Land agents direct the operation. The work is done by a large force of police and soldiery. Under the protection of the latter, the ‘crowbar brigade’ advances to the devoted township, takes possession of the houses.... The sun that rose on a village sets on a desert.” (*Galway Paper*, 1852.) (*Abercorn*.)\*

Let us now see how this system affected the land in *Ireland*, where conditions are quite different from those in England.

<sup>a</sup> An Act to Amend an Act of the Tenth Year of Her Present Majesty, for Amending the Laws Relating to the Removal of the Poor.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> An Act for Continuing and Amending the Act for Facilitating the Sale and Transfer of Encumbered Estates in Ireland.—*Ed.*

## DECREASE OF CULTIVATED LAND. 1861-1866

	<i>* Decrease in cereal crops</i>	<i>Decrease in green crops*</i>
1861-65	428,041 acres	107,984 acres
1866	42,876 acres	20,077 acres
Total .....	470,917	128,061

DECREASE OF \*YIELD PER STATUTE ACRE OF EVERY CROP<sup>a</sup>

1847-1865 per cent: the exact decrease: *oats* 16.3, *flax* 47.9, *turnips* 36.1, *potatoes* 50. Some years would show a greater decrease, but on the whole it has been gradual since 1847.

*Estimated Average Produce per Statute Acre*

	<i>Wheat</i> <i>cwts</i>	<i>Potatoes</i> <i>tons</i>	<i>Flax</i> <i>stones</i> <i>(14 lbs.)</i>
1851	12.5	5.1	38.6
1866	11.3	2.9	24.9*

Though Ireland exported considerable quantities of wheat in the past, it is now said to be good only for cultivating OATS<sup>b</sup> (the yield of which per acre also continuously decreases).

In fact: 1866 Ireland shipped out only 13,250 qrs of wheat against 48,589 qrs shipped in (that is, almost fourfold). Meanwhile, it shipped out approximately one million qrs of oats (for £1,201,737).

\* Since the exodus, the land has been underfed and overworked, partly from the injudicious consolidation of farms, and partly because, under the corn-acre system,<sup>247</sup> the farmer in a great measure trusted to his labourers to manure the land for him. Rents and profits (where the farmer is no peasant farmer) may increase, although the produce of the soil decreases. The total produce may diminish, and still greater part of it be converted into surplus produce, falling to the landlord and (great) farmer. And the price of the surplus produce has risen.\*

Hence, *sterilisation* (gradual) of the land, as in *Sicily by the ancient Romans* (ditto in *Egypt*).

We shall speak of the *livestock*, but first about the *population*.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 191.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This English word is given in the manuscript in brackets after the German equivalent *Hafer*.—*Ed.*

## DECREASE OF THE POPULATION

1801: 5,319,867; 1841: 8,222,664; 1851: 6,515,794; 1861: 5,764,543. If the trend continues, there will be 5,300,000 in 1871, that is, less than in 1801. I shall now show, however, that the population will be lower still in 1871, even though the emigration rate remains constant.

## EMIGRATION

Emigration ACCOUNTS naturally for part of the decrease. In 1845-66 there emigrated 1,990,244, or approximately 2,000,000 IRISH. (Unheard of.) (About  $\frac{2}{5}$  of the TOTAL emigration from the UNITED KINGDOM in 1845-66 which was 4,657,588.) In 1831-41 emigration approximately equalled half the accretion of population during the decade, and after 1847 it was considerably higher than the accretion.

However, emigration alone \* does not account for the decrease of the population since 1847\*.

DECREASE OF THE NATURAL ANNUAL ACCRETION  
OF THE POPULATION

The accretion (annual) in 1831-41 was 1.1 per cent, or ABOUT  $1\frac{1}{10}$  per cent a year. If the population had increased in the same proportion in 1841-51, it would have been 9,074,514 in 1851. In fact, however, it was only 6,515,794. Consequently, the deficit was 2,558,720. Out of this figure, emigration accounted for 1,274,213. That leaves 1,284,507 unaccounted for. Over a million, but not the whole deficit of 1,284,507, died in the FAMINE. Hence, evidently, natural population growth decreased in 1841-51.

This is borne out by the decade of 1851-61. NO FAMINE. The population decreased from 6,515,794 to 5,764,543. Absolute decrease: 751,251. Yet emigration in this period was over 1,210,000. Hence there was an accretion of NEARLY 460,000 during the ten years. Because  $751,251 + 460,000 =$  the number of emigrants  $= 1,211,251$ . Emigration claimed almost triple the accretion. The rate of accretion was 0.7 per cent per year, hence considerably lower than the 1.1 per cent of 1831-41.

The explanation is very simple. \* The increase of a population by births must principally depend on the proportion which those between 20 and 35 bear to the rest of the community. Now the

proportion of persons between the ages of 20 and 35 in the population of the United Kingdom is about 1:3.98 or 25.06 per cent, while their proportion in the emigration even of the present day is about 1:1.89 or 52.76 per cent.\* And probably still greater in Ireland.

#### PHYSICAL DETERIORATION OF THE POPULATION

\*In 1806, with a total population of 5,574,107, there was an excess of males over females by 50,469, whilst in 1867, with a total population of 5,557,196, there is an excess of the females over males.\* At the same time *not only a relative, but an absolute increase* in the number \*of deaf-mutes,<sup>a</sup> blind, insane, idiotic, and decrepit inhabitants. Contrasting 1851 with 1861, whilst the population had decreased enormously, the number of deaf-mutes had increased by 473, on their former total of 5,180; the lame and decrepit by 225, on their former total of 4,375; the blind by 1,092, on their former total of 5,767; the lunatic and idiotic, by the immense number of 4,118, on their former total of 9,980; mounting up, in 1861, notwithstanding the decrease in the population, to 14,098.

#### WAGES

Wages have not risen more than 20% since the potato famine. The price of potatoes has risen nearly 200%, and the rise\* for essential foodstuffs has been 100% \*on an average.

Professor Cliffe Leslie, in the *Economist of February 9, 1867*, says:

“After a loss of two-fifths of the population in 21 years, throughout most of the island, the rate of wages is now only 1s. a day; a shilling does not go further than 6d. did 21 years ago. Owing to this rise in the ordinary food the labourer is worse off than he was ten years ago.”

Partial famines, especially in Munster and Connaught.\*

Bankruptcy of SHOPKEEPERS PERMANENT. Market towns, etc., fall into decay.

#### THE RESULTS OF THIS PROCESS

In 1855-66, 1,032,694 Irishmen replaced by 996,859 head of LIVESTOCK (cattle, sheep and pigs). That, in fact, was the accretion of

<sup>a</sup> After this English word Marx gives its German equivalent in brackets.—*Ed*

LIVESTOCK during that period, with the DECREASE OF HORSES (20,656) compensated by four sheep [to one horse], which are therefore subtracted from the accretion.

\*CONSOLIDATION OF FARMS\*

From 1851 to 1861 the TOTAL DECREASE of FARMS was 120,000. (Though the number of 15-30 ACRE FARMS and FARMS of 30 ACRES and over increased.) Thus, the decrease affected particularly farms of one to under 15 acres.

In 1861 about  $\frac{3}{5}$  of the area (Ireland's total area: 20,349,924 acres) or 12 million acres was held by 569,844 tenants who worked plots of one up to less than 100 acres, and about  $\frac{2}{5}$  (8 million acres) by tenants with over 100 and 500 acres and over (31,927 tenants).

The process of consolidation in full gear. Ulster. (Cultivation of flax; Scottish Protestant tenants.)

*The Times* etc. officially congratulates Abercorn as Viceroy on this system. He, too, is one of these DEVASTATORS. Lord Dufferin: over-population etc.<sup>a</sup>

In sum, it is a question of life and death.

Meagher, Hennessy, *Irishman*.

DECREASE OF CRIME IN IRELAND

	<i>Committed for trial</i>	<i>Convicted</i>
1852	17,678	10,454
1866	4,326	2,418

V

UNITED STATES AND FENIANISM

Written on about December 16, 1867

Printed according to the manuscript

First published in: Marx and Engels: *Works*, Second Russian Edition, Vol. 16, Moscow, 1960

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp. 428, 435.— *Ed.*

Karl Marx

[REMARKS ON THE PROGRAMME AND RULES  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE  
OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY]<sup>248</sup>

[PROGRAMME AND RULES  
OF THE ALLIANCE]<sup>a</sup>

[MARX'S REMARKS]

The socialist minority of the League of Peace and Freedom, having separated itself from the League as a result of the majority vote at the Berne Congress, the majority being formally opposed to the fundamental principle of all workers' associations—that of *economic and social equalisation of classes and individuals*—has thereby adhered to the principles proclaimed by the *workers' congresses* held in Geneva, Lausanne and Brussels. Several members of this minority, belonging to various nations, have suggested that we should form a new *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, merged entirely in the great *International Working Men's Association*, but having a special mission to study political and philosophical questions on the basis of the grand principle of the universal and genuine equality of all human beings on earth.

Convinced, for our part, of the usefulness of such an **enterprise that would provide** sincere socialist **democrats**<sup>b</sup> of Europe and America with the means of being understood and of affirming their ideas, without any pressure from the false socialism which bourgeois democracy finds necessary to apply these days, we consider it our duty, together with our friends, to take

equality of classes!

merged in and established  
against!

So, the socialist democrats  
are not understood through  
the International

<sup>a</sup> *Programme et Règlement de l'Alliance internationale de la Démocratie Socialiste*, Geneva [1868].—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The words in bold type were underlined by Marx.—*Ed.*

the initiative in forming this new organisation.

Therefore, **we have constituted ourselves as the central section of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy**, and we publish today its *Programme and Rules*.

PROGRAMME  
OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
ALLIANCE OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

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

2) It wants above all political, economic and social equalisation of classes and individuals **of both sexes**, commencing with **abolition of the right of inheritance**, so that in future enjoyment be equal to each person's production, and so that, in conformity with the decision taken at the last workers' congress in Brussels, the land, instruments of labour, like all other capital, on becoming the collective property of the entire society, may be used only by the workers, that is, by agricultural and industrial associations.

3) It wants for all children of both sexes, from birth, equal conditions of development, that is, maintenance, education and training at all levels of science, industry and the arts, being convinced that this equality, at first only economic and social, will gradually lead to greater natural equality of individuals, eliminating all kinds of artificial inequalities, historical products of a social organisation as false as it is iniquitous.

4) Being the foe of all despotism, not recognising any political form other than republican, and rejecting completely any reactionary alliance, it also rejects any political action which does not have as its **immediate and direct** aim the triumph of the workers' cause against Capital.

5) It recognises that all the political and authoritarian states that exist at present and are more and more reducing their activities to simple administrative functions of public service in their respective countries, will have to dissolve into a universal union of free associations, both agricultural and industrial ones.

What modesty! They constitute themselves as the central authority, clever lads!

As if one could declare—by decree—the abolition of faith!

Hermaphrodite man! Just like the **Russian commune!**  
The old Saint Simon panacea!

Empty phrase!

If they **are reducing** themselves they will **not have** to dissolve, but will disappear spontaneously.

6) Since the social question can only have a final and real solution on the basis of international or universal solidarity of the workers of all countries, the *Alliance* rejects any policy based on so-called patriotism and on rivalry between nations.

7) It wants the universal association of all local associations on the basis of Liberty.

#### RULES

1) *The International Alliance of Socialist Democracy* constitutes a **branch of the International Working Men's Association** and accepts all its general rules.

2) The *Founder Members of the Alliance* are organising provisionally a *Central Bureau* at Geneva.

3) Founder Members belonging to the same country constitute the *national bureau* of their country.

4) The national bureaus shall establish in all regions **local groups of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy, which, through their respective national bureaus, shall ask the Central Bureau of the Alliance to admit them** into the *International Working Men's Association*.

5) All local groups shall form their bureaus according to the customary procedure accepted by the local sections of the *International Working Men's Association*.

6) All members of the *Alliance* shall pay a monthly contribution of *ten centimes*, half of which shall be retained for their own needs by each national group, and the other half shall go to the Central Bureau for its general requirements.

In countries where this sum is judged to be too high, the national bureaus, in accord with the Central Bureau, shall have the power to reduce it.

7) At the annual Working Men's Congress the *delegation of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, as a branch of the *International Working Men's Association*, shall hold public meetings in a separate building.

#### MEMBERS OF THE GENEVA INITIATORY GROUP

J. Philipp Becker.—M. Bakunin.—Th. Rémy.—Antoine Lindegger.—Louis Nideg-

There is rivalry and rivalry,  
my dear Russian!

The International Association does not admit any  
"international branches".  
New Central Council!

The Rules of the International do not recognise this  
"mediatory power".

New taxes absorbing our  
own contributions!

They want to compromise  
us under our own patronage!

Asinus Asinorum! And  
Madame Bakunin!



ger.—Valérien Mroczkowsky.—Jean Zagorsky.—Phil. Zöller.—A. Ardin.—Ch. Perron.—J. Gay.—J. Friess.—Fr. Rochat.—Nikolai Zhukovsky.—M. Elpidin.—Zampérini.—E. Becker.—Louis Weiss.—Perret.—Marauda.—Edouard Crosset.—A. Blanchard.—A. Matis.—Ch. Raymond.—Mme. Alexeyeva.<sup>a</sup>—Mme. Bakunin.—Mme. Suzette Croset.—Mme. Rosalie Sanguinède.—Mme. Désirée Gay.—Mme. Jenny Guinet.—Antoine Dunaud.—J. Maulet.—Guerry.—Jacques Courtois.—John Potot.—André Bel.—Fr. Bofféty.—Ch. Guyot.—Ch. Postleb.—Ch. Détraz.—J. Croset.—J. Sanguinède.—C. Jaclard.—L. Coulin.—Fr. Gay.—Blaise Rossety.—Jos. Marilly.—C. Brechtel.—L. Monachon.—Fr. Mermillod.—Donat-père.—L. J. Cheneval.—J. Bédeau.—L. H. Fornachon.—Pinière.—Ch. Grange.—Jacques Laplace.—S. Pellaton.—W. Rau.—Gottlob Walter.—Adolphe Haerberling.—Perrié.—Adolphe Catalan.—Marc Hérédier.—Louis Allement.—A. Pellerin-Druart.—Louis de Coppet.—Louis Dupraz.—Guillmeaux.—Joseph Baquet.—Fr. Pisteur.—Ch. Ruchet.—Placide Margarittaz.—Paul Garbani.—Etienne Borret.—J. J. Scopinii.—F. Crochet.—Jean Jost.—Léopold Wucher.—C. Filliétaz.—L. Fulliquet.—Ami Gandillon.—V. Alexeyev.<sup>b</sup>—François Chevalier.

The Founder Members of the *International Alliance of Socialist Democracy*, having decided to start a paper under the name *La Révolution*, to be the press organ of this new Association, the *provisional Central Bureau* will begin publication as soon as 300 shares, of 10 francs each and payable in four instalments quarterly, from January 1, 1869, have been subscribed. Accordingly, the *provisional Central Bureau* is appealing to all *national bureaux of the Alliance* and inviting them to begin subscriptions in their own countries. As these subscriptions are considered voluntary gifts which give no right to receipt of the paper, the *national bureaux* are also requested to compile a list of subscribers.

The paper will appear once a week.

<sup>a</sup> Barteneva.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Bartenev.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The names Johannard and Dupont are written in Jung's hand.—*Ed.*

Jules Johannard  
Eugène Dupont<sup>c</sup>

and they have the cheek to announce in Switzerland that I shall contribute articles to "**La Révolution**",<sup>249</sup> without informing me!

*Subscription cost:*

one year      6 fr.  
six months    3 fr. 50

On behalf of the *provisional Central Bureau:*

Secretary, *Jean Zagorsky*  
rue Montbrillant, 8.

N. B. The *national bureaux* are requested to send the *Central Bureau* the money received for the shares and subscriptions before January 1.

Remarks made by Karl Marx on December 15, 1868

First published, in Russian, in *Generalny Sovet Pervogo Internatsionala. 1868-1870*, Moscow, 1964

Printed according to the French leaflet containing Marx's remarks

Translated from the French

Karl Marx

[IRELAND FROM THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION  
TO THE UNION OF 1801

EXTRACTS AND NOTES]<sup>250</sup>

I. FROM 1778 TO 1782. INDEPENDENCE

A) IRISH PARLIAMENT BEFORE 1782

*Importance of the question for English working class, and working-class movement generally.*

*Until 1800 Ireland, although conquered, remained separate and federate kingdom. Title of King up to peace of Amiens<sup>251</sup> "George III, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith etc."*

The English usurpations in regard to the Parliament at Dublin principally calculated with view to *mercantile monopoly* on the one hand, and, on the other, to have the *appellate jurisdiction* in regard to the *titles of landed estates* in the last instance to be decided at London, only in English courts.

*Poynings' Law*<sup>252</sup>

A Statute of Henry VII, framed by his Attorney-General, Sir Edward Poynings, restrained the Irish Parliament *from originating any law whatever*, either in the Lords or Commons. Before any statute could be finally discussed, it was *previously submitted to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and his Privy Council*,<sup>253</sup> for their consideration, who might *at their pleasure reject it, or transmit it to England*. The British Attorney-General and Privy Council were invested with a power either to *suppress it altogether, or model it at their own will*, and then return it to Ireland, *with permission to the Irish Parliament to pass it into law*. Already *Molyneux* etc. protested against this (17th century). Later, in the 18th century, Swift and Dr. Lucas.<sup>254</sup>

*Statute 6, George I*<sup>255</sup>

(It declared in fact the *legislative supremacy of the British Parliament over Ireland*.)





Poynings' law reduced the Irish House of Commons to a *mere instrument of the Privy Council of both nations*, and, consequently, of the *British Cabinet*.

George I, *Statute*, to neutralise the Irish legislation altogether, and to establish an *appellant jurisdiction to the British Lords*, whereby every decree and judgment of the Irish superior courts, which would tend to affect or disturb the *questionable or bad titles of the British adventurers or absentees*<sup>256</sup> to Irish estates or Irish property, might be reversed or rendered abortive in Great Britain by a *vote of the Scotch and English nobility*.

(*This was re-enacted by the Union!*)

Many British Peers and Commoners, through whose influence this Statute of George I had been enacted, had themselves been deeply interested in effecting that measure, to secure their own grants of Irish estates. Under the 1st clause of this law England assumed a *despotic power* "and declared her inherent right to bind Ireland by every *Statute* in which she should be *expressly* designated".

It was the success of that vicious precedent which had encouraged *George III* and his *British Parliament* to attempt to legislate for America. Cost them the North-American colonies.<sup>257</sup>

### *General Character of Irish Parliament in the 18th Century Until the Upheaving*

Protestant Parliament. Only Protestants electors. In fact the Parliament of the Conquerors. A mere instrument, a mere serf in relation to the British Government. Compensated themselves by despotism against the Catholic mass of the Irish people. *Penal Code* against Catholics<sup>258</sup> rigorously enforced. Only from time to time some efforts of that Parliament to resist the *English commercial legislature* ruining Irish industry and commerce, then principally carried on by the Protestant, Scotch-English part of the population.

As to the *internal composition* of this Parliament etc. more will be said by and by.

A new state of things opened with the *American War of Independence* and the disasters it brought upon England.

B)<sup>a</sup> FIRST EFFECTS OF AMERICAN WAR  
OF INDEPENDENCE ON IRELAND PRIOR  
TO LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDENCE

A) RELAXATION OF PENAL CODE AGAINST CATHOLICS

*American (United States) Declaration of Independence* proclaimed by Congress, 4 July 1776.<sup>b</sup>

April 1777: Congress proclaims the *Constitution (American) of American Republic*.<sup>c</sup>

*War between England and America.*

6 February 1778: *Treaties with France*, by which independence of American Republic [was] recognised and France promised to support the Americans, until they had got rid of the English.<sup>259</sup>

Great fermentation produced by the American events in Ireland. Many Irish, mainly Presbyterians from Ulster, emigrate to America, enrol under the *United States banners* and fight against England on the other side of the Atlantic. *The Catholics*, who for a long time had in vain supplicated for a relaxation of the Penal Code, moved again in 1776, in louder tones.

1778: *Irish Parliament relaxed the severity of the Penal Code*, its worst features obliterated, Catholics were allowed to *take leases of land*.

Curran said afterwards (1792, in debate on *Catholic Emancipation*):

“What was the consequence even of a *partial union* with your countrymen? The united efforts of the two bodies restored that constitution which had been lost by their separation.[...] Your Catholic brethren shared the danger of the conflict, but you had not justice or gratitude to let them share the fruits of the victory. You suffered them to relapse into their former insignificance and depression. And, let me ask you, has it not fared with you according to your deserts? Let me ask you if the Parliament of Ireland can boast of being now less at the feet of the British Minister, than at that period it was of the British Parliament?”

“But you affect to think your property in danger, by admitting them into the state.[...] Thirteen years ago you expressed the same fears, yet you made the experiment; you opened the door to landed property, and the fact has shown the fear to be without foundation.”<sup>260</sup> Then *Protestant Ascendancy*.<sup>261</sup> *Tithes and property of the Protestant Church in Ireland.*

<sup>a</sup> In the manuscript this section is marked II, though the preceding section is marked “A” and the following “C”.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> “Declaration of Independence in Congress, July 4, 1776. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America”.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> “Articles of Confederation, and Perpetual Union”.—*Ed.*

*Main opposition* to every innovation and useful measure on the part of *absentees*. Always steady adherents of the Minister for the time being. Their proxies in the Lords, and their influence in the Commons, were transferred to the Minister on a card or in a letter, and on every division in both Houses they formed a phalanx.

B) THE VOLUNTEER ORGANISATION.  
THE FREE-TRADE MOVEMENT.  
FIRST CONCESSIONS OF ENGLAND

On 4 July 1776 the Americans had proclaimed their *Declaration of Independence*. In the same year the Irish Catholics, as seen, *demand* (they had before supplicated for) relaxation of the Penal Code, redress.

In April 1777 Constitution of American Republic proclaimed. In 1778 first redress of the Catholic grievances etc. This enabled the Irish Protestants, till now considered by the English as their *gaolers* and *bailiffs*, to move.

To understand the movement from 1779-1782 (*Legislative Independence*), it becomes necessary briefly to allude to the state in which England found herself.

June 1778 commenced war between England and France.<sup>262</sup> In 1780 France sent not only, as she had done till then, money subsidies and men-of-war to America, but also an auxiliary army. (6,000 men under the Marquis of Rochambeau.) The French army landed on 10 July 1780 in Rhode Island, surrendered to him by the English. September 1780 English colonel *Ferguson* defeated in the West of North Carolina. 19 October 1781, *Cornwallis* (General) included by Washington in *York Town* (Virginia) had to *capitulate*. (5-6,000 men, many English men-of-war etc. were captured.)

27 July 1778 sea-battle between French and English at *Quessant*. Undecided.

Summer 1779: King of Spain<sup>a</sup> accedes as ally to United States and France. His navy united with the French one. The hostile fleets assailed the *English coast in June*, and only the dissension amongst the French and Spanish Admirals saved *Plymouth* (August 1779) from the destruction of its wharfs and arsenals.

In 1780 England was not defeated on the sea, but lost much in money and *mercantile ships*.

<sup>a</sup> Charles III.—Ed.



26 February 1780 Russia invites all neutral maritime powers to *Armed Neutrality*.<sup>263</sup> England pounces upon Holland. 5 August 1782 naval battle between English and Dutch, at *Doggersbank*, in the North Sea. *Undecided*.

On 30 November 1782 at Paris *Preliminary Peace Treaty between United States and England*.

\* \* \*

1779. Great part of English army and navy consisted of Irishmen. In 1779 *Ireland was left ungarrisoned*, an invasion of Ireland by France threatened, English coast (*Plymouth*) menaced by united French and Spanish navy. Under these circumstances the *Volunteers*—the armed Protestantism of Ireland<sup>264</sup>—arose, partly for defence from the foreigner, partly for self-vindication. In less time than could have been supposed, from the commencement of these armed associations, the whole surface of the island was covered with a self-raised host of patriot soldiers.

\* \* \*

At this place, it will be interesting to anticipate the *whole of the history* of this Volunteer force, because, in fact, it is the history of Ireland to the moment when, since 1795, on the one hand, the *general popular, national and constitutional movement*, represented by them, stripped off its *merely national* character and merged into a *truly revolutionary movement*, and, on the other hand, the British Government changed secret intrigue for brutal force intended to bring about, and succeeding in bringing about, the Union of 1800, i. e. the annihilation of Ireland as a nation, and its transformation into an out of the way country district of England.

There are 4 periods of the Volunteer movement.

*I Period. From 1779 to 1783:* In its first formation the Volunteers, the armed Protestantism of Ireland, embrace all vital elements of all classes, noblemen, gentlemen, merchants, farmers, labourers. Their first object, emancipation from the *commercial and industrial fetters* which the mere mercantile jealousy of England had thrown around them. Then *National Independence*. Then *Reform of Parliament* and *Catholic Emancipation* as one of the conditions of National Resurrection! Their official organisation and the disasters of England give them new strength, but lay also

the germ of their ruin, subordinating them to a weak, bigot, aristocratic Whig, the *Earl of Charlemont*. The first victories (commercial ones) of the Irish Commons they justly claim as their own victory. The votes of thanks by the Irish Commons exalt them. Catholic bodies enroll in them. The apogee of their power in 1783, when their delegates assembled in *Dublin Rotunda*, as *Convention* for Parliamentary Reform. The treason of their chief and the disavowal of them by the Irish *House of Commons* breaks their force and pushes them into the background.

*II Period. From 1783 to 1791 (October).*

Still important as pressure from without upon Irish Parliament, especially House of Commons, and as armed and popular support of the *national and reforming Opposition (minority)* of the House of Commons. The aristocratic element and reactionary part of the middle-class withdrew, the popular element prevailing.

The French Revolution (1789) finds both *Catholic Committee*

(principally composed of Catholic noblemen)

and *Whig Club*<sup>265</sup>

(Reformers)

feeble and dispirited.<sup>266</sup>

There was a steady decline of the Volunteer organisation, and of the strength of the Liberal Party until 1790.

A different race of men from Whig Club orators or Catholic Lords now began to act on the public.

In *Dublin*, *John Keogh*, a strong, rough-souled, sagacious merchant, and men of his stamp, sent the Catholic nobles flying in slavish dread.

And in *Belfast*, Neilson, Russell, McCracken etc., headed a Protestant Party, which advocated Reform, but began soon to think of Republicanism. The government rendered fearful by the *Regency dispute*,<sup>267</sup> and desperate by the French Revolution, began to push corruption and the principles of the Union<sup>a</sup> harder than ever.

*Theobald Wolfe Tone*, the son of a man, half coachmaker and half farmer, a poor and briefless barrister, with a wife and a pack of children, resolved to *redress the wrongs of the Catholics*, restore *representation in the Commons*, and with these, or failing in them, to make his country *an independent republic*. Now he wrote a pamphlet *in favour of the Catholic emancipation*, called: "*An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland, by a Northern Whig*," and received every mark of gratitude from his new clients.

In *October, 1791*, in *Belfast* he founded the *first United Irish Society*.

