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FOREWORD

"In Italy as in Russia there was quite a significant number of such young people, incomparably more than in any other country." (p. 7).

"Indeed, perhaps nowhere is the social revolution as close as in Italy" (p. 8).

"In Italy there predominates that destitute proletariat who are spoken of with such profound contempt by Messrs. Marx and Engels, and in their wake the whole school of German Social-Democrats, and quite mistakenly, since it is in this class and this class alone and by no means in the bourgeois stratum of the working masses referred to above that the entire intelligence and the entire strength of the coming social revolution is to be found" (p. 8).

Contrast the German situation: here the government can rely, on the one hand, on its excellent army, and, on the other hand,

"on the patriotism of its loyal subjects, on boundless national ambition and on that ancient, historical and no less boundless servility and worship of power which to this day characterise the German nobility, the German burghers (bourgeoisie), the German bureaucracy, the German church, the entire guild of German scholars and, under their combined influence, frequently enough, alas, the German nation itself" (p. 11).

"As can be seen, Prussia has swallowed up Germany. This means that as long as Germany remains a state, it will necessarily remain the prime and chief representative and a constant source of all possible despots in Europe", despite any pseudo-liberal, constitutional, democratic and even Social-Democratic forms" (p. 11).
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a [M. A. Bakunin.] Государственность и анархия. Часть I. [Geneva,] 1873.— Ed.

b Here and below Marx indicates in brackets pages in Bakunin’s book.— Ed.
Ever since the middle of the 16th century and up to 1815 the chief source of all reactionary movements was Austria (i.e. the representative of Germany); from 1815 to 1848 divided between Austria and Prussia, with the former predominating (Metternich) (p. 12); "from 1815 this Holy Alliance of pure German reaction was joined, much more for sport than for profit, by our Tartar-German, all-Russian, imperial knout" (p. 13).

To shift the responsibility from themselves the Germans try to persuade themselves and others that Russia was the chief instigator of the Holy Alliance. "In contrast to the German Social-Democrats, whose programme has as its first goal the establishment of a Pan-Germanic Empire, the Russian social revolutionaries are striving primarily to bring about the utter dissolution of our" (the Russian) "Empire", etc. (p. 13).

In the interest of the truth, «not from any wish to defend the policy of the Petersburg cabinet» (p. 13), Bakunin replies to the Germans as follows. (So as not to have to mention the creation of Prussia with Russian help, which had been forthcoming ever since Peter I, the great man overlooks the alliance under Catherine, as well as Russian influence over France since the Revolution and up to and including Louis Philippe.) (He likewise ignores the fact that from the beginning of the 18th century Russia had intrigued with England with the aim of subjugating Europe.) He starts with Alexander I and Nicholas and depicts their activities as follows:

«Alexander rushed hither and thither, bustled about and made a great fuss; Nicholas gave black looks and uttered threats. But that was the end of it. They did nothing ... because they could not, since their friends, the Austrian and Prussian Germans, prevented them from acting; they had only been assigned an honorary role of playing the bogeyman» (intimidation), «the only countries to move were Austria, Prussia and—finally [under the leadership and with the consent of both]—the French Bourbons who moved against Spain»541 (pp. 13, 14).

Russia only once crossed her frontiers and that was in 1849, to rescue Austria from the Hungarian revolution.542 Apart from that she also suppressed the Polish revolution twice in this century with the aid of Prussia543 which had as great an interest in this as herself. Of course, «a Russia of the people is unthinkable without Polish independence and freedom» (p. 14).

Neither intelligence, power or wealth can give Russia such predominance as to entitle her to a «decisive say» in Europe (p. 14).

Russia can only take action at the behest of a Western power. (Thus Frederick II called on Catherine to partition Poland544 and almost Sweden as well.)

As for the revolutionary movement in Europe, Russia, finding herself in the hands of Prussian politicians, played the role of bogeyman and not infrequently that of the screen behind which they were adept at concealing their own aggressive and reactionary manoeuvres. After their recent victories,545 they no longer need this and don't do it any more (p. 15).

Now with Bismarck, Berlin is the visible chief and capital of reaction in Europe (p. 16). Reaction (Roman Catholic) in Rome, Versailles, and to some extent in Vienna and Brussels; knout-reaction in Russia; but the living, «intelligent», really «powerful» reaction is concentrated in Berlin and is spreading from the new German Empire to all parts of Europe, etc. (p. 16).

"The federal organisation of the workers' associations, groups, communities, sects and ultimately of regions and peoples, from below—this sole precondition of true, non-fictional
freedom—is as opposed to their nature as any economic autonomy is incompatible with them—(p. 17).

Representative democracy (представительная демократия) on the other hand has two requirements for its success: state centralisation and the actual subjugation of the sovereign people by an intellectual minority which governs and unfailingly exploits it, while ostensibly representing it—(p. 17).

"The essence of our Tartar-German Empire"—(p. 14).

The new German Empire is warlike; it must conquer or be conquered (pp. 17, 18): it has a "compelling aspiration to become a world state"—(p. 18). Hegemony is merely the modest expression of this aspiration; its precondition is the weakness and subjugation of as many of the surrounding empires as possible. The last French Empire had this role, at present the German has it, and "In our view the German state is the only true state in Europe"—(p. 19).

"State" (empire, royaume); "ruler" (souverain, monarque, empereur, roi); rule (régner, dominer). (In German, on the other hand, Reich originally referred only to a piece of territory (large or small) with definite boundaries, named after the tribe, etc., the people it belonged to. For example, the region of the Upper Palatinate on the Regen up to Viechtach was called the Viechtreich; Achnreich; Vrankryk (in the Netherlands); the Reich of Nimwegen; Reich of Megen; the district of Trarbuch on the Moselle is still called Cröverreich to this day; Westreich is another region on the Moselle.)

France's "career as a state" is at an end; anyone who knows anything of the character of the French knows like us (Bakunin) that as France was able to be the "predominant power" for so long, she will find it impossible to accept a secondary position or even one of equality with others. She will prepare for a new war, for revenge, for the re-establishment of her lost primacy (p. 19). But will she achieve it? Surely not. The latest events have shown that patriotism, the highest civic virtue (эта высшая государственная добродетель) no longer exists in France (p. 19). The patriotism of the upper classes is nothing more than vanity which, however, they will abandon in favour of their real interests, as the last war demonstrated. The French rural population displayed just as little patriotism. Peasants ceased to be patriots once they became property owners. Only in Alsace and Lorraine, as if in mockery of the Germans, did French patriotism make its appearance. Patriotism survives now only in the urban proletariat. This is the main reason why the hatred of the propertied classes turned against them. But they are not patriotic in the true sense, because they are socialist (fraternal towards the workers of all other countries). They took up arms not against the German people, but against Germanic military despotism (pp. 20-22). The war began only four years after the First Geneva Congress and the propaganda of the International created "especially" among the workers—of Latin origin—a new antipatriotic outlook (p. 22).

---

a I.e. the nature of modern capitalist production and bank speculation.—Ed.
b Bakunin has "at least all the surrounding states".—Ed.
c Kingdom.—Ed.
d Sovereign, monarch, emperor, king.—Ed.
e Govern, dominate.—Ed.
1 Bakunin has: "social-estates".—Ed.
This also became apparent at a meeting in Vienna in 1868. "In response to a whole series of political and patriotic proposals," made by the young German bourgeois democrats, the workers replied by saying that they were being exploited by them, had always been deceived and oppressed by them, and that all workers of all countries were their brothers. The international camp of working men was their only fatherland, the international world of exploiters their only enemy (pp. 22, 23). As proof they sent a telegram "to their Paris brethren, the pioneers of workers' liberation throughout the world." (p. 23). This reply raised quite a furor in Germany; it sent waves of panic through all bourgeois democrats, including even Johann Jacoby, and "not only wounded their patriotic feelings but also offended against the official faith [Geburtsstimmung der Vaterland]" of the school of Lassalle and Marx. Probably on the advice of the latter, Mr. Liebknecht, who is now one of the leaders of the German Social-Democrats, but who was at the time still a member of the bourgeois-democratic party (the defunct People's Party), immediately left Leipzig for Vienna to have negotiations (nachzuspüren) with the Viennese workers about the "political tactlessness" that had given rise to the scandal. In justice to him it must be said he acted so successfully that only a few months later, namely in August 1868, at the Nuremberg Congress of German workers, all the leaders of the Austrian proletariat subscribed without protest to the narrower patriotic programme of the Social-Democratic Party (pp. 23, 24). This revealed "the profound gulf between the political leanings of the leaders of the Party, all of whom were more or less learned and bourgeois, and the revolutionary instincts of the German or at least the Austrian proletariat itself." However, such instincts have barely developed in Germany and Austria since 1868, but have come on famously in Belgium, Italy, Spain and above all in France (p. 24). The French workers are fully conscious that, as social revolutionaries, they are working for the whole world (p. 25), "and more for the world than for themselves" (p. 25). "This dream" (эта мечта) "has become second nature to the French proletariat and has expelled the last vestiges of imperial patriotism from their minds and their hearts" (p. 26). When the French proletariat issued its call to arms, it was in the conviction that it was fighting as much for the freedom and rights of the German proletariat as for its own (p. 26). "They were not fighting for greatness and honour, but for victory over the hated military power, which in the hands of the bourgeoisie had been the means of their oppression. They detested the German army, not because it was German, but because it was an army" (p. 26). The uprising of the Paris Commune against the Versailles National Assembly and against the saviour of the fatherland—Thiers—makes crystal-clear the nature of the passion which alone motivates the French proletariat today for whom only a social-revolutionary war continues, etc., to exist (p. 27). In their passion for social revolution "they proclaimed the ultimate dissolution of the French Empire, the shattering of the imperial unity of France, which is incompatible with the autonomy of the French Communities (communautés). The Germans only reduced the frontiers and the power (Cassel) of their political fatherland; they however aimed to "victor" (kill, destroy) it entirely, and as if to symbolise their treasonable intent, they toppled into the dust the Vendôme Column, the revered memorial of French glory" (pp. 27).

Hence the state on the one hand, the social revolution on the other (p. 29). This struggle at its sharpest in France; even among the peasants, at least in Southern France (p. 30). "And this hostile antagonism between two new

---

a Bakunin has: "South German and Austrian". — Ed.

irreconcilable worlds constitutes the second reason why it is impossible for France to become once again a state of the first rank, the predominant state." (p. 30). The men of Versailles, the stock exchange, the bourgeoisie, etc., lost their heads when Thiers announced the withdrawal of the Prussian troops (p. 31). "That is to say, the curious patriotism of the French bourgeoisie looks to the ignominious capitulation of the fatherland for its salvation." (p. 31).

"The sympathies for the Spanish revolution, evinced so clearly nowadays by French workers, particularly in Southern France, where the proletariat evidently longs for fraternal alliance with the Spanish proletariat and would even like to form a "people"'s federation with them, based on free labour and collective ownership" (p. 32).

Народ, people, nation (natio, naci—something born, birth)—

"despite all national differences and state frontiers—these sympathies and aspirations, I say, prove that for the French proletariat above all, as well as for the privileged classes, the age of imperial patriotism is over" (p. 32).

"How then can such an ancient, incurably sick state—like France—take on the youthful and hitherto still healthy German state?" (p. 33)? No form of state, no republic however democratic, can give the people what it needs, "i.e. the free (free—free, but also unbridled) organisation of its own interests from below (снизу вверх), without any interference, tutelage, compulsion from above, because every such statehood (государство), even the most republican and most democratic, even the so-called people's state (многонародное государство) «which has never been thought up by Mr. Marx, is in essence—nothing but the government of the masses from above by an intelligent and hence privileged minority, which rules as if it comprehended the real interests of the people better than the people itself»" (pp. 34, 35).

Since therefore the properised classes cannot satisfy the passion and the aspirations of the people, "only one means is left them—state force (государственное насилие), in a word, the «state», because the actual meaning of «state» is «force» (violence, violence, force), «government by force» (force), concealed if possible, but if the worst comes to the worst, ruthless force, etc." (p. 35). Gambetta cannot mend matters here; the desperate struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat (in France) "calls for the deployment of all means and forces at the disposal of the government (the state), thus leaving no means at all to open up to enable the French Empire to maintain its external supremacy over the European powers": "How could it compete with Bismarck's empire?" (p. 37). France must submit to the superior leadership, the friendly tutelage of the German Empire, just as the Italian state had to bow to the policies of the French (pp. 37, 38).

England: Influence greatly reduced. Following sentence characteristic:

Even as recently as thirty years ago she would not have acquiesced so calmly in either the German conquest of the Rhine provinces, the re-establishment of Russian predominance on the Black Sea, or the Russian campaign in Khidir (p. 39). The reason for this complaisance, etc.—the struggle of the workers' world with the exploitative and politically dominant bourgeois world (p. 39). The social revolution is not far off there, etc. (l.c.)

Spain and Italy, worth not mentioning: they will never become dangerous and powerful states, not from the absence of material means but because the «spirit of the people» is directed towards quite different objectives (p. 39).
On this point: Spain roused herself again in the people's war against Napoleon 555 which was initiated by the unuttered masses themselves. Nothing of the kind in Germany in 1812 and 1813. Remained unmoved until Napoleon's defeat in Russia. The Tirol the only exception (pp. 40, 41).

Meanwhile:

"We have seen that the ownership of property sufficed to corrupt the French peasantry and to extinguish its last remaining sparks of patriotism" (p. 42). In Germany (1812-15) the young citizens or rather the loyal subjects (абхоро4) stirred up by philosophers and poets, took up arms to protect and restore the German Empire, for it was just at this time that the idea of the Pan-Germanic Empire was born in Germany. In the meantime, the Spanish people rose up as one man (поголавно) to defend (отстоять) the freedom of their - homeland - and the independence of their - national life - against the ferocious and powerful oppressor (p. 43). Every form of government was then tried out in Spain, but to no purpose: despotism, constitutionalism, conservative republicanism, etc.; even the petty-bourgeois federal republic along Swiss lines (p. 43).

