

Jean-Numa Ducange

Friedrich Engels and the first steps of the French socialist movement (1891–1895)*

The last years of Engels's life are also those in the course of which French socialism became a large-scale force. Obviously there have existed socialists and forms of socialism in France since the 1830s. However, after the creation of the first French Workers' Party (1879–1882), political socialism made some decisive steps at the beginning of the 90s. Paul Lafargue, Marx's son in law, was elected to parliament to represent Lille from 1891–1893. In 1893 socialist members made a very noticeable entry into the national Assembly: Jean Jaurès, hitherto a moderate republican was elected, for the first time on the basis of a socialist programme while Jules Guesde, one of the principle men to introduce Marxism to France¹ began his first term of office representing Roubaix, an industrial town in the North of France. At that time there was no united socialist party (this remained the case till 1905) but despite these divisions the influence of socialism was growing. Above all, unlike Marx, Engels lived through that decisive period of French history that saw the setting up of republican institutions, some of which are still, today, central to the French political system.

Fredrick Engels's assessments of French socialism have already been studied by several researchers, in particular the important contributions of one of Jacques Texier, the founders of the French journal *Actuel Marx*.² However, the recent publication by MEGA² of all of his letters between 1891 and 1895 now enable some new approaches that we are putting forward in this article.³

* First publication in Chinese language in "Marxismus and Reality" (CCTB / Beijing), Vol. 5, 2015, p. 16–22.

¹ He co-drafted the preamble to the Workers' Party programme at the advice of Marx himself. On Guesde and guesdism, see the works of Claude Willard. A new biography of Jules Guesde with a development on guesdism and Marxism will be published in 2016.

² Jacques Texier, *Révolution et démocratie chez Marx et Engels*, Paris, PUF / Actuel Marx, 1998. See the works of Claude Mainfroy too (*Marx, Engels et la Troisième République*, Paris, Éditions Sociales, 1984).

³ *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe. Werke, Artikel, Entwürfe. März 1891 bis August 1895*, vol. I/32, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 2010. Now MEGA² in this article.

We will have in mind the recent historiography of the French 3rd Republic, particularly studies over the last two years in the context of the French competitive examination for the “Agrégation”, which qualifies future teachers in French (The Syllabus 2014–2016: “Republic, citizenship and democracy in France 1789–1899”⁴). One of the principle problems raised by this syllabus is how to understand why and how the Republic and the republican tradition finally imposed themselves in France at the end of the 19th Century and in what way.

The place of Engels’s writings on France’s political evolution

Between 1891 and 1895 Engels writes several prefaces and short articles with the objective of spreading and popularising his and Marx’s theses on the European socialist movement. In this context, France has an especially important place. In the volume published by MEGA², the first and last articles signed by Engels are largely devoted to France and its revolutionary history. In both cases they are prefaces to a work by Karl Marx: in 1891, a preface to *The Civil War in France* and in 1895 a preface to *Class Struggles in France 1848–1850*. In his correspondence with Paul and Laura Lafarge, French political evolution has an essential place. The questioning about France, its revolutionary struggles and the new Republic proclaimed in 1870 is fundamental. Engels, like Marx, has a considerable mastery of the French language, which they use, most of the time with other Latin counties — Engels wrote the prefaces for the Italian and Spanish editions in French. He also published articles aimed at the French socialist movement in Molière’s language.

On several occasions Engels reiterated the extent that France’s revolutionary and Napoleonic period (1789–1815) showed the way of capitalism’s development in the 19th Century, not only in France’s case but that of many other countries. A significant example is his introduction to the English edition (1892) of *Socialism, utopian and scientific*, where he develops it with particular clarity : “In France the Revolution constituted a complete breach with the tradition of the past ; it cleared out the very last vestiges of feudalism, and created in the « Code Civil » a masterly adaption of the old Roman law — that almost perfect expression of the juridical relations corresponding to the economic stage called by Marx the production of commodities — to modern capitalist conditions ; masterly that this French