From this moment, the movement of the Volunteers merges into that of the *United Irishmen*. The Catholic question became that of

<sup>a</sup> Probably a slip of the pen; in his "Memoir of John Ph. Curran" prefixed to *The Speeches of ... Curran*, Thomas Davis writes (p. XX): "to push corruption and the principles of disunion".—*Ed.*

the Irish people. The question was no longer to remove disabilities from the Catholic *upper and middle classes*, but to *emancipate the Irish peasant*, for the vast part Catholic. The question became *social* as to its matter, assumed *French political principles* as to its form, remained *national*.

*III Period. From 1791 (October) to 1795 (after recall of Lord Fitzwilliam).*

The movement of the Volunteers merged into that of the *United Irishmen*.

Public until 1794, when forced by the government measures to become *secret*. The United Irishmen increased in numbers, the Catholics in confidence, and the *Volunteer Corps* began to restore their array, and improve their discipline.

Acme of their action:

*15 February 1793: A Volunteer Convention at Dungannon* passed resolutions in favour of Emancipation and Reform, and named a permanent Committee. The *Relief Bill of April 1793* was carried by this pressure.<sup>268</sup>

But now, the *Catholic higher classes secede from the movement*; pitched against the *ci-devant*<sup>a</sup> Volunteers (merging into the Secret Societies of the United Irishmen) the *aristocratic and stupidly, bigottedly middle-class yeomen*.

Coercive laws against *military societies, drilling, and the whole machinery of the Volunteers* passed on *11 March 1793*, and the *Alien Act, the Militia, Foreign Correspondence, Gunpowder and Convention Acts*,<sup>269</sup> in fact, a full *code of coercion* passed by the same Parliament, that had passed the Catholic Relief Bill.

The *United Irishmen* became a secret organisation. Recall of Fitzwilliam only left the decision to force.

*IV Period. Volunteer movement merged into the revolutionary movement since 1795.*

\* \* \*

We now return to the development of the *Volunteer Movement, 1779-83*, and the Acts of Irish Parliament under this high popular pressure. The *Armed Associations, first provincial and local*, strongest in the North (Ulster) and Dublin (Leinster). Only Protestants. First *against Invasion*. Protestant farmers rallied under this cry first. Catholics prohibited by statute from bearing arms in Ireland. However, they zealously assisted in forwarding those very associa-

<sup>a</sup> Former.—Ed.

tions into which they themselves had no admission. Their calmness and their patriotism gained them many friends, and a relaxation of intolerance appeared rapidly to be gaining ground, but it was not until the Volunteers had assumed a deliberative capacity, that the necessity of uniting the whole population of the country in the cause of independency became distinctly obvious.

The first object of the Irish Volunteers—after the defence against invasion—was to free themselves mercantilely and industrially, an interest then almost wholly in the hands of the Protestants, although by its very nature a national interest.

It was observed, that this British assumption of authority to legislate for Ireland, whatever colouring it might have received by the dissimulation or ingenuity of its supporters, had, in fact, for its real object the restraint of her commerce and the suppression of her manufactures, so far as they might interfere with the interests of England; because the management of the merely local concerns of Ireland, by her own Parliament, was altogether immaterial to Great Britain, unless where a commercial rivalry might be the probable consequence of successful industry and legislative encouragement.

Peers [showed] no public spirit; the measures of the Commons might be suppressed by an act of the Privy Council; hence determined co-operation of the whole people necessary.

The moment (the distress of England and the armed force of the Volunteers) was favourable.

England, notwithstanding [the fact that] she had in some instances suspended, and in others prohibited, the exportation of Irish manufactures, inundated the Irish markets with every species of her own; a combination of the great capitalists of England to destroy Irish manufacture by inundation of the Irish market.

Hence the Irish resolved to adopt a non-importation and non-consumption agreement throughout the whole kingdom, by excluding not only the importation, but the consumption of any British manufacture in Ireland. No sooner was this measure publicly proposed, than it was universally adopted; it flew quicker than the wind throughout the whole nation. Meanwhile the Volunteer organisation spread; at length almost every independent Protestant enrolled as a patriot soldier. Self-formed, self-governed, no commissions from the Crown, no connexion whatever with the Government, [they] appointed their own officers etc. Yet subordination complete. Their arms at first provided by themselves; but the extraordinary increase of their numbers rendered them at length unable to procure a sufficient supply by purchase; they required arms from the Government; Government did not think it

safe to refuse their demand; and, with an averted eye, *handed out to the Volunteers 20,000 stands of arms from the Castle of Dublin.*<sup>270</sup> Many men who had served in the United States against the Americans became their drill sergeants. At the head of the corps noblemen etc. Important in this movement *the familiar association of all ranks.*

Under these circumstances:

*Sessions of the Irish Parliament 1779-80.* After frivolous speech of the Lord Lieutenant (Harcourt?)<sup>a</sup> in the House of Lords, and usual adulatory address moved in the Commons by *Sir Robert Deane,*<sup>b</sup> *Grattan* moved the following *amendment*:

“That we beseech Your Majesty to believe, that it is with the utmost reluctance we are constrained to approach you on the present occasion; but the *constant drain to supply absentees, and the unfortunate prohibition of our trade,* have caused such calamity, that the natural support of our country has decayed, and our *manufacturers* are dying for want: famine stalks hand in hand with hopeless wretchedness; and the only means left to support the expiring trade of this miserable part of Your Majesty’s dominions, is to *open a free export trade,* and let your Irish subjects enjoy their natural birthright.”<sup>c</sup>

*Mr. Hussey Burgh,* the Prime Sergeant (above the Attorney-General) moved the following amendment:

“That it is not *by temporary expedients,* that this nation is now to be saved from impending ruin.”<sup>271</sup>

Unanimously carried.

Volunteers attributed rightly this unexpected success to their movement. It greatly increased both the numbers and confidence in Volunteer associations.

Although even in *both Houses of the British Parliament* attention [was] called to the Irish distress and the dangerous state of that country, *Lord North* treated the whole [matter] with his usual superciliousness and frivolity. Nothing was done.

The *non-importation and non-consumption movement* became now general in Ireland. At length, a general meeting was convened by the *High Sheriff of the city of Dublin,* and resolutions then entered into by the whole metropolis, which finally confirmed and consummated that judicious measure, and at length convinced

<sup>a</sup> George Nugent-Temple Grenville, the Marquis of Buckingham, was the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland at the time. See his speech at the opening of the session of the Irish Parliament on October 12, 1779, in H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 20-22.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Deane’s address to George III on October 12, 1779, see H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, p. 22.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> See J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. I, p. 126.—*Ed.*

Great Britain, that Ireland would no longer submit to insult and domination. These resolutions were enforced with vigour and strictness. The Volunteers of Dublin resolved to consolidate, chose *William, Duke of Leinster*, for their Chief. This was the first measure of the Volunteers to form a regular army composed of every rank of society. Secret efforts of the Government to seduce the soldier from his officers, or to detach the most popular officers from the command of the soldiers—all in vain!

The appointment of the Duke of Leinster to the command of the Dublin Volunteers, was quickly followed by that of other district generals; and the organisation of 4 provincial armies was regularly proceeded on. The Ulster army appointed the *Earl of Charlemont* its commander-in-chief, the other armies proceeded rapidly in their organisation. Provincial reviews were adopted; and everything assumed the appearance of systematic movement. Soon General Commander-in-Chief [was appointed].

Affairs now approached fast towards a crisis; the freedom of commerce being the subject most familiar to the ideas of the people, was the first object of their solicitude. "A *free trade*" became the *watchword* of the *Volunteers*, and the cry of the Nation; the *Dublin Volunteer Artillery* appeared on parade, commanded by *James Napper Tandy*, with labels on the mouths of their cannon: "*Free Trade or Speedy Revolution.*" Lord North got now frightened. America already lost. On *24th November 1781* speech from the throne wherein *he* [the King] called the *immediate attention* of his *British Parliament* to the situation of Ireland. Now in hot haste these blockheads acceded to the Irish claims. The *British Parliament* met on *25 November*, and the first Bills of concessions received the royal assent on *21 December 1781*. Now these dunderheads passed Bills, distinctly repealing all the Acts which their predecessors had declared absolutely *essential* to secure the *prosperity* of England from the *dangerous industry* of the Irish.

Messages sent over to Ireland, much fuss made of the liberality and justice of Great Britain. Meanwhile *North* tried to pass over the year 1782, by continuing to open the Committee on Irish affairs from time to time, now and then passing a resolution in favour of that country, and thus endeavouring to wear out the session.

Ireland at length perceived the duplicity of proceedings which, while they purported to extend benefits to Ireland?!, asserted the paramount authority of Great Britain, and converted its acts of *concession* into declaratory statutes of its own supremacy. *14 Irish Counties* at once avowed to establish, at the risk of their lives and

fortunes, *the independence of the Irish Legislature*. The cry of "Free Trade" now accompanied with that of "*Free Parliament*".

*George III* forced, from the throne (in his speech), to pass unqualified eulogiums on the *Volunteer army*, as expression of the *loyalty and fidelity of the people*.

The *Army in Ireland* had been under *the regulations of a British Statute*, and the *hereditary revenue of the Crown*, with the aid of a *perpetual mutiny bill*,<sup>272</sup> enabled the British Government to command at all times a *standing army in Ireland*, without the authority or the control of its Parliament. Volunteers became aware of this. *Resolutions were entered into by almost every military corps*, and every corporate body, that they would no longer obey any laws, save those enacted by the *King, Lords and Commons of Ireland*.

The salaries of the *Judges of Ireland* were then barely sufficient to keep them above want, and they held their offices only during the will of the *British Minister*, who might remove them at his pleasure: all Irish justice, therefore, was at his control. In all questions between the Crown and the people, the purity of the judge was consequently suspected.

*The Irish Parliament*, at this period, met but once in 2 years, and in the *British Attorney-General* was vested the superintendence of their proceedings and in the *British Privy Council* the alteration and rejection of their Statutes.

**9 October 1781.** *Irish House of Commons. Irish Parliament* opened, speech of the Viceroy<sup>a</sup> etc., after address to His Majesty passed, *Mr. O'Neill* (House of Commons) moved a *resolution of thanks* to "*all the Volunteers of Ireland, for their exertions and continuance*". Unanimously voted, and directed to be circulated throughout all Ireland, and to be communicated by the Sheriffs of the counties to the corps within their bailiwicks.<sup>b</sup>

This resolution brought down the British Government to the feet of the Volunteers, and raised the Volunteers above the supremacy of Britain, by a direct Parliamentary approbation of self-armed, self-governed, and self-disciplined associations.

These Volunteers by this time exceeded in number the whole regular military force of the *British Empire*.

*Portugal Affair*: By the resolutions of the British Legislature, Ireland had been admitted to export her *linen and woollen manufactures to Portugal*, agreeable to the provisions of the *Treaty of Methuen*,<sup>273</sup> from which liberty she had been previously and explicitly prohibited by express statutes. Irish manufacturers tried immediately to improve this. Portuguese Ministry (under orders of the British Ministers) peremptorily

<sup>a</sup> Frederick Howard, Earl of Carlisle.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 82-85; J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. I, p. 135.—Ed.

refused, seized the Irish merchandise (this in 1782). Petition of the Dublin merchants to Irish House of Commons. In opposition to a motion of Fitzgibbon Sir Lucius O'Brien moved an amendment, calling upon the King, as *King of Ireland*, to assert the *rights of that kingdom* "by *hostility with Portugal*", [and] concluding with: "We doubt not that Nation (Ireland) has *vigour* and *resources* sufficient to maintain all her rights, and *astonish all her enemies*."

House [did] not [have] the courage to pass it.

Now [the] cry in the country, that *their connection with England was only federative*. This engrossed now almost the exclusive consideration of the armed associations of Ireland.

*Want of protection for personal liberty in Ireland: No Habeas Corpus Act.*<sup>274</sup>

*Repeal of the English Statute of 6, George I* asked by the armed Volunteers and corporate bodies<sup>a</sup> etc. *Catholic bodies now also entered the Volunteer army*, officered by Protestants. Regular and public deliberative meetings of the armed Volunteers. The *armed associations of Ulster first appointed delegates* to declare the sentiments of their province, in a general assembly. **Convention at Dungannon, 15 February 1782**. Agreed upon the celebrated *Declaration of Rights and Grievances*.

They were delegates from 25,000 Ulster soldiers, backed by the voice of about 1 million inhabitants of that country.

*Declaration of the Volunteers  
at the Dungannon Convention.  
15 February 1782*<sup>275</sup>

"Whereas it has been asserted that Volunteers, as such, cannot with propriety debate or give their opinions on political subjects, or the conduct of Parliament, or public men, resolved unanimously: That a citizen, by learning the use of arms, does not abandon *any* of his *civil rights*. That a claim of any body of men, other than the *King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland*, to make laws to bind *this Kingdom*, is *unconstitutional, illegal, and a grievance*;

"that the *power exercised by the Privy Council* of both Kingdoms, under the pretence of the *law of Poynings*,<sup>b</sup> is *unconstitutional* and a *grievance*;

"that the *independence of judges* is equally essential to the impartial administration of *justice in Ireland*, as in England; and that the refusal or delay of this right to Ireland, makes a distinction where there should be no distinction; may excite jealousy where perfect union should prevail; and is in itself *unconstitutional and a grievance*; that it is our *decided and unalterable* determination to seek a redress of these grievances ... redress, *speedy and effectual*; that as men, and as Irishmen, as Christians, and as Protestants, *we rejoice in the relaxation of the penal laws against our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects*; and that we conceive the measure to be fraught with the *happiest consequences* to the union and prosperity of the inhabitants of Ireland."

4 members from each county of the province of Ulster were appointed to *act as a committee* for the Volunteer Corps, to call general meetings of the province. That

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, p. 212.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 212, 215.—Ed.



the said committee appoint 9 of their members to be a committee in Dublin, in order to communicate with all other Volunteer Associations in the other provinces, that may think proper to come to similar resolutions; and to deliberate with them on the most constitutional means of carrying them into effect.

*Earl of Bristol*, Englishman by birth, British Peer and Protestant Bishop of Derry<sup>a</sup> (uncle of *George Robert Fitzgerald*), openly declares for the Volunteers (ditto for full *Catholic Emancipation*).

*In every Volunteer Corps of Ireland the **Dungannon** resolutions are accepted.*  
About this time about 90,000 Volunteers are ready.

As soon as the Dungannon Volunteers had received the concurrence of the armed associations, the *Irish House of Commons* assumed new aspect. The proceedings of the people without now told on their representatives within. The whole House appeared forming into parties.

Their Sessions were *biennial*, and consequently their grants to Government *were for 2 years at once*; and till more money was required, their legislative [power] was inactive. They *now determined on granting supplies to the Crown for 6 months only*, as a hint that they would grant no more till their grievances were redressed: this had its effect.

The proceedings of the Volunteers and municipal bodies became every day more serious and decisive, tone in House of Commons more menacing.

*Impracticable to proceed with Lord North any longer.* About April 1782 *Marquis of Rockingham's Cabinet* (*James Fox* etc.). *Duke of Portland*, nominated *Lord Lieutenant of Ireland*, arrived at Dublin **14 April 1782**, had to meet the *Irish Parliament on the 16th April*.

#### C) DECLARATIONS OF IRISH LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDENCE<sup>276</sup>

*Message of George III to **British** Parliament, 18 April 1782.*<sup>277</sup>  
Stating:

“that mistrusts and jealousies had arisen in Ireland, and that it was highly necessary to take the same into immediate consideration, in order to [effect] a *final adjustment*.”

*British House of Commons* in reply: express

“their entire and cheerful concurrence in His Majesty's views of a *final adjustment*”.

The same words “*final adjustment*” were repeated, by the Irish Ministry, when a *Union* was proposed to the Irish Parliament in 1800.

<sup>a</sup> Frederick Hervey.—*Ed.*

Duke of Portland wanted to procrastinate. Grattan communicated to him, that this [was] impossible without provoking anarchy. *House of Commons, 16 April 1782*: Grattan on the point of proposing *Independence motion*, when Mr. **Hely Hutchinson** (Secretary of State in Ireland) rose and said, the Lord Lieutenant had ordered him to *deliver a message from the King*, importing that "His Majesty, being concerned to find that discontents and jealousies were prevailing amongst his loyal subjects of Ireland, upon matters of great weight and importance, recommended the House to take the same into their most serious consideration, in order to effect such a *final adjustment* as might give satisfaction to both kingdoms".

*Hutchinson* accompanied this message, and his statement of his own views on the subject, with a determination to support a declaration of "*Irish rights*" and constitutional "*independence*". *Hutchinson* declared at the same time, that he had simply to deliver the message; he was therefore silent to all details and pledged the Government to none. *Ponsonby* proposed a short address.

*Grattan* spoke: "America has shed much English blood, and America is to be free: Ireland has shed her own blood for England, and is Ireland to remain in fetters?" etc. Proposes *Amendment* to *Ponsonby's* "short address", etc. "to assure His Majesty that his subjects of Ireland are a *free people*, that the Crown of Ireland is an *imperial* crown, inseparably connected with the Crown of Great Britain ... but that the Kingdom of Ireland is a *distinct kingdom*, with a Parliament of her *own* the sole legislature thereof, that there is no body of men competent to make laws to bind the nation but the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland, nor any Parliament which hath any authority or power of any sort whatever in this country, save only the Parliament of Ireland; to assure His Majesty that we humbly conceive that in this right the very *essence of our liberty exists*, a right which we, on the part of all the people of Ireland, do claim as their birth-right, and which we cannot yield but with our lives."

*Brownlow* seconded. *George Ponsonby* stated "that he most willingly consented [on behalf of Portland] to the proposed amendment, and would answer that the noble lord who presided in the Government of Ireland, wished to do everything in his power etc." and "he (Portland) would use his utmost influence in obtaining the *rights* of Ireland, an object on which he had **fixed his heart**".

(1799. Portland openly avowed in 1799 that he had **never** considered this concession of England in 1782 as **final**.)

*Unanimously Grattan's Motion was passed.*

Shortly before and shortly after this scene very decided resolutions on the part of the Volunteer Corps. It was the unanimous *firmness* of the *people*, and not the abstract virtue of their delegates, which achieved this revolution.

*Fitzgibbon* had declared [himself] a patriot; and Mr. *John Scott*, then Attorney-General, afterwards *Lord Clonmel*, even declared: "If the Parliament of Great Britain were determined to lord it over Ireland, he was resolved not to be their villain in executing their tyranny. That if matters should proceed to the extremity to which he feared they were verging, he should not be an insignificant subscriber to the fund for defending their common rights ... he had determined to throw his life and fortune into the scale."

(This true man of the Pitt-Castlereagh school!)

Immediately on this turn, *Portland* sent off 2 despatches to England, one to the Cabinet as a public document, the other, *private and confidential*, to Fox. Explained the reasons for the necessity of acceding... Stated in conclusion that "he would omit no opportunity of *cultivating* his connexion with the Earl of Charlemont, who appeared entirely disposed to place confidence in his Administration, and to give a *proper tone* to the *armed bodies* over whom he had the most considerable influence".

*Parliament* was meanwhile prorogued for 3 weeks, to wait for the King's Reply to their Declaration of Independence. Meanwhile *reviews and discipline* were continued with unremitting vigour by the *Volunteer army*, now about 124,000, of whom upwards of 100,000 effectives. Besides nearly  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the whole English army then Irish, ditto very many *sailors* Irish.

(Portland's conduct in 1782 a *premeditated tissue of dissimulation!*)

27 May 1782 Irish House of Commons met, pursuant to adjournment.

*Portland* in his quasi throne speech: "King and British Parliament ... are united in a desire to *gratify every* wish expressed in your late Address to the Throne... By the papers which, in obedience to His Majesty's commands, I have directed to be laid before you, you will receive the most convincing testimony of the cordial reception which your representations have met with from the Legislative of Great Britain, but His Majesty whose first and most anxious wish is to exercise his Royal Prerogative in such a manner as may be most conducive to the welfare of his faithful subjects, has further given it me in command to assure you of his gracious disposition to give his Royal assent to acts to *prevent the suppression of Bills in the Privy Council of this Kingdom*, and the *alteration of them anywhere*, and to *limit the duration of the Act for the better Regulation and Accommodation of His Majesty's forces in this Kingdom, to the term of 2 years*. The benevolent intentions of His Majesty ... unaccompanied by any stipulation or condition whatever. The *good faith*, the *generosity*, and the honour of *this* (the English) nation, afford them the surest pledge of a corresponding disposition, on your part etc." <sup>a</sup>

*Grattan* the fool rose at once:

"That as Great Britain had *given up every claim to authority over Ireland*, he had *not the least* idea that she should be also bound to make *any declaration that she had formerly usurped that power*. I move you to assure His Majesty of our unfeigned affection to His Royal Person and Government ... magnanimity of His Majesty, and the wisdom of the *Parliament of Great Britain*, that we conceive the *resolution for an unqualified, unconditional repeal of the 6, George I, to be a measure of consummate wisdom and justice*"

and similar talk, and in particular

"that no constitutional question between the two nations will any longer exist".

Sir *Samuel Broadstreet* on the other hand declared: "The Irish Parliament actually sat at that moment under an English statute." Ditto *Flood, David Walsh*:

"I repeat it, that until England declares unequivocally, *by an Act of her own Legislature*, that she had no right, in any instance, to make laws to bind Ireland, the *usurped power of English Legislation* never can be considered by us as relinquished ... we have the *power* to assert our rights as men, and accomplish our independence as a nation."

<sup>a</sup> For Portland's speech in Parliament on May 27, 1782, see H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, p. 131.—Ed.

*Grattan's address was triumphantly carried (only 2 votes against. The secretary Fitzpatrick had accelerated the vote by artifice).*

*Beauchamp Bagenal* proposed to appoint committee "to consider and report what sum the Irish Parliament should grant, to build a suitable mansion and purchase an estate for their deliverer" (i.e. *Grattan*).

*The British Cabinet now frightened.* Their intolerance degenerated into fear. They had already signed the capitulation, and thought it impossible to carry it too soon into execution. America already lost.

Bills to enact the concessions demanded by Ireland were, therefore, prepared with an expedition nearly bordering on precipitancy. The *6th of George I*, declaratory of, and establishing the supremacy of England, and the eternal dependence of Ireland on the Parliament and Cabinet of Great Britain, was *now hastily repealed, without debate, or any qualification by the British Legislature.* This repeal obtained the royal assent, and a copy was instantly transmitted to the Irish Viceroy, and communicated by circulars to the Volunteer commanders.

*Chap. III: An Act, to repeal an Act made in the 6th year of the reign of his late Majesty King George I, entitled, An Act for the better securing the dependency of the Kingdom of Ireland upon the Crown of Great Britain.*

"Whereas, an Act was passed etc., may it please your excellent Majesty, that it may be enacted, and be it enacted, by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that from and after the passing of this Act, *the above-mentioned Act, and the several matters and things therein contained, shall be, and is, and are hereby repealed.*"

*Irish House of Commons, 30 May 1782.* Bagenal resumed the subject of reward to Grattan; proposed £100,000. *Mr. Thomas Conolly* declared that "the Duke of Portland felt with the Irish people ... he (the Lord Lieutenant) begged to offer, as a part of the intended grant to Mr. Grattan, the *Viceregal Palace in the Phoenix Park*"

—the King's best Palace in Ireland.

The Viceroy of Ireland proposing, on behalf of the King of England, to Grattan to reward his services for having emancipated his country from the domination of Great Britain, was an incident as extraordinary as had ever occurred in any Government, and, emanating from that of England, told, in a single sentence, the whole history of her horrors, her jealousies, her shallow artifice and humbled arrogance. Was, of course, rejected by the Irish House of Commons. Grattan got £50,000 from that House.

## II. FROM 1782 (AFTER THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE) TO 1795

*General remark on this period:* When Lord Westmoreland was removed from Ireland, in 1795, Ireland was in a *most unexampled and progressive state of prosperity*. Curran suggested even an intention to impeach Westmoreland for having permitted *a part of 12,000 troops* (which, according to stipulation, should always remain in Ireland) to be drafted out of that kingdom for foreign service.

### A) FROM 1782 TO 1783. (THE FIASCO OF THE REFORM BILL AND THE GREAT DEFEAT OF THE VOLUNTEERS)

*Irish House of Commons: Bills to ameliorate*, by partial concession, the *depressed state of the Catholics*, and some reward for their zeal and patriotism, *were introduced*, and *had arrived to their last stages in the House of Commons, without any effective opposition*. Opposed by bigotry in their latter stages, the Castle powers stirring on. *Those Bills relaxing the severity of the Penal Code passed however through both Houses*. The concessions [though] very limited, still afforded great satisfaction to the Catholics, as the first growth of a tolerating principle. *Grattan still believed in the Whigs*. But at length *Fox himself*, wearied by a protracted course of slow deception, at once confirmed the opinions of the Irish people, and openly proclaimed to Ireland the inadequacy of all the measures that had heretofore been adopted. He took occasion in the *British Parliament*, on the repeal of the 6th George I being there alluded to, to state

*“that the repeal of that statute could not stand alone, but must be accompanied by a final adjustment, and by a solid basis of permanent connexion”, that “some plans of that nature would be laid before the Irish Parliament by the Irish Ministers, and a treaty entered upon, which treaty, when proceeded on, might be adopted by both Parliaments, and finally become an irrevocable arrangement between the two countries”.*<sup>a</sup>

By that speech, the Irish delusion of a final adjustment was in a moment dissipated, the Viceroy's duplicity became indisputably proved.

Still *Flood* was feebly supported in Irish House of Commons, but [was supported] by the *Volunteers*.

19 July 1782 Flood moved for leave to bring in a Bill “to affirm the sole exclusive right of the Irish Parliament, to make laws affecting that country, in all concerns *external and internal whatsoever*”.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 148-51.—Ed

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 145-46.—Ed

Even the introduction of this Bill was negatived without division. Grattan!

On the other hand [Parliament] *passed* [the] foolish motion of Grattan:

“that leave was refused to bring in Mr. Flood’s bill, because the sole and exclusive right to legislate for Ireland in all cases whatsoever, internally and externally, had been asserted by the Parliament of Ireland, and had been fully, finally and irrevocably acknowledged by the British Parliament”<sup>a</sup>

(which was *not* true). (Fox himself had declared the contrary!)  
(*Because of his scepticism Flood had been dismissed from his office of Vice-Treasurer.*)

27 July 1782 the Parliament was prorogued. In the proroguing speech *Portland* stated amongst other things:

“Your claims were directed by the *same* spirit that gave rise and stability to the *liberty of Great Britain*, and could not fail of success, as soon as the councils of that Kingdom were influenced by the avowed friends of the Constitution.

“Convince the people in your several districts, as you are yourselves convinced, that every cause of past jealousies and discontents is *finally removed*; that both countries have *pledged* their *good faith* to each other, and their best security will be an *invulnerable* adherence to *that compact*; that the implicit reliance which Great Britain has reposed on the honour, generosity, and candour of Ireland, engages your national character to a return of sentiments equally liberal and enlarged. Convince them that the two kingdoms are *now one*, indissolubly connected in *unity of constitution*, and *unity of interests*.”<sup>b</sup>

*Marquis of Rockingham* died (1782). *Fox and Lord North Coalition*.

*Portland superseded by Earl Temple* (who later became *Marquis of Buckingham*) (his *Chief Secretary* his brother Mr., afterwards *Lord, Grenville*) (15 September 1782-3 June 1783). Temple made small reforms. Though he obtained no credit from the *body of the people*, he made considerable progress *amongst the aristocracy of the patriots* (*Charlemont, Grattan* etc.).