"Spain was seized (possessed) in real earnest by the demon of revolutionary socialism. Andalusian and Estremaduran peasants, without asking anyone's permission or waiting for anyone's orders, made themselves masters of the estates of the erstwhile landowners. Catalonia, and particularly Barcelona, loudly assert their independence and autonomy. The people of Madrid proclaim a federal republic and refuse to subject the revolution to the future commands of a constituent assembly. Even in the North, in territory under Carlist control, the social revolution is proceeding openly: the fueros (фуеросы) are proclaimed, as is the independence of the districts and communities; all legal and civil records are burnt; throughout the whole of Spain the army fraternises with the people and drives away its officers. General bankruptcy has set in, public and private—the first prerequisite for social and economic revolution" (p. 44). "An end to finance, to the army, the courts, the police; away with government forces and with the - state; what remains is the vigorous and fresh (свежий) people, sustained now only by the passion of the social revolution. Under the collective leadership of the International and the Alliance of Social Revolutionaries it rallies and organises its forces, etc." (p. 44). The only living tradition still surviving in the Italian people is that of absolute autonomy, not only of the - областей (province, region, district), but of the communities (обности). To this, the - only political concept- which really is peculiar to the - people-, we must add the historical and ethnographic - variety- of the - regions- where so many dialects are spoken that people in one - область- (which en passant also means "power, force") only understand the inhabitants of other - regions- with difficulty and sometimes not at all. But socially, Italy is not disunited. On the contrary, there is a - common Italian character and type-, by which Italians are distinguished from all other peoples, even southern ones (p. 45).

The break-up of the latest Italian -state- will unfailingly have -free, social unification- as its consequence (p. 46). All this refers only to the -mass of the people-. In the -upper strata- of the Italian bourgeoisie, on the other hand, as in other countries, we find that -state unity has given rise to the social unity of the class of the privileged exploiters of the labour of the people, a unity which is now being steadily developed. This class is now known in Italy under the collective term -Consorzia ... the whole official world, bureaucratic and military, police and judicial; big landowners, industrialists, merchants and bankers; the entire official and semi-official host of lawyers and writers, the whole parliament (p. 46).

But even the most terrible -desperation- (poverty), even when it afflicts the many millions of proletarians, is not a sufficient guarantee (оказа) of revolution. When man (the destitute) is driven to -despair-, his rebellion becomes that much more possible... In desperation even the German ceases to reason; but an enormous amount is needed to drive him to despair... However, -desperation- and -despair- can do no more than provoke personal or at best local -revolts-; they are insufficient to grip -whole masses of the people-. For that a -universal popular ideal- is needed which historically -always- evolves from the -depths of popular instinct-, in addition a belief (спа) in one's right, -it could be said, a religious belief in this right-. This together with poverty and despair provides the right recipe for social revolution (pp. 47, 48).

"This is the situation in which the Italian people finds itself today" (p. 48).

In particular, it was the -International—i.e. the Alliance, which has been especially effective in Italy in the last two years (1872 and 1873)—that acted as midwife to this ideal.

-It3 pointed out to it [the proletariat] the objective to be achieved and at the same time provided it with the ways and means to organise the energies of the people- (p. 48).

-It is worthy of note that in Italy as in Spain it was not "Marx's state-communist programme" which carried the day (triumphed), but that in both countries there was a widespread and passionate endorsement of the programme of the world-famous (требосное) Alliance or -League of Social Revolutionaries- with its implacable declaration of war on -domination, governmental tutelage, prerogative and authority- of every kind" (p. 49).

-Under these conditions the people can emancipate itself and establish its own particular mode of life —on the basis of the most extensive freedom- of each and everyone, but without constituting a threat at all to the liberty of other peoples" (p. 49).

Therefore, since Italy and Spain adhere to the programme of the Alliance, the social revolution in those countries is at hand, but no policy of conquest is to be feared from them (p. 49).

-The small states—Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden—"for the very same reasons" (i.e. because they have embraced the programme of the Alliance),

-"but chiefly" because of "their political insignificance" (p. 49) present no threat but, on the contrary, have many reasons to "fear annexation by the new German Empire" (p. 50).

-Austria sick unto death. Divided into two states, Magyar-Slav and German-Slav, (p. 50). The Germans wish for hegemony in the latter.

4 In Bakunin this reads "not even at the level of the province, but [only] in the communities"—Ed.

5 The propaganda of the International.—Ed.
"The Germans, -state-worshippers- and bureaucrats by nature, it can be said, base their pretensions on their historic right, i.e. on the right of conquest and -traditions-, on the one hand, and on the alleged superiority of their culture, on the other" (p. 52). In recent years the Germans have been compelled to concede an independent existence to the Magyars. "Of all the tribes that inhabit the Austrian Empire, the Magyars have the most developed state-consciousness after the Germans" (p. 52). They assert their historic right to lord it over all the other tribes who live with them in the Kingdom of Hungary, even though they do not amount to more than 1/3 (i.e.) (viz. 5,500,000 Magyars, 5,000,000 Slavs, 2,700,000 Romanians, 1,800,000 Jews and Germans, around 500,000 other tribes, making 15,500,000 all told) (i.e.). So the Austro-Hungarian Empire (divides) into 2: the Cisleithian state, Slav-German with 20,500,000 (7,200,000 German and Jews, 11,500,000 Slavs, about 1,800,000 Italians and other tribes), and the Magyar-Slav-Romanian-German state (p. 53).

In Hungary

the "majority of the population is subject to the Magyars, does not like them, bears their yoke grudgingly, hence perpetual struggle" (p. 53). The Magyars fear revolt from the Romanians and Slavs; hence in secret league with Bismarck who, "foreseeing the inevitable war with the Austrian Empire, which is destined to disappear, -makes advances- to the Magyars" (p. 54).

In the Cisleithian state the situation is no better; there the Germans want to rule over the Slav majority: "The Germans hate the Slavs as the master is wont to hate his slaves" (p. 54), fear their emancipation, etc. "Like all conquerors of foreign land and subjugators of foreign peoples, the Germans simultaneously and highh unjustly both hate and despise the Slavs" (i.e.). The Prussian Germans' main criterion of the Austrian government is that it is incapable of Germanising the Slavs. "This, in their view and also in fact, constitutes the greatest crime against German patriotic interests in general and against Pan-Germanism" (p. 55) (his emphasis). With the exception of the Poles, the Austrian Slavs have countered this Pan-Germanism with Pan-Slavism, which likewise is a piece of "nauseating folly", "an ideal incompatible with freedom and fatal to the people" (p. 55).

Hereo a footnote in which Mr. Bakunin threatens to treat this question at greater length; here he just calls on Russian revolutionary youth to resist this trend; he admits that Russian agents are busy propagating Pan-Slavism among the Austrian Slavs and trying to persuade them that the Tsar is -eager to free their land from the German yoke, and "this at a time when the Petersburg Cabinet is -openly- betraying the whole of Bohemia and Moravia, selling them to Bismarck as a reward for the promised assistance in the East".

How does it come about, then, that in the Austro-Slav territories there is a whole class of educated, etc., people who either expect to be liberated by the Russians or even hope for "the establishment of a Slav great power under the supremacy of the Russian Tsar" (p. 57). This only goes to show "the degree to which this accursed German civilisation which is -bourgeois- in essence and hence -statist-, has succeeded in entering the soul of the Slav patriots themselves ... they would remain completely German even though the goal they are seeking to achieve is anti-German; using ways and means borrowed from the Germans they want, they think to free the Slavs from the German yoke. Because of their German education they cannot conceive of any way of obtaining their freedom but through the formation of Slav states or a single great Slav empire. They therefore set themselves a purely German objective because the -modern state--centralist, bureaucratic, a police and military state after the fashion, for example, of the new German or -All-Russian- Empire—is a purely German -creation-. In Russia it formerly contained a certain Tartar element, -but even in Germany there is certainly no lack of Tartar civility nowadays-" (p. 57).

"The entire nature, the entire character of the Slav tribe is definitely unpolitical, i.e. non-statist. In vain do the Czechs hark back to (поминают) their Great Moravian Empire and the Serbs their Empire of Dušan. All such things are either ephemeral phenomena or old fairy-tales. The truth is that no single Slav tribe has ever of itself created a -state-" (p. 57).

Polish Monarchy-Republic:

founded under the dual influence of Germanism and Latinism, after the Slav people (-боярь---bondsmen, serf-) had been suppressed by the Szlachta who are not of Slav origin in the opinion of many Polish historians (such as -Mickiewicz-) (p. 58).

Bohemian state (Czech):

patched together on the German model and openly influenced by the Germans; hence soon formed an organic part of the German Empire.

Russian Empire:

Tartar knout, Byzantine blessing and German bureaucratic, military and police Enlightenment (p. 58).

"Hence it is indubitable that the Slavs have never established a -state- on their own initiative. Because they have never been a tribe bent on conquest. Only warlike people found -states- and they invariably found them for their own benefit and to the detriment of subjugated nations." The Slavs were predominantly peaceful, agrarian tribes; they lived cut off and independently in their communities, administered (управляются—also governed) in patriarchal fashion by their "elders" on the basis of the -electoral principle-, collective ownership of land, no nobility, no special priest-caste, all equal, "implementing in a patriarchal and hence imperfect manner the idea of human fraternity." No political bonds between communities; only a defensive alliance in case of attacks from outside; no Slav -state-; but social, fraternal bonds between all Slav tribes, hospitable in the highest degree (pp. 58, 59). "Such an organisation rendered them defenceless against the incursions and attacks of warlike tribes, especially the Germans who sought to extend their rule everywhere" (p. 59). "The Slavs were exterminated in part, the majority subjugated by Turks, Tartars, Magyars and above all Germans" (p. 59). "The second half of the 10th century witnessed the beginning of the tormented, but also heroic history of their slavery" (p. 59). "Unfortunately for Poland her leading parties (руководящиа партия) which to this day have belonged for the most part to the Szlachta, have not yet renounced their -statist- programme and, instead of striving for the liberation and -rebirth- of their -homeland- through social revolution, they remain the prisoners of ancient prejudices and seek either the protection of a Napoleon or else an alliance with the Jesuits and the Austrian feudal nobility" (p. 61).
In our century the Western and Southern Slavs have also awakened; Bohemia the centre for the one, Serbia for the other (pp. 61, 62).

The latest expression of the "state": the Pan-Germanic Empire: "its days are numbered and all nations expect that its collapse will bring about their ultimate emancipation... Are the Slavs envious of the Germans for having earned the hatred of all the other peoples of Europe?" (p. 63)

England does not exist for this coffee-house politician; it is the true apex of bourgeois society in Europe.

Either there will be no Slav "state" at all, or else there will be a vast, all-devouring Pan-Slav, St. Petersburg knout state" (pp. 64, 65).

Nor is it possible to oppose Pan-Germanic centralisation by forming a Pan-Slav Federation in the manner of the United States (p. 66). America is possible only because there is no powerful "state" like Russia, Germany or France on the American continent adjacent to the great republic. Hence, in order to counter a victorious Pan-Germanism on the level of the "state" or politics, only one way remains: to establish a Pan-Slav "state".

Universal Slav servitude beneath the "All-Russian knout" (p. 67). But even this would be impossible. Numerically, there are at least three times as many Slavs in Europe as Germans. Despite this, a Pan-Slav Empire would never be able to match the Pan-Germanic Empire in terms of power and actual "political and military strength."

Why not? "Because German blood, German instinct and the German tradition are all imbued with a passion for "state" order and "state" discipline": with the Slavs the position is the reverse; "this is why they can only be disciplined by having the threat of a big stick hanging over them, while any German will swallow the stick with the conviction (что бы представило) of his own free will. To him freedom consists in "being drilled" and he "willingly bows down" to every authority. Furthermore, the Germans are earnest, diligent people, learned, thrifty, "very, very careful and calculating", which does not prevent them from fighting splendidly if need be, merely when the authorities desire it. They proved this in the recent wars. Moreover, their military and administrative organisation has been perfected to the highest possible degree, beyond the reach of any other nation. So is it thinkable that the Slavs could ever match them on the plane of "statehood?" (pp. 68, 69). "The Germans look to the "state" for their life and their freedom; for the Slavs the "state" is a tomb. They seek their liberation outside the "state", not just in the struggle against the German "state", but in the "universal revolt" against "states" of every kind, in social revolution" (p. 69). "But "states" will not fall of their own accord: they can only be overthrown by an international social revolution which encompasses all nations and peoples" (p. 69). The Slavs' hostility to the state, which hitherto has been their weakness, becomes their strength for the present popular movement (p. 69). The moment is drawing near for the total emancipation of "the mass of unskilled workers" and for their free social organisation "from below", without any "правительственного" (directing, governmental) interference, by means of "free economic", "national" (popular, public) "society", (union, alliance, coalition, federation), "disregarding" all old state frontiers and all national differences, on the sole basis of productive labour, humanised through and through and with total solidarity amidst all its diversity" (p. 70).

"Nationality is a universal human principle, but an historical, local fact having, like all "genuine" and harmless facts, an undoubted right to universal "recognition". Every people and every "little people" has its own character, its manner and these facts (факт) are what form the essence of nationality, the product of the whole of history and the totality of the conditions of life of the nationality. Every people, like every individual, is "inevitably" what it is and has the undoubted right to be itself. This is what the entire so-called "national right" amounts to" (p. 70).

But it does not follow from this that one should lay down his nationality and the other his individuality as a "special principle", etc. "The less they think about themselves, and the more they "are imbued" with a common humanity, then the more the nationality of the one and the individuality of the other gain in vitality and ideas" (p. 71). The Slavs too will only be able to assume "their rightful place" in history and in the free brotherhood of peoples if, jointly with others, they embrace universal interests (p. 71).

"In Germany the Reformation very quickly abandoned its "insurrectionary" character, which is anyway incompatible with the German temperament, and assumed the shape of a "peaceful state" reform which soon came to form the basis for the "most methodical", systematic, learned "state" despotism. In France, after a long and bloody struggle which made no small contribution to the growth of free thought in that country, they (desires for reform) were crushed by the victorious Catholic Church. In Holland, England and later in the United States of America they created a new civilisation which was in essence anti-"state", but "bourgeois-economic" and liberal" (p. 72).

This passage is very typical for Bakunin; the genuine capitalist state for him anti-governmental; secondly, the different developments in Germany, on the one hand, and Holland and England, on the other, are not the result of changes in world trade, but etc.