⁴ See especially Louis Hincker (dir.), *Citoyenneté, République, démocratie en France, 1789–1899*, Neuilly, Atlande, 2014.

revolutionary code still serves as a model for reforms of the law of property in all other countries, not excepting England.”⁵

Engels regularly refers to France’s revolutionary past, even for describing the political means that could be used by German Social-democrats in the event of a Franco-Russian alliance against Germany. In the fragment of an interview to the newspaper *l’Éclair*⁶ Engels stated: “And if France and Russia in alliance attacked Germany, the latter would defend to the death its national existence, in which the German socialists have an even greater interest than the bourgeoisie. The socialists, then, would fight to the last man, and would not hesitate to resort to the revolutionary means employed by France in 1793.”⁷

In the published version of the interview, he insisted, he uses a revolutionary vocabulary that recalls the very French context of 1870, since he evokes the fact of having to defend “*its national existence to the very limit (à outrance)*” — a vocabulary that Engels, a close observer of the 1870 war knew very well — at the time they talked about fighting a war “*to the very limit*” (*à outrance*) against the Prussian occupier.

At the same time Engels could be very severe about a Republic hit by financial scandals, like the Panama scandal regarding the corruption of French leading politicians. He then was unsparing in his criticism, in a new article published in 1893 about the “opportunistisch-radikalen Bourgeoisrepublik”.⁸

It should be noted here that Engels was not only concerned about theoretical issues but also wrote many contributions on immediate political issues. This had long been the case, as is shown by his considerable correspondence with the Lafargue. Engels also identified certain structural features of French politics like the “neo-bonapartism” and the French people’s temptation look for a supreme saviour showed by several political crises, particularly the Boulanger crisis. (In 1889, the former War Minister, Boulanger, had attempted to carry out a coup d’état against the Republic, backed by the extreme right.⁹) Engels firmly condemned those French socialist (at that time very weakly based) who might have seen there an opportunity of developing a proletarian revolution. This crisis in particular led to him making very harsh sentences on the Parisian people being so tempted by a new Bonaparte — all the more severe as it meant he considered the

⁵ MEGA² I/32, p. 407.

⁶ Cf., p. 70.

⁷ Cf., p. 70. In English: Marx Engels Collected Works (MECW), vol. 27, p. 537–538.

⁸ “Zum jüngsten Pariser Polizeistreich”, *Vorwärts*, 13 January 1893. Cf., p. 196.

⁹ Letter to Laura Lafargue of June 1888, See Claude Mainfroy, *op. cit.*, p. 207, 218.

French people had shown themselves worth of their great revolutionary history.

Engels' assessment of the consolidation of the Republic in France

His admiration for the revolutionary past goes alongside a certain disappointment regarding French politics of his time. We will now dwell on an essential historic issue : why and how the republicans asserted their rule in France and how Engels assessed this most important historic fact? We should briefly recall a few historical factors: in 1870 the Republic was proclaimed, in 1871 the Commune insurrection was crushed, a monarchist majority emerged and it was only in 1879 that a clear republican majority took shape. The Republic was then confronted by many political scandals and crises between 1880 and 1890, making possible the overthrow of the regime.

Prior to 1891 there is a constant theme in Engels's writings, as in Marx's: the form of the Republic (in France as in Germany) is the most suited to class struggle because it makes class antagonisms appear more clearly. It is thus the framework in which bourgeoisie and proletariat can best confront one another. However, in certain articles it seems that he is little concerned with the difference between Republic and monarchy. For example in an article in *Volksstaat* of 15 January 1873, he states: "With their customary superficiality, the French squabble about mere *forms*, such as republic and monarchy."¹⁰ However, in 1873 the Republic was being run by a very conservative and anti-republican majority. The Republic seemed to have become an empty word, almost a farce, so it was logical of Engels to consider this fight over the political form as quite secondary.

