REPORT OF THE FRENCH DELEGATES TO THE GENEVA CONGRESS. (1866)

———

PREFACE.

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

I
PREAMBLE

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

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

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

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

The Democracy has so far been continually defeated. From 89 to 1800, the bourgeoisie has made in its ranks, by strokes of decrees, saber or cannon, large gaps that the wars of the Empire have certainly not filled. The Restoration has never claimed the title of popular government. 1830 arrives! New failure. Under the July monarchy, each levy of shields ends with a catastrophe. Labor stirs again, with regard to parliamentary reform; February finds it on its feet, demanding, with great shouts, its emancipation. Determined to make any sacrifice, it offers to the Republic three months of misery; then, rightly or not, it

thinks it perceives that it is being chloroformed, cajoled; it wants something other than speeches; obtaining nothing, it rises, and affirms, five or six time, his sovereignty; finally, from shock to shock, from fall to fall, massacred by the bourgeois republic, as it had been decimated by the monarchies, it falls, after fifty years of combats, in the most remarkable mystification... philanthropy!...

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

II
CAPITAL AND LABOR.

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

What is Labor? What is Capital?

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

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

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

What is capital?

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

Capital, finally, is accumulate labor!

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

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

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

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

Capital — say the partisans of interest — is one of the most active agents of production; with the aid capital, labor doubles, triples, even centuples its products; so it is just that the service rendered by the money-lender, a service that profits the laborer still more than the capitalist, either paid to the latter by

labor, and from that point of view, interest seems to the what is most just, most legitimate; to refuse it would be a denial of justice, a theft.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moreover, the consequences that carry off the productivity of capital, and the parasitism that it develops are so monstrous, that it would be impossible for us to hesitate. What! Can an individual have rendered enough service to society in 10, 20, 50, or even 100 years, to enable all the generations of his line to live in idleness? No! no! Every law that violates equality "of right" is a false law. Now, can we suppose that equality is possible with the idea of rents; is it possible to dream of a society of rentiers, — living on what?

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

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

We do not demand for that patronage, subvention, nor privilege; and we would be permitted to find it strange, when it is a question of interest on capital, that we go on and on constantly with arguments like these: Pay for the service demanded, or let it pass by if you can.

But your so-called service is only one of the faces of the question. When the Bank, thanks to the monopoly that has been conceded to it, issues bill that only have value by common guarantee, and which represent the enormous sum of 950 million for a reserve of around 300 millions, perhaps we do ourselves a service, but we believe by rendering them another at least equivalent by accepting and guaranteeing its values. Now, your "let it pass by" amounts purely and simply to this: You are free, — not to issue fiduciary values, — but to pay the interest on those issued by the capitalists. Derision!

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

III
INSTRUCTION, EDUCATION, FAMILY.

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

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

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

"Society profits first of all from the benefits of education; from which quite naturally fall to it the responsibility for creating, developing, and settle education."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Let the working class think of that!

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

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

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

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

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

"In a real democracy, in which each should have close at hand both higher and lower education, this scholastic hierarchy could not be allowed. It is a contradiction of the principle of society. As soon as education is confused with apprenticeship; when it consists, for theory, in the classification of ideas and, for practice, in the execution of labors; when it becomes at once a matter of speculation, labor and housework, it can no longer depend upon the State; it is incompatible with government. Let there be a central bureau of education, another of manufactures and arts, as there is now an Academy of Sciences and a Bureau des Longitudes. That can be done and we see no harm in it. But again, why is an authority needed for that? Why that intermediary between the student and the schoolroom, between the apprentice and the workshop, when it is not allowed between the workman and the employer."

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

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

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

Instruction by the State is logically, necessarily a uniform program, with the goal of forming all intelligences according to a single type, a type that will

necessarily be, by the very nature of the human mind, the negation of the social life, which is composed of struggles, contradictions, contrary affirmations; it will be immobility, atony, general atrophy, to the detriment of all.

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

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

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

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

This brings us back to the labor of women outside the family; some demand complete liberty on this point. If a woman believes herself fit to fulfill other functions that those we consider as natural, we will certainly refrain from imposing any constraint on her; but it is impossible for us to put the social

forces at the service of institutions that we consider immoral, the practice of which has given rise among contemporary women to maladies unknown to our grandmother, and that we can justifiably consider as one of the most active causes of the degeneration of the race.