"The religious reform"

(also very brilliant that the Renaissance is only thought of in the context of religion)

"produced two main trends in civilised mankind: an economic and liberal "bourgeois" trend, particularly in England and then in America, and the despotic, "statist", essentially also "bourgeois""

he uses this word bourgeois both for capitalism and for the medieval philistines [Spie8biirger] in Germany—

"and the Protestant trend, even though the latter is mixed with aristocratic Catholic elements which, incidentally, became completely subordinate to the "state". The chief representatives of this trend were France and Germany, the Austrian part to begin with and then the Prussian" (p. 73).

"The French Revolution founded a new universal human interest, the ideal of unlimited human liberty, but exclusively in the political realm: contradiction, political freedom [on its own] cannot be put into practice; freedom within a "state" is a lie. Resulted in two main tendencies. Systematic exploitation of the proletariat and the enrichment of a minority. On this exploitation of the people one party desires to set up a democratic republic, the other, more consistent, strives for the monarchic, i.e. an openly "state" despotism" (p. 73).

Against all these aspirations, there is a new trend "leading directly" to Bakunin (p. 74). "Therefore the Slav proletariat must join the International Working Men's Association en masse" (p. 75). "We have already had occasion to refer to the magnificent demonstration of international solidarity by the Viennese workers in
1868" (p. 75) against the Pan-Germanic programme. But the Austrian workers failed to follow this up with the necessary measures, "because they were stopped short (prevented) at the very first step by the patriotic-Germanic propaganda of Mr. Liebknecht and the other Social-Democrats who came with him to Vienna, it would seem, in July 1868 expressly for the purpose of throwing off course (leading astray) the true social instinct of the Austrian workers from the path of international revolution and diverting it towards political agitation in favour of establishing a "state", what they call "народное" (people's state), Pan-Germanic, of course—in short, for implementing the patriotic ideal of Count Bismarck, only on a Social-Democratic basis and by means of so-called legal "popular agitation" " (p. 76).

"For the Slavs this would mean voluntarily submitting to the German yoke and this [is] <<repugnant>> to every Slav heart (p. 77). Hence we shall not only not persuade our Slav brothers to enter the ranks of the Social-Democratic Party of the German workers which is presided over with dictatorial powers by Messrs. Marx and Engels and after them Messrs. Bebel, Liebknecht and some literary Jews; on the contrary, we must strive with all our might to prevent the Slav proletariat from forming a suicidal "alliance" with this party which is in no sense a "people's" party but in its tendency, its aims and its methods is purely "bourgeois" and moreover exclusively German, i.e. "fateful to Slavs" " (p. 77).

The Slav proletariat must not only not join this party, it must avoid all contact with it, and instead must strengthen its bonds with the International Working Men's Association. "The German Social-Democratic Party should on no account be confused with the International (p. 77). The political and patriotic programme of the former has almost nothing in common with the programme of the latter and is indeed diametrically opposed to it. At the Hague Congress the Marxists tried to impose it on the entire International.60 But this attempt provoked a general loud protest from the delegates of Germany, Switzerland, France, Belgium, Holland, England and even to some extent of the United States of America, so that it became apparent to the whole world that no one wants the German programme except for the Germans themselves" (p. 78).

The Slav proletariat must join the International en masse, form sections and, if it appears necessary, a "Pan-Slav federation" (p. 78).

Slav law, "Serbian principality": The Serbs founded a "state" after emancipation from the Turks; its yoke heavier than that of the Turks (p. 79). At the mercy of bureaucratic "robbery" and despotism (I.c.). In Turkish Serbia there is neither a nobility nor very big landowners, nor industrialists, nor even particularly rich merchants; a new bureaucratic aristocracy has grown up, educated for the most part at government expense in Odessa, Moscow, Petersburg, Vienna, Germany, Switzerland and Paris (p. 79).

The Bulgarians want nothing to do with the Serbian "Dušan Kingdom"; nor do the "Croats", the "Montenegrins" and the Bosnian Serbs. For all these lands there is only one possible means of escape, and of unification—social revolution: "certainly not a war between states" which could lead only to their subjugation by Russia or Austria or both (p. 86).

In Czech Bohemia Wenceslas's kingdom and crown have fortunately not yet been restored; the Viennese authorities treat it simply as a province, without even the privileges of Galicia; and yet there are as many political parties in Bohemia as in the dear "Slav state". "Indeed, this damned German spirit of politicking and "statehood" has made such inroads into the education of Czech youth that there is a serious risk of the latter ending up by losing the capacity to understand their own people."

"In all Austrian towns where the Slav population has intermingled with the German, the Slav workers play the most active part in all the general rallies of the proletariat. But there are almost no workers' associations in these towns apart from those which have recognised the programme of German Social-Democracy, so that in effect the Slav workers, carried away by their social-revolutionary instincts, have been recruited into a party whose direct and loudly proclaimed goal is the foundation of a Pan-Germanic "state", i.e. a vast German "prison."

They must accept the programme of the International under the leadership of Bakunin (p. 89) (the Slav section in Zurich, a member of the Jura Federation, is specially recommended as a recruiting office in the Note to p. 89).

"Austria" (Conclusion).

The Empire continues to exist only through the calculated tolerance of Prussia and Russia who do not yet wish to proceed with dismembering it because each is waiting for a favourable opportunity to seize the lion's share (p. 93).

Russia: "There is but one constitution of benefit to the people—the destruction of the (Russian) Empire" (p. 96). Does it have the military power to take on the new German Empire? At present this the only political issue in Russia (I.c.). "This question ... inexorably posed by Germany's new situation, i.e. by the fact that it has grown overnight (so any nuts) into a gigantic and omnipotent state. But all history shows, and rational logic confirms, that two states of equal strength cannot exist side by side. One must conquer the other" (p. 97). This is essential for Germany. "After long, long political humiliation it has suddenly become the most powerful empire on the European continent. Can it endure beside itself, under its very nose as it were, a power entirely independent of it, one it has not yet subdued and which dares to claim equal status; and the power of Russia at that, "the most hated of all!" (p. 97).

"There can be few Russians, we believe, who are unaware of the degree to which the Germans, all Germans, but chiefly the German bourgeoisie, and under their influence, alas! the German people too, hate Russia" (p. 97). This hatred is one of Germany's most powerful national passions. (p. 98).

Initially, a genuine hatred by German civilisation for Tartar barbarism (p. 98). In the twenties the protest of political liberalism against political despotism (I.c.). They put the entire blame for the Holy Alliance onto Russia (I.c.). In the early thirties sympathy with the Poles, hatred of the Russians for suppressing the Polish uprising (I.c.). They forgot again that Prussia had helped to put down the Poles; Prussia gave her assistance because a Polish victory would have meant rebellion throughout the whole of Prussian Poland, which would have "nipped the rising power of the Prussian monarchy in the bud" (I.c.).

In the second half of the thirties the emerging Slav question provided a new reason to hate the Russians, one which gave that hate a political and national direction: the formation in Austria and Turkey of a Slav Party which hoped for and expected help from Russia. The idea of a Pan-Slav republican federation to which the Decembrists (Pestel, Muravyov-Apostol, etc.) aspired. Nicholas took it up, but in the form of a unified, Pan-Slav and autocratic "state" under his sceptre of
iron. In the early thirties and forties Russian agents travelled to the Slav territories from Peters burg and Moscow, some officially, others as unpaid volunteers; the latter belonged to the Moscow Slavophile Society. 569 Pan-Slav propaganda spread among the Southern and Western Slavs. Many pamphlets, some written in German, others translated into it. Fear among the Pan-Germanic public. Bohemia—Russian! Spotted their appetite and ruined their sleep (p. 99). The greatest hatred of Russia from this time; for their part the Russians have no love for the Germans. Under these circumstances what possibility is there for the All-Russian and Pan-Germanic Empires to live as neighbours? (p. 100). But there were and still are grounds for them both to keep the peace. First: Poland (L.c.) opposed to partition, etc. For Austria, Poland a bulwark against Russia and Prussia. Second: Austria, which they wish to dismember. The partition of Austria will divide them, but until then nothing can separate them (pp. 100-102). Third: the new German Empire, hated by all and with no ally apart from Russia, and perhaps the United States. Still has much to do before it can achieve the idea of Pan-Germanic Empire; would have to take the whole of Lorraine away from France; to devour Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark and the Scandinavian peninsula; the Russian Baltic provinces, so as to achieve sole control of the Baltic. It would leave Hungary to the Magyars, Galicia with the Austrian Bukovina to the Russians; it would reserve its rights to the whole of Austria up to and including Trieste and also Bohemia, which the Russian Cabinet would not even dream of contesting... “We” (Bakunin) “have certain knowledge that secret negotiations about the partition of the Austrian Empire in the shorter or longer term have long since been in train between the Peters burg and the German courts”, in the course of which each side naturally tries to dupe the other. On its own part the Pan-Slav Empire [is] not capable of carrying out any great plans; “hence an alliance with Russia is and will for a long time remain an urgent necessity”... “The same true of Russia. “Conquest in every direction and at any price is the normal condition of life for the Russian Empire.” In which direction then? West or east? The western route is that of Pan-Slavism and an alliance with France against the united military might of Prussia and Austria and with the probable neutrality of England and the United States. The other, eastern route leads to India, Persia, Constantinople. The enemies there [are] Austria and England, probably joined by France; allies—Germany and the United States (pp. 102-104).

The first route (Pan-Slavism, against the German Empire). The assistance of France worthless, her unity shatted forever, etc.: this route is revolutionary: it leads to an uprising of the peoples, the Slavs especially, against their legitimate rulers, both Austrian and Prussian-German. Nicholas rejected this course of action from instinct, principle, etc. (!) But over and above that “it must not be forgotten that the liberation of Poland is absolutely impossible to All-Russian statehood”. Centuries of struggle between two opposing forms of the state—the will of the Szlachta and the Tsarist knout. The Poles often seemed on the verge of victory. But as soon as the people rose—up—in Moscow in 1612,569 and then the insurrection of the Ukrainians and the Lithuanian serfs under Bogdan Khmelnitsky—570—it was at an end. “The Russian knout triumphed thanks to the people.”

This admission on p. 110.

The All-Russian knout-Empire built on the ruins of the Szlachta Polish state. “Take these supports away from it, i.e. the provinces which formed part of the Polish state up to 1772, and the All-Russian Empire will vanish” (p. 110).

---

a Here Marx has: “Berussische”, a word coined from Russian and German.—Ed.

b Bakunin has: “undoubtedly”,—Ed.

c Bakunin has: “dominating”—Ed.

d In Bakunin this part of the sentence reads: “people in it will instantly conspire and establish secret contacts with all the conquered regions so as to restore the Polish state”.—Ed.

e To be sure.—Ed.
"This is a huge number with which to keep the Austrian authorities and the Germans in general in a state of constant uneasiness, but it is very little to give the Russian armies serious support against the combined forces of Prussian Germany and Austria. The Russian government knows this and so does not even contemplate a Pan-Slav war against Austria, which would inevitably turn into war against the whole of Germany. Nevertheless, it does employ agents to disseminate actual Pan-Slav propaganda in the Austrian territories. It is very useful for it to have such blind, etc., supporters in all the Austrian provinces. " This paralyzes, impede and alarms the Austrian government and strengthens the influence of Russia not just on Austria, but on the whole of Germany. Imperial Russia incites the Austrian Slavs against the Magyars and Germans, knowing full well that in the last analysis it would abandon them to the mercies of those Germans and Magyars" (pp. 112, 113).

By taking the western, Pan-Slav course of action Russia has to fight against all the Germans, both Prussian and Austrian, against the Magyars and against the Poles. Could Russia defeat even Prussian Germany alone in an offensive war (which she would have to conduct under the pretext of liberating the Slavs)? The Russian nation would have no interest in a war; for peoples in general have no interest in purely political wars conducted by governments; the only instance [of a popular war] in recent history [was] Napoleon I, but he was regarded rather as continuing the Revolution; the only genuine example [was] the last Prussian war against the Second Empire. At that time Pan-Germanic interest outweighed all others in the hearts and minds of all Germans without distinction, and at the present moment this is what constitutes the special strength of Germany... Russians displayed no interest in their government even in the Crimean War, "which was a defensive war, not a war of conquest".

This on p. 117; by contrast the war against Napoleon III was evidently a mere offensive war? 572.

The Russian peasant is not even aware that he is a Slav ... for the Slav peoples there must be war against all <state>, to begin with in alliance with the Latin nations, who like the Slavs are threatened by the German policy of conquest... And then with the Germans, but only when they too have become opposed to the <state>... But until then an alliance of the Slavs and the Latin nations against the German politicians bent on conquest remains a necessity... " Strange\^\textsuperscript{a} vocation for the German tribe! By stirring up (arousing) universal alarm and universal hate against themselves, they unite the nations"... "In this sense the Russian people too [is] completely Slav." But its hostility does not extend to the point of declaring war against them on their own initiative; it will only reveal itself if the Germans invade Russia and try to set up their own rule there,—but it would take no part in an offensive war against the Germans... But do the government resources, both financial and military, suffice [for a war] against Germany?... In the situation postulated here (a Russian offensive) the Germans would be fighting on their own soil and «this time» there would be a truly «universal» uprising of all classes and of the entire population of Germany (pp. 114-120).

The Russian officer a better human being than the German... the latter a civilised wild animal... Germans, especially officers and officials, combine education with barbarism, erudition with servility... But for a regular army there is nothing more perfect than the German officer—his entire life: receiving and giving orders... Ditto the German soldier—ideal for the regular army both by nature and training... First break the soldier’s body in and thereby the spirit... Discipline, etc.... The superiority of the German officers over those of other nations lies in their knowledge, their theoretical and practical grasp of military affairs, their ardent and completely perfunctory devotion to soldiering, their precision, their methodicalness, «self-help», inescapable samian (repulsive) and, on top of it all, a relative probity (честность). The organisation and equipment of the German army are genuine and not merely something that exists on paper, as with Napoleon III and as it will be with us. And then [there is] the administrative, civil and above all military control, so that widespread deception is impossible. "With us by contrast there is nothing but back-scratching from bottom to top and from top to bottom, so that it is almost impossible to discover the truth" (pp. 121-128).

Even if Russia maintains a million troops, half of them are needed domestically to keep an eye on the beloved people. How many needed then for the Ukraine, Lithuania and Poland (p. 128).