Nevertheless Engels rapidly showed himself aware of the progressive political upheavals affecting the majority of the French people — that is the peasantry. "And then again, the debonapartisation and republicanisation of the peasants, which is now in full swing, is another tremendous gain."¹¹ Similarly, during the 1877 crisis that shows the possibility of a restoration of the Monarchy: "It was thus another proof of the high instinctive political intelligence of the French working class, that as soon as, on the 16th May last, the great conspiracy of the three Monarchist factions declared war against the Republic, the workmen, one and all, proclaimed the maintenance of the Republic to be their chief immediate object."¹² In the same spirit, Engels

¹⁰ The crisis in Prussia, MECW 23, p. 400.

¹¹ Engels to Becker, 11 January 1878, MECW 45, p. 295.

¹² The Workingmen of Europe in 1877, MECW 24, p. 223.

came to consider that the weight of the socialists as an important factor. In a letter dated 1886, he considered that: “the French parliamentary workers’ party is a great historic event and a great stroke of luck for Germany”.¹³

Between 1891 and 1895 Engels deepened his thinking on the subject. In his preface to *The Civil War in France*, as in many previous writings, he vigorously reaffirmed the class character of the State: “In reality, however, the state is nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and indeed in the democratic republic no less than in the monarchy”. At the same time, in his *Critique of the Erfurt programme* (written in 1891 but published in 1901) Engels clearly considered the Republic as being, nevertheless, a more advanced form: “In my view, the proletariat can only use the form of the one and indivisible republic.”¹⁴ In particular, he refines his comments: he considers that the centralised bonapartist state prolongs the monarchist tradition, whereas the experience of the First Republic (1792–1788) showed that it was possible to develop the autonomy of the commune against the State.

Engels completed this re-assessment by republishing Marx’s writing on the Paris Commune. The First Republic developed non-authoritarian and decentralised forms of democracy, in which he saw the forerunner of the “dictatorship of the proletariat”. The French researchers Claude Mainfroy and Jacques Texier, have pointed out the importance of this “correction” of Marx’s position in the *18 Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, where he considered, as did Tocqueville, that the Revolution and the Empire had consolidated the growth of the monarchical State then that of the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, Engels never published another article defining exactly this change of perspective, but it is evident that he became more complex in his assessment of the French revolutionary tradition whose origins (1792–1798) appeared more positive to him.

The political evolution of the Third Republic probably pushed him to go further in this direction. Reading his correspondence shows this fairly clearly. It is true that he remains concerned about the danger of socialism becoming dissolved in bourgeois republicanism. Thus, in a letter to Victor Adler on 17 July 1894 he wrote: “I further told them (the French Socialists) that, though fusion rather than a mere alliance with the new Socialists might be their inevitable fate, they should bear in mind the possibility of there being

¹³ Engels to Bernstein, 24 February 1886, MECW 47, p. 414.

¹⁴ A Critique of the Draft Social-Democratic Programme of 1891, MECW 27, p. 219.

bourgeois elements amongst the latter and that this might involve them in a conflict over principles, in which case a split might become inevitable.”¹⁵

However, a few months later, in 19 January 1895 he expresses to Laura Lafarge his confidence in the French socialist members of parliament: “Anyhow our 50 French Socialist members are in luck. In less than 18 months they have upset three ministries and one president. That shows what a Socialist minority can do in a parliament which, like the French or English, is the really supreme power in the country. A similar power our men in Germany can get by a revolution only.”¹⁶

Evidently Engels does not address the Germans in the same way as the French, with whom he follows different strategic objectives. While he does not make any precise definition of the role of parliamentarianism in the labour movement, everything seems to show a greater recognition of the parliamentary and electoral game — a development that is still more sharp in his famous last article or “legacy” the 1895 introduction to *Class Struggles in France*, to which we will return in the last part of this article.¹⁷

It thus appears that the republican gains, strongly emphasised by French historians today, despite its inadequacies on certain subject (particularly on the colonial question) have indeed contributed to redefining Engels’s strategic and political perspectives. Did he, for all that, renounce the avenue of revolutionary breach in favour of a stage-wise perspective of reaching socialism? This brings us to the heart of a decisive discussion for understanding the different forms of socialism from Engels time to our days. However, first of all a detour is needed regarding Engels’s a major struggle over this period: the spread and rooting of Marxism in Europe.