The *armed Volunteers* had now assumed a deliberative capacity: Paraded as soldiers and debated as citizens. More than 150,000 Volunteers now appeared upon the regimental muster-rolls. *Strong accession to them of Catholics*. They resolved no longer to obey, or suffer to be obeyed, any statute or law *theretofore* enacted in England, and to oppose their execution with their lives and fortunes. The magistrates refused to act under them, the judges were greatly embarrassed, no legal causes could be proceeded on, under the authority of British Statutes, though naming Ireland, no counsel would plead them, no juries would find for them, the

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 166.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 170-72.—*Ed*

operation of many important laws, theretofore in force, was necessarily suspended.

*Parliament divided between Flood and Grattan*, the latter (Whig spelt) always in the majority. This division of nation the British Administration wanted to foster. Baffled by the *injudicious conduct of some Members of the British Parliament*.

In the *House of Commons* (British) *Sir George Young* (Sinecure placeman in Ireland, although not Irish, viz. *Vice-treasurer of Ireland*) opposed the *Bill of Concession* to Ireland, and Repeal of 6, George I. Protested against the *Power of King and Parliament to pass such bills*. (He could not act against the will of the Ministers.)

*Lord Mansfield*, notwithstanding the repeal of 6, George I, proceeded to entertain, in the Court of King's Bench,<sup>278</sup> at Westminster, an appeal from the King's Bench of Ireland, observing that "he knew of no law *depriving* the British Court of its vested jurisdiction". The interest of money 5% in England, 6% in Ireland. Mansfield had placed very large sums of Irish mortgages to gain the additional 1%. Felt that they were not likely to gain any additional facilities by the appealant jurisdiction being taken from the British courts and transferred to Ireland herself: hence his reluctance to part with it.

*Lord Abingdon*, in the *House of Lords*, totally denied the authority of King and Parliament of England to emancipate Ireland; he moved for leave to bring in a Declaratory Bill to re-assert the right of England to legislate externally in the concerns of Ireland.

The Volunteers beat to arms throughout the whole kingdom; above 120,000 paraded. All confidence in Great Britain dissipated. Flood gained much ground amongst the people. Now *new panic of the British Ministry*. Without waiting for further and peremptory remonstrances from Ireland, they passed the following Statute:

*Anno vicesimo tertio (1783)*  
*Georgii III. Regis<sup>a</sup>*

Ch. XXVIII. An Act for removing and preventing all doubts which have arisen, or might arise, concerning *the exclusive rights of the Parliament and Courts of Ireland, in matters of legislation and judicature; and for preventing any writ of error or appeal from any of His Majesty's Courts in that Kingdom from being received, heard, and adjudged, in any of His Majesty's Courts in the Kingdom of Great Britain*. Whereas ... doubts have arisen whether the provisions of the said (their last) Act are sufficient to secure to the people of Ireland the rights claimed by them, *to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of that Kingdom, in all cases whatever* etc. etc. ... be it declared and enacted ... that the said right claimed by the *people of Ireland*, to be bound only by laws enacted by His Majesty and the Parliament of *that Kingdom*, in *all cases whatever*, and to have all actions and suits at law or in equity, which may be instituted in that Kingdom, decided in His Majesty's Courts therein finally, and

<sup>a</sup> The twenty-third regnal year (1783) of King George III (J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. I, p. 153).—Ed.

without appeal thence, shall be, and it is thereby declared to be *established and ascertained for ever*, and shall, at no time hereafter, be questioned or questionable.

And be it further enacted ... that no writ of error or appeal shall be received or adjudged, or any other proceeding be heard by or in any of His Majesty's Courts in this Kingdom, in any action or suit at law or in equity, instituted in any of His Majesty's Courts in the Kingdom of Ireland, etc. etc.

This measure brought into the British House of Commons by Mr. Townshend, passed through both Houses, and received the Royal assent without debate and with very little observation. In England held out a mere consequential *declaratory* part of a general constitutional arrangement entered into between the two nations. This measure came too late to satisfy the Irish people as to the purity of their *own Parliament*. It convinced them of either its inefficiency or corruption, or the *Renunciation Act of the British Parliament would have been quite unnecessary*. They had to secure their liberties. The Renunciation Act of Ireland had discredited the Irish Parliament with the Irish people.

Mr. Flood had become most prominent among the Irish patriots. Grattan his enemy. The discussion on the English Renunciation Act led to the conclusion of the necessity to reform *their own Parliament*, because, without its comprehensive Reform, there was no security against the instability of events and the duplicity of England.

Rotten borough system.<sup>279</sup> Many members of the Irish *House of Commons* nominated by individuals (borough-mongers) and *Peers*, who in this way voted by proxy in the House of Commons. The King constitutionally nominated *Peers*, and the *Peers* created *Commoners*. The representation of the people in the Commons was *purchased for money*, and the exercise of that representation was sold for office. These purchases made by servants of the executive Government, in trust, for the uses and purposes of its ministers to carry measures. The Volunteers had the facts sifted. One Peer nominated 9 *Commoners* etc. Many individuals openly *sold their patronage for money, to the best bidder*, others returned members at the nomination of the Viceroy or his Secretary; and it appeared that the number of representatives elected freely by the *people did not compose 1/4 of the Irish Commons*. The Volunteers at length determined to demand a reform of *Parliament*. Delegates from several Volunteer regiments again assembled at Dungannon, to consider the expediency and means of an immediate reform of Parliament. Flood [had] great influence now. 300 delegates, men of great influence, many of them members of the House of Lords and the Commons chosen by different corps.



10 November 1783 was proclaimed for the first sitting of the Grand National Convention of Ireland at Dublin. [The delegates] arrived there escorted by small detachments of Volunteers from their respective counties. Rotunda chosen as their place of meeting (vis-à-vis the magnificent dome of the Commons' House of Parliament). Bishop of Derry and Earl of Charlemont rivals for the presidency. The British Ministers knew that if a reform of Parliament were effected in Ireland, it could not be long withheld from England. Then the commercial jealousy of England. Charlemont, their fool. By intrigue he (supported by Grattan) [was] elected before the Earl of Bristol, Bishop of Derry, arrived. Collision in the Convention between Flood and the Bishop on one side, Charlemont and his friends on the other.

After much deliberation, a plan of reform, framed by Mr. Flood and approved by the Convention, was directed to be presented by him to Parliament forthwith, and the sittings of the Convention were made permanent till Parliament had decided the question. Mr. Flood obeyed his instructions, and moved for leave to bring in a Bill of reform of the Parliament. The Government knew that the triumph of the Parliament implied not only the destruction of the Convention, but of the Volunteers.

The Government refused leave to bring in Flood's Bill,<sup>a</sup> because it had originated from their (the Volunteers) deliberations. (Yelverton now Attorney-General.) (Furious speech of Fitzgibbon.)<sup>b</sup> Unprecedentedly violent debate. Bill was rejected by 158 to 49; 158 of the majority were placemen and the very persons on whom the reform was intended to operate. Ditto 158 placemen who carried the Union Bill in 1800, which, if the Reform had succeeded, never could have been passed. An address to the King (moved by Conolly), offending against the Volunteers, carried.<sup>c</sup> Earl Charlemont, suppressing this news, told the Volunteers, he had received a note from the House of Commons, which left no hopes of a speedy decision, the Convention ought to adjourn till Monday,<sup>d</sup> then to decide upon ulterior measures, if the Bill should be rejected. He had secretly decided that they should meet no more. On the Monday morning he repaired to the Rotunda before the usual hour of sitting; only his own immediate partisans present. He adjourned the Convention sine die. When the residue of the

<sup>a</sup> "A Bill for the More Equal Representation of the People in Parliament, November 29, 1783." See H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, p. 191.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 191-94.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 38.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> December 1. 1783.—Ed.

delegates came, the door closed, the Convention dissolved. The Bishop became now the popular man. Charlemont went down. He, a bigot, hated the Catholics, Bishop was quite the opposite. Exclusion on the one side, and toleration on the other became the theme of partisans. The dispute ran high. *The people began to separate.* This effected all the mischief the Government expected.

A *Northern Corps*, calling itself "*Bill of Rights Battalion*", says in Address to the Bishop among other things:

"The gloomy clouds of superstition and *bigotry*, those *engines of disunion*, being fled from the realm, the interests of Ireland can no longer suffer by a diversity of *religious persuasions*. All are united in the pursuit of one great object—the extermination of corruption from our Constitution; nor can your Lordship and your virtuous coadjutors, in promoting civil and *religious liberty*, be destitute of the aid of *all professions*."

Bishop answered in the same strain (dated 14 January 1784): in conclusion he said:

"The hour is now come ... when Ireland must necessarily avail herself of her whole internal force to ward off foreign encroachments, or once more acquiesce under those encroachments, the better to exercise anew the tyranny of a *part* of the community over the dearest and inalienable rights of *others*. For one million of *divided* Protestants can never, in the scale of Human Government, be a counterpoise against 3 millions of united *Catholics*. But, gentlemen of the Bill of Rights Battalion, I appeal to yourselves, and summon you to consistency—*Tyranny is not Government, and Allegiance is only due to Protection.*"

The Government resolved (too impotent to act) to watch the progress of events. Many of the best patriots thought the Bishop's language too strong. The idea of coercing the Parliament very rapidly lost ground. No military language to Parliament etc.

The people were severed, but the Government remained compact; the Parliament was corrupted, the Volunteers were paralysed, and the high spirit of the Nation exhibited a rapid declension.

Weak ly foolish Charlemont, after the dissolution of the Convention, recommended a *Reform Bill* to be presented to Parliament, as emanating solely from *civil* bodies, unconnected with military character. Of course, the placemen, who had scouted the military Bill, because it was military, now rejected the civil Bill, because it was popular. Meetings of the Volunteers were suspended, their reviews continued, to amuse the languid vanity of their *deluded general*.

The *temperate* (bourgeois parliamentary) system now gained ground. The Volunteers of Ireland survived these blows for some years. The Whig orators (Grattan etc.) lost ground and influence.

December 1783. Pitt Minister. Duke of Rutland Viceroy (!)

B) FROM THE END OF 1783 TO 1791  
(FOUNDATION OF UNITED IRISHMEN)

*Pitt in England.*

*Duke of Rutland (Lord Lieutenant) died October, 1787.*

*Marquis of Buckingham (formerly Earl of Temple) second time Viceroy (16 December 1787-5 January 1790).*

*John Fane, Earl of Westmoreland [Lord Lieutenant] (Hobart, afterwards Earl of Buckinghamshire, Chief Secretary) from 5 January 1790 onwards (until 1795).*

In *Irish House of Commons* repeated attempts at *Reform* (Flood, Grattan, Curran etc.) failed.

*Place Bill, Pension Bill, Responsibility Bill, Inquiry into the Sale of Peerages* and into the *Police of Dublin* the most material measures pressed by the Opposition during *Westmoreland's* Office, hence after the *Revolution of 1789* in France.

{ The *Place, Pension and Responsibility Bills* proposed by Mr. Grattan, *acceded to by the Viceroy*, passed into laws. *Place Bill*—a bill to vacate the seats of members *accepting offices under Government*, omitting the term of *bona fide* offices, thereby leaving the Minister a power of packing the Parliament; this Bill one of the instruments of *Castlereagh* for carrying the Union. }

[Up] to 1790 all these things as also *Emancipation, Reform, Tithe questions* failed.

There was a steady decline of the Volunteer organisation, and of the strength of the Liberal party to 1790. We have *Tone's* word that when the French Revolution broke out, both *Catholic Committee* and *Whig Club*<sup>280</sup>—the *Emancipation* and *Reform* parties—were feeble and dispirited.<sup>a</sup>

*Irish House of Commons. February 14, 1785. Militia against Volunteers. Gardiner* {on behalf of the Minister, and, as Curran told him, "in hope of being rewarded, by being raised to a higher rank", became actually *Lord Mountjoy* by the Union} moved a grant of £20,000 for clothing the Militia. This motion was levelled at the Volunteers, and therefore violently debated. One of the reasons of its *being carried*—the fool-rogue<sup>b</sup> *Grattan* went with the Government. *Fitzgibbon*, the *Attorney-General*, said amongst other things *against Curran*, who opposed the Bill and defended the Volunteers: "he (Curran) poured forth a studied panegyric of the Volunteers.... I shall even entrust the defence of the country to **gentlemen**, with the *King's commission* in their pockets, rather than to his (Curran's) friends, the **beggars** in the streets."

*Orde's Propositions<sup>c</sup> and Regency Bills* the things most important during this period as **international** questions between Ireland and

<sup>a</sup> See *Davis' "Memoir"* in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. XIX.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> "The fool-rogue" was inserted by Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Marx means *Orde's* propositions regarding the trade between Ireland and Great Britain made on February 11, 1785. See H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. I, pp. 214-17.—*Ed.*

*England*; before speaking of them, we shall, however, allude still to a few other objects treated in Parliament during the period 1783-1791.

**Renewed efforts for reform** made in 1784. In consequence of a requisition, Henry Reilly, Sheriff of the County of Dublin, summoned his bailiwick to the court-house of Kilmainham for the 25 October 1784, to elect members to a national congress. For this Mr. Reilly was attached by the King's Bench, on a crown motion, and on the 24 February 1785 Mr. Brownlow moved a *vote of censure on the judges of that court*, for the attachment. Speech of Curran. Motion rejected by 143 to 71.<sup>a</sup>

Shows still a great independent minority.

#### PENSIONS, DISFRANCHISEMENT OF EXCISE OFFICERS, GOVERNMENT CORRUPTION

The endeavour to *regain by corruption* what was surrendered to force, began in 1782, and increased greatly after the defeat of Orde's Propositions.<sup>281</sup>

### *Pensions*

*Pensions*, 13 March 1786. *Irish House of Commons*. Bill of Forbes to limit the amount of pensions. Defeated, i.e., adjournment ad Calendas Graecas<sup>b</sup> carried. As Curran said [the] object of the Bill [was] to "restrain the Crown from doing wrong by a physical necessity". "The Pension List, like charity, covers a multitude of sins ... coming home to the members of this House ... the Crown is laying a foundation for the independence of Parliament ... they" (the members of this House) "will have this security for their independence, that while any man in the kingdom has a shilling, they will not want one" (Curran).

12 March 1787. (Forbes renewed his Bill for limiting Pensions. Curran supported him. Orde, Secretary. Also failed.)

"The King's authority" (here) "delegated first to a Viceroy, and next it falls to a Secretary, who can have no interest in the good of the people, no interest in future fame etc.... What responsibility can be found or hoped for in an English Secretary? ... A succession of men" (these Secretaries), "sometimes with heads, sometimes with hearts, oftener with neither" (Curran). "Where will you look for Orde's responsibility as a Minister? You will remember his *Commercial Propositions*" (Curran).

"A right honourable member opposes the principle of the Bill, as being in restraint of the Royal Bounty.... A gross and general application of the people's money to the encouragement of every human vice, is a crying grievance.... The pension list, at the best of times, was a scandal to this country; but the present abuses of it have gone beyond all bounds" (Curran).

"That unhappy list has been degraded by a new species of prostitution that was unknown before: the *granting of honours and titles, to lay the foundation for the grant of a pension*; the suffering any man to steal a dignity, for the purpose that a barren

<sup>a</sup> See Davis' commentary in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 42.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Until the Greek calends.—Ed.

beggar steals a child. It was reducing the *honours of the State* from badges of dignity to badges of mendicancy" (Curran). The Bill would "restrain a Secretary from that shameful profusion of the public treasure.... It is a law necessary as a counterpoise of the Riot Act, [...] a penal law adopted from Great Britain, giving a new force to the executive magistrate. It is a Bill to preserve the independence of Parliament" (Curran).

11 February 1790. Irish House of Commons (government corruption and patriot opposition proceeded, the public daily being more convinced that nothing but a reform of the Commons could save the Constitution of 1782 from the foul policy of the Ministers). *Forbes* moved an address describing and censuring several recent pensions. Curran supported it. Motion rejected by 136 to 92.

### Government Corruption

House of Commons. 21 April 1789. *Disfranchisement of Excise Officers' Bill*. Bill rejected by 148 to 93.

Curran's prophecy in his speech on that occasion was fulfilled. The English executive inflicted incompetent men and corrupt measures on Ireland, then took advantage of her own crime and our misfortunes to provincialise us, and now uses these very events as arguments **against our independence**. Curran said inter alia:

"The opposition to this measure [...] comes from the avowed servants of the crown and of every administration ... the men sent to grind us are, in general, the refuse of Great Britain.... Cart-loads of excise officers—revenue troops—collected from every corner of the nation, and taking possession of boroughs on the eve of an election" (Curran).

House of Commons. 25 April 1789. *Dublin Police*.

Sir H. Cavendish moved two resolutions to the effect that the *Dublin Police System* was attended with waste, and useless patronage. Ministers opposed the Resolutions. Rejected by 132 to 78.

Curran in support said among other things:

"Advantage had been taken of some disturbances in 1784, to enslave the capital by a police. A watch of old men, at 4d. per night, was naturally ineffectual."

House of Commons. 4 February 1790. *Stamp Officers' Salaries*. {Curran proposes to regulate, cut them down etc. Rejected by 141 to 81.} (This was one means of government corruption.) Westmoreland Viceroy, Hobart his Secretary.

Curran says inter alia: the *Earl of Temple* (afterwards *Marquis of Buckingham*) incensed because of his failure in the *Regency Bill* increased the *Revenue Board*, the *Ordnance*, £13,000 addition to the infamous *Pension List*; (Under Lord *Harcourt* compact [was] made that the *Board of Accounts* and the management of the stamps {stamp duties had been granted in *Harcourt's* times} should be executed by one board.) *Buckingham* separated them in order to make places for members of Parliament. "Two country members prying into stamps!" "In proportion as you rose by union, your tyrant became appalled: but when he divided, he sunk you, and you became debased." "I rise in an assembly of 300 persons, 100 of whom have places or pensions.... I am showing the danger that arises to our honour and our liberty, if we submit to have corruption let loose among us ... the people now are fairly told that it is lawful to rob them of their property, and divide the plunder among the honest gentlemen who sell them to the administration."

In his bold speech Curran alludes to the *French Revolution*.

House of Commons. February 12, 1791. *Government Corruption*. {New attempt of Curran to prove the impurities of Government.} Curran's principal theme: "Raising

men to the peerage for money, which was disposed of to purchase the liberties of the people." "Miserable men introduced" (by these means) "into this House, like beasts of burden, to drudge for their employers." On the other hand "those introduced into the House of Lords, to frame laws, and dispose of the property of the Kingdom, under the direction of that corruption by which they have been raised".

"I have proof<sup>a</sup> ... that a contract has been entered into by the present ministers to raise to the peerage certain persons, on condition of their purchasing a certain number of seats in this House."

Curran states: "During the whole of last session" (1790) "we have, in the name of the people of Ireland, demanded from them the *Constitution of Great Britain*, and it has been uniformly denied. We would have passed a law to restrain the shameful profusion of a pension-list—it was refused by a majority. We would have passed a law to exclude persons, who must ever be the chattels of the government, from sitting in this House—it was refused by a majority. A bill to make some person, resident among you, and therefore amenable to public justice, responsible for the acts of your governors—has been refused to Ireland by a majority of gentlemen calling themselves her representatives [...] This uniform denial ... proof to them" (the people) "that the imputation of corrupt practices is founded in fact."

The vain attempt—in 1790-91—of the Parliamentary Minority against government corruption proves on the one hand its increase, on the other the influence of French Revolution of 1789. It also shows why, at last, foundation of United Irishmen [took place] in 1791, since all Parliamentary action proved futile, and the Majority of Parliament mere tool in the hands of the Government.

\* \* \*

ATTEMPTS OF GOVERNMENT AGAINST IRISH INDEPENDENCE REPELLED  
ON OCCASION OF ORDE'S COMMERCIAL PROPOSITIONS  
AND THE REGENCY BILL.

a) Orde's Commercial Propositions.  
(Duke of Rutland, Lord Lieutenant)<sup>282</sup>

In May, 1784, Griffith proposed in *Irish House of Commons inquiry* in the commercial intercourse between *Britain and Ireland*. He desired to show that *Irish trade should be protected from English competition etc.*

Government took this proposal out of his hand.

On 7 February 1785, Mr. Orde, the Chief Secretary, announced, and on 11 February moved the 11 propositions on trade, commonly called the *Irish<sup>a</sup> propositions* (in fact, of *English* origin).

There were 4 principles established in these propositions:

1) Taxes on all goods, foreign and domestic, passing between the 2 countries, should be equal

{placing England and Ireland on the same footing, to the ruin of the latter.}

<sup>a</sup> This word is underlined by Curran.—Ed

2) *Taxes on foreign goods should always be higher than on the same articles produced in either island* (this sacrificed the realities of French, Spanish, and American trade then increasing, to the profits of English competition).

3) *That the regulations should be unalterable* (thus abdicating legislation).

4) *That the surplus of the hereditary revenue* (hearth tax, and certain customs, and excises, over £656,000 a year) *should be paid over to the English Treasury, for the support of the Imperial* (English) *navy.*

Yet this plan was proffered as a boon, a reciprocity plan; Orde (in contrast to Flood) hurried the Commons on to seize upon it, because otherwise the *jealousy of the English monopolists* might be awakened. The thing was a favour—to be paid for by £140,000 of new taxes, asked and voted in return for it.

On the 22nd of February 1785 Pitt moved the Resolution in *British House of Commons* which declared that Ireland should be allowed the advantages (i.e. competition) of British Commerce as soon as she had “irrevocably” granted to England an “aid” (i.e. tribute) for general defence. North and the Tories, Fox and the Whigs—

as a party manoeuvre—

*saw in English jealousy to Ireland* a sure resource against the “heaven born Minister”. Fox obtained adjournments, and all England “spoke out”, from Lancashire to London, from Gloucester to York. Pitt sounded a parley. He submitted to some of their terms; *retained all that was adverse to the Irish Constitution*, suffered the loss of all that could by any ingenuity be serviceable to Irish trade. *Returned the Act thus approved of by him in the form of 20 English propositions.*

The 11 propositions had been increased in England to 20, each addition a fresh injury. *Half the globe*, namely, all between Magellan and Good Hope, was (articles 3 and 9) *interdicted to Ireland’s ships: interdicts were also laid on certain goods.* The *whole customs legislation of Ireland* was taken away by clauses which forced her (art. 4) to enact (register) *all navigation laws passed or to be passed by England;* (art. 5 and 8) to impose *all the colonial duties that England did;* (art. 6 and 7) to *adopt the same system in custom-houses that England did;* and finally (art. 17 and 18) to *recognise all patents and copyrights granted to England.*

*Irish House of Commons. 30 June 1785: Orde moves the adjournment of the House till Tuesday fortnight.* Curran opposes this. Adjournment is carried. Curran says:

“When we had the 11 propositions before us, we were charmed with them. Why?—because we did not understand them. Yes, the endearing word *reciprocity* rang at every corner of the streets.”

23 July 1785. Orde moves new adjournment; Curran opposes; adjournment carried.

11 August 1785. Curran asks Orde what has become of the 11 propositions “as of them only that Parliament could treat”. They were “proposed as a system of final and permanent commercial adjustment between the 2 kingdoms”. “As a compensation for the expected advantages of this system, we were called upon

{and they did so!}

to impose £140,000 a year on this exhausted country.” “We submitted.” “We have oppressed the people with a load of taxes, as a compensation for a commercial adjustment: we have not got that adjustment.”

Curran plainly threatened that the people would take revenge against the persons who, in a thin House, would accept the 20 propositions after the adjournment. He threatened that such a

demand for surrender of the Constitution would be answered not merely “by words”. All this is taken from Curran’s speech of 23 July.<sup>a</sup>

12 August 1785. *Orde* moved his *Bill* (the 20 propositions). Opposed by *Grattan*, *Flood*, *Curran*. *Leave to bring in the Bill* carried by 127 to 108 (=19 votes: this showed that the *Bill* would be rejected).

*Curran*: “The commercial part of it” (the *Bill*) “is out of the question: for this *Bill* portends a surrender of the Constitution and the liberties of Ireland.... I fear the British Minister is mistaken in the temper of Ireland, and judges of it by former times. Formerly the business here was carried on by purchase of majorities ... things have changed. The people are enlightened and strong, they will not bear a surrender of their rights, which would be the consequence, if they submitted to this *Bill*. It contains a covenant to enact such laws as England should think proper: they would annihilate the Parliament of Ireland. The people here must go to the bar of the English House of Commons for relief; and for a circuitous trade to England, we are accepting a circuitous constitution.... A power to bind externally, would involve a power to bind internally. This law gives the power to Great Britain, of judging what would be a breach of the compact, of construing it; in fact, of taxing us as she pleased; while it gives her new strength to enforce our obedience. In such an event we must either sink into utter slavery, or the people must wade to a re-assumption of their rights through blood, or be obliged to take refuge in a Union, which would be the annihilation of Ireland, and what, I suspect, the Minister is driving at<sup>b</sup>.... Civil war or a Union at best.”

15 August 1785: *Orde*, on presenting the *Bill*, abandoned it for the session, and for ever. Thereupon *Flood* moved: “Resolved—That we hold ourselves bound not to enter into any engagement to give up the sole and exclusive right of the Parliament of Ireland to legislate for Ireland in all cases whatsoever, as well externally as commercially and internally.” *Curran* supported him. *Flood* withdrew his motion, the House adjourned, and *Orde*’s Propositions merged in a secret design for the Union.

### b) Regency Bill (1789)<sup>283</sup>

*George III* mad for some time, concealed, in the end of 1788 could no longer be hid. In the ministers’ draft of the address in answer to the Lord Lieutenant (*Buckingham*) (he had again become Viceroy in December 1787), they praised themselves.

*Irish House of Commons*. February 6, 1789. *Grattan* moved amendment, substituting a general expression of loyalty. *Curran* spoke in support. “Every man sees the change of public administration that is approaching.”

(People thought that *Fox* would become Minister under the Prince of Wales.<sup>a</sup>)

“It has been delayed and opposed by a party in another kingdom. Upon what principle of wisdom or justice can Ireland enlist herself in that opposition etc?”

*Grattan*’s amendment was carried without a division although he called *Buckingham* “a jobber in a mask”

<sup>a</sup> This sentence is in German in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The words “or be obliged to ... is driving at” are italicised by *Curran*.—*Ed.*



(*Fitzherbert Buckingham's Chief Secretary*),

so prostrated was the Castle at the prospect of the *Prince's Regency, with Fox as Premier.*

*February 11, 1789:* Ministers tried to postpone the discussion on the Regency. Their *avowed motive* to have from England the *Resolutions* of the British Parliament, appointing the *Prince Regent of Great Britain with limited powers.* These resolutions passed on *23 January*, accepted by Prince on *31st January*, but had not reached the Irish Government. *The postponement was refused by the House.* Conolly then *moved an address to be presented to Prince, as Prince Regent of Ireland with full kingly powers. Motion passed without a division.*

*February 12, 1789.* Conolly moved the address. *February 17* concurrence of Lords brought up and agreed to. On *19 February* presented to *Buckingham.* He *refused to transmit it.* *February 20, 1789* agreed to transmit it *by deputation.* Vote of censure against Buckingham.

*February 27, 1789.* Deputation (Conolly, O'Neil, etc.) deliver a letter to the Commons with answer of Prince Regent, thanking "warmly" the Irish Parliament.

*March 20, 1789.* Still more fervent letter of the Prince Regent, announcing his father's recovery, read in the Irish House of Commons.