Germany will have a real «million»-strong army, which in organisation, «drilling», moral, knowledge and equipment will be the best in the world. And behind it the entire people in arms "which in all probability would not have risen up against the French if Napoleon III rather than the Prussian Fritz had been the victor in the last war, but which would rise up as one man against a Russian invasion",... But where will the Russian million be? On paper... Where the officers and the equipment... No money... The Germans received 5 thousand million from the French.\footnote{572} At least 2 went on armaments... "Indeed at the moment the whole of Germany is transformed into a menacing arsenal, bristling on every side." At your very first step on German soil you will be utterly defeated and your offensive war will be turned into a defensive war, against which the German army will cross the frontiers of the All-Russian Empire. Then a general uprising of the Russian people? "Yes, if the Germans occupy Russian «regions» and march e.g. directly to Moscow; but if they do not commit this act of folly, but march northwards towards Petersburg, through the Baltic provinces, there they will find many friends, not just among the bourgeoisie, the Protestant parsons and Jews, disaffected barons and their children, and students, but also among our countless Baltic generals, officers, officials both high and low who congregate in Petersburg but are also scattered throughout the whole of Russia; even more, they will lead Poland and the Ukraine to rise up against the Russian Empire" (pp. 128-131).

The Poles have no more dangerous or insidious enemy than Bismarck. "It appears as if he has made it his life’s task to wipe (eradicate) them from the face of the earth. And this does not prevent him from extorting the Poles to rise up against Russia when German interests require it. And despite the fact that the Poles loathe him and Prussia, not to say Germany as a whole, which the Poles will not admit even to themselves, although in the depths of their souls there burns the same historical hatred of the Germans that is to be found among all the other Slav peoples— the Poles will doubtless rise up at Bismarck’s summons" (p. 133).

"In Germany and in Prussia herself a numerous and serious political party has existed for a very long time; even three parties: a liberal-progressive party, a purely democratic one and a Social-Democratic party,\footnote{574} which together have an undoubted majority in the German and Prussian parliaments, and an even more decisive one in society itself; these parties, which have foreseen and in part already, as it were, call forth a German war with Russia, have realised that the uprising..."
and the restoration of Poland *within certain limits* will be the necessary precondition of that war" (p. 135). Neither Bismarck nor any of these parties has any wish to restore to Poland all the territories taken from her by Prussia; neither Königsberg nor Danzig, nor even the smallest portion of West Prussia; and only a very little of the Duchy of Posen. But they will give the Poles the whole of Galicia together with *Lvov* and Cracow since all this is Austrian at present, and as much of the Russian territory as they can seize. In addition, money, weapons and military aid, in the form of a Polish loan on German security of course... The Poles will jump at it. With a few exceptions the Poles do not concern themselves with the "Slav question"; they find the Magyars much closer and more comprehensible... Numerous parties among the Poles; in the background always the restoration of the Polish "state" within the frontiers of 1772. The only difference between the parties is that some favour one means and others another to achieve this end... Bismarck will demand that they formally renounce their claims to the greater part of the old Polish territories which are now Prussian... It is true, it will be a strange Poland that will have been restored under the aegis of Count Bismarck. But better a strange Poland than none at all: besides the Poles envisage the possibility of a Polish loan on German security of course... The Poles will jump at it. With a few exceptions the Poles do not concern themselves with

---

\[\text{Notes on Bakunin's Statehood and Anarchy}^{507}\]

---

about the matter whether this takes place as the result of a war started by Russia against Germany, or vice versa. Incidentally, since according to Bakunin there is nothing but a "class of officials" in Serbia, apart from the people, what shall the Serbian social revolution consist in, if not in the elimination of the class of officials, since it is this class which alone constitutes the "state" there? (pp. 138, 139)

Hence for the All-Russian Empire the road to Europe is now blocked; Count Bismarck holds the keys to its gates and nothing in the whole world could induce him to hand them over to Prince Gorchakov. But if the north-western route is blocked, then there remain the southern and the south-eastern routes—Bokhara, Persia, Afghanistan, East India and finally Constantinople. Russian politicians have long raised the question as to whether the capital and the centre of gravity of the Empire should not be transferred from Petersburg to Constantinople. It is true that these insatiable patriots wanted both, the Baltic and Constantinople. But they are getting used to the idea of giving that up; their eyes were opened above all by events of recent years, in particular the "union of Schleswig-Holstein and Hanover with the Prussian Kingdom," which was thereby transformed into a North Sea power" (p. 139).

"All are familiar with the axiom that no "state" can lay claim to a place in the first rank without extensive frontiers to the sea which ensure it direct communication with the whole world and allow it direct participation in world communication, material or social; to picture an "outer world" (outside society), without that soon stagnation... China... A host of conditions must be fulfilled for a people consolidated into a "state" to participate in world communication; nowadays they include (принадлежность) -natural common sense and innate energy-, education, the capacity for productive labour -and the most extensive inner freedom, impossible as this may be for the masses within a state... "But these conditions necessarily include also navigation, sea trade, because the sea as a form of transport surpasses all others—the railways included—in relative cheapness, speed and also freedom in the sense that the sea belongs to nobody. It may be that air travel will prove to be even more serviceable in every respect and will be particularly important because it will finally level up the conditions of development and life of all countries."

This is the central issue for Bakunin—leveling out, e.g. the whole of Europe to the level of Slovak mouse-trap sellers. "For the present, navigation remains the chief instrument for bringing about the well-being (the great progress, "the prosperity") of the peoples." This is the only point at which Mr. Bakunin speaks of economic conditions and understands that they create conditions and differences among peoples independent of the "state"...

Once states (государства) cease to exist and "a free, fraternal union of free productive associations, communities and regional federations" arises from the ruins of all states "in complete freedom and organising themselves from below, embracing, without distinctions of any kind, because free peoples of all languages and nationalities,—once this is done, the way to the sea will be open to all in equal measure: directly for coastal dwellers and, for those living further from the sea, with the aid of the railways, which will be completely liberated from all..."
But how far open, s'il vous plaît? As far as the English are concerned, [it was] “open” to the ramparts of Kronstadt.

“For Bakunin it is an established fact that an offensive and defensive alliance between Prussia and Russia was concluded after the Paris Treaty or at least at the period of the Polish insurrection of 1863.

Hence Bismarck’s nonchalance in launching the war with Austria and the greater part of Germany in the face of the threat of Franco-German intervention, and hence Russia’s whole-hearted war with France. The slightest show of force by Russia on the frontier in either war, especially in the last one, would have put a stop to the victorious advance of the Prussian army. The whole of Germany, particularly the north of Germany, was completely demured to troops in the last war; Austria only remained inactive because of Russian threats; Italy and England only refrained from intervening because Russia did not want them to. If she had not shown herself to be such a determined ally of Prussia, the Germans would never have taken Paris. But Bismarck was obviously convinced that Russia would not let him down. On what did this conviction rest? Bismarck knows that Russian and Prussian interests are entirely antagonistic, apart from on the Polish question. War between them inevitable. But there may be grounds for delaying it since each hopes to derive greater benefit from their enforced alliance until the day of crisis arrives. The German Empire far from secure either internally or externally. Internally, still a host of petty princes. Externally, Austria and France. Obeying an inner necessity, it contemplates new adventures. new wars. Restoration of the mediaeval Empire with its original frontiers, based on the patriotic Pan-German feeling which is the whole of German society; dreams of annexing the whole of Austria with the exception of Hungary, but including Trieste as well as Bohemia, the whole of German-speaking Switzerland, a part of Belgium, the whole of Holland and Denmark, essential for the establishment of its naval power; plans stirring up a considerable section of western and southern Europe against it and their implementation not feasible without Russian agreement. Hence the Russian alliance is still necessary for the new German Empire (pp. 148-151).

The All-Russian Empire, for its part, cannot dispense with the Prusso-Germanic alliance. It must advance towards the south-east—the Black Sea instead of the Baltic; otherwise it will be cut off from Europe; and for that Constantinople is, essential; otherwise can always be denied access to the Mediterranean, as was the case during the Crimean War. Hence Constantinople the great goal. This in conflict with the interests of the whole of southern Europe, France included; in conflict with English interests and even those of Germany, since if Russia had absolute control over the Black Sea, the entire Danubian basin would be made directly dependent upon Russia. Despite this Prussia has formally proposed to Russia to assist her in her southern policy: it is no less certain that she will break her promise at the first opportunity. But such a breach of the agreement not to be expected now, at the very beginning of its fulfilment. Prussia helped Russia to nullify the clauses of the Paris Peace Treaty; will support her just as strongly on the issue of Khiva. It is of benefit to the Germans that Russia should be engaged as far to the east as possible. What is the purpose of the Russian war against Khiva?... India? Not at all. China would be much simpler; and the Russian government is indeed planning something of the sort. “It is striving quite openly to detach Mongolia and Manchuria from China”; “one fine day we shall hear of a victory of Russian forces on the western frontier (I of China)... The Chinese feel themselves constrained within their own territory, too numerous; hence emigration to Australia, California; other masses may move to the north and north-west. And then in a trice Siberia, the whole area stretching from the Gulf of Tartary to the
Urals and the Caspian Sea, will cease to be Russian. In this giant territory, 12,200,000 square kilometres, more than 20 times as large as France (528,600 square kilometres), there are at present only 6 million inhabitants, of whom only about 2,600,000 are Russian, all others are natives of Tartar or Finnish origin, and the number of troops there is quite negligible. The Chinese will be able to cross the Urals and penetrate as far as the Yenissei. This rapid increase in population makes it almost impossible for the Chinese to maintain an existence within the frontiers of China. In the Chinese interior there are vigorous, warlike people, reared amidst constant civil wars in which tens and hundreds of thousands have been annihilated at a stroke. In recent times they have become acquainted with European weapons and discipline, in short, with the state civilisation of Europe. At the same time, great barbarity; no instinct for freedom or humanity. At present they band together under the leadership of a crowd of military adventurers, American and European, who have made their way to China since the last Anglo-French expedition (1860). This is the great threat from the East. And our Russian authorities are playing with this threat with all the naivety of a child. They want to test their frontiers; and yet Russia neither has been to this day, nor will the ever be able, to populate the newly acquired Amur region where in a territory of 2,100,000 square kilometres, almost four times the size of France, there are merely 65,000 inhabitants including the army and navy; and with all this there is the wretched condition of the Russian people driving it to a general revolt; and despite this the Russian government hopes to extend its sway over the whole of the Asiatic East. It would have to turn its back on Europe, as Bismarck wishes, and hurl its whole army into Siberia and Central Asia, and conquer the East like Tamerlane. But Tamerlane, unlike the Russian government, was followed by his own people. As far as India is concerned, the Russians cannot help themselves to her in the face of English opposition. "But if we cannot conquer India, we can destroy or at least weaken the hold of the English there, provoke native rebellions against England, assist them, maintain them, if need be with the aid of military intervention." "It will cost us very dear in terms of both money and men... What for...? To alarm the English to no purpose? - No-, but because the English are in our way. Where are they in our way? In Constantinople. As long as the English retain their power they will never and at no price in the world agree to Constantinople falling into our hands, becoming the new capital not just of the All-Russian Empire, but of a Slav and Eastern Empire too." This is why the Russian government is waging war in Khiva; this is the reason for its long-standing wish to move closer to India. "It is on the lookout for the spot where England is vulnerable, and, not finding one anywhere else, threatens her in India. In this way it attempts to reconcile England to the idea that Constantinople must become a Russian city... Its supremacy in the Baltic is lost. The Russian Empire, built on the bayonets and the knout, hated by the mass of all the peoples, including the Slavs and starting with the Great Russians themselves, demoralised, disorganised, etc., is incapable of waging a war against the newly risen German Empire. Hence, "it is necessary to renounce the Baltic and to await the moment when the entire Baltic region will become a German province. This can be presented only by a "popular revolution." But such a revolution would be death to the state, and our government will not look to it for its salvation.

(This last sentence p. 160.)

For our government the only solution lies in an alliance with Germany. Sacrificing the Baltic, it must look to the Black Sea for compensation and even for its political survival; and this can only be achieved with German aid. "The Germans have committed themselves to assist us. We have no doubt that a formal treaty has been agreed between Bismarck and Gorchakov." Naturally, the Germans have no intention of implementing it. They cannot abandon the mouth of the Danube and their Danube trade to the arbitrary will of the Russians; to set up a great Pan-Slav Empire in southern Europe would be suicidal for the Pan-Germanic Empire. But "to guide and push the Russian armies towards Central Asia, towards Khiva, on the pretext that this is the most direct way to Constantinople, that is quite another matter." Gorchakov and Alexander II tricked by Bismarck, as Napoleon III had been before them. But this is what has happened, and there is no use crying over spilt milk. It is impossible for the feeble Russian forces (драбьмым силам) to overturn the new Germanic Empire; only the revolution could do that, and as long as it is not victorious in Russia or Europe the victor will be "statist" Germany which will carry all before her, and the Russian government, like all continental governments in Europe, will survive only with her permission and by her «favour». "More than ever before the Germans have become our masters, and it is not for nothing that all the Germans in Russia celebrated the victory of the German armies over France with such noise and enthusiasm; it is not for nothing that all the Petersburg Germans gave such a triumphant welcome to the new Pan-Germanic Emperor." "At the present time, on the whole continent of Europe, only one truly independent state survives: Germany... The chief reason for this is the "community instinct" which is the characteristic feature of the German people. The instinct on the one hand, for blind obedience towards the more powerful, [on the other,] for ruthless suppression of the weaker" (pp. 151-163).

There now follows a survey of the recent history of Germany (especially since 1815) as proof of her instinct for servility and suppression...

The Slavs in particular have had to suffer from the latter. The "historic mission" of the Germans at least in the north and east consisted, in their own view, in the extermination, enslavement and "forcible Germanisation" of the Slav tribes. "This long and -melancholy- history of memory which is deeply rooted in every Slav heart will doubtless resound in the last inevitable struggle [of the Slavs] against the Germans unless the social revolution pacifies them first" (p. 164).

This is followed by a history of German patriotism since 1815. (His material from Professor Miller's History from 1816 to 1866.)