The issue of the penetration and popularising of Marxism in France

Who were the people who read Engels’s writings over this period in France and what influence did they have? Too often the specialists on Marxism have neglected this question by offering very internal studies of the texts in question.

First of all, (and this is an important contribution of the texts collected in the MEGA²) we must note the quantity of Marx’s writing translated and into French and re-read and corrected by Engels himself. This is the case, for example of *Ludwig Feuerbach and the end of classical German philosophy*,

¹⁵ F. Engels to V. Adler, 17 July 1894, MECW 50, p. 326.

¹⁶ F. Engels to Lafargue, 19 January 1895, MECW 50, p. 424.

¹⁷ See Georges Labica (ed.), *Friedrich Engels. Savant et révolutionnaire*, Paris, PUF, 1998.

amongst others. It is not the effort of spreading but also the care of the translation that is so striking.

Many researchers have insisted on the poverty of French Marxism at that period, sometimes described as an “unfindable Marxism”.¹⁸ Indeed, Engels himself is often dissatisfied at the attitude of some of his French allies. However, this should be qualified by the fact that Engels considered that a character like Jules Guesde enabled the socialist cause to advance in France. On the other hand, even though we would have to wait till the 1920–1930 years before Engels’s writing were really well distributed in France, a careful study will show that, nevertheless many writings were translated in that period.¹⁹ Just limiting ourselves to the years 1891–1895 we can note the following (see at the end of our article).

Clearly, this does not mean that these articles were very widely read or distributed by the French Marxists. Moreover we must understand whom we consider “Marxists”. Georges Labica points out that in the entry devoted to the term “Marxism” in the *Dictionnaire critique du marxisme*²⁰ (*Critical Dictionary of Marxism*) the best article on the history of this famous and controversial word “Marxism” was that by the historian Georges Haupt, “Regarding Marx and Marxism”. Certain aspects of the article are a bit dated today, but he proposes a historic reading based on some often-neglected criteria.²¹ Georges Haupt prompted us to grasp the history of the use of the term “Marxism” in a given political context: what it described at the moment it appeared and how it is echoed by a wide public — that is beyond just the theoretical discussions between theoreticians. To sum up, he prompts us to understand its penetration (real or not) on a wider scale. This “Marxism” is very much linked to a work that was famous in its time, Fredrick Engels’s *Anti-Dühring*, published for the first time in 1878, significant extracts of which were translated into French during the period we are considering. The aim of this work was to gather in a few simple formulae a kind of Marxist handbook, by proposing a simplified and systematic dialectic, suitable for use by activists. Thus the “Marxism” of political parties is a historical, whose poverty in many aspects is easily shown. However, as a central reference

¹⁸ Daniel Lindenbergh, *Le marxisme introuvable*, Paris, 10/18, 1975.

¹⁹ Jean-Numa Ducange, Julien Hage (ed.), *Le Parti communiste français et le livre*, Dijon, EUD, 2014.

²⁰ Georges Labica et Gérard Bensussan (dir.), *Dictionnaire critique du marxisme*, Paris, PUF, 1982, p. 561–564.

²¹ Georges Haupt, “De Marx au marxisme”, in Georges Haupt, *L'historien et le mouvement social*, Paris, Maspero, 1980, p. 77–108.

point of a political party it plays a specific role that must be understood to more fully understand its spread in the political and social environment in which it evolved. The Australian historian Robert Stuart, in several of his works including *Marxism at work*, studied some elements of this aspect of French Marxism.²² For our part, we have been inspired by this method to understand the birth of Marxism in France through a biography being prepared of the historical figure of Jules Guesde. The importance must be stressed of the reviews published and the lectures given in the context of political education, the little pamphlets and workers almanacs (in which, as is well shown by the texts collected by MEGA, Engels regularly published short articles aimed at activists). All kinds of printed matter, however brief, which showed a certain view of the world influenced by Marxism were distributed (for example a “class-based” reading of social and political relations that stress the central role of class struggle or about the mechanism for extracting capitalist surplus value) and were an important factor in the history of socialism in the 1890s. This does not mean that the works of Marx and Engels were well known and read, but a whole series of formulae, quotations and summaries enabled the socialist activists, sympathisers and fringe groups to grasp some rudiments of Marxism. Engels unquestionably contributed to this during that period.