*Pitt, to maintain his power, had defended and carried in England, the right of election of the Regent, hence the right to restrain his power.*

The Irish in this case maintained the common Constitution against the oligarchic and ministerial encroachments of Pitt.

\* \* \*

There are for this *lapse of time* two things still to be considered,  
1) the *Tithe Riots* etc., showing the state of the Catholic Irish peasantry at that time, and

2) *The Dublin Lord Mayor election*, showing the *influence of the French Revolution upon the (into the bargain Protestant) Irish middle-class.*

### 1) *Tithe Riots* etc. *English Riot Act Introduced in Ireland*<sup>284</sup>

*Irish House of Commons. January 19, 1787. Outrages in the South. Disturbances in the South caused by the misery of the people, Tithes, Rents, absenteeism,*<sup>285</sup> *bad tenures, harsh treatment* etc.

*Towards the close of the 18 century (since end of 1791) political parties united themselves with the peasants (the republicans of the North).*

*1786:* In the Lord Lieutenant's Opening Speech, he referred to the "frequent outrages" ("Right Boys" of Kilkenny, who were bound amongst each other by

*oath*<sup>286</sup>). Yet the *only Bill on disturbances* brought in by Government was a *Dublin Police Bill*, against which the City petitioned.

1787 Viceroy's speech referred much more positively to the *Southern outrages*, and the debates on the *Address* in reply to it [were] violent. During this debate the *government party* (Fitzgibbon for instance) treated the disturbances as *against the clergy, accused the landlords of grinding the people, and abetting the disturbances, and asked for fresh powers.*

*House of Commons. 19 January 1787. Fitzgibbon*, in [his] speech (1787) said the disturbances commenced in *Kerry*, the people assembled in a mass-house, there took an *oath to obey the laws of Captain Right*. Soon spread through the province of Munster. Their objects the *tithes*, then to *regulate the price of lands, to raise the price of labour, and to oppose the collection of hearth-money and other taxes.* "I am very well acquainted with the province of Munster, and I know that it is impossible for human wretchedness to exceed that of the miserable peasantry in that province. I know that the unhappy tenantry are ground to powder by relentless landlords<sup>a</sup>—far from being able to give the clergy their just dues, they have not food or raiment for themselves, the landlords grasp the whole; and ... not satisfied with the present extortion, some landlords have been so base as to instigate the insurgents to rob the clergy of their tithes, not in order to alleviate the distresses of the tenantry, but that they might add the clergy's share to the cruel rack-rents already paid.... The poor people of Munster live in a more abject state of poverty than human nature can be supposed able to bear—their miseries are intolerable, but they do not originate with the clergy; nor can the legislature stand by and see them take the redress into their own hands. Nothing can be done for their benefit while the country remains in a state of anarchy."

*Longfield*, a County Cork Gentleman, stated that the disturbances were exaggerated, though the distress was not. He accused the government of looking for a year at the disturbances, for a political purpose.

*Curran moved an amendment* to the address (withdrawn without a division). *Said inter alia:*

"Cease to utter idle complaints of inevitable effects, when you yourselves have been the causes ... the patience of the people has been totally exhausted; their grievances (have long) been the empty song of this House, but no productive effect has ever followed. The *non-residence of the landholders, the tyranny of intermediate landlords. You denied the existence of the grievance, and refused redress....* No wonder that the peasantry should be ripe for rebellion and revolt.... Not a single man of property or consequence connected with the rebels....

"You were called on solemnly ... for a *proper reformation in the representation of the people: did you grant it?* No; and how does it at present stand? Why, Sir, *seats in this House are bought and sold. They are set up to public sale; they have become an absolute article of commerce—a traffic of the constitution....* Saleable rotten boroughs. As they have bought the people for a sum of money, it is natural they should sell them.... The peasantry have formed hopes of relief.... *People, when oppressed, [...] though oppressed by law, will make reprisals; and these are the real causes of the disturbances. System of vile jobbing extends to commissions of the peace (24 commissions of the peace sent down to the County of Clare in one post) and to the sheriffs. You may talk of commerce expanding ... but what, in God's name, have they to do with the wretched peasantry?"*

*House of Commons. 19 February 1787. "Right Boy Bill".* One clause of the Government, [which was] abandoned, was *directing magistrates to demolish mass-houses*

<sup>a</sup> The passage "to exceed that of ... relentless landlords" is italicised by Davis.—*Ed.*

at which combinations shall be found, or unlawful oaths administered. Curran resisted the Bill altogether:

Curran: "The people are too much raised by a consciousness of their strength and consequence to be proper objects of so sanguinary a code as that now proposed...." He alludes to pamphlet of Dr. Woodward, Bishop of Cloyne, in defence of tithes "tending manifestly to revive the dissensions from which we had so recently emerged, and to plunge us into the barbarism from which we were emerging, or, perhaps to immerse us in the bloodshed of a religious war".... (The Bill was committed by 192 to 31.)

20 February 1787. Discussion of the same Bill, by which a Riot Act passed. O'Neill moved to limit it to Cork, Kerry, Limerick, and Tipperary. (Limiting motion rejected by 176 to 43.) In the Bill Todesstrafe—capital punishment—for tendering an oath etc.

"I fear," said Curran, "that, as the coercion is so great, and as no means are taken for the relief of the poor, rebellion will go in the dark ... until the whole Kingdom set in a flame."

13 March 1787. Tithes. Grattan having moved a resolution that if tranquillity were restored, at the opening of the next session, the House would consider the Tithe Question. **Motion lost, without a division.** Curran supported Grattan's Motion.

Curran: "A law of pains and penalties severe beyond all example of any former period.... The offence was local and partial ... the causes of such offence were universal.... The abject and miserable state of the peasantry of Ireland. The Secretary" (Englishman!) "declares he is a stranger to their distresses, and will not hold out any hope that they should be ever considered by the Parliament!" ... "The honourable gentlemen could not let the Riot Act pass without accompanying it with an express disavowal of all intention to alleviate, or even at any period, however distant, to listen to their complaints." "Who are to execute it" (that law)? "That very body of men in the class above the peasants, who have been represented as adverse to the rights of the clergy, and are said to have connived at these offences." ... "But whatever may be the idea of an English Secretary, this House must be too wise to say that inveterate evils can receive any sanction from any length of time."

## 2) Election of Lord Mayor of Dublin (1790)<sup>287</sup>

*Disputed election for the Mayoralty of Dublin*, connected with the attempt of the English Government to govern or provincialise Ireland by corruption. Hence the burgesses of Dublin pledged themselves in their guilds not to return any one as Lord Mayor or Member of Parliament for the city, who held a place or pension from the Government. Alderman James was a Police Commissioner. Under the old Corporation laws the Lord Mayor and Aldermen sat and voted in one chamber, the Sheriff and Common Councilmen in a second. 16 April 1790 the former chose Alderman James as mayor elect for the ensuing year, the Common Council rejected him. Seven other names afterwards sent down were similarly rejected. Then the Common Council elected Alderman Howison; Napper Tandy led the popular party. The Aldermen repeated their election of James. This dispute came before the Privy Council, where Curran pleaded for the Common Council. Privy Council decided for a new election. Aldermen re-elect James and Councilmen Howison. This whole process, with interference of the Privy Council, repeated several times.

On 10 July 1790 Curran pleads for the Common Council before the Privy Council, presided by Fitzgibbon (became Lord Chancellor, and Lord Clare, in June 1789.)

He flagellated that fellow masterly.

Privy Council decided for *James*, he resigned, on *5th August 1790* *Howison* chosen by the *Aldermen*, approved by the *Common Council* and *Privy Council*. Thus this struggle ended in *utter defeat of the Government*.

On *16 July*, in the *Common Council*, *Napper Tandy* carried 17 Resolutions censuring the *Privy Council*, *Aldermen*, and summoned meeting of freemen and freeholders<sup>288</sup> at the *Exchange*. This meeting held on *20 July*, *Hamilton Rowan* in the chair, adjourned to *3d August*, after appointing a committee to prepare a state of facts.

*3d August* that *State of Facts* read, and *James's resignation* was announced.

*Sir E. Newenham* denounced *Fitzgibbon*, who on *24 July* had in *House of Peers* made audacious speech, where he read a *Resolution of the Whig Club*<sup>289</sup> and attacked them, until *Lords Charlemont and Moira* avowed the *Resolution*. (*Whig Club* founded in *Dublin*, summer 1789.)

*Whig Club*, [which] met on *2d August*, drew up a *Report against Fitzgibbon*.

*Fitzgibbon* had become so unpopular, that the guild of merchants, who had, in the previous winter, voted him an address in a gold box, for services to their trading interests, expunged the resolutions on *13 July*, 1790, as "disgraceful".

From the above-quoted "*State of Facts*", *August 3, 1790*. (Aggregate meeting of the citizens of *Dublin*, held at the *Royal Exchange*.) Among other things it said:

"That we do acknowledge, that for the last 10 or 11 years the citizens of *Dublin* did take an active part for the liberty of their country etc. etc.;

"that we do acknowledge [that] the freedom of the *City of Dublin* [was] refused to His Excellency etc. the *Earl of Westmoreland* etc.;

"that we do not deny that many among us did, on a former occasion, favour the scheme of *Protective Duties* etc.;

"that we do acknowledge to have expressed our approbation of the conduct of the minority of the late *Parliament* in the last session ... that those measures had no other view, meaning or object, save corruption only: ... that the nation was told by a very high authority (*Fitzgibbon*) ... that in order to defeat an opposition in *Parliament*, this nation had been, in the Administration of the *Marquis of Townshend*, bought in by the *Government*, and sold by the *Members of Parliament* for half a million, and that if opposition continued to the present Administration, this nation must be bought and sold again etc. etc."

---

The Judges, dependent on the Crown, the Army independent of Parliament, the Legislature at the feet of the British Attorney-General, and the people bound by the laws of Scotch and English Delegates. {The two last points apply to the period before 1782.}

C) FROM OCTOBER 1791 TO COMMENCEMENT OF APRIL 1795  
(LORD FITZWILLIAM'S RECALL  
AND REPLACEMENT BY LORD CAMDEN)

{ From October 1791 to 4 January 1795. (Arrival of Fitzwilliam.)  
Continuation of Lord Westmoreland's Government. (His Secretary  
Major Hobart.) }

*French events during this time: 1793.* Duke of York, 8 September thrashed by Houchard, has to abandon the siege of Dunkirk, Dutch and English thrown back into Flanders.<sup>a</sup> The allies were repulsed on the *Upper Rhine*, towards the end of December they had to abandon the whole territory as far as Worms. The Republicans were victorious in the *South and West* of France as well. In *October 1793* they subdued the rebellious Lyons and in *December 1793* the English-held *Toulon*, drove the Spanish over the Pyrenees and attacked them on their own territory.

1794. 18 May, Moreau and Souham won a total victory over the Duke of York at Tourcoing.

26 June 2nd battle of Fleurus (Jourdan). Belgium quickly conquered. The leaders of the English and Dutch troops were compelled to think only of the defence of the Netherlands.

*October and November* the Dutch lost all their frontier fortresses.

*October* Jourdan compelled the Austrians to abandon the entire left bank of the Rhine up to Mainz, 26 *October* he entered Coblenz. On the entire left bank of the Rhine, only Mainz and Luxembourg remained in the hands of the allies.

27 *December* Pichegru in Holland.

1795. 20 *January 1795* Pichegru's entry into Amsterdam. *Batavian Republic*.

*September* Düsseldorf in Jourdan's hands, Mannheim in Pichegru's. The Austrians had to withdraw across the Main. *Clairfait* defeated the French army at Mainz on 29 *October*. Pichegru and Jourdan had to retreat. *An armistice towards the end of the year.* Moreau was given the command of the Rhine army.

*At the beginning of 1795* a peace treaty with the leaders of the Vendée. (The Peace of La Mabilois.) Pitt landed an émigré army at *Quiberon* on 27 *June 1795* etc. On 20 *July* it was crushed by Hoche etc.<sup>290</sup>

{ *February and March 1796* Stofflèt, Charette etc. were court-martialled and executed by firing-squad. *July 1796* he [Hoche] reported to the Directory that the civil war in the West had been brought to an end. }

1796, 1797. Bonaparte in Italy.

---

<sup>a</sup> The next passage, up to and including the words "1796, 1797. Bonaparte in Italy", is in German in the manuscript.—Ed.

*First United Irishmen Society founded by Theobald Wolfe Tone in October 1791.*<sup>291</sup>

Their avowed (and by the mass of the *Societies* alone wished for) objects were *Union between Catholics and Protestants*, perfect *Emancipation for the Catholics* (Belfast had proposed this already in 1783) and *Popular Representation for the men* of both creeds. (*Tone* and others of the leading men for *independent Republic*. Without the cruelty of Government they would have been *overruled* by the Whigs, and outvoted in the *Societies*.)

*The Belfast Society met publicly, as did all the United Irish Societies until 1794.* The Catholics, on their part, were rapidly advancing in political spirit and information.

*Keogh* and the leading (not aristocratic and Whiggish) Catholics were *United*.

The Confederation extended to *Dublin*, received the support of the leading citizens, and of *many of the Volunteer Corps*. Its chief organ was *The Northern Star*: the first number of this paper, printed 4 January 1792 (manager *Samuel Neilson*), occupied itself chiefly with French politics. *The Evening Star* appeared in Dublin soon after, but *The Press* did not commence until 28 September 1797.

Returning now to *Westmoreland's Administration*, we remark that *Catholic Emancipation* and *Parliamentary Reform* were the two cries!

*Irish House of Commons. 18 February 1792. Catholic Emancipation.*

These proceedings began by the presentation of a petition from the *Protestants of County of Antrim* for the Bill.

Some small thing was proposed by Grattan. (Rejected.)

*Curran*. "At Cork, the present Viceroy was pleased to reject a most moderate and modest petition from the Catholics of that city. The next step was to create a division amongst the Catholics themselves: the next was to hold them up as a body formidable to the English Government, and to their Protestant fellow-subjects.... It is not a question merely of the sufferings or their relief—it is *a question of your own preservation* ... a partial liberty cannot long subsist ... alienation of 3 millions of our people, subserviency and corruption in a fourth ... *the inevitable consequence would be an Union with Great Britain*. And if any one desires to know what that would be, I will tell him. *It would be the emigration of every man of consequence from Ireland; it would be the participation of British taxes, without British trade; it would be the extinction of the Irish name as a people* etc."

The petition for the Catholics *rejected with indignation*, by 208 to 23. This rejection inflamed the Catholics.

DOINGS OF CATHOLICS, UNITED IRISHMEN  
AND ADMINISTRATION UNTIL CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL  
OF 1793<sup>292</sup>

In *March, 1792*, the *Catholic Committee*,<sup>293</sup> or rather *Convention* (for it was a body of delegates) met, and *Tone* was named its secretary. The agitation by means of these societies became most vigorous. The shining<sup>a</sup> progress of the French

<sup>a</sup> In his "Memoir" Davis has "stirring". See J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. XXI.—*Ed.*

Revolution, and the organisation of the political societies in England and Scotland<sup>294</sup> aided them. The United Irishmen increased in number, the Catholics in confidence, and the Volunteer Corps began to restore their array, and improve their discipline. The ministry grew alarmed. "In *December* (1792) the Catholics thundered out their demands ... they were supported by all the spirit and intelligence of the Dissenters.<sup>295</sup> *Dumouriez was in Brabant*—Holland was prostrate before him." (*Wolfe Tone*.)

7 *December 1792. Government Proclamation against all seditious meetings*: In this proclamation we read: "The *first battalion of National Guards* were to have paraded, clothed like Frenchmen etc." This proclamation answered by the *United Irishmen*.

16 *December 1792, Rowan* (of Dublin) Chairman, when the address was voted, Dr. *Drennan* wrote it.

The main content of this proclamation,<sup>a</sup> on account of which Rowan and Drennan were prosecuted, was: 1) It called the *Volunteers to arms*:

"To your formation was owing the peace and protection of this island; to your relaxation has been owing its relapse into impotence and insignificance. 2) Elective franchise to the whole body of the people ... reform in representation. 3) *Universal Emancipation* and representative legislature, in these 4 words lies all our power.... We, therefore, wish for *Catholic Emancipation without any modification*, but still we consider this necessary enfranchisement as nearly the portal to the temple of national freedom.... The *Catholic cause* is subordinate to *our cause*, and included in it; for, as *United Irishmen*, we adhere to no sect, but to society—to no party, but the whole people, ... were it (Catholic Emancipation) obtained tomorrow, tomorrow would we go on as we do today, in the pursuit of that Reform, which would still be wanting to ratify their liberties as well as our own. 4) For both these purposes it appears necessary that *provisional conventions* should assemble preparatory to the convocation of the Protestant Convention (this then to communicate with the Catholic Committee or Convention in Dublin).... If a Convention on the one part does not soon follow, and is not soon connected with that on the other, the *common cause* will split into the *partial interest*—the people will relapse into inattention and inertness—too probably, *some local insurrections, instigated by the malignity of our common enemy, may commit the character, and risk the tranquillity of the island...* The *15th of February approaches...*<sup>296</sup> Let parochial meetings be held as soon as possible; let each parish return delegates; let the sense of Ulster be again declared from *Dungannon...* Citizen Soldiers etc." (This address was issued in meeting at a *fencing school*, Dublin, several corps of Volunteers with their side-arms going there, as well as *Napper Tandy* etc.)

In *December 1792* Rowan was arrested on an information and admitted to bail.<sup>b</sup>

The prosecution of the "*Northern Star*" of Belfast for publishing the *Declaration and Address* of the "*Irish Jacobins* (name of the society) of Belfast" on *15 December 1792*.

The *Declaration* of the "*Irish Jacobins*" says among other things:

---

<sup>a</sup> Marx means the proclamation "The Society of United Irishmen at Dublin. To the Volunteers of Ireland" quoted according to Davis' commentary in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, pp. 154-55. The division of the text into points is by Marx.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> The following two sentences are in German in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

### *Declaration*

“1st) Resolved—That this Kingdom (meaning the Kingdom of Ireland) has no *national government*, inasmuch as the great mass of the people are not represented in Parliament. [...] 3d) That the people of Ireland can never effectually constitute their own laws, without an extension of the elective franchise to all its citizens. 4th) That the elective franchise can never be obtained without a cordial, steady, and persevering union of all the Irish people of every denomination. 5) That the penal code of statutes which have for upwards of a century doomed our fellow-citizens, the Roman Catholics of this Kingdom, to a *state little inferior to the unlettered African*, is a disgrace to the land we live in. [...] 7) That to obtain this most desirable end (natural rights of men) we entreat our fellow-citizens of every denomination in Ireland, England, and Scotland, to turn their thoughts to a *National Convention*, in order to collect the sense of the people as to the most effective means of obtaining a *radical and complete Parliamentary reform*, an object without which these kingdoms must for ever remain wretched etc.”

### *“Address. The Irish Jacobins of Belfast to the Public”*

Among other things: “Where the mode of government is not derived from all the people clearly expressed, that nation has no constitution; need we say this is the case with Ireland; it possesses only an acting government [...]: in such a government the supreme authority has more power to oppress the subject than to defend his rights.... *Out of 5 millions of people* (meaning the Irish people) *90 individuals actually return a majority of the House of Commons*, who instead of representing the voice of the nation, are influenced by *English interests*, and that *aristocracy whose baneful exertions* have ever tended to sap the vital principles etc. of this unhappy and wretched country.... By unanimity and perseverance this divided land will be liberated *from the shackles of tyranny*.... *It is by procuring a renovated representation that liberty will be established in this country; this can only be accomplished by a National Convention*. The Roman Catholics are already convened; let the Protestants follow their peaceful example.”<sup>297</sup>

15 February 1793: *Volunteer Convention*, said to represent 1,250,000 people, met at *Dungannon*, passed resolutions in favour of *Emancipation* and *Reform*, and named *a permanent Committee*. This, doubtless, assisted the carrying of the *Relief Bill*, but it made the Ministry resolve to *crush the Protestants*, while it *conciliated the Catholics*.

*Irish House of Commons*. 10 January 1793. Lord Westmoreland opens Parliament [with a speech]. Complained of the *discontent of Ireland*, but said nothing of the *corruption, extravagance, and alien policy of ministers*. It complained of the *invasion of Holland* by France, but was silent of the European conspiracy against the Republic. It recommended a *relaxation of Catholic fetters*, but *not the motives*: English declaration of war against France, Custine had conquered the Rhine (21 October 1792), *Dumouriez's* battle of *Jemappes* (6 November 1792) and annexation of *Belgium*. The speech also stated that *Government had increased the military establishment*, and recommended the *formation of a militia*. This last was a *stroke against the Volunteers*. The Address moved was echo to the speech, Grattan moved a trivial amendment.

Catholics had acquired spirit and organisation by *Wolfe Tone, Keogh, Byrne, Todd Jones* and *M'Cormick*. The *Catholic Committee negotiated with the Government*, the



successes of France compensated them for the *baseness of their* [Catholic] *aristocracy*. Supported by the *United Irishmen*.

In opposition to the *Catholic Committee* and the *United Irishmen*, the Ministry stimulated Protestant bigotry and Catholic division. Out of doors they got the *exclusive Corporation of Dublin* to address the other Irish Corporations against Emancipation, and they intrigued with the *Aristocracy* (lay and clerical) of the *Catholics*. In Parliament they found the relics of the old exclusion Party.

11 January 1793: Curran supported Grattan's amendment which was carried.

"Parliament has become *unpopular in the country*... How could the credit of Parliament survive its independency? ...More than half of us have no connexion with the people... The disunion of the people from this House raises from this—the people are not represented. And to restore the Union ... wanted a *radical Reform of the Commons*... Without them (the Catholics) the country cannot be saved. *Give them no qualified Emancipation*... *A hated Government, an unpopular Parliament, a discontented people*... *The Catholic Petition* (1792) *has been rejected by the influence of the Irish Administration*."

Early in January 1793<sup>a</sup> Curran unsuccessfully resists the Attorney-General's motion for the committal of M'Donnell, the printer of the *Hibernian Journal*, for publishing that the House was not free and independent.

On January 14, 1793 (so persuasive were French victories) Grattan obtained a *Committee of the Whole House on Parliamentary Representation*, and moved resolutions [pointing out] among other things that of the 300 members only 84 [are] returned by counties, counties of towns and cities, together with the University, while the remaining 216 [are] returned by boroughs and manors. Finis: "Resolved—*That the state of the representation of the people in Parliament requires amendment*."

Curran supported this. He said:

"The *Catholic Question must precede a Reform*. Their place in the state must be decided first.... *Ireland feels, that without an immediate Reform her liberty is gone*."

*Motion lost by 71 to 153.*

But the *Opposition* had already yielded to the Ministers *Indemnity for their violent Proclamations against the Republican Volunteers*: they had consented to the *Militia and Gunpowder Bills*, and therefore the Resolutions were resisted.

11 March 1793 another *Government Proclamation*, forbidding *military societies*, drilling, and the *whole Machinery of the Volunteers, without naming them*.

April 1793: *Relief Bill* of the Catholics passed, admitting Catholics to the franchise, the bar, the University, and to *all the rights of property*; but *excluding them from Parliament, from State Offices, and from all, indeed, that the Bill of 1829 conceded*.<sup>298</sup>

The Bill of 1793 was brought in 10 days after the declaration of war against France.<sup>b</sup>

The same Parliament which passed the *Relief Bill*, passed the *Alien Act, the Military Foreign Correspondence, Gunpowder, and Convention Acts*, in fact, a *full code of coercion* and a *Secret Committee*. It got 20,000 *Regulars* and 16,000 *Militia*.

*Convention Bill*:

"A law," says Curran, "*not to restrain but to promote insurrection*." The law declares that no body of men may delegate a power to any smaller number, to act, think, or petition for them.

<sup>a</sup> According to Davis, on January 29, 1793. Cf. his commentary in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 152.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> On February 21, 1793.—Ed.

This [is] in fact a bill to prevent assemblies of the people to petition against grievances. According to the Convention Act it is a *high misdemeanour* in any part of the people to *assemble* for the purpose of choosing any persons to act for them in framing petitions or other representations for the producing of any change in anything established by law. It was intended to put an end to societies formed and forming, in 1793, for the purpose of procuring a *Parliamentary Reform*. (Cobbett.)<sup>299</sup>

Thus armed, the Government commenced its crusade of prosecuting and persecuting, and obtained fresh laws from time to time, and, after the truce of 1795, drove the quarrel to an Insurrection and to the Union.

1794. The agitation continued. (Government prosecutions against Volunteers, United Irishmen etc.) The *United Irishmen Society* was changed into a *secret and secretly organised body*. The Catholics still laboured; the French had conquered; their Government aroused by the *Irish Jacobin Resolutions of Belfast*, and the suggestions of some Irish patriots, bethought themselves to assist the discontented Irish to effect a separation. *Rev. Jackson* sent there as an agent, put himself in communication with Tone. Betrayed; arraigned for treason (after arrest), hanged.

29 January 1794, Curran as defender of Rowan:

“But now, if any aggregate assembly meets, they are censured; if a printer publishes their resolutions, he is punished; rightly, to be sure, in both cases, for it has been lately done. If people say, let us not create tumult, but meet in delegation, they cannot do it ... the law of last session has for the first time declared such meetings to be a crime.”

*The informer system is flourishing.*

FROM 4 JANUARY 1795 TO THE END OF MARCH 1795.  
LORD FITZWILLIAM

4 January 1795, Lord Fitzwilliam,

*Whig, who had opposed Pitt,*

[was] sent by him to Ireland, charged with the *carrying of Catholic Emancipation (and Reform Bill)*, and pacification of Ireland. The apparent causes [were] the *rapid progress of the United Irishmen and the French armies*, who had driven the Spaniards behind the Pyrenees, the Austrians behind the Rhine, destroyed the Duke of York's army, and prepared the occupation of Holland in the winter 1794-95.<sup>a</sup>

But from papers published (correspondence *between Fitzwilliam and Lord Carlisle*<sup>b</sup>) [it is] evident that Pitt (this was, perhaps, second thought, when the King's and Beresford's influence prevailed) has

<sup>a</sup> See Davis' commentary in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 233.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Marx refers to [Carlisle] “A Letter ... to Earl Fitzwilliam, in Reply to His Lordship's Two Letters” (London, 1795) and “A Letter from Earl Fitzwilliam to the Earl of Carlisle” (1795). Further on Marx cites facts according to Mitchel's *History of Ireland...*, Vol. I, pp. 218-19.—Ed.

chosen him as tool to agitate the Irish, inflame them, and drive them into Rebellion.

Fitzwilliam was one of the most indulgent landlords of Ireland and very popular. What Pitt wanted, was to raise the Catholics to the height of expectation, and by suddenly recalling Fitzwilliam, to drive them into commotions, which would throw the Protestants into the arms of England for protection, whilst the horrors would be aggravated by the mingled conflicts of parties, Royalists and Republicans.

Pitt had sent Fitzwilliam to Ireland with unlimited powers.

The day Fitzwilliam arrived, peace was proclaimed throughout all Ireland. The day he quitted it, she prepared for insurrection.

*Irish House of Commons. 22 January 1795:* Fitzwilliam opens with plausible speech. Grattan outdid the Ministers in servile adulation<sup>a</sup> (as to the Address). An *Emancipation Bill*<sup>300</sup> was read a first time, but *ample supplies were voted*, £2 millions loan was voted, and *Anti-Gallican frenzy* got upon certain classes. Fitzwilliam recalled.