"The political existence of the Prussian monarch (in 1807) was only preserved thanks to the intercession of Alexander I" (pp. 168-169).

Fichte's Speeches to the German Nation. "But contemporary Germans, while retaining all the outworn pretentions of their patriotic philosopher, have renounced his humanism... The patriotism of Prince Bismarck or Mr. Marx is more accessible to them" (p. 171).

After Napoleon's flight from Russia, Bakunin maintains, "Frederick William III embraced his saviour, the Emperor of all the Russians, in Berlin with tears of emotion and gratitude" (l.c.).

"Only one course remained open to Austria: to avoid stifling Germany" by entering the German Confederation with all her possessions as she originally wanted, "while at the same time preventing Prussia from seizing the leadership of
the German Confederation. Following this policy, she could reckon on the active help of France and Russia. *Russian policy until recent times*, i.e. up to the Crimean War, consisted above all in systematically encouraging the mutual rivalry between Austria and Prussia so that neither might gain the upper hand over the other, and at the same time in sowing the seeds of mistrust and fear in the smaller and medium principalities of Germany, whilst protecting them from both Austria and Prussia” (p. 183). Prussia’s influence chiefly moral; much expected of her (after 1815). Hence it was vital for Metternich to ensure that the (promised) constitution should not be granted and that Prussia should join Austria at the head of the reaction. “In his pursuit of this plan he discovered the most enthusiastic support in France which was ruled by the Bourbons and in Tsar Alexander who was manipulated by ‘Arakcheev’” (p. 184).

“The Germans have no need of freedom. Life for them is simply unthinkable without authority, i.e. without a supreme will, a supreme idea and an iron hand — to drive them on. The stronger this hand, the prouder they are and life is more congenial to them” (p. 192).

1830-1840. Blind imitation of the French. “The Germans stopped devoting the Gods and instead turned all their hatred towards the Russians” (p. 196). “Everything hinged on the outcome of the Polish revolution. If it had been victorious, the Prussian monarchy, cut off (separated) from its north-east rampart and compelled... to surrender if not all then at least a considerable part of its Polish possessions, would have been forced to seek new bases in Germany herself, and since at the time it could not achieve this by conquest... it would have had to do so by means of liberal reforms” (p. 199). Following the defeat of the Poles, Frederick William III, who had performed such important services for his son-in-law Tsar Nicholas, “cast off his mask and pursued the Pan-Germanic patriots even more vehemently than before” (p. 200).

“In the conviction that the mass of the people harbour all the elements of their future normal organisation in their instincts, as these have been developed to a greater or lesser extent by history, in their daily needs and their conscious or unconscious aspirations, we seek that ideal” (the ideal of social organisation) “in the people itself; and since every -state- power, every authority is by its very nature and its position placed outside the people and above it, and since it must necessarily strive to force the people to submit to rules and objectives alien to it, this is why we declare ourselves the enemies of all power vested in authority, the -state-, the enemies of all -state- organisation in general and in that the people can only be happy and free when it creates its own life, by organising itself from below, by means of autonomous and completely free associations (correspondence) and without any official tutelage -but not independently of various and equally free influences, both of people and parties-” (p. 213). These are “the convictions of the social revolutionaries, and this is why we are called anarchists” (p. 215). “Idealists of every kind, metaphysicians, positivists, advocates of the primacy of science over life, doctrinaire revolutionaries, all together, with the same zeal (άγάπη), although with differing arguments, defend (οικονομείον) the idea of the -state- and of -state- power, seeing in it, and very logically in their way, the only salvation for society. Very logically because, starting from the -assumption- that the idea precedes life, that abstract things take precedence over social practice and that therefore the science of society must form the starting-point for social revolutions and transformations, they necessarily arrive at the conclusion that since the idea, theory, science, at the present time at least, is everywhere the province of a very few people, this small number of people must therefore be entrusted with the management of society, and that they should provide not merely the inspiration, but also the leadership of every popular movement and that on the day after the revolution a new social organisation should be established not by the free association of popular organisations, communities, -districts, regions from below- in accordance with the people’s requirements and instincts, but solely through the dictatorial authority of that learned minority, albeit a minority elected by the “will of the people”” (p. 214).

Hence the “doctrinaire revolutionaries” are never enemies of the -state-, but only of existing governments whose place they wish to occupy as dictators (p. 215).

“And this is so true that at the present time when reaction is triumphant throughout Europe, when all the governments, etc., are making preparations under the leadership of Count Bismarck for a desperate struggle against the social revolution; at a time when it would seem that all sincere revolutionaries should join forces to resist the desperate onslaught of international reaction, we see the opposite, namely that under the leadership of Mr. Marx the doctrinaire revolutionaries everywhere take up the cudgels on behalf of -statehood- and the -worshippers of the state- and against the -popular revolution- (p. 216). In France they stood on the side of the -state- republican-reactionary Gambetta against the revolutionary *Ligue du Midi* which alone could have saved France both from the German yoke and from the much more dangerous and now victorious coalition of clerics, Legitimists, Bonapartists and Orleans; in Spain they openly sided with Castelar, P. y Moro and the Madrid Constituent Assembly, in Germany and around her, in Austria, Switzerland, Holland and Denmark, they serve Count Bismarck whom on their own admission they regard as an extremely useful revolutionary -statesman- and assist him in the Pan-Germanisation of all these countries” (pp. 216, 217).

(Feuerbach was still a metaphysician: “he had to make way for his -legitimate- successors, the leaders of the school of materialists or realists, most of whom, such as, for instance, Messrs. Büchner, Marx and others” have not yet succeeded in liberating themselves “from the dominance of metaphysical abstract thought”) (p. 207).

“But the principal propagandist of socialism in Germany, at first in secret and not long afterwards in public, was Karl Marx. Mr. Marx played and still plays too an important a role in the socialist movement of the German proletariat for it to be possible to overlook this remarkable personality without having made the attempt to describe some of his true characteristics. By origin Mr. Marx is a Jew. It may be said that he combines in himself all the virtues and defects of this gifted race. Nervous (nervösen), as some say, to the point of cowardice, he is extraordinarily ambitious and vain, quarrelsome, intolerant and absolute like Jehovah, the God of his forefathers, and like Him, vindictive to the point of insanity. There is no lie, slander, which he would be incapable of inventing against anyone who had the misfortune to arouse his jealousy, or, what amounts to the same thing, his hatred. And he stops short at no intrigue, however "infamous", if only in his opinion (which incidentally is mostly mistaken) this intrigue can serve to strengthen his position, his influence or his power. In this respect he is a political -man- through and through. These are his negative characteristics. But he has also a great many positive qualities. He is very -clever- and extraordinarily versatile and -learned-. A doctor of philosophy, it can be said that, as early as 1840 in Cologne he was the heart and soul of a very important circle of leading Hegelians, with whom he began to publish an oppositional journal* which was soon suppressed on

---

* Rheinische Zeitung für Politik, Handel und Gewerbe.— Ed.
ministerial orders. To this circle belonged the brothers Edgar and Bruno Bauer, Marx, Stirner and later in Berlin the first circle of German nihilists whose cynical logic far surpassed that of the most ferocious Russian nihilists. In 1843 or 1844 Marx moved to Paris. There for the first time he made contact with the society of French and German communists and with his compatriot, Moritz Hess, another German Jew, who had been a learned economist and socialist even before him and who at this period exerted an important influence on the intellectual development of Mr. Marx. It is rare that one comes across a man who knows as much and has read as intelligently as Mr. Marx. Even at this early date the economy was the sole object of his concern. He studied the English economists with particular zeal since they excel all others in the positive character of their knowledge and in their practical sense, nourished by the facts of the English economy, their vigorous criticism and the scrupulous boldness of their conclusions. But to all this Mr. Marx added two new features of his own: the most abstract, most ingenious dialectics which he had acquired in the Hegelian school and which he frequently pushed to mischievous, not to say perverted lengths, and the communist point of view. Mr. Marx read, it goes without saying, all the French socialists from St. Simon to Proudhon inclusively, the last named being someone he hated, as is well known, and there is no doubt that the merciless criticism that he directed against Proudhon contains more than a grain of truth; Proudhon, despite all his efforts to stand on the firm ground of reality, remained an idealist and a metaphysician. His point of departure was the abstract idea of law; he proceeds from law to the economic fact, while Mr. Marx, on the other hand, has stated and proved the indubitable truth, which is confirmed by the entire history of human society, of peoples and of states, past and present, that the economic fact everywhere took and takes precedence over juridical and political law. The exposition and proof of this truth is one of the principal scientific achievements of Mr. Marx. But the most remarkable fact, and one which Mr. Marx has acknowledged, is that in the political sphere Mr. Marx is a direct disciple of M. Louis Blanc. Mr. Marx is incomparably more intelligent and incomparably more erudite than that little unsuccessful revolutionary and statesman; but as a German and despite his respectable height, he served his apprenticeship with the diminutive Frenchman. And there is a simple explanation for this singular fact: the particular Frenchman, as a bourgeois politician and a self-confessed follower of Robespierre, and the learned German in his threefold character as Hegelian, Jew and German, are both ferocious worshippers of the state and preachers of state communism, only with the difference that the one rests content with rhetorical declarations instead of arguments, and the other, as befits a learned and painstaken German, supported the principle which was equally dear to him with every subtlety of Hegelian dialectics and the whole wealth of his vast erudition. In around 1845 Mr. Marx became the leader of the German communists and subsequently, together with Mr. Engels, his devoted (пенёвына) friend, who was just as intelligent, though less learned, albeit much more practical and no less capable of political slander, lies and intrigue, he founded a secret society of German communists or state-socialists. Their central organ was the journal, of course—led by himself and Mr. Engels, was transferred to Brussels when both were expelled from Paris in 1846, and it remained there until 1848. Incidentally, until that year their propaganda, although it had made some headway in Germany,

remained secret and therefore did not penetrate to the outside world.” (pp. 221-225).

At the time of (the revolution of) 1848 the urban proletariat in Germany, at least in its vast majority, was still beyond the reach of Marx’s propaganda and beyond the organisation of his communist party. The latter was concentrated chiefly in the industrial towns of Rhenish Prussia, especially in Cologne; branches in Berlin, Breslau and, finally, in Vienna, but very weak. Instinctively the German proletariat was naturally in favour of socialist aspirations, but no conscious demands for social revolution in 1848-49 even though the Communist Manifesto had been published as early as March 1848. It made almost no impression at all on the German people. The urban revolutionary proletariat still under the direct influence of the political party of radicals or at best the democrats (p. 230). At that time there was one more element in Germany, which now does not exist there, the revolutionary peasantry, or a peasantry at least ready to become revolutionary ... at that time, it was ready for anything, even for a “general revolt.” “In 1848 as in 1830 the German liberals and radicals feared nothing so much as such a revolt, nor do socialists of Marx’s school like it any better. It is a well-known fact that Ferdinand Lassalle who confessed to being a direct disciple of the supreme leader of the communist party in Germany, which did not prevent his teacher from giving vent, after Lassalle’s death, to his jealous and envious (malevolent) dissatisfaction with his brilliant pupil, who had left his teacher far behind him in terms of practical politics; it is a well-known fact that Lassalle more than once gave it as his opinion that the defeat of the peasants’ uprising in the 16th century and the subsequent strengthening and blossoming of the bureaucratic state in Germany was a real victory for the revolution. For the communist or socialist democrats of Germany, the peasantry, any peasantry, is reactionary; and the “state”, every “state”, even the Bismarckian one, revolutionary. And let no one imagine that we are slandering them. As proof that they actually think in this way we shall point to their speeches, their pamphlets, journalistic statements and lastly their letters—all these things will be made available to the Russian public in due course. Moreover, the Marxists cannot in fact think in any other way; “state” at any price, they must inevitably abominate every popular revolution, especially peasant ones, peasants by their very nature and directly aiming at the destruction of the “state”. As all-devouring Pan-Germans they must repudiate peasant revolution if only because that is the specific form of the Slav revolution” (pp. 230-232).

“Not only in 1848, but even now the German workers blindly submit to their leaders, while the leaders, the organisers of the German Social-Democratic Party, lead them neither to liberty nor to international fraternity, but beneath the yoke of the Pan-Germanic “state.”” (p. 254).

Bakunin recounts how Frederick William IV was afraid of Nicholas (reply to the Polish deputation in March 1848 and Olmütz, November 1850) (pp. 254-257).

1849-1858: The German Confederation counted for less than nothing among the other sovereign powers. “Prussia not more than ever the slave of Russia.” Her subservience to the interests of the Petersburg court went so far that the Prussian Minister of War and the Prussian ambassador to the English court, a friend of the
King's, were both dismissed because they had revealed their pro-western sympathies.” Nicholas furious about Schwarzenberg's and Austria's ingratitude.

“Austria, the natural enemy of Russia on account of her interests in the east, openly took sides with England and France against her. To the great indignation of the whole of Germany, Prussia remained “true to the last” (p. 259). “Manteuffel became Prime Minister in November 1850 to put his signature to all the conditions of the Olmütz conference, which were humiliating in the extreme for Prussia, and to put the finishing touches to subjecting both Prussia and the whole of Germany to the hegemony of Austria. Such was the will of Nicholas such too were the aspirations of the major part of the Prussian Junkers or nobles who could not even bear to think of emerging Prussia into Germany and who were even more devoted to the Austrian” (p. 261).

“At this time (1866 et seq.) the so-called People’s Party came into existence. Its centre Stuttgart. A group wanting federation with republican Switzerland was the main impetus behind the founding of the Ligue de la Paix et de la Liberté

(p. 271).

“Lassalle founded a mainly political party of German workers, organised it and subjected it to strict discipline and to his dictatorship; in a word he did what Mr. Marx intended to do in the International in the next three years. Marx's attempt failed, but Lassalle’s was completely successful” (p. 275).

“The first act of the people’s state” (according to Lassalle) “will be the granting of unlimited credit to the workers’ production and consumption associations, for only then will these be able to fight bourgeois capital and to defeat and absorb it in the not too distant future. When the process of absorbing it is completed, then the period of the radical transformation of society will commence. This is Lassalle’s programme and this is the programme of the Social-Democratic Party. In actual fact Lassalle, but to Marx, who gave a complete exposition of it in the celebrated Manifesto of the Communist Party, published by him and Engels in 1848. And there is a «definite pointer to it» in the first Manifesto of the International Association written by Marx in 1864, in the words: ‘the great duty of the working classes’, etc., or, as it is put in the Communist Manifesto, ‘the first step in the revolution’, etc., and ending with ‘to concentrate all instruments of production in the hands of the state’, i.e. of the proletariat ‘raised to the level of the ruling estate’.” (pp. 275, 276).