It should be noted that certain specific features of “French style” Marxism were able to develop in opposition to Engels views, for example on the agrarian question. For Engels in 1894, smallholding “were irreparably doomed to perish”²³ and the position of the French socialists regarding small peasant ownership was a political mistake. However, on this issue Engels seems to have incorrectly assessed the development of French capitalism, since this did not cause the disappearance of small-scale peasant ownership and its defence was to be the subject of important political debate in France. The tradition of the defence of small peasant ownership was to be a constant characteristic of the French socialist and communist movement, which provoked many controversies with the supporters of collectivisation of the land, on the soviet model.

²² Robert Stuart, *Marxism at Work. Ideology, Class and French Socialism during the Third Republic*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. *Marxism and national Identity: Socialism, Nationalism, and national Socialism during the French fin de siècle*, New York, New York University Press, 2006.

²³ The Peasant Question in France and Germany, *Marx Engels Selected works*, vol. 3, p. 462.

Putting the theories of Engels's old age in the perspective of the history of Marxism

This last remark prompts me to make a few remarks about the history and legacy of Engels's writing in the history of Marxism. The will, in fact enable us to understand the development of Marxist studies inspired by his last writings.

Regarding the evolution of French politics, Engels hesitated between the defence and even admiration of the gains republican France, to which a major part of the French people and workers were attached, and the fear that the identity of socialism might be dissolved in bourgeois republicanism. His closest friends, Guesde and Lafargue were themselves very hostile to the moderate republicans, but their sectarianism and adventurism was sometimes harshly criticised by Engels. His hesitations are most important for an understanding of the later history of Marxism. For example, in a quite different context, the history of the Communist movement in the 20th Century was riddled with the same hesitations. In France the Communist Party was, at first, very hostile to the Third Republic, particularly in the 1924–35 period. However, in the Popular Front period (1935–38), faced with fascism, it revived the tradition of taking the republican assets into account.²⁴

The same applies to the Germans and the defence of the legacy of the French Revolution, a favorite theme with Engels. In 1913, when the German Reich authorities celebrated the Leipzig “Battle of the Nations” (1813, the German uprising against the French occupation) as an essential moment in the history of the German nation, the German Social-democrats, many of whom had been very close to Engels, hesitated about the meaning to give to this celebration. On the one hand it was impossible not to pay tribute to the 1813 popular uprising, yet on the other hand Napoleon's occupation had enabled the ground to be cleared to enable the economic and eventual political development of Germany. Moreover, condemnation of Napoleon often led to that of the French revolutionary tradition to which many German Marxists were attached.

Engels's last article, the introduction to the *Class Struggles in France 1848–50* was cited for decades after as his “political legacy”. It has aroused many controversies, especially in Germany, but puts forward certain aspects of the French revolutionary tradition. Some have seen in it a forecast of

²⁴ See Jean Vigreux, *Le Front Populaire*, Paris, PUF, 2011. On French Revolution, Republican tradition and the communist movement see: Jean-Numa Ducange, *La Révolution française et l'histoire du monde*, Paris, Armand Colin, 2014.

political reformism, like Edouard Bernstein and Jean Jaurès. Was Engels giving up his definition of the State as a class state to see it as an area of class confrontation? Some major contributions to Western Marxism have stressed this aspect, contrasting an “old man Engels” with a more revolutionary Marx.

Many commentators make Friedrich Engels the *de facto* source of social-democratic reformism. Others have stressed the very circumstantial context of this article by Engels, especially as the original text was only published long after his death. Its separate volume of “critical apparatus”, the authors of MEGA² rightly insists that Engels himself had no intention of making it his “legacy”, that he was working on a number of other projects alongside it. The preface is linked to Western European political evolution — in particular for strengthening the German Social-democratic Party in a legal context — rather than a deliberate “legacy”.