### III

#### B) LORD CAMDEN'S ADMINISTRATION. APRIL 1795-END OF JULY 1798

*Camden's arrival* attended by almost insurrectionary outrages. The Beresfords assaulted, *Clare* (Lord Chancellor, i.e. Fitzgibbon) almost killed in his carriage.

Camden's *Chief Secretary Mr. Pelham (Earl Chichester)* afterwards replaced by his nephew *Stewart (Lord Castlereagh)*.

Camden became *extremely popular* amongst the *armed associations which were raised* in Ireland under the title of *Yeomen*. He was considered the guardian of that Institution.

*Irish House of Commons. 4 May 1795. Second Reading of the Emancipation Bill.* Rejected by 155 to 84.

Fitzwilliam's recall was a triumph for the separation party. An Irish Republic now became the only object of the United Irish. The bulk of the Presbyterians of *Down, Antrim, and Tyrone* joined, as did multitudes of Protestants and Catholics in *Leinster*. At this time the *Catholics of the North* were *Defenders or Ribbonmen*.<sup>301</sup> Both sides made ready for the worst.

An *Insurrection Act* passed, making death for any one to take an oath of Association; another allowing the Lord Lieutenant to *proclaim countries* [in a state of siege], in which case no one could go out at night; and *magistrates* obtained the *power of breaking into houses, and transporting to the navy all persons whom they suspected*. Other acts—*granting indemnity for magistrates guilty of any illegality*—giving the Lord

<sup>a</sup> Davis wrote "he outdid ministers in loyalty". See J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 233.—Ed.

Lieutenant the *power of arrest without bail—licensing the introduction of foreign troops (Germans), and establishing the Yeomanry Corps*—followed each other in quick succession.

The *Yeomanry* consisted of the *Tory Gentry*, and *their dependants*, undisciplined and unprincipled, *legal banditti*. No villainy but was perpetrated by them. Whipping, pitch-capping, half or whole hanging, sending to serve in the navy—as the leisure or facilities of the officer allowed.<sup>302</sup>

1795. Among the papers found by Jackson *View of Ireland*, by Tone:

“The *Established Churchmen* in Ireland have engrossed, besides the whole church patronage, all the profits and honours of the country exclusively, and a very great share of the landed property. Aristocrats, adverse to any change, decided enemies of the French Revolution. *Dissenters ... Republicans [...]. Catholics*, the great body of the people, in lowest degree of ignorance, ready for any change, because no change can make them worse. The whole peasantry of Ireland, the most oppressed and wretched in Europe, may be said to be Catholic. Within these 2 years [they] have received a certain degree of information, [...] various insurrections, [...] bold, hardy race, and make excellent soldiers. [...] *Defenders*. [...] They are so situated that they have but one way left to make their sentiments known, and *that is by war*. [...] All Parliamentary, Grand Jury etc. Acts proceeding from aristocrats, whose interest is adverse to that of the people.”

*Defenders* (in the North). The *Lords' Committee of 1793* describes them

“as poor ignorant labouring men”, [fighting] for Catholic cause, relieved from hearth-money, tithes, county cesses, lowering of their rents. First they appeared in County *Louth*, April 1793, several of them armed; assembled mostly in the night, forced into the houses of Protestants and took from them their arms. Spread soon through the counties of *Meath, Cavan, Monaghan* and other parts adjacent. The Secret Committee tried to connect them with *Catholic Gentlemen*, and the *crown prosecutors* tried to trace them to the *United Irishmen Association* and French gold. Before *Drogheda*, *Spring Assizes, April 23, 1794*, *Drogheda Defenders*, declared *not guilty*. *Dublin Defenders, December 22, 1795*. *James Weldon*, connected with them, hanged.

*House of Commons. February 3d, 1796. Indemnity Bill.*

25 February 1796. *Insurrection Bill (it gave the right of arbitrary transportation to magistrates).*

*Curran*: “It is a Bill for the *rich*, and *against the poor*.”<sup>a</sup> “What is a Bill which puts the liberty of the poor man, who has no visible means of living but labour, in the discretion of the magistrates? [...] In Ireland,” where poverty [is] general, “it constitutes *poverty a crime*.” “Let the rich men of Ireland, therefore, fear when they enact a law against poverty, lest poverty should enact a counter-law against riches.” “Gentlemen have reasoned to prove that he who should be transported by this law would only be sent into an honourable retirement, where he might gain glory by fighting for his country from which his poverty had expelled him.”

*Irish House of Commons. 13 October 1796. French War*. Camden opened [Parliament with the call:] *resist invasion! (Hoche's force was just assembling at Brest,*

<sup>a</sup> Here and below in this paragraph italics is by Curran.—Ed.

and Wolfe Tone, Grouchy, and a part of that expedition, reached Bantry Bay on the 22 December and did not leave it till the 28.) Camden denounced also "popular passion and popular opinion".

Curran. "Government encourages every attack upon the reputation of the Catholics, and the most wicked and groundless prosecutions against their lives." "Look at the scene that has been exhibited for 2 years in one of your counties, of robbery, and rape, and murder, and extermination" (of the Catholics). "...Law can give them no protection under a hostile and implacable government."

Ponsonby's Amendment defeated by 149 to 12. Then the Attorney-General moved for leave to bring in a Bill, similar to such as have been enacted on like occasions in England, to empower the Lord Lieutenant, to take up and detain all such persons as were suspected of treasonable practices. Leave being given, the Bill was forthwith presented, read a first and second time, and committed for the morrow.

14 October 1796. Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. Leave to bring it in granted, read, 2 times, etc. all in a few minutes in the morning after midnight.

17 October 1796. Catholic Emancipation Bill. Rejected.

6 January 1797. Hoche's Expedition.<sup>303</sup> Secretary Pelham brought down a message from the Lord Lieutenant full of English palaver, in reference to France and especially the expedition of Hoche.

Curran. "You have already laid a shilling on the brogues of your beggar peasants; will you impose another shilling upon them? [...] What wealth they have? Seven pence per day."

24 February 1797. Internal Defence. Sir Laurence Parsons moved an Address for an increase of the domestic army, especially the Yeomen infantry. Grattan supported, and the Ministers opposed, the Address. Neither party foresaw how the patriots of the Clubs would turn into the scourges of the People—traitors to their country and their oath, when under the bribe of payment, the compulsion of discipline, and the spirit of the army.

Curran. "At this moment the gaols are crowded ... they<sup>a</sup> make a demand of redress an act of treason."

Since end of March 1796 whole counties of Ireland proclaimed (put in state of siege).

House of Commons. March 18, 1797: Disarming of Ulster. Message of Lord Camden. (Pelham is still Secretary.) General Lake—cowardly, infamous, cruel—was to disarm the inhabitants together with the magistrates. Lake's Proclamation. Belfast, 13 March 1797.

19 March 1797. Grattan: "The Lord Lieutenant attaints one entire province of Ireland of High Treason."<sup>b</sup> Amendment of Grattan.

20 March 1797. Amendment rejected by 127 to 16.

Curran. "The North is deeply discontented. By what? Your own laws, your Convention Act, Gunpowder Act, Insurrection Act. The first denies the natural right of sufferers—the right of petition or complaint; the second, the power of self-defence ... the third, the defence of a jury against the attempts of power."

May 15, 1797. Last speech of Curran in the House of Commons, secedes from it, ditto Grattan; the Opposition ceased to attend, and House adjourned on 3 July 1797. Castlereagh Chief Secretary.

We have seen the decreasing minorities of the party who gallantly struggled to

<sup>a</sup> The Commoners.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Marx quotes Grattan probably according to J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. 267; see also H. Grattan, *The Speeches...*, Vol. III, p. 299.—Ed.

maintain the parliamentary constitution of Ireland. But they grew daily more powerless. The people looked to the *United Irish Executive*, to *France*, to *arms*, to *Revolution*. The Government *persisted in refusing Reform and Emancipation*, continued the suspension of the Constitution, and incessantly augmented the despotism of their laws, the profligacy of their administration, and the violence of their soldiery—they trusted to intimidation. *Under these circumstances, the opposition determined to abandon the contest.*

*The Government and the United Irishmen* now face to face. The Government strengthened itself by *spies on the United Irishmen* (such as Maguane and others), the “*battalion of testimony*” (*Bird, Newell, O'Brien* etc.), *free quarters*, prosecutions, patronage, and calumny.

*Orr* *hanged 14 October 1797* for having (allegedly) administered the *oath of the United Irish* to a private soldier. The Oath is: first, to promote a brotherhood of affection among men of all religious distinctions; secondly, to labour for the attainment of Parliamentary Reform; 3dly, an obligation of secrecy, added to it when the Convention Law had made it criminal for any public delegation to meet for that purpose. The Insurrection Act makes the administering of such an oath felony of death.

The *United Irish Society* of 1791 formed in 1791, for the achievement of Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform. In 1792-93 it increased, retaining its original objects. In 1794, the views of Tone and Neilson, who both desired an independent republic, spread; but the formal objects were unchanged, when, on *10 May 1795*, the organisation of Ulster was completed. The recall of Fitzwilliam, the consequent disappointment of the Catholics, the accumulation of coercive laws, the prospects of the French Alliance, and the natural progress of a quarrel, rapidly spread the influence, and altered the whole character of the Society. The *test* of the Society was made more decisive, and less constitutional. In the *autumn of 1796 the organisation was made military in Ulster*. Towards the *middle of 1797*, this system spread to Leinster. So far back as *May 1796*, the Executive had *formally*<sup>a</sup> communicated with France, through Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Only on *19 February 1798* [it was] resolved “that they would not be diverted from their purpose by anything which could be done in Parliament”.

In the *winter of 1796-97*, the coming of the French was urged as a reason for immediate insurrection; but it did not prevail. In *May, 1797*, the order for the execution of the 4 soldiers of the Monaghan militia, was regarded by the militias as sufficient motive for action; but not so thought the Executive. In the *summer of 1797* the militia regiments sent a deputation, offering to *seize the Castle*. The Northern leaders were for an outbreak, so was Lord Edward. Still nothing was done. And again, in the *beginning of 1798*, the *people subjected to free quarters, whipping, burnings, and transportation*, pressed for insurrection. Lord Edward disposed to it. Emmet wanted to wait for France, and thus they were, when the sleek traitor *Reynolds of Kilkee* glided into their councils through Lord Edward's weakness. *Arthur O'Connor* was arrested at Maidstone, in the act of embarking for France; on *12 March*, a meeting of Leinster delegates, including *Oliver Bond, McCann* etc., were arrested at *Oliver Bond's* warehouse, Dublin. *MacNevin, Thomas Emmet, Sampson* were not taken for some days. *Warrant against Lord Edward*; he escaped and lay concealed. *New Directory*, John Sheares one of it. On *19 May*, just 4 days before the rising was to take place, Lord *Fitzgerald* was poisoned on, and on *21st* the two Sheares.<sup>b</sup> Thus the insurrection began, without its designers to lead it, and without time to replace them.

<sup>a</sup> The word “formally” is italicised by Davis.—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> Henry and John.—*Ed*

23 May 1798 insurrection commenced, 17 July Lord Castlereagh announced its final defeat.

*Before the outbreak of the insurrection, trials took place in February and March 1798.*<sup>a</sup>

The insurgents during the struggle not treated as soldiers, but hanged. Burning every cottage, and torturing every cottager—the loyalists. Martial law proclaimed, and the courts of justice closed. No quarter on either side. *Bills of attainder* and all sorts of legal murder. Juries (packed) recorded the opinions given them by the judges.

25 July 1798 the state prisoners' negotiation with Government. Their lives secured [by] Mr. Cooke, on behalf of the Ministers. On the other hand, they were to describe the *United Irish affairs*, so far as they could, without implicating individuals. Byrne, however, was hanged: compact was finally settled on 29 July, at the Castle, by "deputies from the gaols". The Government broke the compact. They, not only in their press, but by their indemnity act, described the United Leaders as confessing guilt, and craving pardon, neither of which they did. Instead of allowing them to go abroad, they were kept in gaol here for a year, and then thrust into Fort George, from whence they were not released, till the Treaty of Amiens,<sup>304</sup> in 1802.<sup>b</sup>

Within 12 days from the first rising, the *people of Wexford* had cleared their county, with the exception of *Ross and Duncannon*, two places unfit to resist a skilful attack. Similar successes attended the *Kildare* insurrection.

*Antrim and Down* did not rise for a fortnight, and there, after similar blunders, and a shorter struggle, the Presbyterians were ousted.

The *Wexford men* protracted the war; partly from a vague hope for foreign assistance, but still more from despair, for they could not trust the faith of their persecutors; and not a few of these heroic men died in the *plains of Meath*, in an effort to force their way into Ulster.

The soldier having done *his own work*, and that of the *assassin* and *brigand*, too, [it was the turn of] the bow-string of the Attorney-General. Courts-martial hanged those taken in battle, and courts-civil slaughtered the prisoners. Most *unaccountably the insurgents did not retaliate*. They besides spared females, the loyalists did not.

*German and English troops* were also employed in these affairs.

#### PITT'S PLAN TO ENFORCE AND PROVOKE THE INSURRECTION

1784. Independence assailed by Pitt under colour of commercial tariff.

1789. The Prince Regent's Question determined to extinguish the Irish Legislature.

<sup>a</sup> This sentence is in German in the manuscript.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> J. Mitchel, *The History of Ireland...*, Vol. II, pp. 15, 19, 26. Further, till the end of the section, there follow excerpts from Davis' "Memoir" in J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, p. XXIV.—Ed.

1798. Rebellion used to terrify the minds of men out of common sense.

1798-99 and 1598-99 It is here well worthy of reflection, that the exercise of *free quarters* and *martial law*, the suspension of all municipal courts of justice, the *discretionary* application of *the torture* to suspected persons, executions in cold blood, and the various measures which *Mountjoy* and *Carew*, and the other officers of Elizabeth practised in Ireland by her authority, in 1598-99, were again judged to be expedient, and were again resorted to with vigour in 1798-99, 200 years after they had been practised by the ministers of Elizabeth.

*United Irish Societies known to Government.*

Though it appeared, from public documents, that Government had full and accurate information of the *United Irish Societies*, and that their leaders and chiefs were fully known to the British Ministry, the Government did nothing to suppress, but everything to *exasperate*, the people.<sup>a</sup>

*Under Camden's Administration:*

Earl of *Carhampton*, Commander-in-Chief of Ireland, first expressed his dissatisfaction of *Pitt's inexplicable proceedings*. Although martial law was not yet declared, *Carhampton* ordered his troops to intervene, wherever insurrectionary movements occurred.<sup>b</sup> This was prohibited by *Camden*. *Carhampton* found that troops in the garrison of Dublin were daily corrupted by the *United Irishmen*; he therefore withdrew them and formed two distinct camps on the South and the North, some miles from the capital. This measure also refused by the Lord Lieutenant whom *Carhampton* refused to obey. The King's sign manual was at length procured, ordering him to break up his camps, and bring back the garrison; this he obeyed and marched his troops into Dublin barracks. He then resigned his command, and *publicly declared*, that some deep and insidious scheme of the Minister was in agitation; for, instead of suppressing, the Irish Government was obviously disposed to excite, an insurrection. Mr. *Pitt* counted on the expertness of the Irish Government to effect a premature explosion. *Free quarters* were now ordered.

{ *Free quarters* rendered officers and soldiers despotic masters of the peasantry, their homes, food, property, and occasionally, their families. This measure was resorted to, with all its attendant horrors, throughout some of the best parts of Ireland, previous to the insurrection, and for the purpose of exciting it. }

to irritate the Irish population; *Slow Tortures*<sup>c</sup> were inflicted under the pretence of forcing confessions; the people were goaded and driven to madness.

*General Abercromby*, who succeeded as Commander-in-Chief, was not permitted to abate these enormities, and therefore resigned with disgust. { *General Abercromby*, in general orders, stated that the army placed under his command, from their state of

<sup>a</sup> This paragraph and the text that follows it, till the end of the section, is Marx's rendering of the text from *Mitchel's History of Ireland..* (Vol. I, pp. 261-62) which is close to the original.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> This sentence and the one that follows it are in German in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Italics by J. Mitchel.—*Ed.*



disorganisation, would soon be much more formidable to their friends than to their enemies, and that he would not countenance or admit *free quarters*;}.

Ireland was by those means reduced to a state of anarchy, and exposed to crime and cruelties to which no nation had ever been subject. The people could no longer bear their miseries. Pitt's object was now effected and an *insurrection was excited*.

### *United Irishmen and Pitt. (Poland and Prussia)*<sup>305</sup>

Until 1795 the *United Irishmen* were Protestants, of a minor division of the people. Many of them were Pitt's dupes. At the same time (1793 sqq) emissaries were sent from Berlin to Poland in order to form there Jacobinical Clubs, that they might offer a pretext for the introduction of new armies.<sup>306</sup>

### *Exorbitation of the People. Castlereagh's Boast*

The Irish people were to be tormented, outraged, forced into actual rebellion. Recall of Lord Fitzwilliam involved the country in consternation and dismay. To this succeeded, to fret and exasperate, the *Habeas Corpus Act Suspension Bill*, the *Searching for Arms Act*, the *Bill to transport persons not found at home from sunset to sunrise*; further *many persons were shot* because, being terrified, they attempted to escape when challenged, or, *being seized*, they were consigned to Prussia. Ensor met some of them at Berlin, and the law indemnified the perpetrators of such prodigious deeds. Then the *Yeomanry* were raised: these committed dreadful outrages, particularly in the North; burning houses in open day, commanded by their officers, who were also magistrates. The Militia rivalled the Yeomanry. It is said that *pitch-caps* were invented by some bravos of the North Cork Militia. Still more ferocious the *Dublin Corporation*. The riding-house, in Marlborough Street, distinguished for Protestant loyalty, and *torture was administered by the scourge and the triangle*. Summary executions not uncommon in preparing the Irish for the Union; bodies of Irishmen, deluded by the British Ministry, irritated and inflamed, tortured, tormented, in phrensy and despair, grasped such arms as they could seize, and defied their enemies. *This was called rebellion; and Castlereagh boasted that he had made the conspiracy explode. He charged that mine as well as fired it.*

PITT IN BRITISH PARLIAMENT DEFENDER OF THE UNION,  
IN ORDER TO PREVENT MEASURES OF PACIFICATION.  
CASTLEREAGH, 1797, IN IRISH PARLIAMENT

*Castlereagh* had been reformer in Ireland as Pitt in England, till office made him *explode*. Declared 1792 for Irish Parliamentary Reform. Ditto 1793 for Grattan's motion for Parliamentary Reform. When, lo! the Ministry of Ireland was changed and Camden succeeded Lord Fitzwilliam. With the change of men *Castlereagh's* opinion of Reform was upset. *In 1797*, the serpent, the viper, and snake made

another feat: *he declared for a wise and well digested plan of Reform at a proper time. Yet then he has nearly completed the scheme of the Union, and the extinction of the Parliament of his country.*

### *Pitt in British Parliament*

The *reign of terror* (Pitt thundered against the French one) prepared the Union. Pitt, while talking of the prodigious wickedness of interfering with prerogative orders and ancient customs, meditated during years of such verbose, political prudery, *the end and ruin of the fundamental constitution of Ireland*. At the very time when this his machination was completing, *he defended*, with swollen rhetoric, *the independence of Ireland's Parliament*. In the debate on the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, in 1795, "he deprecated the discussion *as a manifest violation of the independence of the Irish Parliament*".<sup>a</sup> Two years later, in 1797, when Fox proposed to address His Majesty on the best means to tranquillise Ireland, this *W. Pitt* objected "on the unconstitutionality, the impropriety, and the danger to be apprehended from the interference of the British Parliament in the affairs of Ireland". This flagitious impostor deprecated any means for Ireland's prosperity; for he proposed, through its agonies and confusion, to effect its incorporate Union with Great Britain.

#### LORD CORNWALLIS' ADMINISTRATION (AUGUST 1798 SQQ). CASTLEREAGH CHIEF SECRETARY. THE UNION TRICK

Then there was *Lord Cornwallis*, the man thrashed by the Americans, during their War of Independence. As a governor for India, he was further qualified for destroying a nation's rights.

(There he incorporated Tippoo Sahib for the East India Company.)

*Cornwallis was the intermediate agent between Pitt and Robert Stewart, commonly called Lord Castlereagh.*<sup>b</sup>

In *India* Cornwallis had defeated *Tippoo Sahib*, but concluded a peace which only increased the necessity of future wars.<sup>307</sup>

*19 October 1781, capitulation of Cornwallis by Yorktown.*

Quietness was almost restored. Gornwallis affected impartiality, whilst he was deceiving both parties. He encouraged the United Irishmen, and he roused the Royalists; one day he destroyed, the next day he was merciful. His system, however, had not exactly the anticipated effect. Everything gave reason to expect a restoration of tranquillity, it was through the *impression of horror* alone that an Union could be effected, and he had no time to lose, lest the country might recover its reason.

Fortunate accident for him: A portion of an armament, destined by France to aid the Irish insurgents, had escaped the Irish cruisers, and landed about a 1,000

<sup>a</sup> Ensor's italics in this sentence.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union. Ireland as She ought to Be*, Newry, 1831, pp. 87, 88.—*Ed.*

troops at *Killala Bay* (in the North-West of Ireland).<sup>a</sup> They entered Killala without opposition, surprising the bishop and a company of parsons who were on their visitation. They were joined by a considerable number of peasantry, unarmed, unclothed, and undisciplined. But the French did their best to render them efficient. Marched into the country. *Lord Hutchinson* commanded the garrison of *Castlebar*, a few miles from Killala. His force numerous, with a good train of artillery. *General Lake* with his staff had just arrived. French attacked them. *In a few minutes, the whole of the royal army was completely routed.* About 900 French and some peasants took possession of *Castlebar*.<sup>b</sup> (This battle is called the *Races of Castlebar*.) The English fled in full haste to *Tuam*.

A considerable part of the *Louth and Kilkenny regiments* (militia), not finding it convenient to retreat, joined the victors, and in one hour were completely equipped as French riflemen. About 90 of these men were hanged by Cornwallis afterwards at *Ballynamuck*. The defeat of *Castlebar*, however, was a *victory to the Viceroy*; it revived all the horrors of rebellion, which had been subsiding, and the desertion of the militia regiments tended to impress the gentry with an idea, that England alone could protect the country.

Lord Cornwallis was supine, and the insurgents were active in profiting by this victory; 40,000 of them were prepared to assemble at the *Crooked Wood*, in *Westmeath*, only 42 miles from Dublin, ready to join the French and march upon the metropolis.

The French continued too long at *Castlebar*, and Lord Cornwallis at length collected 20,000 troops, with which he considered himself pretty certain of conquering 900 men. With above 20,000 men, he marched directly to the [*Shannon*]<sup>c</sup> to prevent the passage, but he was out[manoeuvred]: the insurgents had led the French to the source of that river, and it was *ten days* before *Castlereagh*, *by the slowest possible marches, which tended purposely to increase the public terror*, reached his enemy. After some skirmishes, in which the French [were] victorious, they capitulated at *Ballynamuck*.<sup>d</sup> They were sent to Dublin and afterwards to France.

Horrors now were everywhere recommenced; executions were multiplied. Cornwallis marched against the peasantry, still masters of *Killala*; and after a sanguinary conflict in the streets, the town was taken: some were slaughtered, many hanged, and *the whole district was on the point of being reduced to subjection*, when Cornwallis most unexpectedly *proclaimed an armistice*, and without any terms allowed the insurgents freely to disperse, and gave them *30 days*, either to surrender their arms or be prepared for slaughter; leaving them to act, as they thought proper in the interval. *This interval was terrific to the loyalists*; the 30 days of armistice *were 30 days of new horror*, and the *Government had now achieved the very climax of public terror*, on which they so much counted for inducing Ireland to throw herself into the arms of the protecting country. *And the first step of Pitt's project was fully consummated.*

---

<sup>a</sup> On August 22, 1798; then follow, up to the section "More about the Union", excerpts from J. Mitchel's *History of Ireland...*, Vol. II, pp. 27-39, 43, 45, 47-51, 59-62, 76-77 and 79.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> On August 27, 1798.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The manuscript is damaged here.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> On September 8, 1798.—*Ed.*

## THE UNION

Pitt now conceived that the moment had arrived to try the effect of his previous measures to promote a Legislative Union.

The Irish Peers, under Lord Clare's, Lord Chancellor's, despotism, [were] ready for anything. The lure of translation neutralised the scruples of Episcopacy. Single exceptions: *Marly*, Bishop of Waterford, and Dixon, Bishop of Down. The rebellion had commenced on 22 May 1798, and on 22 January 1799, an Union was proposed. 40,000 British troops were then in Ireland.<sup>308</sup>

Pitt now conceived the moment to have come to try the effect of his previous measures to promote a *Legislative Union*, and annihilate the Irish Legislature.

The measure *first proposed* indirectly by Speech from the Throne on 22 January 1799. Lord Cornwallis' unexpected warfare against 900 Frenchmen, evidently intended more for terror than for victory.

{*King's title* was "George III, King of *Great Britain, France, and Ireland*, Defender of the Faith" etc. France was dropped on Amiens Peace.}

Clare's (Fitzgibbon's) only check [was] the bar, which he resolved to corrupt. He doubled the number of bankrupt commissioners, revived some offices, created others, and under pretence of furnishing each County with a local judge, in 2 months established 32 new offices, of £600-700 each.

*First Parliamentary debate* on 22 January 1799, lasted till 11 o'clock of 23 January (22 hours). Government obtained *majority of 1* by open sale of a certain Fox, lawyer.

*2nd debate* on 5 o'clock of 23 January 1799, continued till late in the morning of the 24, Government defeated. In every debate upon that measure, it was insisted upon that *Parliament was incompetent, even to entertain the question of the Union*. In this sense spoke *Saurin*, since Attorney-General, *Plunket*, since Lord Chancellor, *Sir John Parnell*, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, *Bushy*, since Lord Chief Justice, *Lord Oriel*, the then Speaker of the Irish House of Commons.

*Sir Lawrence Parsons* and others showed by irrefutable facts that the country had been worked upon by the English Minister, to terrify the Irish gentry into a resubmission to those shackles from which the spirit of the Volunteers and the nation had but a few years before released them. It was argued that the insurrection, first organised and fostered by Pitt, and protracted by Cornwallis, had been suppressed by the Irish Parliament; and that the introduction of foreign and mercenary Germans, to inmolate the Irish, instead of extinguishing, had added fuel to the insurrection. Then great point: *the incompetence of Parliament to betray its trust. Act of Union in itself a nullity ab initio*,<sup>a</sup> and a fraud upon the then existing constitution.

Act of 23 George III "recognising the unqualified independence of Ireland, and expressly stipulating and contracting that *it should endure for ever*".

24 January 1799 111 Members decided *against* Union, 105 for. Voted that night 216. Absent 84.

*House of Lords* on 22 January 1799 in answer to the Viceroy's address voted *for* the Union.

The Irish Lords lay prostrate before the Government, but the leaders were not *inattentive to their own interest*. The *defeat of the Government in the Commons* gave them

<sup>a</sup> From the beginning.—*Ed.*

an importance they had not expected. The accounts of Lord Annesley etc. prove their corruption. A great proportion of the 1½ millions levied upon Ireland, and distributed by Castlereagh's *Commissioners of Compensation*, went into the pockets of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of Ireland.