“But is it not «clear» that Lassalle's programme is indistinguishable from that of Marx whom he acknowledged as his teacher? In the pamphlet directed against Schulze-Delitzsch, Lassalle ... having explained his basic conception of the social and political development of modern society, says explicitly that the ideas themselves and even the terminology he uses belong not to him but to Mr. Marx... All the «strangers» is it, therefore, to see the protest printed by Mr. Marx after the death of Lassalle in the Preface to Capital. Marx complains bitterly that Lassalle has robbed him by appropriating his ideas. This protest, a very «strange» one from a communist who preaches collective ownership but who does not comprehend the fact that an idea, once uttered, ceases to be the property of an individual. It would be another matter if Lassalle had «copied one or more pages...” (p. 276). “In contrast to his teacher Marx, who is strong on theory and on intrigue behind the scenes or under cover, but loses all importance and force in the public arena, Lassalle was made by nature for open struggle in practical politics” (p. 277). “The entire liberal and democratic bourgeoisie deeply detested him: «like-minded comrades», socialists, Marxists and Marx himself, concentrated on him all the force of their malevolent envy (западисты). Indeed, their loathing of him equalled that felt by the bourgeoisie; during his life they did not venture to express their hatred because he was too strong for them” (pp. 277, 278).

“We have already expressed our deep aversion to the theory of Lassalle and Marx which recommends to the workers, if not as an ultimate ideal, at least as the principal immediate objective, the establishment of a people’s state (народничество), which, as they put it, will be nothing other than ‘the proletariat raised to the level of the ruling estate’. The question is, if the proletariat is to be the ruling class, over whom will it rule? This means (this implies—наравне с тем) that another proletariat will remain which will be subject to this new domination, this new state (народничество).”

It implies that as long as the other classes, above all the capitalist class, still exist, and as long as the proletariat is still fighting against it (for when the proletariat obtains control of the government its enemies and the old organisation of society will not yet have disappeared), it must use forcible means, that is to say, governmental means; as long as it remains a class itself, and the economic conditions which give rise to the class struggle and the existence of classes have not vanished they must be removed or transformed by force, and the process of transforming them must be accelerated by force.

“For example, the «крестьянская чернь», the vulgar peasants, the peasant rabble, who, as is well known, do not enjoy the goodwill of the Marxists and who, standing on the lowest rung of civilisation, will probably be governed by the urban and factory proletariat” (p. 278).

That is to say, where peasants en masse exist as owners of private property, where they even form a more or less considerable majority, as in all the states of the West European continent, where they have not yet disappeared and have not been replaced by agricultural day labourers, as in England, there the following may happen: either the peasants prevent or bring about the downfall of every workers’ revolution, as they have done hitherto in France; or else the proletariat (for the peasant proprietor does not belong to the proletariat, and even if he does belong to it in terms of his actual position, he does not think of himself as belonging to it) must, as the government, take the measures needed to enable the peasant to directly improve his condition, i.e. to win him over to the revolution; these measures, however, contain the seeds which will facilitate the transition from the private ownership of the land to collective ownership, so that the peasant arrives at this economically of his own accord; but it is important not to antagonise the peasant, e.g. by proclaiming the
abolition of the right of inheritance or the abolition of his property; the latter is possible only where the capitalist tenant farmer has ousted the peasants, so that the actual farmer is as much a proletarian, a wage-labourer, as the urban worker, so that he has the same interests as the latter directly and not indirectly. Still less should smallholdings be strengthened by increasing the size of allotments simply by dividing up the large estates among the peasantry, as in Bakunin’s revolutionary campaign.

"Or, if this question is considered from the national point of view, then it must be assumed that for the Germans the Slavs will, for the same reason, be placed in the same relationship of slavish dependency on the victorious German proletariat as that in which the latter finds itself vis-à-vis its own bourgeoisie" (p. 278).

Schoolboyish rot! A radical social revolution is bound up with definite historical conditions of economic development; these are its premisses. It is only possible, therefore, where alongside capitalist production the industrial proletariat accounts for at least a significant portion of the mass of the people. And for it to have any chance of victory, it must be able *mutatis mutandis* at the very least to do as much directly for the peasants as the French bourgeoisie did in its revolution for the French peasantry at that time. A fine idea to imagine that the rule of the workers implies the oppression of rural labour! But this is where we glimpse Mr. Bakunin’s innermost thought. He understands absolutely nothing of social revolution, only its political rhetoric; its economic conditions simply do not exist for him. Now since all previous economic formations, whether developed or undeveloped, have entailed the enslavement of the worker (whether as wage labourer, peasant, etc.), he imagines that *radical revolution* is equally possible in all these formations. What is more, he wants the European social revolution, whose economic basis is capitalist production, to be carried out on the level of the Russian or Slav agricultural and pastoral peoples, and that it should not surpass this level, even though he can see that *navigation* creates distinctions among brethren; but of course he only thinks of *navigation* because this distinction is familiar to all politicians! *Willpower*, not economic conditions, is the basis of his social revolution.

"Where there is a state (государство), there is inevitably domination (господство) and consequently there is also "slavery": domination without slavery, hidden or masked, is unthinkable—that is why we are enemies of the "state"* (p. 278).

"What does it mean to talk of the proletariat "raised to the level of the ruling estate"?

It means that the proletariat, instead of fighting in individual instances against the economically privileged classes, has gained sufficient strength and organisation to use general means of coercion in its struggle against them; but it can only make use of such economic means as abolish its own character as wage labourer and hence as a class; when its victory is complete, its rule too is therefore at an end, since its class character will have disappeared.

"Will perhaps the entire proletariat stand at the head of the government?"

In a *trade union*, for example, does the entire union form its executive committee? Will all division of labour in the factory come to an end as well as the various functions arising from it? And with Bakunin’s constitution «from below», will everyone be "at the top"? If so, there will be no one "at the bottom". Will all the members of the community at the same time administer the common interests of the «region»? If so, there will be no distinction between community and «region».

"There are about 40 million Germans. Does this mean that all 40 million will be members of the government?"

Certainly! For the system starts with the self-government of the communities.

"The entire people will rule, and no one will be ruled."

When a person rules himself, he does not do so according to this principle; for he is only himself and not another.

"Then there will be no government, no state, but if there is a state, there will be both rulers and slaves."

That just means when class rule has disappeared there [will] be no state in the present political sense (p. 279).

"The dilemma in the theory of the Marxists is easily resolved. By people’s government they” (i.e. Bakunin) “understand the government of the people by means of a small number of representatives chosen (elected) by the people."

Asine! *"This is democratic twaddle, political claptrap! Elections—a political form found in the tiniest Russian commune and in the artel. The character of an election does not depend on this name but on the economic foundation, the economic interrelations of the voters, and as soon as the functions have ceased to be political, 1) government functions no longer exist; 2) the distribution of general functions has become a routine matter which entails no domination; 3) elections lose their present political character."

"The universal suffrage of the whole people“—
such a thing as the whole people, in the present meaning of the word, is an illusion—

"to elect its representatives and 'rulers of state'—that is the last word of the Marxists and also of the democratic school—is a lie which conceals the despotism of the ruling minority, a lie that is all the more dangerous as it appears as the expression of the so-called will of the people."

With collective ownership the so-called will of the people disappears and makes way for the genuine will of the cooperative.

"So the result is the control of the vast majority of the people by a privileged minority. But this minority, the Marxists say,"

Where?

"will consist of workers. Yes, quite possibly of former workers, but, as soon as they have become the representatives or rulers of the people, they cease to be workers"—

no more than a factory owner today ceases to be a capitalist when he becomes a municipal councillor—

"and will gaze down upon the whole world of the common workers from the eminence of 'statehood': they will no longer represent the people, but only themselves and their 'claims' to govern the people. Anyone who can doubt this knows nothing of human nature" (p. 279).

If Mr. Bakunin were familiar even with the position of a manager in a workers' co-operative factory, all his fantasies about domination would go to the devil. He should have asked himself: what forms could management functions assume within such a workers' state, if he wants to call it that? (p. 279).

"But these chosen people will become passionately convinced as well as learned socialists. The words 'learned socialism'—

never used—

'scientific socialism'—

used only in contrast to utopian socialism which wishes to foist new illusions onto the people instead of confining its scientific investigations to the social movement created by the people itself; see my book against Proudhon"—

"which recur repeatedly in the writings and speeches of the Lassalleans and Marxists, prove themselves that the so-called people's state will be nothing more than the highly despotic direction of the masses of the people by a new and very small aristocracy of genuinely or supposedly learned men. The people is not scientific; that means it will be wholly liberated from the cares of government, it will be completely incorporated into the herd that is to be governed. A fine liberation!" (pp. 279, 280).

Notes on Bakunin's Statehood and Anarchy

"The Marxists perceive this" (!) "contradiction and, recognising that a government of scholars" (quelle révée!) a "will be the most oppressive, most hated and most desppicable in the world, and that for all its democratic forms it will actually be a dictatorship, they console themselves with the thought that this dictatorship will be provisional and brief" [p. 280].

Non, mon cher!—The class rule of the workers over the strata of the old world who are struggling against them can only last as long as the economic basis of class society has not been destroyed.

"They say that their sole concern and objective will be to educate and uplift the people" (aiè-house politician!) "both economically and politically to such a level that all government will soon become unnecessary and the state will completely lose its political, i.e., its 'dominating' character, and will change of its own accord into the free organisation of economic interests and communities. This is an evident contradiction. If their state is truly a people's state, why destroy it, and if its abolition is necessary for the real liberation of the people, then how dare they call it a people's state?" (p. 280).

Apart from his harping on Liebknecht's 'people's state, which is nonsense directed against the Communist Manifesto, etc., it only means that, as the proletariat in the period of struggle leading to the overthrow of the old society still acts on the basis of the old society and hence still moves within political forms which more or less correspond to it, it has at that stage not yet arrived at its final organisation, and hence to achieve its liberation has recourse to methods which will be discarded once that liberation has been attained. Hence Mr. Bakunin deduces that the proletariat should rather do nothing at all... and just wait for the day of universal liquidation—the Last Judgement.

"By our polemics against them"

(which appeared, of course, before my book against Proudhon and the Communist Manifesto, and even before St. Simon) (a beautiful υστερον πρότερον) b

"we have forced them to admit that freedom or anarchy"

(Mr. Bakunin has only translated Proudhon's and Stirner's anarchy into the barbaric idiom of the Tartars),

"i.e. the free organisation of the working masses from below" (nonsense!) "is the ultimate goal of social development and that every 'state', the people's state included, is a yoke which engenders despotism, on the one hand, and slavery, on the other" (p. 280).

"They assert that this authoritarian yoke, dictatorship, is a transitional phase essential to the attainment of the complete liberation of the people: anarchy or freedom—the end; domination or dictatorship—the means. Hence in order to

---

a K. Marx, The Poverty of Philosophy. Answer to the "Philosophy of Poverty" by M. Proudhon.—Ed.

b Hysteria proton: a figure of speech in which what should come last (hysteron) is put first (proteron); inversion of natural order.—Ed.
The contradiction that our polemics rest. They assure us that only a dictatorship, their own of course, can form the basis of the people's freedom; we reply that no dictatorship can ever have any goal but to perpetuate itself and that it is capable only of breeding and nurturing slavery in the people that is forced to endure it; freedom can only be created by freedom (the freedom of the permanent citizen Bakunin), "i.e. by the rebellion of the whole people and the free organisation of the masses from below" (p. 281).

Whereas the political and social theory of the anti-state socialists or anarchists leads inexorably and directly to a complete break with all governments, with all modes of bourgeois politics, leaving no alternative but social revolution, (leaving nothing of the social revolution but phrases),

the opposite theory, the theory of the state communists and of scientific authority, on the pretext of political tactics, lures its supporters no less inexorably and ensnares them in an incessant process of "horsetrading" with governments and the various bourgeois political parties; that is to say, it drives them directly into the arms of the reaction" (p. 281). "The best proof of this is Lassalle. Who is ignorant of his relations and his deals with Bismarck? The liberals and democrats [...] used this to accuse him of venality. The same, though not so openly, has been 'whispered' among various followers of Mr. Marx in Germany" (p. 282).

Lassalle's attitude towards the mass of common workers was more like that of a doctor towards his patients than one brother to another. He would not have betrayed the people for anything in the world (i.e.) Lassalle had openly declared war on the liberals and democrats; he detested and despised them. Bismarck's attitude to them was the same. This was the first reason for their rapprochement. "The chief basis for this rapprochement" was implicit in Lassalle's political and social programme, in the theory of communism founded by Mr. Marx" (p. 283).

The principal point of this programme: the (supposed) liberation of the proletariat by means of the 'state alone'-... Two means... the proletariat must carry out revolution in order to subject the state to it—this is the heroic method—according to the theory of Mr. Marx... the people must then put all power into his own hands and the hands of his friends... "They will find a single state bank, concentrating in their hands all commercial, industrial, agricultural and even scientific production, and divide the population into two armies, industrial and agrarian, under the direct command of engineers of the state who will form a new privileged scientific and political estate" (pp. 283, 284).

As for making a revolution, Germans themselves do not believe in it... "It is necessary for another people to make a start or for some external 'force' to drag them along or 'give' them a push." Hence some other means required to obtain control of the state. Necessary to gain the sympathy of people who stand or can stand at the head of the state... In Lassalle's day, as today, Bismarck stood at the head of the state... Lassalle chiefly endowed with practical instinct and 'intelligence', which are missing in Mr. Marx and his followers. Like all theoreticians, Marx a lifelong and incorrigible dreamer in practice. He demonstrated this by his hapless campaign in the International Association, whose goal was to set up his dictatorship International and to extend it through the International to the entire revolutionary movement of the proletariat in Europe and America. To set yourself such a goal you must be either a madman or a completely abstract theoretician. This year Mr. Marx suffered a complete and thoroughly merited defeat, but it is "unlikely to rid (refutatns) him of his ambitious dreaming" (pp. 284, 285). "Such dreams, together with his desire to gain admires and adherents among the bourgeoisie, led and lead Marx again and again to drive the proletariat into negotiations with the bourgeois radicals. Gambetta and Castelar—those are his 'true' ideals" (pp. 284, 285). "These attempts, which have intensified in Marx in recent years, to make deals (c ada) with the radical bourgeoisie, testify to two different dreams: first, if the radical bourgeoisie attains power, it will perhaps be in a position to 'want' to use that power to the advantage of the proletariat, and second, it will be able to hold out against the reaction whose roots are hidden within itself" (p. 285).