What conclusion can we draw from this introduction, published in 1895, for the history of Marxism? While many commentators cite this article in isolation, the assessments it contains must be strictly seen in the context of the situation, and seen in relation to his other articles on France. In fact, taken as a whole, it is not possible to recommend revolution and an insurrectional approach in all circumstances. Obviously the evolution of the German policies weighed on it. However, his assessment of French politics also led him to this recognition, since Engels recognised the success of the French Third Republic and the necessities this imposed on the socialist movement in this new context.

Nevertheless, Engels does not recommend a simple social-democratic path: he never abandons ideological struggle or the spreading of Marxist articles to analyse history or present situation. This is even one of his primary tasks. While maintaining his faith in marxist analyses, Engels thinks that the new developments in the labour movement will not necessarily go through an insurrectionary and violent route as in the past. Engels did not here invent a social-democratic way or declare himself, after his death, to be anti-marxist and anti-communist. In fact he updates marxist analysis and policy. By insisting on the long term struggle, on the necessity to capture partial positions in the parliamentary or semi-parliamentary political context and in the State machinery, Engels opens an avenue of reflection that others will develop still further. Authors as varied as Karl Kautsky, Jean Jaurès, Otto Bauer, Antonio Gramsci or Nicos Poulantzas. This could certainly be extended by studying the thinking of the “euro-communist” parties or else the changes at work in the “Chinese style” socialism since the end of the 70s. Evidently each author

would deserve to be developed in his own context. We are here limiting ourselves to outlining a few lines of reflection.

Let's start with Karl Kautsky, very much influenced by Engels and one of his closest political associates. Kautsky published a very important book, *Parliamentarianism and Socialism* the first german edition of which appeared in 1893. In this, the importance of the Parliamentary question is developed as against the inadequacies of direct democracy, which was then being advocated by some activists. This article is rarely cited, even though it is exactly contemporary with the articles by Engels that we have just been studying. It shows the integration of marxist thinking and the question of institutions born of the french republican tradition and the contradictory role of the State, even in a capitalist regime. Kautsky was also to develop this following on the *Critique of the Erfurt Programme* (published in 1901) in a series of articles on "Republic and Social-democracy", in which he makes a distinction between the First and Third French Republic.²⁵ Despite their divergent assessments, the French Socialist Jean Jaurès, one of the key men in the unification of the socialists in 1905, developed similar themes, also based on Engels's last article. The historian Jean-Paul Scot recently stressed Jaurès's "revolutionary reformism", partly based on Engels, which cannot be reduced to the usual "reform/revolution" cleavage, as it was defined for a long time following the Russian Revolution of 1917.²⁶

Twenty years later, one of the principal leaders of the Austrian Social-democrats, Otto Bauer, took up similar themes. In the 1926 Linz programme, there is still an explicit reference to the "dictatorship of the proletariat", whereas most Social-democrats had dropped it, but in a sense close to that of Engels in the period 1891–95 — that is, taking into account the new realities created by a republican context with democratic progress.

In the same period, the communist theoretician Antonio Gramsci developed his concept of "hegemony", drawing his sources from deep and ancient reflection on the means for revolution and the passage to socialism in a semi-developed capitalist country like Italy. Forty years later the French-speaking Greek Communist Nicos Poulantzas's theoretical reformulation took up the same themes and extended Gramsci's in *State, Power and Socialism* (1978). In a context of Marxist crisis in Europe, where, in the words of the Italian Communist leader of the time Enrico Berlinguer, the driving force of the 1917

²⁵ Karl Kautsky, *Republik und Sozial-demokratie in Frankreich*, Neue Zeit, Jg. 23 (1904–05), I. Bd., Nr. 9–15.

²⁶ Jean-Paul Scot, *Jean Jaurès, le réformisme révolutionnaire*, Paris, Seuil, 2014.