Cornwallis coquetted with the persons, assuming to themselves the title of "*Catholic Leaders*". The *Catholic Bishops* were generally deceived into the most disgusting subserviency.

The members of the old opposition, who were returned to the new *Parliament* in 1797, did not exceed 50.

Strongest cause of division amongst the Members [was] the *Catholic Question*. Cornwallis flattered the Catholics promising certain emancipation; the *priests* bowed before him. Never yet did any clergy so retrograde as the *Catholic Hierarchy*, on that occasion. Corruptly deceived. In 1798 the Catholics were hanged, in 1799 caressed, in 1800 cajoled, in 1801 discarded.

Mr. Pitt, by *private* dispatch to Cornwallis, desired that the measure should not be then pressed, unless *majority of 50* [was] certain. Clare, the Chancellor, overhauled this. Thousands of addresses and petitions against any further discussion. As a punishment for the rejoicings at Dublin over the rejection of the Union, soldiers were ordered to fire amongst the people, of whom a few [were] killed and some wounded.

It appears in full proof, that in proportion to their respective numbers, the *British Commons*, at the period of the Irish Union, [had] ¼ more corrupted, corruptible, and influenced members than *that of Ireland at any period*.

5 and 6 February 1800. *Union accepted by Irish House of Commons*.

Castlereagh compelled even *felons* in the gaols to sign Union petitions.

English generals, who, at a moment *when martial law existed*, or a recollection of its execution was still fresh in every memory, could not fail to have their own influence over proclaimed districts and bleeding peasantry; tried to procure addresses to Parliament.

Mr. Darby, High Sheriff of King's County,<sup>309</sup> and Major Rogers of the artillery, had gone so far as to place 2 six-pounders towards the doors of the Court House, where the gentlemen and freeholders of the county were assembling to address as Anti-Unionists.

In interval between old and new Parliament, the Parliamentary patrons had breathing-time after the preceding session, and began to tremble for their patronage and importance; some desperate step by Government became necessary to insure continuance of their support. Now unparalleled measure.

Castlereagh publicly declared, *first*, that every nobleman, who returned Members to Parliament, should be paid, in cash, £15,000 *for every Member so returned*; *secondly*, that every Member who had *purchased* a seat in Parliament should have his purchase money repaid to him, by the Treasury in Ireland; *thirdly*, that all Members of Parliament, or others, who were losers by an Union, should be fully recompensed for their losses; and that £1,500,000 should be devoted to this service; in other terms, all who supported this measure were, under some pretence or other, to share in the bank of corruption. A declaration so flagitious and treasonable was never publicly made in any country; [it] had its effect; before the meeting of Parliament he had secured a *small majority of 8 above a moiety of the members*.

After the debate on the Union in 1800, he performed his promise, and brought in a Bill to raise 1½ million of money upon the Irish people, nominally to compensate, but really to bribe their representatives, for betraying their honour and selling their country. George III gives his assent to a Bill to levy taxes for the compensation of Members of Parliament, for their loss of the opportunities of selling what it was criminal to sell or purchase.

*The Union Bill but feebly resisted. The divisions of January and February 1800 reduced the success of the Government to a certainty.*

<i>Lord Shannon received for his patronage in the Commons.....</i>	<i>£45,000</i>
<i>The Marquis of Ely.....</i>	<i>£45,000</i>
<i>Lord Clanmorris, beside a British peerage .....</i>	<i>£23,000</i>
<i>Lord Belvidere, beside his douceur .....</i>	<i>£15,000</i>
<i>Sir Hercules Langrishe .....</i>	<i>£15,000</i>

*15 January 1800* Speech from the Throne, debate proceeded till past 10 o'clock on the 16th. (60 members absent. Not governmental ones.)

*5 February next division.* The Union propositions, as passed by the British Parliament, were, after a long speech, laid before the House of Commons by Castlereagh. After a debate of the entire night, at 11 the ensuing morning, the division took place.

Members 300, absent 27, rest 273. *For Castlereagh's Motion* 158, against 115, majority 43. (273 members present.)

The *House was surrounded by military*, under the pretence of keeping peace, in fact, to excite terror. (*British Regiment.*)

The Bishops Troy, Lanigan, and others, deluded by the Viceroy, sold their country, and basely betrayed their flocks, by promoting the Union. Rebellion had terrified the great body of Catholics who could not move. Besides the 1½ million Castlereagh also had unbounded *secret service money* from England. *British clerks and officers were smuggled into the Irish Parliament* to vote away the Constitution of the Country. By the subjugation of Ireland, England has gained nothing but an accumulation of debt, an accession of venality to her Parliament, an embarrassment in her councils and a progressive danger to the integrity of the empire. *The name of Union* has been acquired, but the attainment of the substance has been removed farther than ever. *Castlereagh* palpably purchased 25 Members before the *second discussion* in 1800, which made a difference of 50 votes in favour of Government. Thus Pitt and Castlereagh carried *the Union*.

\* \* \*

### *More about the Union<sup>a</sup>*

The Irish Parliament were only delegates for a few years. How could they vote their own dissolution and extinction for ever? If the Irish Parliament was authorised to destroy the Constitution, why not the English? *Why not pass a royal law? No appeal was made to the people.* This was done in *Scotland*<sup>310</sup>; [they] did not dare doing it in Ireland. Even the rotten boroughs sickened at the sound.

*The Irish Parliament of 1800* elected in 1797 for 8 years.

The Union carried during the reign of *Martial Law!* On the other hand, *Resolution of the English House of Commons in 1741*: "that *the presence of armed soldiers, at the election of members of Parliament, is a high infringement of the liberty of the subject, and an open defiance of the laws and constitution!*"

*Martial Law Bill in Ireland from commencement of the rebellion in 1798, renewed 1799, in 1800* revived, but in fact it was to be considered as a continuance of [the]

<sup>a</sup> The heading is in German in the manuscript. This section is Marx's rendering of a passage from Ensor's *Anti-Union...*, p. 126.—Ed.

former act passed (1799); in 1801, the act of 1800 was continued, for a very short time, by the *United Parliament, without any inquiry!*

*The Act of the Union is an Act of Conquest (Ensor).*

*Ireland's Union with England—Cromwell's scheme. It was among the delusions of Monk.* The English Government had no object by the Union, which means the extinction of Irish Legislature, but to deprive Ireland of its political consequence and authority, and subject her property and people to the mercy of England.

*The English Ministry, in guaranteeing Norway to Sweden,* stipulated that Norway, by its union with Sweden, should enjoy an independent Parliament.<sup>311</sup>

Just as the Union of Ireland with England was declared necessary, so had *Lord Grenville* declared: "*Hampshire* ought to be no more dear to us than *Hanover*."

*Popular Meetings (and Petitions)  
Despite Martial Law and the Suspension  
of All Guarantees for Popular Security.  
Ditto House of Commons during 1799<sup>a</sup>*

Popular indignation universal. Though sheriffs were chosen to obstruct petitioning, though the military opposed their assembling, and dispersed them; yet they met and protested, as at *Birr*, where Major Rogers actually marched with cannon against a county meeting. They met in *Dublin*, as in 1759, on the mere rumour of a projected Union. The people assembled in the towns of *Belfast*, *Limerick*, *Drogheda*, *Newry*, *Maryborough*, *Carrickfergus*, *Pontadown*, etc.; in the Counties of *Dublin*, *Cork*, *Limerick*, *Wexford*, *Cavan*, *Longford*, *Tipperary*, *Galway*, *Monaghan*, *Fermanagh*, *Kilkenny*, *Meath*, *Carlow*, the *King's and Queen's Counties*, *Leitrim*, *Kildare*, *Down*, *Westmeath*, *Armagh*, *Clare*, *Louth*, *Donegal*, *Mayo*, *Wicklow*, *Tyrone*, *Antrim*, *Waterford*. Thus the population in towns, cities and counties petitioned against that fatal measure, in spite of all terrors and opposition.

The *Irish Commons* coincided with them. Though a mere fictitious representation, first by *the borough system*, and secondly by *its election* (a mere farce), for the *annalist* remarks: "through *consternation of some, and hostility of others*, it had *little more than the formality of an election*." Yet the House of Commons had in 1799 rejected the Union by 111 to 105!

*Corruption etc. in 1800*

The English Government resumed the measure. Merciless profligacy. Vote with us or vacate your seat! Open, flagitious bribery! The bribe was administered in every form to wretches. Mr. *Edgeworth* relates that he was offered to vacate a seat, that a more convenient person might be elected in his place. *Offices* were granted simply, or divided among many; *pensions* added; endless promises. The *Church* afforded a great vent for the increase of prostitution; *rectories* and *bishoprics* were

<sup>a</sup> In this section and in the two sections that follow it Marx sets forth, very closely to the original, passages from *Ensor's Anti-Union...*, pp. 94-97 and 110.—*Ed.*

granted *thrice* in succession to clerical friends of members, advocates for the Union. The *army and navy, boards and concessions*, were exposed at the Union mart; *lawyers* were to be advanced to the *Bench*, by voting away the Parliament. *Commoners* were to be made *Lords*, and *Lords* to be *relorded with a superior title*.

So numerous were the *superadded placemen alone in the Commons*, that in the year of the Union 1800, *35 new writs were moved for the re-election of members*, who had accepted places from England's Minister! The *Lords*, and the other boro[ughmongers],<sup>a</sup> of course, obtained a grand division of the Union-bribe—£622,000 was voted in the *United Parliament*, in 1801, [as] *compensation for the borough-holders!* Only £622,000 paid, as a first instalment, by the borough-mongers of [England] to the borough-mongers of Ireland!

Yet, after this overwhelming corruption, prompt payment, and endless expectancy, the *minority opposed to the Union, in the first* [division], in a House of Commons, of whom *84 only* returned for the counties, counties of cities, and the University, and *216* for [boroughs and manors]. A simple bribe disqualifies a member from sitting in Parliament; and shall not such bribery, a small part of the corruption, dismiss the Act of Union from the Statute-Book?

### *Just Punishment of the Traitorous Catholic Hierarchy and the Few Higher Class Catholics Who Joined Them*

Cornwallis (Pitt) had promised them full emancipation. Fulsome address from the Catholic clergy and Bishop Lanigan from Kilkenny to Cornwallis. Yet King George III, as will be seen from the following, accepted the Union as means to make *no further* concessions to the Catholics. Pitt in 1801 handed in his resignation, on pretext that King kept not his word as to Catholics. This [was] mere show. He wanted not to be minister during truce with Bonaparte.<sup>312</sup> Re-entered afterwards the Ministry *without* stipulating any favour for Catholics.

George III, in his letters, published by Lord Kenyon, declares that he was inclined to assent to the Union, believing that the Union would for ever preclude any further concessions to the Catholics.

His words in his letter to Pitt, February 1, 1801, are: "When the Irish propositions were transmitted to me, by a joint message from both Houses of Parliament, I told the Lords and Gentlemen, sent on that occasion, that I would with pleasure, and without delay, forward them to Ireland; but that, as individuals, I could not help acquainting them, that my inclination to an Union with Ireland was principally founded on a trust, that the uniting the established churches of the 2 kingdoms would for ever shut the door to any further measures with respect to the Roman Catholics."<sup>b</sup>

### *On the Legality of the Union*

Attorney-General's *Scott's* (afterwards Lord Clonmel, principal agent of Pitt etc.) declaration of resisting the usurpation of England, in 1782, was repeated in 1800, by 2 successive Attorney-Generals of Ireland. *Mr. William Saurin*, in his place in

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript is damaged here.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 110.—*Ed.*



*Parliament*, declared that he considered the *Irish representatives incompetent to exact a legislative Union*; and that any statute, made by a Parliament, thus constituted, would not be constitutionally binding on the *Irish people*. [After becoming] Attorney-General, [he] never afterwards repeated his scepticism.

*Mr. Plunket* made the same declaration, but in rather stronger terms, as he vouched for his son as well as himself; and soon after became Attorney-General.

In every debate upon that measure, it was insisted upon that the Parliament was incompetent, even to entertain the question of the Union. So *Saurin*, *Plunket* (since Lord Chancellor), *Sergeant Ball*, the ablest lawyer of Ireland, *Fitzgerald*, Prime-Serjeant of Ireland, *Moore*, since a judge, *Sir John Parnell*, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, *Bushe*, since Chief Justice, *Lord Oriel*, the then Speaker of the (Irish) House of Commons.

*January 1799. Irish House of Commons.* *Plunket* (Solicitor-General for Ireland under *Addington* Cabinet) declared: "I tell [you]<sup>a</sup> that if, circumstanced as you are, you pass this Act, it will be a mere nullity, and that no man in Ireland will be bound to obey it."<sup>b</sup>

*7 May 1802 Forster* declared in the *United House of Commons* 1802 that *Castlereagh*, in Ireland, had made use of public money [for the pur]pose of obtaining votes in favour of the Union.

*Grey, May, 1806, House of Commons* said that "these votes for Union were purchased by corruption".

"The ac[t of]<sup>a</sup> borough-mongers and placemen is irrevocable, against the Irish Nation!" (Ensor.)<sup>c</sup>

### *Opinions of English Liberals and Radicals on the Union*

*Lord Holland*: The *English* were injured (by the Union) particularly by the means it affords to increased parliamentary corruption. This was foreseen by *Lord Holland*, who, in debating the Union preparatory to its enactment, said "that it was incompatible with the opinions of all those who wished for Parliamentary Reform".  
 . {The Representative Irish Peers, thickening the ranks of the House of Lords, have strengthened the prerogative. The whole peerage of Ireland is a borough, of which the King is Patron.}

*George Tierney* said, speaking of the Union before it was enacted, that it would ruin Great Britain. It has ruined both England and Ireland. The subjugation of Ireland has made England's people a mere taxable commodity. Instead of the universal tranquillity, which *Canning* promised, when advocating the Union, the Union was followed by new and severe laws, extraordinary commissions, and unlimited agitation. Ireland is mocked with some of the minor forms of freedom.

"Union of 1800 a ruin to the annexed, a torment to the annexing nation." (*Barrington*.)

*Cobbett. Political Register, 14 February 1807*, in connection with the "Threshers" disturbances in West Ireland,<sup>313</sup> lays the following ironical words in the mouth of an *Irish exciseman*:

<sup>a</sup> The manuscript is damaged here.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Cf. *J. Mitchel, The History of Ireland...*, Vol. II, p. 77.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *G. Ensor, Anti-Union...*, pp. 97-98.—*Ed.*

"He had no doubt but with an entire repeal of the Habeas Corpus Act, a due execution of the statutes for martial law, and the assistance of 60,000 regular troops, Ireland would become a valuable dependence to England, and produce so considerable a revenue, as to [be] able with the aid of Sir John Newport, in borrowing 2 or 3 millions a year, very nearly to pay the troops to keep the peace, the custom-house officers to collect the revenues, and the salaries and pensions of the 'friends of government'."<sup>a</sup>

In connection with the Irish *Insurrection Bill* of 1807, which was still in force in 1809:

*Cobbett. Political Register, 9 December 1809: "Angry with the Irish; because—because what? Why, because their existence endangers our safety! Angry with them, because they are alive, and have a desire to enjoy life! Sad dogs those Irishmen must be to desire to keep alive, when to keep alive may be dangerous to us!" ... "We may, as I before observed, be angry with the Irish, because about 5 millions of them continue to be alive, we may hate them and curse them; we may wish their island sunk to the bottom of the sea; but, still they live, and live they will" ... "It is, therefore, as useless to be angry with them as it would be to be angry with thunder and lightning."*<sup>b</sup>

*Cobbett. Political Register, 20 February 1811:*

"What an infamy to the English nation, who really seem to desire to be deceived with regard to Ireland; but, whose silly and base desire will be frustrated in spite of themselves; for hear and see and *feel* the truth they must. They may hide their heads in their hoods and cloaks as long as they will; they may, as long as they please, pay impostors to sooth their cowardly fears, but all will not do. Ireland! Ireland! Ireland! will, maugre all their miserable devices, present herself to them in her true and formidable shape."<sup>c</sup>

*Ensor. "Ireland with its foundations is pressed downward by the accumulated burthens of England and her empire." (Pays 5 millions now for absentees etc. to England.)*<sup>d</sup>

*Curran: She (Ireland) "thought the circulation of the political blood could be carried on only by the action of the heart within the body, and could not be maintained from without". "The instruments of our government have been almost simplified into the tax gatherer and the hangman." With the Union: "all semblance of national independence buried in that grave in which our legislation is interred, our property and our persons are disposed of, by laws made in another clime, and made like boots and shoes for exportation to fit the wearers as they may. ... It was, in fact, the real design of a rash, and arbitrary, and short-sighted projector, at once to deprive you of all power, as to your own taxation, and of another power of not very inferior importance, and which, indeed, is invariably connected with taxation, to rob you of all influence upon the vital question of peace and war; and to bring all within the control of an English minister. This very power, thus acquired by that detested Union, has been a millstone about the neck of England. From that hour to this she has been flaring away in her ruinous and wasteful war."*<sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register*, No. 7, February 14, 1807, Vol. XI, p. 255.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 23, December 9, 1809, Vol. XVI, pp. 866-74.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 15, February 20, 1811, Vol. XIX, pp. 420-21.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 118.—*Ed.*

<sup>e</sup> Marx quotes passages from Curran's speech made on October 17, 1812, at the General Election in Newry. See J. Ph. Curran, *The Speeches...*, pp. 465-66, 468-69.—*Ed.*

*Ensor*: "England paralysed at home and abroad." *Castlereagh*, advanced to be English minister by the Irish war. He taxed the English nation with "an ignorant impatience of taxation". "The whole House of Commons is a labyrinth of pretension, imposture, falsehood, injustice, and gloating corruption.... There is no shame, no regard to facts, no respect for consequences, since the Union, in the English Parliament."<sup>a</sup>

*Morning Chronicle*, 1828: "The hatred of the Union is the only point, we believe, as to which all Irishmen are agreed. It has been an unfortunate measure both for England and Ireland!"<sup>314</sup>

Petty said: "England has constantly lost, these 500 years, by the meddling with Ireland."<sup>b</sup>

### Loss to England<sup>315</sup>

*Irish Members—access of venality and corruption to the House of Commons. Increase [of] ministerial usurpation.*

"How the Irish Members precipitated themselves, when the Manchester Massacre was to be justified by *Castlereagh*, the manager of the Union! How they thronged to pass the 6 Acts!"<sup>316</sup> (*Ensor*)

"The French war strengthened the royal prerogative in England, as it increased the means of expenditure, and the fons of corruption. These effected the Union, and the Union multiplied every scheme of rapine and prodigality." (*Ensor*.)

*Ireland—one of the pretexts of keeping a large standing army.*

By the Union, the military of one country, when transferred, are in effect foreign mercenaries. War service in time of peace.

*English House of Commons*. "Increased members, and the increased and multiform business in the House of Commons, have lessened the attention of the great body of the members. The House of Commons, before the Union of Scotland and England, consisted of 513 members. At this period the business of the nation preceded application to private affairs. The legislature then met in the morning. The members were fined if they absented themselves when the Speaker took the Chair, and absence for a whole day was punished with an enhanced penalty. Now the House consists of 658 members, yet not a 10th are present when the Speaker takes the Chair on any day. Business is often transacted when there is, technically, no House." (*Ensor*.)

"Every acquisition of a nation by a nation is injurious to the liberty of both. The accessory country is a lapsed inheritance, while the people who make the acquisition are submissive to their own rulers, lest they might countenance any disturbance in the superadded nation; they submit at home for a barren, often expensive, superiority abroad. [...] This the whole story of the Roman history ... as the world fell before the Roman aristocracy, the Roman citizens were pauperised and enslaved. [...] Every impeachment of liberty in one country leads to its loss in another." (*Ensor*.)

"Talk about revolutionary principles! The Duke of Clarence, afterwards William IV, called, in 1793, an effort to abolish the slave trade part of 'the levelling principles of the French Revolution!'"

<sup>a</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 11.—Ed

<sup>b</sup> W. Petty, *The Political Anatomy of Ireland*, Dublin, 1769, p. 320 (quoted from G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 31).—Ed

"Say not, then, that *England will never consent to relieve Ireland from the Union*—repeat not that she will never be bullied or frightened. The English are the sport of frights.... When Englishmen proclaim, we will not be frightened: it is as the coward's song, surprised by the darkness of night. The English not be frightened! ... England not to be frightened by Ireland! The whole history of the connexion of the 2 countries betrays terror, paralysis, distraction. England's numerous laws against Ireland's trade, manufactures, and commerce—against her people, as a religious community, as a political society—prove that the fears of England have neither measure nor limit.... Nay, their jealousy, their suspicion, their alarm, *confessedly induced them to force the Union on Ireland, by which they ensured the evil they laboured to prevent.*" (Ensor.)

### *Confiscations in Ireland*<sup>317</sup>

Sir W. Petty says generally: "*most of the lands of Ireland have been, within 150 years, forfeited*."<sup>a</sup>

In fact, *all Ireland has been confiscated, three times, again and again. On some occasions, such were the forfeitures, that the territory on sale, from the glut of the market, fell to 1/4 of its former annual value. Lawrence mentions, "that from 1654-1660, not only the adventurers<sup>318</sup> and soldiers, but all persons who could command money, traded in land, and thereby obtained better estates in one year than by treble the sum they got ever before in 7 years' traffic".*

This upsetting and dislocation of property, by force of arms, were aggravated by wicked inquisitions, and the practices of the crown lawyers. When the head of a clan died, if the descent followed the Irish custom, the land was forfeited: for this custom was repugnant to the English code. [Yet, if]<sup>b</sup> this land were distributed according to the English law, that was reputed irregular, for it should have been transmitted, said the lawyers, *according to the Brehon law*<sup>319</sup>. Thus the land was forfeited either way, and the Crown became the sole heir. By these means, whether in peace or alleged insurrection, property was subjected to chicane, and the people were systematically robbed. Sometimes the people revolted, e.g. under *Edward II* and *Charles I.*<sup>320</sup> Harris states the reasons of this last insurrection thus: "The preposterous rigour, and unreasonable severity—the covetous zeal and uncharitable fury of some men—and, lastly, *the fear of utter extirpation.*"

### *Scotch Union with England*

Scotland and England parts of the same island. But the population differed from that in England. In Scotland at that time there was peace at home and abroad. There were only *3,000 troops in Scotland* (Defoe).<sup>c</sup> Again, when the Parliament of Scotland was to be elected, the electors were apprised that they were to depute members to decide respecting the Union of the 2 countries. When Union [was] first proposed in the Scotch Parliament, *64 majority for Union. Scotland by*

<sup>a</sup> W. Petty, op. cit., p. 359 (quoted from G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, p. 51).—*Ed*

<sup>b</sup> The manuscript is damaged here.—*Ed*

<sup>c</sup> D. Defoe, *The History of the Union of Great Britain*, Edinburgh, 1709; quoted from G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...* p. 56.—*Ed*

the Union secured for itself the *republican form* of Church government. Presbyterianism became thus by law the religion of the State. By the Irish Union the *religion of 1/10 of the people was declared to be the State religion. Act of Union declares this to be the law for ever. Yet the repeal of the Scotch Union in the English House of Commons<sup>a</sup> in 1713 [was] rejected by a majority of 4 voices.<sup>b</sup>*

[IRELAND FROM THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION  
TO THE UNION OF 1801

SUMMARY]<sup>321</sup>

1) FROM 1778 TO 1782.  
(LEGISLATIVE INDEPENDENCE).  
(CATHOLICS)

a) Penal Code up to 1778 in full vigour against the Catholics.  
*Statè of Irish Parliament in 18th century until American War of Independence. Poynings' Law (a statute of Henry VII, by his Attorney-General, Sir Edward Poynings). Statute 6, George I.*

Only some opposition to England on commercial matters.  
*Influence of absentees. (Peers principally.)*

b) 1778 Irish Parliament relaxes *severity of the Penal Code*,<sup>322</sup>  
*Catholics were allowed to take leases of land. This [is a] consequence of the American war, and the treaty of France with America (6 February 1778).*

C) VOLUNTEER ORGANISATION.  
THE FREE TRADE MOVEMENT.  
FIRST CONCESSIONS OF ENGLAND

*June 1778 commenced war with France. Summer 1779 King of Spain accedes as ally to United States and France. Plymouth assailed by their united fleets (August 1779). Threatened invasion of Ireland.*

*The Volunteers—armed Protestantism of Ireland.*<sup>323</sup> {(26 February 1780: Armed Neutrality founded by Russia.)} In 1779 Ireland left ungarrisoned.

The *Armed Associations first local and provincial, strongest in the North. First against Invasion. Protestant farmers rallied first under*

<sup>a</sup> See Debates in the English House of Lords on the Union with Scotland on June 2, 1713, in *A Collection of the Parliamentary Debates in England, from the Year M. DC, LXVIII to the Present Time*, Vol. VI, 1740.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> G. Ensor, *Anti-Union...*, pp. 54, 56-57. Ensor has: "... in the English House of Lords..."—Ed.

this cry. Catholics assisted. Soon cry of the *Volunteers*: “Free Trade” (i.e. *Free Export*) and emancipation of Irish industry and commerce from the shackles laid upon them by England (to free themselves mercantilely and industrially). England suspends, prohibits export of Irish manufactures, inundates Irish market with her own manufactures. *Non-Importation and Non-Consumption Agreement*. In the Volunteer movement *Association of all ranks*.

*Sessions of Irish House of Commons 1779-80* under this high popular pressure.

*Grattan* moves an amendment to the address, where we find the following:

“constant drain to supply absentees, and the unfortunate prohibition of our trade”, demands to “open a free export trade”.

*Amendment of Hussey Burgh* (the Prime Sergeant):

“that it is not by temporary expedients, that this nation is now to be saved from impending ruin”.<sup>324</sup>

Unanimously carried. *Volunteers* rightly attributed to themselves this success. Increase in their number and confidence. *Lord North* supercilious. Does nothing. *Non-Importation and Non-Consumption Act now general* [cry] in Ireland. *Dublin* (city) *Resolutions*. *Dublin Volunteers* chose *William, Duke of Leinster*, for their Chief. Soon 4 provincial armies organised, *Earl of Charlemont* first commander-in-chief of the Ulster army, soon *general commander-in-chief*.

*Free Trade* became the watchword of the *Volunteers*. *James Napper Tandy* at the head of *Dublin Volunteer Artillery*, with labels on the mouths of their cannon: “*Free Trade or Speedy Revolution*”. Meanwhile: 19 October 1781, *Cornwallis* capitulates at *York Town* (Virginia).

30 November 1782. *Paris Preliminary Treaty between United States and England*.

*Lord North* now frightened. America already lost.

*English House of Commons*. 24 November 1781 speech from the throne. 25 November 1781 *British Parliament* meets, first *Bills of concessions* receive royal assent.

2 December 1781. In hot haste these laws restrictive of commercial and manufactural restraint are now revoked, but *North* tried, by considering them bit by bit, in longer intervals, to get over the session of 1782 and do no more. Now, on the contrary, the *Irish Volunteers* became aware that under the pretext of making concessions *British Parliament* asserts its legislative authority over Ireland. *Free Parliament* becomes now a watchword added to that

of *Free Trade*. 14 Irish counties at once avowed to establish, at the risk of their lives and fortunes, the *independence of the Irish Legislature*.