As a practical man Lassalle realised this (i.e. that the radical bourgeoisie is neither willing nor able to liberate the people, but wishes only to exploit it); moreover he detested the German bourgeoisie; Lassalle also knew his fellow countrymen too well to expect any revolutionary initiative from them. Only Bismarck remained to him. "What brought them together was provided to him by Marxian theory itself: a unified, forcibly centralised state. Lassalle wanted this and Bismarck created it. How could they not come together?" Bismarck the enemy (!) of the bourgeois. His present activities prove that he is no fanatic and no slave of the aristocratic-feudal party... "His chief purpose, like that of Lassalle and Marx—the state. And therefore Lassalle proved himself to be incomparably more logical and practical than Marx, who acknowledges Bismarck as a revolutionary, 'albeit in his own way', and who dreams of his overthrow, probably because he occupies the first place in the state, a position which in Mr. Marx's opinion ought to be filled by himself. Lassalle lacked such sanity; therefore he did not怀抱 the idea of forming an alliance with Bismarck. "In complete conformity with the political programme propounded by Messrs. Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto, Lassalle put only one demand to Bismarck: that he should make government credit available to workers' production associations." And at the same time, "in agreement with the programme, he began peaceful and legal agitation among the workers to achieve the introduction of the franchise" (pp. 288-289).

After Lassalle's death, alongside the workers' educational societies and Lassalle's General Association of German Workers, "a third party—the Social-Democratic Party of the German Workers—was formed under the direct influence of the friends and followers of Mr. Marx. At its head were Bebel, n'oyafasulis (a semi-worker), and Liebknecht, a complete theorist and agent of Mr. Marx" (p. 289).

We have already referred to Liebknecht's activities in Vienna in 1868. These resulted in the Nurnberg Congress (August 1868) at which the Social-Democratic Party was finally organised. "The desire (intention) of its founders, acting under the direct leadership of Marx, was to make it the Pan-Germanic section of the International Working Men's Association," But the German and, above all, the Prussian laws were opposed to such a union. Hence it was only touched on indirectly: "The Social-Democratic Party of the German Workers enters into relations with the International Working Men's Association within the limits permitted by German laws." "There can be no doubt that this new party was founded in Germany with the secret hope and intention of making use of it to introduce into the International the entire programme of Marx which the first Geneva Congress (of 1866) had rejected." 399 "Marx's programme became the programme of the Social-Democratic Party", the 'conquest' of "political power" became the 'first and immediate

\[a\] Direct disciple in Bakunin. — Ed.

\[b\] Italicised in Bakunin too. — Ed.
objective", a recommendation followed by this significant phrase: "The conquest of political power (universal suffrage, freedom of the press, freedom of association and meetings, etc.) as the indispensable preliminary (необходимое и необходимое) condition of the economic emancipation of the workers." This phrase means before advancing towards social revolution, the workers must carry out the political revolution, or, as better hefits the German character, conquer, or, better still, acquire, political rights by means of peaceful agitation. But since every political movement preceding or, what amounts to the same thing, occurring outside the social one can be none other than a bourgeois movement, it follows that this programme recommends the German workers first and foremost to acquire bourgeois interests and objectives and to carry out the political movement for the benefit of the radical bourgeoisie which then in gratitude will not liberate the people, but will subject it to a new rule and new exploitation" (pp. 289-291).

The success of this programme a moving reconciliation took place between the German and Austrian workers and the bourgeois radicals of the People's Party. On the basis of "the Nuremberg Congress delegates nominated by the Congress for the purpose went to Stuttgart where a formal defensive and offensive alliance was concluded between the cliques of the deceived workers and the ring-leaders of the bourgeois radical party. As a consequence of this alliance both groups appeared together at the Second Congress of the Ligue de la Paix et de la Liberté, which opened in September in Berne. But a very remarkable fact. There was a split between the bourgeois socialists and the radicals on the one hand—and the social revolutionaries belonging to the party of the Alliance on the other" (pp. 291, 292). Marx's school has provided us with many examples of this ability to call one-selves socialists; a friend of the people, while remaining, all joined together in unmanly opposition; and the German dictator is very hospitable under the indispensable condition that people bow down to him, so that his banner covers a very large number of people who are bourgeois socialists and democrats from top to toe; even the Ligue de la Paix et de la Liberté could find refuge there if it were only prepared to acknowledge him as the top man (вождь).

If the bourgeois congress had proceeded in this fashion, the position of the Allianceists would have been incomparably more difficult; it would have led to the same struggle between the League and the Alliance that now rages between the Alliance and Marx. However, the League showed itself to be more stupid, but also more honest than the Marxists; it denied equality (ненависть) "in the consciousness of the masses." It thereby cut itself off from the proletariat, died, and left behind it only two shades who roam around uttering lamentations: Amand Goegg and the St. Simonist millionaire, Lemoine... Another fact about this Congress: the delegates who came from Nuremberg and Stuttgart, i.e. the workers mandated by the Nuremberg Congress of the Social-Democratic Party of the German Workers and the bourgeois Swabian "People's Party", together with the majority of the League, voted unanimously against equality. And a further remarkable fact is that the Brussels Congress of the International, which concluded its deliberations some days before the one in Berne, repudiated all solidarity with the latter, and all the Marxists who took part in the Brussels Congress spoke and voted along those lines. How could it come about then that other Marxists, acting like the first under the direct influence of Marx, should have gone along in such touching harmony with the majority at the Berne Congress? All that remained an enigma which has still not been resolved to the present day. The same contradiction became manifest throughout 1868 and even into 1869 in the Volksstaat... At times very powerful articles were printed in it against the bourgeois League; these were then followed by unmistakable "declarations" of affection, and at other times friendly remonstrances. The paper as it were implored the League to "moderate" its over-enthusiastic proclamations of bourgeois instincts which compromised its defenders in the eyes of the workers. This indescision persisted in Mr. Marx's party up to September 1869, i.e. up to the Basle Congress. This Congress is epoch-making in the history of the International" (pp. 293-296).

For the first time the Germans appeared at an international congress, and they came as a party organised around a bourgeois political programme rather than a national people's one. Under the leadership of Liebknecht they voted as one man. His first concern, understandably in view of his programme, was to put the political question before everything else. The Germans decisively defeated the Basle Congress retained the programme of the International in all its purity; it refused to allow the Germans to mutilate it by introducing their bourgeois policies. It was in this way that the split in the International came about, and it was the Germans who were responsible for it. They wished to impose their narrowly bourgeois, national-political, exclusively German and Pan-Germanic programme on an association which was first and foremost international. "They were squarely defeated and the League of Social Revolutionaries, the Allianceists, were not slow to make use of this defeat." Hence the bitter hatred of the Germans for the Alliance. The end of 1869 and first half of 1870 were filled with venomous attacks and even more insidious and not infrequently base intrigues by the Marxists against the Alliance people" (p. 296).

A victory by Napoleon III would not have had such long-lasting adverse effects as the German one (p. 297).

All Germans without exception rejoiced at the victory, even though they knew that it would set the seal on the predominance of the military; "not a single German gave up the cult of hisondaissance, nor the political question before everything else. It is true that a majority of the workers had been drafted into the army where they distinguished themselves in carrying out their duty as soldiers, killed everyone, etc., at the command of their superiors and even took part in plundering. Some of them, while carrying out their war-like duty in this way, at the same time wrote heart-rending letters to the Volksstaat with vivid accounts of the barbarous crimes committed by the German armies in France" (pp. 298, 299). Meanwhile there were a few instances of bolder opposition: the protests of Jacoby, Liebknecht and Bebel: these were isolated and also very rare cases.

"We cannot forget the article published in the Volksstaat in September 1870 in which Pan-Germanic victory jubilation is openly expressed. It begins with the words: Thanks to the victories gained by the German armies, the historical initiative has finally passed from France to Germany: we Germans, etc." (p. 299).

"In a word, we can say without any exception that the triumphant feeling of national military and political victory predominated and still predominates among all Germans. It is upon this that the power of the Pan-Germanic Empire and its great Chancellor, Count Bismarck, may be said chiefly to be founded" (p. 299).

"And do you know what ambition now predominates in the mind or the

a Bakunin has: "social people's".— Ed.

b Bakunin has: "made no small contribution to this defeat"— Ed.
instinct of every German? The desire to expand (распространить) -far, wide- the German Empire” (p. 303). This passion is “now also the entire activity of the Social-Democratic Party. And do not imagine that Bismarck is such an ardent enemy of that party as he pretends (предыдущего). He is too cunning, not to perceive that it serves him as an advance guard, spreading the idea of the Germanic state in Austria, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Holland and Switzerland. The dissemination of this Germanic idea is at present the principal aspiration of Mr. Marx who, as we have already remarked, has attempted to renew (восстановить) to his own advantage within the International the exploits and the victories of Count Bismarck. Bismarck holds all parties in his hand and is hardly likely to hand them over to Mr. Marx” (p. 304).

“Through the voice of its great Chancellor, this” (Pan-Germanic) “Empire has declared a war to the death on social revolution. Count Bismarck uttered this death sentence in the name of 40 million Germans who stand behind him and support him. Marx too, his envious rival, and behind him all the [ring]leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party, for their part declared the same desperate war on social revolution. We shall discuss all this in depth in the next section” (pp. 307, 308). “Hitherto, it” (the social revolution) “has concentrated its forces in Southern Europe: Italy, Spain, France; but soon, we hope, the peoples of the north-west will rise up beneath its banner: Belgium, Holland and, above all, England, and then at last the Slav tribes too” (p. 308).

APPENDIX

“The main features of the ideal” of the Russian people: 1. “the universal conviction, shared by the entire people, that the earth, the whole earth watered by their sweat and fertilised by the labour of their own hands, belongs to the people; 2. that the right to use it belongs not to the individual, but to the “community”, to the “communal assembly” which shares it out among individuals for a fixed period; 3. quasi-absolute autonomy, communal self-administration and in consequence the resolutely hostile attitude of the “community” towards the state” (p. 10).

“The three negative features are: 1. the patriarchal state; 2. the engulfing of the individual by the “communal assembly”; 3. faith in the Tsar. One could add 4. the Christian faith, whether of the established church or the sects (p. 10); but this plays a less significant part in Russia than in Western Europe” (l.c.).

Points 2 and 3 are “natural consequences” of point 1, the “patriarchal state”. Father, “communal assembly”, the Tsar (p. 15). “The “community” is his world. It is nothing but the natural extension of his family, his clan. It is for this reason that the patriarchal principle dominates in it, the same odious despotism and the same general subservience and hence too the хороньо (quintessential, deeply rooted) injustice and the same radical denial of every right of the individual, as in the family too. The decisions of the “communal assembly”, whatever they may be, are law. “Who dares to go against the communal assembly?” enthuses the peasant with “amazement”... In the “communal assembly” only the “elders”, the heads of the family, have the right to vote... But above the “community”, above all the communities, stands the Tsar, the “universal” patriarch and progenitor, the father of all Russia. Hence his power is without limit” (p. 15). “Every community forms a “closed whole”, and in consequence no community has, or feels the need for, any independent organic bonds with other communities. They are only joined to each other through the “Tsar, the Father”, and only by virtue of the supreme, fatherly power which he wields” (pp. 15, 16).
Bakunin's *Statehood and Anarchy* appeared anonymously in Geneva in 1873 and was received by the Bakuninists as a programme document. Marx's work on this book was closely associated with the ideological and political struggle waged by Marx and Engels and their followers against anarchism, a struggle which went on even after the Bakuninists' defeat at the Hague Congress and the expulsion of the leaders of the Alliance from the International (see notes 30 and 38).

Marx's *Notes on Bakunin's Book* form an original critical and polemical work combining the analysis of the ideas of Bakunin, the ideologist of anarchism and, at that time, the principal opponent of Marxism, and profound criticism of anarchist doctrines with the development of the basic propositions of scientific communism on the state, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the alliance of the working class with the peasantry.

This work is part of a thick notebook of Marx's manuscripts, entitled *Russo II*, 1875, which contains synopses of works by Russian authors. The manuscript of the *Notes* amounts to 24 large-size sheets. Marx wrote direct quotations from Bakunin's book in Russian or in German translation, or gave brief rendering in German of separate passages. Marx's own text consists of laconic comments and lengthier insertions.

In the present volume all passages from Bakunin's text are in small type; the words and passages translated from the Russian are placed in "", and those from the German are in "". Wherever Marx finds one or several equivalents to the Russian word in German or other languages these have been translated into English. Marx's own remarks are in long primer. The italics in the quotations are Marx's unless otherwise stated in the footnotes.

Bakunin is referring to the representatives of the bourgeoisie who "came heartily to hate the present order, the political, economic and social order, who had turned their backs on the class that had produced them and had given themselves completely to the people's cause" (pp. 6-7).

The reference is to the suppression of the revolutions in the Kingdom of Naples (1820-21) and Spain (1820-25) by decision of the congresses of the Holy Alliance (see Note 145), which sent Austrian troops to Italy (Troppau and Lattesche congresses, 1850-21), and French troops to Spain (Versailles congress, 1822).

The first partition of Poland (1772) was initiated by Frederick II of Prussia. Catherine II agreed to it because of Russia's difficult position owing to the Russo-Turkish war of 1768-74 and Austria's threat to enter the war on the side of Turkey (see also Note 9).

The reference is to the Polish uprisings of 1830 and 1863 (see notes 389 and 14).

The reference is to the French National Assembly, the elections to which were held on February 8, 1871. The majority of the deputies were monarchists. After the uprising of March 18, 1871, the Assembly fled to Versailles, from where it fought against the Commune.