October revolution seemed exhausted, Poulantzas sought to reformulate an ambitious theory of the State inspired by the earlier thoughts of Engels, combining forms of democratic control and partial conquests. As a recent republication of *State, Power and Socialism* stresses, “revolution has ceased to be synonymous with an armed confrontation with the State”,²⁷ which is considered to be a strategic field of struggle as a whole and not a block to be unilaterally destroyed.

Today Nicos Poulantzas and Antonio Gramsci are again discussed in radical left circles, especially in Europe and Latin America, for thinking of alternatives to capitalism. Thus, while conditions in the 21st Century are radically different from Engels’s times, each generation of Marxists has taken up his final intuitions of the period 1891–95, which were formulated in the light of the specific situation in France at the time.

Our historical genealogy has tried to show the importance of these writings, which still provide important theoretical tools for thinking of the transition to socialism.

Author: Ass. Prof. Jean-Numa Ducange, Université de Rouen, UFR LSH,
Département d'histoire, Bâtiment Robespierre, Rue Lavoisier,
76821 Mont-Saint Aignan cedex, Frankreich.
E-Mail: jean-numa.ducange@univ-rouen.fr

²⁷ Nicos Poulantzas, *État, pouvoir et socialisme*, Paris, Les Prairies ordinaires, 2013, p. 30.

Appendix: list of the key texts of Marx and Engels published in France 1891–1895

- Marx, *Le 18 Brumaire de Louis Bonaparte* (1891, in the newspaper *Le socialiste* then a book : Imprimerie ouvrière).
- Engels, « Capital et salaire^o » (1891, *Le socialiste* et 1892, *Almanach de la question sociale et de la libre pensée*).
- Engels, « Le socialisme en Allemagne » (1891, *Almanach du Parti ouvrier*)
- Engels, « L'anarchie. Entrevue avec le socialiste allemand Engels » (6 avril 1892, *L'Éclair*).
- Engels, « Trois grandes batailles de la bourgeoisie contre la féodalité » (*Le socialiste*, 4–11–25 december 1892 translation and extract from the preface of *Socialism : utopian and scientific*)
- Engels, « Conversation avec Frédéric Engels », (*Le Figaro*, then in *Le socialiste*, 20 mai 1893)
- Engels, « F. Engels et les élections allemandes. Interview publié par le *Daily Chronicle* » (*Le socialiste*, 15 juillet 1893).
- Engels, « Barbarie et civilisation » (*L'Ère nouvelle*, 1 juillet 1893 then a new publication as book ; it's the last chapter of *L'origine de la famille, de la propriété privée et de l'État* published the same year by éditions G. Carré). « Origine et développement de l'État athénien » (*L'Ère nouvelle*, 1^{er} août 1893, chapter V of the same book).
- Marx, *Le Capital* (extracts selected by Paul Lafargue, Guillaumin, 1894).
- Engels, *Ludwig Feuerbach et la fin de la philosophie classique allemande* (*L'Ère nouvelle*, avril–mai 1894).
- Marx, « Discours sur la question du libre-échange » (*L'Ère nouvelle*, juin 1894, then in *Le Socialiste*, 23 juin–7 juillet 1894).
- Marx, « Une lettre de Karl Marx. Remarques critiques sur le programme socialiste » (*Revue d'économie politique*, T. VIII, septembre–octobre 1893). First translation of *Critique du programme de Gotha*.
- Marx, Engels, *Manifeste du Parti communiste* (*Ère nouvelle*, 1895. First publication as a book)
- Engels, « Contribution à l'histoire du christianisme primitif » (*Le Devenir social*, avril–mai 1895).
- Marx, *Critique de la philosophie du droit de Hegel* (*Le Devenir social*, septembre 1895 then as a book : Giard et Brière 1895).
- Engels, « Complément et supplément au III^e livre du *Capital* » (*Le Devenir social*, novembre 1895).
- Engels, « Préface aux *Luttes de classes en France* de K. Marx » (*La jeunesse socialiste*, juillet 1895)
- Engels, « Extrait du *Livre III* du *Capital* » (*La jeunesse socialiste*, juillet–août 1895).