*Resolutions entered into by almost every military camp, and every incorporate body, that they would no longer obey any laws, save those, enacted by the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland.*

At that time: *Poynings' Statute* subjected Irish Legislature to *British Attorney-General and British [Privy] Council*. 6, *George I to Statutes of British Parliament and British Appellant Jurisdiction*.

*Standing army in Ireland independent of Parliament, under the regulations of a British Statute, Perpetual Mutiny Bill and hereditary Revenue of the Crown.*

*Judges of Ireland hold their offices only during the will of the British Minister, and their salaries barely sufficient to keep them above want.*

*Irish Parliament met but once in 2 years. In the British Attorney-General was vested the superintendence of their proceedings, in the British Privy Council the alteration and rejection of their Statutes. Want of Protection for Personal Liberty in Ireland: No Habeas Corpus Act.*

*9 October 1781. Irish House of Commons. Resolution of vote of thanks for the Volunteers, for their exertions, and continuance. Unanimous.*

These brought down the British Government to the feet of the Volunteers—self-armed, self-governed, self-disciplined associations; by this time [they] *exceeded in number the whole regular military force of the British Empire*. Now **regular and public deliberative meetings of the Volunteers**. Catholic bodies entered the Volunteer army, officered by Protestants. Cry: "that their connection with England was only federative". *Repeal of 6, George I asked.*

The armed associations of Ulster first appointed delegates to declare their sentiments in a general Assembly. *Convention at Dungannon, 15 February 1782. Agreed upon the celebrated Declaration of Rights and Grievances. Delegates of 25,000 Ulster soldiers.*

Convention resolves to appoint 9 of their members to act as a *Committee at Dublin*, to communicate with the other Volunteer Associations, deliberate with them on carrying the *Dungannon Resolutions* into effect. *In every Volunteer Corps of Ireland the Dungannon Resolutions accepted.*

*Pressure of this on the Irish House of Commons. Its sessions [were] biennial, and, consequently, their grants for the Government for 2 years at once. They now resolved on granting supplies to the Crown for 6 months only. This had its effect.*

## C) DECLARATION OF IRISH INDEPENDENCE

Proceedings of Irish *voluntary bodies and corporate bodies* [became] every day more serious and decisive, tone in the House of Commons more menacing. Lord North no longer possible.

April 1782. Marquis of Rockingham Cabinet (James Fox in it). Duke of Portland, nominated Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, arrives at Dublin 14 April 1782, had to meet the Irish Parliament on 16 April.

Message of George III to British Parliament, 18 April 1782, wherein necessity expressed

“to come to a final adjustment with Ireland”.

British House of Commons express their full concurrence.

House of Commons, 16 April 1782. Portland had wanted to procrastinate, Grattan communicated to him that [this was] impossible without provoking anarchy. Hely-Hutchinson, Lord Lieutenant had ordered him to communicate King's message for “a final adjustment”. Grattan's amendment of the address in reply affirming Ireland to be a

“distinct kingdom with a Parliament of her own the sole legislature thereof” etc.

G. Ponsonby (on behalf of Portland) seconded this. Unanimously passed. Strictly before and after this scene firm Resolutions of the Volunteer Corps. Their firmness achieved this Revolution (even Fitzgibbon and John Scott, afterwards Lord Clonmel, on 16 April 1782 frightened into patriotism). Immediately after this Portland sends two despatches to England, one public, the other private and confidential to Fox, as to the necessity of yielding (ascertaining at the same time that he would act on the Volunteers through Charlemont, on the House of Commons through dissension of Flood and Grattan).

Irish Parliament prorogued for three weeks, to wait on King's Answer.

Meanwhile public reviews of the Volunteers (then 100,000 effectives); nearly  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the whole English Army, besides, are Irish; many sailors ditto.

Irish House of Commons meets: 27 May 1782: Quasi Throne Speech of Portland. Will concede to all demands, British Parliament ready; King gives his Royal Assent to acts to prevent the suppression of Bills in the Privy Council of the Kingdom, limits the Act (Mutiny Bill) for Army to 2 years. (Besides much soft-sawder.) Grattan fool, address of thanks.

“The British Government had given up every claim to authority over Ireland” (he says), “that we conceive the resolution for an unqualified repeal of 6 George I to be a measure of consummate wisdom”, “that no constitutional question between the 2 nations will any longer exist.”



*Grattan's Address carried* (only 2 votes against). *Bagenal* proposes to appoint committee for sum to be voted by Nation to Grattan.

*Britishers frightened.* Precipitantly Bills enacted for making the concessions to Ireland. 6, *George I repealed by British Parliament*, obtains sanction of King, instantly transmitted to the Irish Viceroy, by him communicated to all the Volunteer Corps.

*Irish House of Commons, 30 May 1782.* *Bagenal's* proposition for Grattan repeated. *Portland* offers him, as part of the intended grant, on the part of the Crown, the "*Vice-Regal Palace in the Phoenix Park*", the King's best palace in Ireland. Of course refused. Grattan got from House of Commons £50,000.

II) FROM 1782  
(SINCE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE)  
TO 1795

A) 1782-1783. (REFORM BILL DEFEATED.  
VOLUNTEERS HUMBLIED)

*Some small measures to relax the severity of Penal Code against Catholics.* Opposed by bigots and Castle<sup>325</sup> influence. Passed however. *The concessions very limited.*

At length *Fox himself* declared in *British Parliament* that "the repeal of that Statute" (6, *George I*) "could not stand alone, must be accompanied by a *final adjustment*", "treaty, to be adopted by both Parliaments, to be entered upon ... to finally become an *irrevocable arrangement between the 2 countries*".

By this Viceroy's duplicity [was] exploded, Grattan's stupidity exposed, Flood is now still feebly supported in the House of Commons, but strongly by the Volunteers.

19 July 1782 Flood moves leave to bring in a Bill for the ascertaining of Irish legislative etc. independence. Even leave to bring in this Bill was *negated without a division.* (*Grattan!*)

27 July 1782. *Irish Parliament.* Prorogued by *Portland.* In his proroguing speech: "*inviolable adherence to that compact etc.*"

*Marquis of Rockingham died 1782. Fox-North Coalition.* *Portland superseded by Earl of Temple (later Marquis of Buckingham).* His *Chief Secretary Mr., afterward Lord Grenville.* His *Administration from 15 September 1782—3 June 1783.*

*More than 150,000 Volunteers* now on the Muster-rolls. *Strong accession to them of Catholics.* Resolved no longer to obey or suffer to be obeyed any law or statute passed in England for Ireland.

*Hence standstill. Magistrates, counsels acted ditto. Juries would not find for them. Action of many important laws suspended.*

*Parliament divided between Flood and Grattan. The latter (Whig spelt) always in majority. British Administration resolved to foster the division of Nation thus created. Baffled by injudicious conduct of some Members of the British Parliament.*

*Sir G. Young in British House of Commons. Lord Mansfield in the Court of King's Bench. Lord Abingdon in the House of Lords.*

*Volunteers beat to arms throughout Ireland. Above 120,000. Flood [has the] upper hand amongst them. New panic of British Ministry.*

*1783. 23 Act of George III. All right of legislative interference on the part of British Parliament, and appellat jurisdiction in England, repudiated. Without debate passed.*

*This British Renunciation Act discredited the Irish Parliament with the Irish People. Showed either its insufficiency or corruption, or would have been superfluous. Reform of the Irish Parliament now the cry.*

*Irish Parliament. Rotten Borough System. Members of House of Commons nominated by individuals, especially Peers, nominated by the King, voted by proxy in House of Commons. Membership purchased by money and its exercise sold for office. These purchases also made by servants of the Executive Government. The Volunteers had the facts sifted etc. 1 Peer nominated 9 Commoners etc. 1/4 of members only freely elected by people. New Delegates Assembly of Volunteers in Dungannon. 10 November 1783 was proclaimed for the first sitting of the Grand National Convention of Ireland at Dublin. Rotunda place of their meeting. British Ministers knew that if Reform [were effected] in Ireland [it] could not be withheld from England. Then commercial jealousy of England. Charlemont President by trickery. Plan of Reform passed, to be brought into the House of Commons by Flood. *Sittings of Convention were made permanent till answer [was received].**

*The Government refused leave to bring in Flood's Bill, because it had originated from armed deliberation.*

*The Government knew that the triumph of the Parliament implied not only the destruction of the Convention, but of the Volunteers. Bill rejected by 158 to 49. 158 of the majority were placemen, as in 1800. Address to the King, offending the Volunteers, carried. Charlemont adjourns the Convention by tricks. Now struggle between the bigots (Charlemont) and Emancipation (Catholic) amongst the Volunteers and People. (Earl Bristol, Bishop of Derry for full emancipation. Address in that sense by Belfast Volunteers.) Foolish Charlemont made*

new "civil", not military "*Bill of Reform*" to be introduced in *House of Commons*. Of course rejected. Now begins the *Period of Moderate Parliamentarism*. The Volunteers survived the blows for some years, but [were] decaying. The Whig Orators (*Grattan* etc.) lost ground and influence.

B) FROM THE END OF 1783 TO 1791  
(FOUNDATION OF UNITED IRISHMEN)

*December 1783. Pitt Minister. Duke of Rutland Viceroy. Orde Minister. Rutland died October 1787.*

*Duke of Rutland Viceroy. (Orde Chief Secretary.) December 1783-October 1787.*

In the *House of Commons* repeated useless attempts at Reform. Orde's Commercial Propositions.

*May, 1784. Griffith* proposes House of Commons inquiry into the commercial intercourse between Ireland and Great Britain, Irish trade he wanted to be protected against English competition. Government took that proposal out of his hands.

7 February 1785. Orde announced, and on 11 February 1785 moved, 11 Propositions on Trade. This plan proffered as a boon of reciprocity. Favour [to be] paid for by £140,000 new taxes.

22 February 1785. Pitt moved 20 Resolutions in the British House of Commons. Amended in English sense. Then sent to Ireland. Half the globe interdicted to Irish ships and interdicts laid on Irish goods. Whole Custom-House Legislation taken away from Ireland etc. (See p. 22<sup>a</sup>.)

*Irish House of Commons. On 15 August 1785, after different previous stormy sittings, Orde had to abandon his Bill for the session, [and] for ever. Orde's Propositions merged into a secret design for the Union.*

11 August 1785. Curran had threatened with opposition, "not only by words".

12 August 1785. Curran:

"the Bill portends a surrender of the Constitution and Liberties of Ireland".

*Irish House of Commons. 14 February 1785. Bill for raising Militia. Against the Volunteers. (£20,000 for Militia.)*

1784 renewed effort for Reform. Henry Reilly, Sheriff of the County of Dublin, in consequence of a requisition, summoned his bailiwick

<sup>a</sup> Here and further on Marx refers to the main section of his manuscript (see pp. 240-41 of this volume).—Ed.

etc. for the **25 October 1784**, to elect members for a *national congress*. For this attached by the *King's Bench*, on a Crown Motion.

**24 February 1785** Brownlow moved *vote of censure on the judges of that Court*, for the attachment. *Rejected* by 113 to 71.

The endeavour to regain by corruption what was surrendered to force, began in 1782, and increased greatly after the defeat of Orde's Propositions.

*Irish House of Commons 13 March 1786*. Forbes moves to limit the amount of Pensions. This failed.

**12 March 1787**. Forbes renewed his Bill. Failed again.

*No Ministerial Responsibility in Ireland*.

*Irish House of Commons January 19, 1787*. Outrages in the South, caused by misery of the people, from tithes, rents, absenteeism, bad tenures, harsh treatment etc. (Since the end of 1791, United Irishmen, Political Parties united themselves with the peasants, the Republicans of the North.)

**1786**. Lord Lieutenant's Opening Speech referred to "frequent outrages" in the South, "Right Boys" of Kilkenny. Yet the only Bill, brought in by Government, the *Dublin Police Bill*, against which the City of Dublin petitioned.

**1787**. Viceroy's speech on this subject much more positive. Fitzgibbon accused the landlords of grinding the people, and abetting the disturbances against the clergy, asked for more powers.

**19 January 1787**. Fitzgibbon said the disturbances commenced in Kerry etc. "Captain Right". Spread then through Munster etc. Their object the tithes, then to regulate the price of lands, raise the price of labour, oppose the collection of hearth-money and other taxes.

*Curran during the debates:*

"You may talk of commerce extending ... but what, in God's name, have they to do with the wretched peasantry?"

**19 February 1787**. *Right Boy Bill*. Bill committed by 192 against 31. By it *Riot Act*, introduced from England, passed.

**20 February 1787**: Proposed to limit the Bill to Cork, Kerry, Limerick, Tipperary. Motion lost without a division. By this Bill capital punishment for tendering an oath etc.

**13 March 1787**. *Tithes*. Grattan moved, that if tranquillity [were] restored, at the opening of the next session, the House would consider the *Tithe Question*. Motion lost, without a division. *English Secretary* declared

"he was a stranger to the distress" and would "never have it considered by the Parliament".

This Riot Act to be enforced by the very same landed proprietors whom Fitzgibbon had accused of grinding the peasant and instigating him against the clergy.

*Marquis of Buckingham (formerly Earl of Temple) second time Viceroy. 16 December 1737-5 January 1790. (Orde Secretary!) (Fitzherbert Chief Secretary.)*

*Influence of French Revolution of 1789 commences during this period.*

*Irish House of Commons. 21 April 1789. Disfranchisement of Excise Officers' Bill. Rejected by 148 to 93.*

*25 April 1789: Dublin Police. Motion*

*"attended with waste, and useless patronage". Rejected by 132 to 78.*

*Regency Bill, 1789. George III mad for some time, concealed, at the end of 1788 it could no longer be hid. In the ministers' draft of the address in answer to Lord Buckingham they praised themselves.*

*6 February 1789 Grattan moved amendment. ([People] believed that Fox would become Premier Minister under the Prince of Wales.) Carried without a division.*

*11 February 1789 Ministers tried to postpone division on the Regency; their avowed motive to know the Resolutions of the British Parliament (appointing Prince Regent with limited powers). (These resolutions passed in England on 23 January, accepted by Prince 31 January, but had not yet reached the Irish Government.) Postponement refused. Prince nominated Prince Regent of Ireland with unlimited Powers. Passed without division.*

*12 February 1789 Conolly moves address, February 17 concurrence of Lords, 19 February presented to Buckingham. Refused to transmit it, 20 February 1789 Deputation to Prince appointed. Vote of Censure against Buckingham. 27 February 1789 Deputation (of the Commons) send them letter with "warmest thanks" of the Prince, 20 March 1789 still more fervent letter of the Prince to Irish House of Commons on recovery of his father's health.*

ADMINISTRATION OF JOHN FANE, EARL OF WESTMORELAND  
(CHIEF SECRETARY HOBART,  
AFTERWARDS EARL OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE)  
(5 JANUARY 1790—4 JANUARY 1795)

*House of Commons, 4 February 1790. Stamp officers' Salaries. (Proposed to cut them down and regulate them. Rejected by 141 to 81.) (Curran in his speech alludes to the French Revolution.)*

*11 February 1790. Forbes moves an address describing and censuring several recent pensions. Rejected by 136 to 92.*

Curran states, afterwards (speech in *House of Commons*, February 12, 1791):

"During the whole of the session of 1790, we have, in the name of the people of Ireland, demanded from them the *Constitution of Great Britain*, and it has been uniformly denied. We would have passed a law to restrain the shameful profusion of a pension-list—it was refused by a majority. We would have passed a law to exclude persons, who must ever be the chattels of the government, from sitting in this House. Refused by a majority. A bill to make some person, resident among you, and therefore amenable to public justice, responsible for the acts of your governors ... refused. [...] This uniform denial ... proof to the people of Ireland, that the imputation of corrupt practices is founded in fact."

### *Disputed Election of Lord Mayor in Dublin (1790)*

Citizens of Dublin pledged themselves to elect no one as *Lord Mayor* or *Member of Parliament* for the city, who held place or pension from Government.

16 April 1790 Aldermen choose *Alderman James*, a Police Commissioner, Lord Mayor for the ensuing year. Rejected by the Common Council, ditto 7 other names. They elected *Alderman Howison* (*Napper Tandy* led the popular party). Aldermen re-elect James. Before the Privy Council. Orders new election. Same farce repeated.

10 July 1790. Curran pleads before Privy Council for Howison. Privy Council for James, who resigns on 5 August 1790. Howison chosen [by the] Aldermen.

16 July 1790. *Napper Tandy* in Common Council carried Resolutions censuring Privy Council, Aldermen, and summoned meeting of freemen and freeholders at the Exchange. Adjourned to 3 August to draw up *State of Facts*, which [was] done accordingly.

24 July: Whig Club [passed] similar Resolutions. Their quarrel with *Fitzgibbon*.<sup>a</sup>

.....  
Insurrectionary outrages at Dublin on Camden's arrival. *Fitzwilliam's* recall triumph for the Separation party. *Irish Republic* soon object of the *United Irishmen*. Bulk of the Presbyterians of *Down*, *Antrim*, *Tyrone*, joined by multitudes of Catholics and Protestants in *Leinster*. Catholics of the North *Defenders* or *Ribbonmen*.

*Irish House of Commons* 4 May 1795. *Second Reading of the Emancipation Bill*. Rejected by 155 to 84. {An *Insurrection Bill* passed etc., law allowing the *Lord Lieutenant* to proclaim counties:

<sup>a</sup> The next, 9th, page of the manuscript is missing.—Ed.

magistrates obtained power of breaking into houses, and transporting to the navy all whom they suspected. *Indemnity* for magistrates guilty of illegality—giving the Lord Lieutenant *power of arrest without bail*—licensing the *introduction of foreign troops* (German), establishing the *Yeomanry Corps*.)

*Irish House of Commons 3 February 1796. Indemnity Bill.*

*25 February 1796. Insurrection Bill. {Right of arbitrary transportation to serve in the navy given to magistrates.} Curran:*

“bill for the *rich*, and against the *poor*”.

**Since end of March 1796** whole counties of Ireland proclaimed.

*13 October 1796. French war.* (Hoche was just assembling at Brest, and *Wolfe Tone, Grouchy*, and a part of the expedition, reached *Bantry Bay* on the *22 December*, left it only the *28*.)

*Camden opens Parliament. Resistance to France (Invasion!) and “popular passion and public opinion”.*

*Curran.* Government has instigated persecution of Catholics, for 2 years [they] murdered etc. *in one of the counties. Ponsonby's Amendment to Address rejected* by 149 to 12. Then [the] *Bill* (by *Attorney-General*) [was] passed, [the] *Bill* to empower the Lord Lieutenant to *take up and detain all such persons, as were suspected of treasonable practices* etc. It was read many times, once or twice committed for the morrow.

*14 October 1796. Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act.*

*17 October 1796. Catholic Emancipation Bill rejected.*

*6 January 1797. Hoche's Expedition.* Pelham brings down message of Viceroy for new war taxes.

*24 February 1797. Internal Defence. Yeomanry Infantry* etc. (p. 38).<sup>a</sup>

*18 March 1797. Disarming of Ulster.* Message of Camden. (*Proclamation of General Lake. Belfast. 13 March.*)

*15 May 1797. Curran, Grattan* etc. secede from the House.

*3 July 1797* House adjourned. *Castlereagh Chief Secretary.*

*14 October 1797. Orr* hanged for having administered *oath of the United Irishmen* to a private soldier (proven only by an informer etc.)

{*10 May 1795. Organisation of Ulster* (United Irishmen) completed. In *autumn 1796* made *military* in Ulster. Towards the *middle of 1797*, this system spread to *Leinster*. Only *19 February 1798* the *Executive of the United Irishmen* resolved

“that they would not be diverted from their purpose by anything which could be done in Parliament”.

<sup>a</sup> See this volume, pp.253-54.—*Ed.*

(Lose time for action.) *March 1798* Arthur O'Connor arrested, at Maidstone, in the act of embarking for France; *12 March*, Oliver Bond, McCann etc. at Oliver Bond's warehouse, Dublin. Shortly afterwards McNevin, Thomas Emmet, Sampson. *New Directory*. John Sheares one of it. *19 May*, just 4 days before the insurrection was to take place, *Lord Fitzgerald* pounced upon, *21 May 2 Sheares*. Thus the insurrection began without its designers to lead it.}

*23 May 1798* the insurrection commenced (Dublin), *17 July* Lord Castlereagh announced *its final defeat*.

*Treason trials were held in February and March 1798 before the beginning of the insurrection.<sup>a</sup> Free quarters. Slow tortures, under the pretence of forcing confessions etc. Summary executions. At the outbreak of the insurrection martial law proclaimed.*

*25 July 1798*. Negotiations of leaders from gaol with the Government. Settled *29 July*. (Released only by *peace of Amiens*, 1802!)

PITT'S PLAN TO ENFORCE AND PROVOKE THE REBELLION  
(P. 41 SQQ.)<sup>b</sup>

*1598-99 Elizabeth (Mountjoy and Carew); same 1798-99.*

*Earl of Carhampton. General Abercromby.*

*United Irishmen and Pitt. Prussia and Poles.*

*Castlereagh boasted that he had made the conspiracy explode. He charged the mine as well as fired it.*

*Pitt 1795 and 1797* opposed debates for pacification of Ireland in *British Parliament* on pretext that *it was an encroachment on Irish independence.*

LORD CORNWALLIS GOVERNMENT. UNION

*Pitt, Castlereagh, Cornwallis. (19 October 1781 Cornwallis's Capitulation at York Town, Virginia.)*

Cornwallis wants terror to carry the Union.

Happy accident for him:

*22 August 1798* about 1,000 French, under Humbert, entered Killala Bay, carried Castlebar *27 August*.

<sup>a</sup> This sentence is in German in the manuscript.—Ed

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 256-59.—Ed.



8 September surrendered at Ballinamuck. (*Hardy's* flotilla taken on 11 October with Tone, who died on 19 November.)

*Revival of horrors.*

40,000 troops in Ireland. *Martial Law* continuing (it was constantly renewed, and discontinued in 1801).<sup>a</sup>

House of Commons 22 January 1799. Legislative Union first proposed in Speech from the Throne (debate lasted 22 hours, until the *morning of 23 January*). Government obtained majority of 1, by open sale of certain *Fox*, lawyer.

2nd *debate*, on 5 o'clock of 23 January 1799, lasted till morning 24. Government defeated. 111 members decided against Union, 105 for. (*Voters* 216, *Absent* 84.)

*Lords Spiritual and Temporal* use this House of Commons' Opposition to get money etc. out of Government, stipulated for their sale.

*Cornwallis* bamboozles the *Catholic Bishops*; [their] disgusting subserviency.

Petitions, Addresses, Dubliners fired into for their rejoicings.

5 and 6 February 1800 Union accepted by Irish House of Commons. Still minority of 115 of a total of 273 votes. In interval between old and new Parliament corruption broadcast (pp. 48, 49<sup>b</sup>).

*Castlereagh's shameless measure.*

*The House of Commons* was surrounded by a British Regiment.

*Castlereagh* palpably purchased 25 members before the 2nd *division* in 1800, which made a difference of 50 votes in favour of Government. Thus Pitt and *Castlereagh* carried the Union.

Written in October-November 1869

Reproduced from the manuscript

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

<sup>a</sup> The sentence in brackets is in German in the manuscript.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, pp. 262-63.—*Ed.*

## Frederick Engels

[NOTES ON GOLDWIN SMITH'S BOOK  
*IRISH HISTORY AND IRISH CHARACTER*] <sup>326</sup>

1) GOLDWIN SMITH,  
*IRISH HISTORY AND IRISH CHARACTER*  
(PART OF IT IN NOTEBOOK III UNDER O'CONNOR <sup>327</sup>)

Goldwin Smith, *Irish History and Irish Character*, Oxford and London, Parker, 1861.

Behind the cloak of objectivity, the apologetic English bourgeois professor. Even from a geographical point of view, Ireland, he says, was destined to be subjugated by England, and he attributes the slow and incomplete conquest to the width of the Channel and to the position of Wales between England and Ireland.

Ireland is said to be a GRAZING COUNTRY by nature, see Léonce de Lavergne.<sup>a</sup> Smith thinks that

"it is difficult, over a great part of the island, to get in a wheat harvest ... its natural way to commercial prosperity seems to be to supply with the produce of its grazing and dairy farms the *population of England*" (p. 3).

There *are* coalfields in Ireland (p. 4).

The climate is supposed to have debilitated the Irish and retarded their development, in comparison with such BRACED PEOPLE as the Scandinavians

(and Laplanders?). On the other hand, the prospect is held out to the Irish

of the VILLAS OF NOBLES and MERCHANT PRINCES, such as can now be found in Scotland (p. 5)

(IN THE GROUSE MOORS AND DEER FORESTS!).

Greatly deplores the lack of *moderation* in Irish eloquence. Nevertheless the Irishman complements the Englishman, and it

---

<sup>a</sup> Léonce de Lavergne, *The Rural Economy of England, Scotland and Ireland*. Translated from the French. Edinburgh, 1855. See this volume, p. 159.—Ed.

would be unfortunate if as a result of emigration the Celtic element were DRAINED OFF.

Originally the clan or tribe [was] the social form common to all Celts (and to other nations)

in Wales as well. Soon more intermingling of the different clans in the Irish plain and loosening of ties within the clans; on the other hand [there existed] the rule of the more powerful over those who were weaker, the beginnings of monarchy. The main prerogative of the king seems to have been the exaction of tribute, rather than regular jurisdiction.

The FACTION FIGHTS of the Irish, TWO YEAR OLDS and THREE YEAR OLDS, are vestiges of the old clanships, as are also the COUNTY jealousies and COUNTY FIGHTS<sup>a</sup> (cf. the FIGHT between Cork and Tipperary on the emigrant ship).

The FAIRIES too have their FACTION and COUNTY FIGHTS<sup>b</sup> (cf. Kohl).<sup>328</sup>

The old loyalty to the clan chief and submission to his will explain much in the Irish character.<sup>c</sup>

The land of the clan [was] communal property. In this context Smith realises that in Ireland it was *never the Irishman, but only the Englishman who held land as private property*, although he merely says that private property confronted the Irishman only in the "form of insecurity, degradation, and despair" (p. 21).

Sir John Davies, pp. 135, 136,<sup>d329</sup> writes of the CHIEFRIES that "though they had *some portions of land allotted to them*", [their income] "did consist chiefly in *cuttings and cosheries and other Irish exactions*, whereby,

the English LAWYER says,

"they did spoil and impoverish the people at their pleasure. And when their chieftains were dead, their sons or next heirs did not succeed them but their tanists who were elective and *bought their election by strong hand*; and by the Irish custom of gavelkind, the inferior tenancies *were partable amongst all the males of the sept both bastards and legitimate* and after partition made, if anyone of the sept had died, his portion was not divided among his sons, but the chief of the sept made a new partition of all the lands belonging to the sept and gave everyone his part according to his antiquity."

Quoted p. 22.

The English LAWYERS are supposed to have called this, and TANISTRY in particular, "no estate, but only a transient and scambling possession", and Davies was entirely

<sup>a</sup> G. Smith, op. cit, pp. 15-17.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> J. G. Kohl, *Reisen in Irland*, Bd. I, Dresden und Leipzig, 1843, S. 34.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid, p. 19.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> Engels' note in the margin: "Davies, excerpts, pp. 4, 2."—Ed.

in agreement with this and also with the king being obliged to compel the people, if necessary by force, to accept CIVILITY,<sup>a</sup>

i.e. the English law.