The facts revealed in recent times about the mortality of the children handed over to these *businesswomen of breeding* that we call by the name of child-minders, come on this point to confirm what we advance here about the functions of women In the presence of such documents, what are we to say of the economic-philanthropic system that for fifty years has sought to take hold of the direction of the working classes, and not knowing how to react against such a state of things come to flatter us with regard to free and obligatory instruction?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OPINION OF THE MINORITY.
(Bourdon, Varlin.)

Finding ourselves in agreement on the obligation to be educated in a society where we profit each day from the insights of other; recognizing the necessity of education being at once scientific and professional, we are radically divided on

the means of spreading it: some maintain that this responsibility falls on the family; the others, that it must be borne by society.

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

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

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

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

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

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

That the mother directs his first step; that the father teaches him to hunt and gather the fruits with which he must nourish himself, and his education is complete. He can live freely and in conditions of complete equality with his fellows. The number of his brothers, even the loss of his parents would not be for him causes of inequality; the bit of demand for such an education is the guarantee that he will receive it from a strong being, whatever it may be. In the civilized state, it is something else: Man being created for enjoyments, that habit has transformed into needs, in order to satisfy them, he must produce, produce a great deal; muscular strength no longer suffices, he must put intelligence to work.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV

COOPERATION DISTINGUISHED FROM ASSOCIATION.

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

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

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

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

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

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

services, advantages, duties, etc., which they are in a position to obtain and to give to each, recognizing that they are perfectly independent, whether for their production, or for their consumption.

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

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

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

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

On the contrary, what makes up the essence of cooperation is that, thanks to free contract, the individuals are not only obliged synallagmatically and commutatively toward one another, but they also acquire by the pact, considerable quantity of rights and liberty without having to fear any infringement on their free initiative, which finds itself, on the contrary, increased by the quantity of efforts provided by each.

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

To this day *Association,* as it has been understood and practiced, has meant: Submission of the individual to the collectivity leading almost unerringly to the destruction of liberty and individual initiative; — *Cooperation* means: Contract freely consented to, with a unique aim, determined and defined in

advance. In *Association,* the general interest was the higher principle before which the individual bows; in *Cooperation,* it is the collectivity that is organized, in view of furnishing he individual all the means of increasing their liberty of action, to develop their individual initiative.

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

V
UNEMPLOYMENT, STRIKES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To establish exchange on the basis of reciprocity.

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

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

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

VI
TAXATION

> You set apart for the Lord all that opens the womb of the mother, all the first-born of your livestock, and you consecrate to the Lord all

> the first-born males that you have.... And you purchase with money all the first-born of your children.
>
> (Exodus, chapter XIII, v. 12 and 13.)

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

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

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

These principles are generally recognized, but the practice is far from being in agreement with the theory. If we must believe Mr. de Parieu, “the social order would be inverted and the peoples are not slow to perish of their own excesses, without a series of restrictive, repressive or preventive measures, among which it is appropriate to place taxation,” and he adds that “the artifices that steal

from the majority of the citizens the exact figure of the taxes that they pay does not cease for long to be licit and to hold, as it were, a beneficial anesthesia...." That would be the affirmation of our incompetence, and we would have thought ourselves authorized, by universal suffrage, to consider ourselves adults.

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

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

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

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

VII
THE PERMANENT ARMIES CONSIDERED IN THEIR RELATIONS WITH PRODUCTION.

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

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

Employ these same men to destroy each other and to plunder the products of the peaceful laborers, it is doubly harmful, triply harmful to production. And I it was necessary to hold to the study of the direct relations of the armies with that same production, there would have to be joined to the facts pronounced above the statistics of he unproductive expenses necessitated by the upkeep of

the soldiers, and all will be said. But to instruct the people, to make them ethical, is to stimulate labor and increase the sum of collective well-being, and it is from that point of view that it is especially suitable to envision the permanent armies. The *International Association* only has to subscribe to the protestations that we have at all times addressed to the people, in order to proclaim the condemnation of the system.

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

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

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

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

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

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

VIII
FREE EXCHANGE. —COMMERCIAL TREATIES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

nation—what interest do we have in seeing either protection or free trade triumph?

What we want is the freedom to organize equal exchange among producers, service for service, labor for labor, credit for credit. In all commercial speculation, one of the two contracting parties has lost what the other has gained, it is the state of war. It is up to us to organize peace in industry by the gradual suppression of the random chances of commerce, by cooperation, which, based on reciprocity and justice, can only allow, between the contracting parties, a mutual exchange of equivalent services.

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

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

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

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

X
OF THE RECONSTITUTION OF POLAND.

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

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

APPENDIX.

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

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

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

———

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

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

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

[Working translation by Shawn P. Wilbur]