The reference is to the Fifth Nuremberg Congress of the Union of German Workers' Associations led by August Bebel which was held on September 5-7, 1888. The congress signified the break of the Union's majority from the liberal bourgeoisie and its firm adherence to class proletarian stand. By 69 votes against 44 the delegates accepted the International's platform, which was put concisely in the new programme of the Union proposed to the congress. This programme declared the abolition of the capitalist system to be the goal, and the proletarian class struggle the means of attaining it. The congress stated that the workers would be able to emancipate themselves only by seizing political power and acting "jointly with the workers of all countries".

The reference is to the French National Assembly, the elections to which were held on February 8, 1871. The majority of the deputies were monarchists. After the uprising of March 18, 1871, the Assembly fled to Versailles from where it fought against the Commune.

The *Vendôme Column* was erected in Paris between 1806 and 1810 as a tribute to the military victories of Napoleon I. On May 16, 1871, by the order of the Paris Commune, the Vendôme Column was destroyed as a symbol of militarism.

In the spring of 1873 the last units of the Prussian occupation troops were withdrawn from French territory. They were stationed there under the terms of the Frankfurt Peace of 1871, which concluded the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71.

Marx is referring to the activities of the *Comité de propagation révolutionnaire socialiste de la France méridionale*. It was founded by the former Paris Commune refugees living in Barcelona Charles Alerini and Paul Brousse and the member of the International's Lyons section Camille Camet in the spring of 1873 for spreading anarchist ideas in France and among the Commune refugees.

The reference is to Alsace and the north-eastern part of Lorraine captured by Germany in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, to Russia's refusal to observe the article of the Peace Treaty of 1856 (see Note 578) which forbade it to maintain its navy in the Black Sea, and to the campaign undertaken by the Russian government in the spring of 1873 against the Khiva Khanate.

The reference is to the Spanish Revolution of 1808-14 (see K. Marx, "Revolutionary Spain", present edition, Vol. 13).
In 1809 Tirol was the scene of a popular uprising, headed by Andreas Hofer, against the Franco-B Bavarian occupation. The uprising was a failure. p. 494

See Note 62. p. 494

The Carlists—a reactionary clerical-absolutist group in Spain consisting of adherents of the pretender to the Spanish throne Don Carlos, the brother of Ferdinand VII. Relying on the military and the Catholic clergy, and making use of the support of the backward peasants in some regions of Spain, the Carlists launched a civil war in 1833, which in fact turned into a struggle between the feudal-Catholic and liberal-bourgeois elements and led to the third bourgeois revolution (1834-43). After Don Carlos’ death in 1855 the Carlists supported his grandson Don Carlos Jr. In 1872, in the situation of political crisis and sharper class conflicts, the Carlists stepped up their activity, which took on the scope of a new civil war that ended only in 1876. p. 494

Fueros here means the charters which, in medieval Spain, established the rights, privileges and duties of townspeople and members of village communities in matters of local government, jurisdiction, taxation, military service, etc. p. 494

A reference to the activity of the Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see Note 30) during the fifth bourgeois revolution in Spain (see Note 62). p. 494

The programme of the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy was drawn up by Bakunin and published as a leaflet in Geneva in 1868 in French and German. It proclaimed atheism, equality of classes and the abolition of the state, and rejected the need for political action on the part of the working class (for Marx’s remarks and criticism of this programme, see present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 207-11). p. 495

According to the Austro-Hungarian compromise of 1867 the Habsburg Empire was transformed into a dual constitutional monarchy, Austria-Hungary. The Czech territories were incorporated into Cisleithania—part of the empire with Austria as its centre, and Slovakia, into Transleithania with Hungary as its centre. p. 495

The Great Moravian Kingdom (the Great Moravian Principality) was the early-feudal state of the Western Slavs in the 9th-early 10th centuries. At the time of its flourishing it embraced the territories of Moravia, Slovakia, Bohemia, Lüžica, Pannonia, and probably Malopolska and parts of the Slovenian lands. p. 497

An ironical allusion to the following passage from Bakunin’s book: “Against these people-suppressing trends ... an entirely new trend has finally developed leading directly to the abolition of all exploitation and all political or legal, as well as governmental-administrative oppression, i.e. to the abolition of all classes by means of making all estates economically equal, and to the abolition of their last stronghold, the State” (p. 74). p. 499

Bakunin is referring to Article 7a, “On the Political Action of the Working Class”, which was included into the “General Rules of the International Working Men’s Association” by the majority vote at the Hague Congress (see Note 58). p. 500

St. Wenceslas’ crown—a symbol of the Czech people’s historical right to state independence. In the 1860s-early 1870s, the campaign of the Czechs for state sovereignty and national equality proceeded under the banner of the restoration of the rights of St. Wenceslas’ crown. p. 500

Under the direct influence of anarchists, Serbian and Bulgarian students in Zurich organised a small group, Slavenski Savez, within the Alliance of Socialist Democracy (see Note 30). After several attempts in the spring of 1872 to constitute itself as a section of the International and the General Council’s refusal to recognise it, the group affiliated to the Jura Federation (see Note 298) in June-July 1872. The group’s programme was drawn up by Bakunin and published as “Supplement B” to his Statehood and Anarchy. The Slavenski Savez ceased to exist in the summer of 1873. p. 501

Slavophiles (A. Khomyakov, the brothers Aksakov, I. Kireevsky, Yu. Samarin and others)—representatives of a trend in the 19th-century Russian social and philosophical thought. In the late 1830s-1850s they advanced a theory of Russia’s unique path of historical development which, in their opinion, differed from that of Western Europe. Among the characteristic features of their theory were monarchism, a negative attitude to revolution and a leaning towards religious-philosophical conceptions. The Slavophiles met mostly at the literary salons of Moscow. p. 502

The reference is to the liberation of Moscow on October 22-26, 1612 by the people’s militia under Minin and Pozharsky, who united the country’s patriotic forces at the final stage of the struggle against the Polish-Lithuanian and Swedish invaders in the early 17th century. p. 502

Bogdán Khmelnitsky led the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people in 1648-54 against the rule of the Polish szlachta and for the reunification with Russia. As a result, the Ukraine was re-united with Russia in a single state (1654). p. 502

Bakunin is referring to the bloody suppression of the Polish uprising of 1863-64 (see Note 14) by Mikhail Muravyov, the Governor-General of Lithuania and Byelorussia, who was nicknamed “the hangman” for this. p. 503

This remark relates to the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71, the beginning of which Marx described as follows: “On the German side the war is a war of defence, but who put Germany to the necessity of defending herself? Who enabled Louis Bonaparte to wage war upon her? Prussia! It was Bismarck who conspired with that very same Louis Bonaparte for the purpose of crushing popular opposition at home, and annexing Germany to the Hohenzollern dynasty” (see present edition, Vol. 22, p. 5). p. 504

See Note 84. p. 505

The three parties are:

- The National-Liberal Party—the party of German and, above all, Prussian bourgeoisie formed in the autumn of 1866 after a split in the Party of Progress. The policies of the National Liberals mirrored the capitulation of a significant part of the liberal bourgeoisie to Bismarck’s Junker government after Prussia’s victory in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866 and the establishment of its supremacy in Germany.

- The Party of Progress was founded in June 1861. It advocated the unification of Germany under Prussian hegemony, the devolution of an all-German Parliament, and the establishment of a strong liberal Ministry responsible to the Chamber of Deputies. Its opposition to the Bismarck government was just so many words.
By the Social-Democratic Party Bakunin means the Social-Democratic Workers' Party (the so-called Eisenachers) and the General Association of German Workers uniting Lassalle's followers (see Note 334).

583 J. G. Fichte, Reden an die deutsche Nation (Berlin, 1808)—a course of lectures delivered by Fichte at Berlin University in the winter of 1807, when after the signing of the Peace of Tilsit Germany was in a state of extreme national humiliation. They developed the idea of the nation as a collective personality having its own, special vocation. Fichte called on his compatriots to unite; he believed that political independence can be attained through stronger moral principles and an education reform. According to him, a nation should foster an awareness of its vocation and duty.

584 Nicholas I was married in 1817 to the Prussian Princess Charlotte (Alexandra Fyodorovna), daughter of Frederick William III.

585 Ligue du Midi—a revolutionary-democratic organisation embracing 15 departments. It was set up on September 18, 1870 in Marseilles on the initiative of the more active section of the middle commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, and assumed responsibility for providing local defence in view of the weakness of the central authority. The League's programme included the basic democratic demands set forth by the French sections of the International. By late 1870 it had been declared illegal and disbanded.

586 In the notes for his L'Empire knouto-germanique, Bakunin wrote: “It is clear that urged by the same logic Mr. Engels could say in a letter written this year to the friends of ours, without the slightest irony but, on the contrary, quite seriously, that Mr. Bismarck, like King Victor Emmanuel, has rendered immense services to the revolution by creating great political centralisation in their respective countries” (Archives Bakounine, par A. Lehning, Vol. II, Leiden, 1965, p. 195).

587 The reference is to the so-called Doctors' Club, a Berlin group of Young Hegelians in which Marx had a prominent place. The Young Hegelians drew radical atheistic conclusions from Hegel's philosophy, but at the same time removed it from reality, turning it into a self-contained, determining force. In fact, the Young Hegelians were withdrawing more and more from practical revolutionary action.

Here and below, Bakunin made many inaccuracies when citing the facts of Marx's biography.

588 This refers to “The Free” (Die Freien)—a Berlin group of Left Hegelians which was formed in the first half of the 1840s and included Edgar Bauer, Max Stirner and others. Marx gave a highly negative assessment of the actions of “The Free” and of their empty abstract criticism.

589 See Note 378.

590 A reference to the Communist League—the first German and international communist organisation of the proletariat formed under the leadership of Marx and Engels in London early in June 1847 as a result of the reorganisation of the League of the Just (see Note 220). The League's members took an active

Duchy of Warsaw on Polish territory seized by Prussia during the partitions of Poland at the end of the 18th century, and planned to use it as an advanced post in the event of war with Russia.

591 Charles Thomas Young, a native of Suffolk, was employed in the employ of the English company. He had to renounce its rights to Schleswig and Holstein (see Note 527).

592 The digging of the Kiel Canal, the project of which was first mentioned in the press in the 1870s, began in 1887. The opening took place on June 20, 1895.

593 The Paris Treaty—the peace treaty that concluded the Crimean war (1853-56) (see Note 19). It was signed by Austria, Britain, France, Prussia, Sardinia and Turkey, on the one hand, and Russia on the other, at the Congress of Paris on March 30, 1856. Under the treaty, Russia ceded the mouth of the Danube and part of Bessarabia, renounced its protectorate over the Danubian Principalities and its protection of Christians in Turkey, agreed to the neutralisation of the Black Sea (involving the closure of the Straits to foreign warships and a ban on Russian and Turkish navies and naval arsenals on the Black Sea), and returned the fortress of Kars to Turkey in exchange for Sebastopol and other Russian towns held by the Allies.

594 A reference to the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (see Note 94).

595 The reference is to the events of the Anglo-French-Chinese war of 1856-60 (Second Opium War). In August 1860 Anglo-French troops captured Tientsin and in October 1860 Peking. The Chinese government was forced to sign new, very damaging treaties with Britain and France in 1860. The war was an important step towards turning China into a semi-colony.

596 Preparing for a war with Austria (see Note 5), in the autumn of 1865 in Bialitz Bismarck managed to extract a promise of French neutrality in the war from Napoleon III in exchange for raising no objections to the incorporation of Luxembourg into the French Empire. Bismarck did not keep his promise.

597 The reference is to the treaties of Tilsit—peace treaties signed on July 7 and 9, 1807 by Napoleonic France, and Russia and Prussia, members of the fourth anti-French coalition. In an attempt to split defeated powers, Napoleon made no territorial claims on Russia and even succeeded in transferring some of the Prussian monarchy's eastern lands to Russia. The treaty imposed harsh terms on Prussia, which lost nearly half its territory to the German states dependent on France, was made to pay indemnities and had its army reduced. However, Russia, like Prussia, had to break its alliance with Britain and, to its disadvantage, join Napoleon's Continental System. Napoleon formed the vassal
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part in the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany in 1848-49. In 1849 and 1850, after the defeat of the revolution, it was reorganised and continued its activities. In the summer of 1850 disagreements arose between the supporters of Marx and Engels and the sectarian Willich-Schapper group, which ended in a split within the League. Owing to police persecutions and arrests of League members in May 1851, the activities of the Communist League as an organisation practically ceased in Germany. On November 17, 1852, on a motion by Marx, the London District announced the dissolution of the League. The Communist League played an important historical role as the first proletarian party based on the principles of scientific communism, as a school of proletarian revolutionaries, and as the historical forerunner of the International Working Men's Association.

Marx moved to Brussels on February 3, 1845, after the French government had expelled him from Paris by the decree of January 16, 1845. At that time, Engels was in Barmen and joined Marx in Brussels on April 5, 1845.

In the note to the Preface to the first German edition of Volume One of Capital Marx wrote: "This is the more necessary, as even the section of Ferdinand Lassalle's work against Schulze-Delitzsch, in which he professes to give 'the intellectual quintessence' of my explanations on these subjects, contains important mistakes. If Ferdinand Lassalle has borrowed almost literally from my writings, and without any acknowledgement, all the general theoretical propositions in his economic works, e.g., those on the historical character of capital, on the connexion between the conditions of production and the mode of production, &c. &c. even to the terminology created by me, this may perhaps be due to purposes of propaganda. I am here, of course, not speaking of his detailed working out and application of these propositions, with which I have nothing to do" (see present edition, Vol. 35).


The Nuremberg Congress (see Note 549) sent a delegation to the conference of the People's Party (see Note 99), which took place on September 19-20, 1868 in Stuttgart and declared the Party's support for the Nuremberg programme.

The second congress of the League of Peace and Freedom was held on September 21-25, 1868 in Berne.

The reference is to the resolution on the League of Peace and Freedom adopted by the Brussels Congress of the International on September 12, 1868 in connection with the League's invitation to attend its congress in Berne in September 1868. The invitation was sent to the International on the initiative of Bakunin, who, being a member of the League's Central Committee, sought to establish his authority over the International Working Men's Association (see The General Council of the First International, 1868-1870. Minutes, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, pp. 297-98).