How often a new division took place is not clear (!), certainly not at every death. (See Hallam.<sup>b</sup>)

*Every two or three years*, see Davies, excerpts, p. 82.<sup>c</sup> In any case it is obvious that because of the English conquest, the Irish up to 1600 had not yet gone beyond communal property! But Smith (p. 24) asserts that as early as the

"invasion the land which a member of a sept had occupied seems generally to have passed at his death, as a matter of course, *to all his sons*".

This is wrong; see Davies, who considers that partition still exists at least in the northern part of Ireland.<sup>d</sup>

Even today, he says, "spend me and defend me" is more natural to the Irish peasant than the relationship of landlord and tenant.

The term GAVELKIND was introduced into Ireland by English LAWYERS, for they confused Irish law with the Kentish GAVELKIND, which knows no primogeniture either (p. 25).

St. Bernard's pronouncement about the Irish Church, on the basis of which Henry II justified Adrian's Papal Bull,<sup>330</sup> because it was necessary to bring the whole church under the sway of Rome in the face of external enemies, contains nothing but trash:

1) They pay no first-fruits or tithes. 2) they do not properly marry

(i.e. not in accordance with the formalities prescribed by Rome),

nor do they go to confession (?), no one exhorts them to do penance and no one imposes a penance. Moreover, 3) there are far too few priests. But *all this had already been put right by St. Malachy, as St. Bernard himself admits. (De vita St. Malachiae, ch. 8.)*

Giraldus Cambrensis however repeats the same accusations:

they pay neither tithes nor first-fruits, disregard the "rites of marriage, do not come to church and marry the wives of deceased brothers".<sup>e</sup> In addition one can merely say that the hierarchy is incomplete, there are far too many bishops and for a long time there were no archbishops at all, and their ORDINATIONS are not quite lawful (p. 33).<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> J. Davies, *Historical Tracts*, London, 1786, pp. 134-35.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> H. Hallam, *The Constitutional History of England, from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II*, Vols. I-III, London, 1869.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> In the manuscript this is written above the preceding quotation.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> In the manuscript this remark is inserted between the lines.—Ed.

<sup>e</sup> Giraldus Cambrensis, *Topographia Hibernica, et Expugnatio Hibernica*. Edited by James F. Dimock, London, 1867, p. 289.—Ed.

<sup>f</sup> See St. Bernard, *De Vita S. Malachiae...*, Ch. 10; p. 33 refers to Smith's book.—Ed.

The only towns were those of the Danes  
(says Davies).<sup>a</sup>

That heathen elements are still evident in their religion is obvious, it was so everywhere. Thus in Ireland one can find "the pledge of blood" in addition to the touching of a relic when concluding an agreement, the noisy, orgiastic WAKES which accompany funerals, the fact that the right arm is not baptised etc.

In Germany and England one can find quite different things.

FOSTERAGES and the special emphasis laid on sponsorship (GOSSIPREDE) as being binding for life, are probably also of pagan origin. Cambrensis: "As for their own brethren and kinsmen, the Irish persecute them when living unto death, and avenge them when slain; while such love and fidelity as they show is confined to their foster-brethren and foster-children." Quoted p. 37.<sup>b</sup>

Marriage however seems to have been in a bad way, for Davies, p. 146,<sup>c</sup> speaks of "their common repudiation of their wives, their promiscuous generation of children, their neglect of lawful matrimony"; he associates this with "their uncleanness in apparel, diet, and lodging, and their contempt and scorn of all things necessary for the civil life of man".

The fact that in law BASTARD CHILDREN are placed on a par with legitimate children is connected with this but also with communal property.

The Irish squire of the last century is said to have still eaten at the same table with the RETAINERS of his HOUSEHOLD, almost like the old clan chief (p. 39).

The laws of the conquerors against bards and STROLLING SINGERS were directly political,

because they were the upholders of the NATIONAL tradition. As late as the end of the 18th century there were still a few old travelling harpists.<sup>d</sup>

But their Irish can no longer be understood today.

The Normans in Ireland "formed only a military colony, or rather garrison, holding its ground against the natives with difficulty, and living in a perpetual state of border war". From the outset therefore [they tried to gain the] ASCENDANCY. The Pale<sup>331</sup> was a part of feudal England on the other side of the Channel (p. 56).

The ENGLISH INTEREST and the ANGLO-IRISH INTEREST in the Pale arose already at that time. The Irish barons were jealous of the English officials who came from England, etc., and of those who also owned English ESTATES, and who for the most part were absentees<sup>332</sup> and remained English.

During the Wars of the Roses<sup>333</sup>

<sup>a</sup> The parenthesis was inserted later.—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Giraldus Cambrensis, op. cit., Vol. II, p. III; p. 37 refers to Smith's book.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> The page reference—which is not given in Smith's book—was presumably inserted by Engels later.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., p. 43.—*Ed.*

the government of the Pale became so weak that it entrusted the policing and keeping of order to the private BROTHERHOOD of St. George.<sup>a</sup>

(Moore sub anno 1472, not in the Chronology.)<sup>334</sup>

The Statute of Kilkenny<sup>335</sup> is said to be merely an act of self-defence AND there was NOTHING PECULIARLY MALIGNANT IN IT. That crimes against Irishmen were not punishable is said to have been the natural consequence of the fact that in Ireland two nations living in the same country were subject to two different codes of law!

"An Irishman who had murdered an Englishman would have been only fined for it by his Brehon!!"

Proof of this is

the affair of the sheriff whom an Irish chief was prepared to admit into his territory, provided the government fixed the wergeld to be paid for him should the case arise.<sup>b</sup>

The *quinque sanguines*<sup>c</sup> are correctly understood as 5 clans.

English statesmen, such as Spenser, Davies and Bacon, who were interested in Ireland, regarded "the settlement and subjugation of Wales by Edward I" as an ideal.<sup>d</sup>

At any rate Davies, see pages 105-07, notebook 3, 2.<sup>e 336</sup>

Finally under: Poyning's administration (Henry VII) every murder was made punishable according to English law<sup>f</sup>

(i.e. within the Pale). Almost all his laws are said to *have benefited Ireland*, because they placed IMPERIAL (here it is simply a euphemism for English) INTERESTS AND POLICY above ASCENDANCY (!).

"It can hardly be doubted that the most obnoxious of his statutes, as they tended to make imperial policy and imperial interests paramount over the policy and interests of ascendancy, were at the time of their enactment beneficial to the *Irish people*""!! (p. 73).

These Acts were effective only within the Pale, and not a trace of the Irish people could be found there! (Davies, pp. 136-39.)<sup>g</sup>

He claims that with Henry VIII and Wolsey "the deep and reflecting statecraft of a politic age now began to appear" in the Irish administration of the regents sent to Ireland (p. 74).

<sup>a</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., p. 66.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> Engels' note in the margin: "Davies, pp. 134, 135; notebook pp. 4, 2; Spenser, p. 20."—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Five bloods. See this volume, p. 292.—Ed.

<sup>d</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., p. 71.—Ed.

<sup>e</sup> This note was inserted later.—Ed.

<sup>f</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., pp. 72-73.—Ed.

<sup>g</sup> The source reference was inserted later.—Ed.

Yes indeed, the French wars and the Wars of the Roses had come to an end!

The war against the Geraldines<sup>337</sup> in the reign of Henry VIII was waged by both sides with great cruelty and caused much destruction; in addition there was treachery and perfidity on the part of the English against Fitzgerald and his five uncles, and against others as well.

Under Elizabeth "there was corruption, corruption in the very vilest form, corruption which preferred war to peace because war held out hopes of lucre which peace threatened to destroy".

Then, in the age of the adventurers,

"the eagle took wing for the Spanish main, the vultures descended upon Ireland"....

But in Ireland, too, Raleigh had a castle and an estate granted to him at Lismore. Wakefield, Vol. I, p. 70.<sup>a 338</sup>

"A dexterous use of intrigue, chicanery and the art of inciting to rebellion, procured for the sharper in Ireland wealth ... in the shape of confiscated lands" (p. 79).

In 1561 Shane O'Neill came to England with a guard of GALLOWGLASSES, who were bareheaded, wore GLIBS, SAFFRON shirts, short skirts and shaggy cloaks and were armed with *hatchets*<sup>b</sup>

(at a time when muskets were in use!).

P. 86. Elizabeth's expenditure for the war in Ireland amounted to at least £4-500,000 per annum, hence the counterfeit money. "Assuredly whoever may have profited by the misery and depression of Ireland, *it has not been the English nation.*" (!!) "To the English nation Ireland has been a source of expense, danger, and weakness without intermission from the conquest almost down to the present hour."

And à qui la faute?<sup>c</sup> Surely that of THE ENGLISH NATION!

James is said to have been obliged to create SHAM BOROUGHS, not only to obtain a majority, but also because there were no real boroughs!!! (p. 96).

Just as Potemkin's villages had likewise been a historical necessity.<sup>339</sup> Good for the reformers.

Sir Thomas Smith's first colonies "were planted in Down and Antrim on lands which were *presumed in law to be vacant* by the attainder of O'Neill". This failed, "the native occupants, says Hallam, not acquiescing in this doctrine of our lawyers".

Arthegal in Spenser's *Faerie Queene* is LORD DEPUTY Gray.

<sup>a</sup> Engels wrote the passage from "But in Ireland..." to "... Vol. I, p. 70." in the margin and marked the place for it in the text.—Ed.

<sup>b</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., p. 80.—Ed.

<sup>c</sup> Whose fault is it?—Ed.

"When the chieftains of the septs O'More and O'Connell<sup>a</sup> were attainted, in the reign of Mary"

(King's and Queen's Counties),<sup>340</sup>

"the septs pleaded that the chieftain could not by his attainder forfeit the sept land *which he never had possessed*. A feeling that the land was still theirs and that they were unjustly kept out of their possessions ... is perhaps not extinct even at the present day" (p. 101).

To show his impartiality, Strafford also extorted considerable sums from the colonists of Londonderry, because they had committed a small formal BREACH OF THE COVENANT, thus arousing the wrath of London, the mother city, against him and Charles.<sup>b</sup>

"It is not too much to say that the English Puritans regarded the Irish Catholics, after O'Neill's massacre, with the rage of the Orangeman<sup>341</sup> towards the Papists added to the rage of the Englishman of Calcutta towards the Sepoy mutineer<sup>342</sup> (p. 113).

so that on the whole, Cromwell countenanced as few murders as he possibly could.

Cromwell's transportation of Irish rebels to the West Indies to be employed there *as slaves* is said to be less harsh

"than the measure which the Catholic House of Austria dealt at the same time to the Protestants of Bohemia and other conquered provinces in the Thirty Years' War" (p. 114).

*To be looked up.*<sup>343</sup>

In defence of the judicial murder of Archbishop Plunket [he says that] although Titus Oates' plot was an invention, "there was a Popish plot for the extirpation of Protestantism and liberty throughout Europe, of which the King of France<sup>c</sup> was the powerful head, of which the Jesuits were the restless and unscrupulous agents, in which the King and the heir presumptive to the crown<sup>d</sup> were deeply engaged and which all but overthrew the religion and liberties of England in the next reign" (p. 119).

*Not a word about the breach of the Treaty of Limerick.*<sup>344</sup>

"James II issued a mandatè nominating a Papist to the Professorship of the Irish language in Trinity College. It turned out that *no such Professorship existed*" (p. 135).

The money which the ABSENTEES take with them is said to be mainly expended on unproductive work and thus for the most part lost in any case; therefore it does not matter much that the money is not spent in Ireland (p. 144).

What does the West End of London say to this?

<sup>a</sup> A mistake in Smith's book, it should be "O'Connor".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> Charles II.—*Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> Louis XIV.—*Ed.*

<sup>d</sup> The Duke of York, later James II.—*Ed.*



In his *Modest Proposal*, Swift speaks of young unemployed Irishmen (A. D. 1729) "who either turn thieves for want of work or leave their dear native country to fight for the Pretender,<sup>a</sup> or sell themselves to the Barbadoes".<sup>b</sup>

That is into slavery lasting for a longer or shorter time.

He then proposes that some of the children be assigned to the butcher, and in his *Maxims* he suggests that the Irish be permitted to sell their surplus population into slavery.<sup>c</sup>

Even before the reign of James II the potato is said to have been the symbol and REPROACH OF IRELAND. Under James II "an Irish deputation was followed about the streets of London by a mob with potatoes stuck on poles" (p. 150).

Ireland's distress ... "overflowed to England, and bringing pauperism" (!) "and disease" (!) "into our great cities, punished England for whatever share she may have had in Irish wrongs" (p. 151).

According to Phelan's *Remains*, Vol. II, p. 42, the landlords preferred Catholic SERFS to Protestant TENANTS, especially because the former always offered to pay the highest rent. The Protestants therefore emigrated to America.

(No date mentioned.)

MacGeoghegan says in his *History of Ireland*<sup>345</sup>: "from calculations and researches made at the French war-office, it has been ascertained that from the arrival of the Irish troops in France in 1691, up to 1745, the year of the battle of Fontenoy, more than 450,000 Irishmen died in the service of France."

In the independent Irish Parliament before the Union

(according to an INQUIRY MADE [in] 1784 FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT) out of "300 seats 116 were shared among 25 proprietors (one nobleman had 16) and that the government could count on 86 votes of members for proprietary seats, the owners of which let them out for titles, places or pensions, 12 votes of their own, 45 votes of placemen, and 32 of gentlemen who had promises or had avowed their expectations" (Massey, *History of England*, Vol. III, p. 264).

And what about the English Parliament of the time?

Sir Jonah Barrington was JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT OF ADMIRALTY IN IRELAND.

Pitt would have given parliamentary reform and Catholic Emancipation to Ireland, but his

"liberal policy ... was fatally arrested and the world" (!) "was flung into dismay, despair of liberty and absolutist reaction, by the tremendous eruption of absurdity, cruelty, and ultimately of military vanity and rapacity, which Frenchmen imagine to be the grandest and most beneficent event in history" (p. 165).

No trace of objectivity remains here.

"An alien and disaffected element incorporated in a nation can only be a source of internal division and weakness. It would be better in every point of view, that

<sup>a</sup> The Old Pretender, James Francis Edward Stuart, Chevalier de St. George.— *Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See G. Smith, op. cit., p. 147.— *Ed.*

<sup>c</sup> G. Smith, op. cit., p. 148. Smith has *Modest Proposal* instead of *Maxims*.— *Ed.*

the British Empire should be reduced to a single island, to England, to Yorkshire, or Kent, *than that it should include anything which is not really its own*" (p. 179).

!! *Donc*—! After 700 years of struggle!

Federation, he declares, is impossible between Ireland and England (*he does not speak of a real federation with a federal parliament responsible for federal affairs, but only of a personal union*).

"This dog-collar-union, two independent parliaments and two independent governments linked together by a nominal allegiance to the same crown ... must be an irony or a nuisance" and would end either in complete separation or in the rule of the English parliamentary government over Ireland too, as between 1782 and 1798, as a result of corruption and intrigue (p. 181).

What about Sweden and Norway? And Austria-Hungary?<sup>346</sup>

"The course of events has left no basis whereon Irish nationality can be established." The Irish and the English are said to be composed of the same elements, although in different proportions ... "but what is of most importance and in fact *almost decisive*, the language of both islands is the same" (p. 183).

Hence, the two are *one* nation and separation of any kind is absurd! As though the English language had not made the Irishman even more Irish!

From p. 184 onwards [he deals with] "the agrarian outrages, of which the *surplus population was the main cause*"!!<sup>a</sup>

#### GOLDWIN SMITH. CONCLUSION

#### (PASSAGES QUOTED WORD FOR WORD AND ADDENDA)

"The dampness of the climate, while it is the source of vegetable wealth and vegetable beauty, could not fail to relax the energies of the people and to throw them back in the race of nations for preeminence in things requiring physical exertions. We see this when we compare the early history of the Irish with that of the Scandinavians, braced to daring and enterprise by the climate of the North" (p. 4).

Edward III and Henry V fought the battles of Crécy, Poitiers, etc., in France,<sup>347</sup> "on these famous fields where, in the overthrow of the French chivalry by peasant hands, feudalism found its grave!" (p. 65, see below p. 71).<sup>b</sup>

#### *Statute of Kilkenny:*

"*There is nothing peculiarly malignant in the attempt* of that Statute to restore a sharp division between the English and the natives. The object of the framers was not to prevent the beneficial fusion of the two races into one nation, but to prevent the one which they very naturally and rightly thought the more civilised, from degenerating into the barbarism of the other; and at the same time to check the increase of the 'rebel' elements in the country ... the same legislators forbid, under

<sup>a</sup> After this paragraph there follows the note: "(For the end see p. 5)".—*Ed.*

<sup>b</sup> See this volume, p. 292.—*Ed.*

the severest penalties, the making of private war upon the Irishry,<sup>348</sup> and the exciting them to war" (p. 68).

(Very kind!)

"It sounds shocking that the killing of an Irishman by an Englishman should have been no felony and that it should have been a good plea to an indictment for murder that the murdered person was not an Englishman nor a member of one of the five 'bloods' or septs which had been admitted within the pale of English law. *But nothing more is in fact implied in this than that the Irish were not under the English but under the native or Brehon jurisdiction.* The existence of two races in the same country under different laws, and with different punishments for crimes, inconceivable as it appears now"

(he does not know the Levant!),

"appeared quite natural at a time when the distinction of races was far stronger and when law was the peculiar custom of the race, not a set of principles common to all mankind. It would have been the same in England had the Anglo-Saxons succeeded in obtaining from {William} the Conqueror 'the laws of Edward the Confessor'. One kingdom would then have contained two nations, the Normans and the Saxons, living under different penal codes. *The rule of impunity held good for both sides. An Irishman who had murdered an Englishman would have been only fined for it by his Brehon.* The Government having on one occasion desired a native chief to receive a sheriff into his territories, the chief consented, but at the same time desired the Government to say what sum of money, or eric, they set upon the sheriff's head, in order that, if he was killed, that sum might be duly assessed upon the sept" (p. 69).

*England* as a government is said to have always been well disposed towards Ireland:

"The truth is that the Plantagenet Government, when it found time to attend to Ireland, intended not evil but good to the Irish people (p. 68)... The English Government was not unwilling to admit the Irishry to the English law. Five *whole septs*" (!!)"the five bloods ... were admitted collectively, and individual denization seems to have been freely granted" (pp. 69-70).

But the bad Irish barons did not want this and it is they who frustrated the good intentions of the government (pp. 68, 69).

"*The idea that the English Government deliberately excluded the Irish from the pale of humanity vanishes away*" (p. 70).

(Certainly—in his mind!)

"*From the ruins of the feudal aristocracy which the Wars of the Roses had laid in the dust, arose the powerful monarchy of the Tudors*" (p. 71).

Hence it had not found its grave as a result of those battles in France!

"At no period of the struggle" (Henry VIII and Elizabeth) "unhappily could England put forth her whole power to *strike, in mercy*, a decisive blow" (p. 77).

### Under Elizabeth:

"Finally, there was corruption; corruption in the very vilest form; corruption which preferred war to peace because war held out hopes of lucre which peace threatened to destroy. The great events and discoveries of the Elizabethan era produced a love of adventure which broke forth in every direction, and varied in the dignity of its objects and its character, from the height of heroism to the depth of baseness. The eagles took wing for the Spanish main; the vultures descended upon Ireland. A daring use of his sword procured for the adventurer in the Spanish colonies romantic" (!) "wealth in the shape of ingots and rich bales; a dexterous use of intrigue, chicanery and the art of inciting to rebellion, procured for the sharper in Ireland wealth less romantic but more solid and lasting in the shape of confiscated lands" (p. 79).

"The reign" (of James I) "began well, with a broad act of oblivion" (?). "Even the arch-rebel Tyrone was received into favour"

(! after all, he had made his peace even before the death of Elizabeth!) (p. 94).

By the judgment of the King's Bench<sup>349</sup> (1605) which stated that Irish TENURE was unlawful, and introduced English law, "*the chiefs gained a boon* by having their demesne lands and their territorial rights finally made hereditary instead of elective" (p. 95).

Ten years later living in exile and completely expropriated these chiefs (those of them that still lived in 1605) were able to ponder what a *BOON* it was!

"There seems no reason to doubt that it was in honest pursuance of *the same policy of civilising and conciliating*" (!!)"*the Irish*, by giving them English institutions, that a Parliament more regular and comprehensive than any which had preceded, was called for all Ireland, without distinction of race or religion." (??) "It is true that the Government took *active measures to obtain a majority*, and that it created a number of rotten, or rather of sham boroughs. But it does not seem that freedom of election was *otherwise*" (!!)"interfered with" (!) (pp. 95-96)... "It was *necessary* to create sham boroughs, not only to give the Government a majority, *but also because real boroughs there were none*" (!!) (p. 96).

"*It appears, to say the least, extremely doubtful* whether the lands of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, on which the Ulster colony was planted, had been forfeited for any real offence *and whether the plot in which these noblemen were alleged to have been engaged, was not invented by the teeming brain of officials* desirous of sharing their estates. They fled, it is true, but not from justice; for justice, when the forfeiture of land was in prospect, there was none" (p. 100).

He asserts that in 1640 and 1641, Richelieu and the Pope<sup>a</sup> fomented civil war in England and Ireland, and the Irish officers who had returned from France and Spain also added fuel to it. Then came the Catholic rising

"with that great massacre of the Protestants in Ulster which is connected with the name of Sir Phelim O'Neill.<sup>350</sup> To doubt that there was a great massacre seems

<sup>a</sup> Urban VIII.—*Ed.*

idle, since Clarendon,<sup>a</sup> a contemporary, well informed and sober writer, reckoned the number of persons killed at 40 or 50,000" (!). "It seems not less idle to doubt which party struck the first blow; as well might it be doubted which party struck the first blow in the Sicilian Vespers.<sup>351</sup> An abstract of depositions describing some of the scenes which occurred in the massacre has been preserved by Rushworth (*Collections*, Vol. IV, p. 405).<sup>b</sup> It presents an appalling but *perfectly credible* picture of the vengeance which a people brutalised by oppression wreaks, in the moment of its brief triumph, on the oppressor. *Well might phantoms of horror haunt the accursed spots and the ghosts of the murdered be heard to shriek from beneath the bridge at Portnadown*" (pp. 107-08).

This is again very vague!

"Under the Protectorate" (Cromwell) "... the Protestant community at least (in Ireland) presented a picture of prosperity such as the island had never before seen" (??) (p. 114).

This sycophant regards Macaulay as A GREAT WRITER.

"It would be as easy to sing of the siege of Troy after Homer, as to write about the siege of Londonderry after Macaulay" (p. 120).

While he advises the Irish (see Preface)

"to pay more attention to general causes"

so as to be able to explain away such infamies in an objective manner, he always attributes the actions of the Irish to petty parochial causes. Thus under James II:

"The Irish people, it has been justly observed, in entering upon the civil war, were moved, not by attachment to the House of Stuart or to its political principles, but, like the Highland Clans, by *motives of their own* ... probably the mass of James's party, though they were fighting for the Catholic religion, were fighting less for the Catholic religion than for that old and terrible subject of Irish civil wars, the *land*" (p. 121).

(That is their own land!).

"*Land* had been the great source of contention and misery in Ireland throughout her history" (p. 125).

Not the Englishmen's greed for land, but the *land* itself must be blamed for it. IT'S CHITTY THAT'S DONE IT.

"Their descendants" (the descendants of Cromwell's landlords) "became probably the very worst Upper Class with which a country was ever afflicted. The habits of the Irish gentry grew beyond measure brutal and reckless, and the *coarseness* of their *debaucheries* would have disgusted the crew of Comus. Their *drunkenness*, their *blasphemy*, their *ferocious duelling*, left the squires of England far behind" (!). "If there was a grotesque side to their vices which mingles laughter to

<sup>a</sup> E. H. Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland, Begun in the Year 1641*, Oxford, 1712.— Ed.

<sup>b</sup> J. Rushworth, *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State...*, London, 1682.— Ed.

our reprobation, this did not render their influence *less pestilent* to the community of which the malice of destiny had made them the social chiefs. Fortunately their recklessness was sure, in the end, to work, to a certain extent, its own cure; and in the background of their swinish and uproarious drinking bouts, the Encumbered Estates Act rises to our view" (p. 140).<sup>352</sup>

"In 1778 the *increasing spirit of toleration* began sensibly to exert its power" and the worst PENAL LAWS were repealed. In "1778 Lord North proposed (somewhat under duress, it is true) large relaxations of the iniquitous and absurd restrictions on Irish trade ... two years later the same minister, taught wisdom by his American disasters, proposed and carried further concessions. Twenty years more, and Mr. Pitt, having come into power *instinct with all the liberal ideas* of the new era, extinguished one" (!) "source of misery and discord by giving Ireland a *full measure of Free Trade*"

(that is with England!)

"as an article of the Union" (!) (pp. 158-59).

The "nice *spirit* of toleration", the "liberal ideas of the new era", etc., have brought all this about. Not the Englishman's fear of the Americans and French! These are the "*general causes*" which have to be kept in mind, but by no means the real ones!

"Among the phantoms of hatred and suspicion which arose from this field of carnage, was the horrible idea that the English Government had intentionally stimulated the Irish people into rebellion in order to pave the way for the Union. *No evidence in support of this charge can be produced*" (p. 176).

"A nation must be very shallow or very depraved which, in the meridian light of modern philosophy, can imagine that a mere extension of its territory, unsanctioned by nature and morality, can add to its greatness" (p. 179).

And this when the English have been engaged in conquests throughout the century!

Conclusion:

"The original source of the calamities of Ireland was the partial character of the Norman Conquest, which caused the conquerors instead of becoming an upper class, to remain a mere hostile settlement or Pale.... The next great source of mischief was the disruption of Christendom at the period of the Reformation and the terrible religious wars which ensued upon that disruption and into which both nations, in common with the other nations of Europe, were drawn. Then Ireland became a victim to the attempt of Louis XIV, which was in part a sequel of the religious wars, to destroy the liberty and religion of England through his vassals, the House of Stuart. Finally the French Revolution breaking out into anarchy, massacre and atheism, at the moment when the Government of England under Pitt had just entered on the path of reform and toleration, not only arrested political progress in this as in other cases, but involved Ireland in another civil war" (p. 193).

Again fine "general causes"! As general as possible!

Preface:

"It" (this book) "would serve a good purpose if it should fall into the hands of any popular writer on Irish history, and induce him to pay more attention than writers

on that subject have generally paid to *general causes*, to cultivate *the charities of history* and in the case of the rulers as well as of the people, to take fair account of misfortunes as well as of crimes."

On Ireland's INDEPENDENCE, p. 180:

"Independence would of course be feasible in itself if it could only be accompanied by geographical separation; *but so close a neighbourhood would involve contact and contact would bring on collision*"

(hence as on the Continent where the countries are in direct contact?);

"rivalry, jealousy, hostility would spring up all the more certainly because there would be between the two countries the memory of a former union and of a recent divorce; and Ireland, menaced by the power of England, would become the ward and the vassal of France, or some other foreign power which for its own purposes would constitute itself her protector."

All this applies also to Russia and Poland, to Hungary and Austria and indeed between 1815 and 1859 to Austria and Italy, and to every case of subjugation. It is appropriate that England's former infamies have to serve as a pretext for the infamies committed at the present time.

Federation in this case requires two partners of equal strength, "but it could not be naturally or usefully formed between two states one of which is far more powerful than the other, since in the Federal Council the vote of the more powerful would always prevail".

Written in November 1869

Printed according to the manuscript

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